

Role of Word of Mouth Communication in North Cyprus: Painkillers and Dermocosmetics Products

Çağlar Akgül

Submitted to the
Institute of Graduate Studies and Research
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Master of Arts
in
Communication and Media Studies

Eastern Mediterranean University
February 2015
Gazimağusa, North Cyprus

Approval of the Institute of Graduate Studies and Research

Prof. Dr. Serhan iftioęlu
Acting Director

I certify that this thesis satisfies the requirements as a thesis for the degree of Master in Communication and Media Studies.

Prof. Dr. Sleyman İrvan
Chair, Faculty of Communication and Media Studies

We certify that we have read this thesis and that in our opinion it is fully adequate in scope and quality as a thesis for degree of Master of Arts.

Asst. Prof. Dr. Anıl Kemal Kaya
Supervisor

Examining Committee

1. Assoc. Prof. Dr. Agah Gmş

2. Assoc. Prof. Dr. Bahire zad

3. Asst. Prof. Dr. Anıl Kemal Kaya

ABSTRACT

There are numerous companies in the global market who are in the same sector and competing with each other; they are offering almost similar products or services while they are reaching their customers. In the medical sector it is clearly considered that companies are producing too many medicines and derma-cosmetic products on the market and they are offering similar features and benefit products for their patients.

The aim of this research is to contribute to the literature about Word of Mouth (WOM), which has a great impact in the medical sector especially in developing countries. As TRNC is a small semi-island, people rely more on word of mouth communication than any other promotional mixed elements. Thus, this research explores “The Importance of Word Of Mouth (WOM) Communication in the Medical Sector in the TRNC Market”. Therefore in this research Interpersonal Communication, Word of Mouth Communication and diffusion on innovation theory was used.

In this study, quantitative research, survey method was conducted as primary resources and it was limited only to the painkiller and derma-cosmetic products in Famagusta TRNC market.

Before collecting the accurate data 50 questionnaires were distributed as a pilot test and according to the feedback the pilot test questionnaire was renewed. Data

collection was done by 320 respondents in 15 different areas in Famagusta. There were 33 questions in the questionnaire and it was prepared as in-house to explore the study. According to research it seen that people who live in Famagusta 110 of the respondents (34.4%) are doing periodic check-up. Also the 212 of the respondents (66.3%) take care for their personal care. In addition to this when they have some headache 101 (31.6%) of claimed that they directly gets painkiller medicine. Also 148 of the respondents claimed that they use derma-cosmetic products when they need it and when they pass purchasing process quality is the first criteria that they look for then price and brand names comes next. On the other hand only 36 of the respondents claimed that they get influenced form advertising. Lastly 241 of the respondents claimed that no matter either positive or negative experience they share this information with their close group and use either positive or negative WOM communication.

Keywords: Word of Mouth (WOM), Derma-cosmetics products, Painkiller products.

ÖZ

Günümüzde küresel pazar alanında bir çok benzer ürünler farklı firmalar tarafından üretilmektedir. Bu benzer özellikteki ürün veya hizmetleri müşterilere sunarlar. Sağlık sektöründe bulunan firmalar çok fazla benzer özellikte medical ve dermo kozmetik ürünler üretip satmaktadırlar.

Bu araştırmanın amacı, ağızdan ağıza iletişimin sağlık sektöründeki etkilerini göstermeye çalışmaktır. Kuzey Kıbrıs Türk Cumhuriyeti küçük bir yarım ada'dır. Dolayısıyla insanlar yapılan promosyonlardan çok ağızdan ağıza yapılan iletişime güvenmektedir. Bu araştırma ile KKTC sağlık sektörü pazarında ağızdan ağıza iletişimin önemi açıklanmaktadır. Ayrıca bu araştırmada Ağızdan ağıza iletişim ve kişiler arası iletişim teorileri kullanılmıştır.

Bu araştırmada nitel araştırma anket teknikleri birincil kaynak olarak kullanıldı ve KKTC Gazimağusa sağlık sektöründeki ağrı kesici ve dermo kozmetik ürünler ile sınırlandırıldı. İlk olarak 50 farklı kişiye pilot anket uygulandı. Alınan bu bilgiler ışığında anket soruları geliştirilip son haline getirildi. Gazimağusa bölgesinde bulunan 15 ayrı yerden toplamda 320 kişi ile anket çalışması yapıldı. Bu araştırmayı yapmak için kişilere 33 farklı soru hazırlandı.

Bu araştırmaya göre Gazimağusa'da yaşayan 110 kişiden (%34,4) katılımcı yıllık rutin checkup yapar. Ayrıca 212 kişiden (%66,3) katılımcı kişisel bakımına önem verir. 101 katılımcı (%31,6) baş ağrısı his ettiğinde direk olarak ağrı kesici alırlar.

148 katılımcı derma kosmetik ürünü ihtiyaç duyduğunda kullanır ve kaliteye önem verirler fakat diğer 36 katılımcı reklamlardan etkilenirler. Son olarak 241 katılımcı ise olumlu ve olumsuz deneyimlerini diğer çevrelerindeki kişiler ile paylaşırlar.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Ağızdan Ağıza İletişim, Dermo kozmetik ürünler, Ağrı kesici ürünler.

To My Sisters **Çiğdem, Henna Su** and My Parents,

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

First of all I would like to mention my thanks and appreciation to the most important people in my life my parents Mr Hüseyin Akgül, Mrs Kerime Akgül and sweet siblings Miss Çiğdem Akgül and Henna Su Akgül for their moral and financial support throughout my study; I could not have done it without them.

I would also like to say thank you to my supervisor Assist. Prof. Dr. Anıl Kemal Kaya for his support and encouragement throughout my MA. program she was a great professor and friend.

Also a big thanks to the Eastern Mediterranean University Faculty of Communication and Media Studies Dean Prof. Dr Süleyman İrvan, academic members as Assoc. Prof. Dr. Nuten Kara, Assoc. Prof. Dr. Bahire Özad, Assoc.Prof. Dr. Agah Gümüş, Assoc. Prof. Dr. Hanife Alienfedioğlu and lecturer Ms. Umut Ayman.

Also, lastly I would like to thank Seniha Hassan, she has always given me motivation and support throughout my study.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | |
|---|------|
| ABSTRACT..... | iii |
| ÖZ..... | v |
| DEDICATION..... | vii |
| ACKNOWLEDGEMENT..... | viii |
| LIST OF TABLES..... | xii |
| LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS..... | xv |
| 1 INTRODUCTION..... | 1 |
| 1.1 Aim of the Study..... | 2 |
| 1.2 Problem Statement..... | 3 |
| 1.3 Importance of the Study..... | 3 |
| 1.4 Motivation of the Study..... | 3 |
| 1.5 Background Information..... | 4 |
| 1.6 Research Questions..... | 5 |
| 1.7 Assumptions of the Study..... | 6 |
| 1.8 Limitations of the Study..... | 6 |
| 1.9 Definitions of the Study Terms..... | 6 |
| 2 LITERATURE REVIEW..... | 8 |
| 2.1 Importance of Word Mouth Communication..... | 8 |
| 2.1.1 Importance of WOM Communication in a Social Life..... | 10 |
| 2.2 Word of Mouth Communication In The Service Sector..... | 11 |

| | |
|---|----|
| 2.3 WOM Communication and Other Promotional Mix Elements..... | 12 |
| 2.3.1 Word Of Mouth on Brands..... | 12 |
| 2.3.2 Relationship Marketing and Customer Loyalty..... | 14 |
| 2.3.3 Online Marketing..... | 15 |
| 2.4 The Importance of WOM Communication in the Painkiller and Derma-cosmetic Products..... | 18 |
| 2.4.1 Medical Sector..... | 18 |
| 2.4.2 Word Of Mouth Marketing In the Health Sector..... | 20 |
| 2.4.3 The Effects of WOM Communication on the Consumer in Service Sector..... | 22 |
| 2.5 Related Marketing Theories..... | 23 |
| 2.5.1 Effects for scientific research..... | 23 |
| 2.5.2 Medical Publications..... | 24 |
| 2.5.3 In Relationships with Guide Author..... | 25 |
| 2.5.4 Relationships with Patient Groups..... | 25 |
| 2.5.5 Crisis Management..... | 25 |
| 2.6 Related Communication Theories..... | 27 |
| 2.6.1 Interpersonal Communication Theory..... | 27 |
| 2.6.2 Word of Mouth Communication Theory..... | 28 |
| 2.6.3 Diffusion of Information..... | 29 |
| 3 METHODOLOGY..... | 31 |
| 3.1 Research Methodology..... | 31 |
| 3.2 Research Producers..... | 31 |
| 3.3 Research Design..... | 32 |
| 3.4 Data Collection and Instrument..... | 32 |

| | |
|--|-----|
| 3.5 Population..... | 32 |
| 3.6 Sampling Size..... | 33 |
| 3.7 Data Analysis..... | 33 |
| 4 FINDINGS..... | 35 |
| 4.1 Descriptive Statistic..... | 35 |
| 4.2 Relability Test..... | 49 |
| 4.3 Crosstabulation..... | 50 |
| 5 CONCLUSION..... | 88 |
| 5.1 Summary of the Research..... | 88 |
| 5.2 Conlusion Drawn for The Study..... | 90 |
| 5.3 Suggestion for Further Research..... | 91 |
| REFERENCES..... | 92 |
| 7 APPENDICES..... | 95 |
| Appendix A: Pilot Test..... | 96 |
| Appendix B: The Population distribution of the region of Famagusa..... | 100 |
| Appendix C: Survey..... | 101 |

LIST OF TABLES

| | |
|---|----|
| Table 1: Pharmaceutical market leading companies in Turkey..... | 18 |
| Table 2: Per capita consumption of drugs..... | 15 |
| Table 3: World pharmaceutical market..... | 20 |
| Table 4: Frequency table distribution of nationality..... | 35 |
| Table 5: Frequency table of Sex..... | 36 |
| Table 6: Frequency table of distribution of area | 36 |
| Table 7: Frequency of income..... | 37 |
| Table 8: Frequency of occupation..... | 37 |
| Table 9: Frequency of period checkup..... | 38 |
| Table 10 Frequency of personal care..... | 38 |
| Table 11 Frequency of how often painkillers are used..... | 39 |
| Table 12: Frequency of how often derma-cosmetic products are used..... | 39 |
| Table 13: Frequency of what participants look at when purchasing derma-cosmetic products..... | 40 |
| Table 14: Frequency of the effect of advertising on painkillers..... | 40 |
| Table 15: Frequency of the effect of advertising on derma-cosmetics..... | 41 |
| Table 16: Frequency of how often medication was used without prescription..... | 41 |
| Table 17: Frequency of how you decide on buying medication without prescription..... | 42 |
| Table 18: Frequency of what kind of products you would buy without prescription..... | 42 |
| Table 19: Frequency of buying medication on recommendation..... | 43 |
| Table 20: Frequency of reasons for buying medication without prescription..... | 43 |

| | |
|---|----|
| Table 21: Frequency of where you follow derma-cosmetics..... | 44 |
| Table 22: Frequency of where you follow painkillers..... | 44 |
| Table 23: Frequency of painkillers on recommendation..... | 45 |
| Table 24: Frequency of doctors prescribing too much medication..... | 45 |
| Table 25: Frequency of product promotion with doctors..... | 45 |
| Table 26: Frequency of the first person you would consult..... | 46 |
| Table 27: Frequency of whether you would pass on negative or positive feedback about the health service..... | 46 |
| Table 28: Frequency of would you consult a doctor straight away..... | 47 |
| Table 29: Frequency of painkiller recommendation by pharmacists..... | 47 |
| Table 30: Frequency of derma-cosmetics recommended by pharmacists..... | 48 |
| Table 31: Frequency of derma-cosmetics recommended by friends..... | 48 |
| Table 32: Frequency of how important recommendation is on painkillers..... | 49 |
| Table 33: Yearly routine checkups & sex cross-tabulation..... | 50 |
| Table 34: Yearly routine checkups & age cross-tabulation | 51 |
| Table 35: Yearly routine checkups & uses of derma-cosmetic products cross- tabulation | 52 |
| Table 36: Yearly routine checkups & purchasing Derma-cosmetic products cross- tabulation..... | 53 |
| Table 37: Do you have yearly routine checkups Advertising effect painkillers cross- tabulation..... | 55 |
| Table 38: Period checkup and How do you decided cross-tabulation | 56 |
| Table 39: Period checkup and What kind of products cross-tabulation | 57 |
| Table 40: Period checkup and on suggestion cross-tabulation | 58 |
| Table 41: Period checkup and Reasons cross-tabulation | 59 |

| | |
|---|----|
| Table 42: Period checkup and Where you follow dermo cosmetic cross-tabulation | 61 |
| Table 43: Period checkup and Where you follow painkillers cross-tabulation | 62 |
| Table 44: Period checkup and Suggested derma-cosmetics cross-tabulation | 64 |
| Table 45: Period checkup and Suggested painkillers cross-tabulation | 65 |
| Table 46: Period checkup and To much medication cross-tabulation | 66 |
| Table 47: Period checkup and Promotion with doctors cross-tabulation | 67 |
| Table 48: Period checkup and Consult doctor straight away cross-tabulation | 68 |
| Table 49: Personal care and Sex cross-tabulation | 69 |
| Table 50: Personal care and Age cross-tabulation | 70 |
| Table 51: Personal Care and Period Checkup cross-tabulation | 71 |
| Table 52: Personal care and How Often Derma-cosmetic cross-tabulation | 72 |
| Table 53: Personal care and When Purchasing Derma-cosmetic cross-tabulation | 73 |
| Table 54: Personal care and Advertising Effect On Derma-cosmetic cross-tabulation | 75 |
| Table 55: Personal care and How Do You Decide cross-tabulation | 76 |
| Table 56: Personal care and To Much Medication cross-tabulation | 77 |
| Table 57: Personal care and First Person To Consult cross-tabulation | 78 |
| Table 58: Personal care and Passon Negative Positive Feedback cross-tabulation | 79 |
| Table 59: Personal care and Recommendation by pharmacist on painkillers cross-tabulation | 81 |
| Table 60: Personal care and Recommendation by pharmacist on derma-cosmetic cross-tabulation | 82 |
| Table 61: What Kind of products and How do you decide cross-tabulation | 84 |
| Table 62: What kind of products and First person to consult cross-tabulation | 86 |

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

| | |
|--------------|-------------------------------------|
| WOM | Word of Mouth |
| WOMC | Word of Mouth Communication |
| PWOM | Positive Word of Mouth |
| NWOM | Negative Word of Mouth |
| TRNC | Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus |
| TR | Turkey Republic |
| WOMM | Word Of Mouth Marketing |
| TOBBA | Turkey Health Sector Report |

Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION

Customers get numerous messages from the environment; some of these reach them accurately but some do not. Furthermore, companies cannot control all the messages related with them. No matter If they are positive or negative messages, all these messages can definitely diffuse very quickly in the environment. Customers rely more on personal opinions about a company or brand rather than company commercials. This does not mean that advertising or other promotional mix elements are not important.

According to Robert East, “Under these circumstances, we would expect negative information to have more effect on judgment. Studies have supported this negativity effect (East, Hommond, & Lomax, 2008).”

Word of Mouth (WOM) especially positive wording related to brands or companies is the most effective and cost efficient marketing method for companies when they try to persuade their customers instead of non-personal communication. The customers rely more on what other people say about the company or brand rather than the company commercials. This does not mean that advertising or other promotional mix elements are not important. This means that they are not enough to change the customers’ attitudes, beliefs or lifestyles. Sometimes one negative word of mouth communication related with the company or brand, stops consumers from

purchasing that product. Shortly, it can be said that, WOM has a great impact on other peoples' choices on purchasing behavior and this can be the most effective and fastest marketing managements strategy.

According to Argan; People start to spend more time on the Internet rather than other mass media tools. They read online newspapers, read blogs, social media more willingly than watching TV advertising and reading newspaper as hard copy. For instance; Mary Kary and Amway are well known brands used to attract potential customers. Virtual Marketing is a logical technique used on the Internet similar to WOM. The Internet is a faster and easier way of passing on information to others (Argan, 2006, p.234).

1.1 Aims of the Study

This study highlights the importance of WOMC on the sales of painkillers and derma-cosmetic products. The study aims to explore how WOMC is effective in the medical products related to painkiller and derma-cosmetic in the TRNC market in 2014.

According to Argan; WOM is one of the oldest methods of marketing on consumer purchasing. For example, if a customer has had good experiences when s/he has purchased a product: s/he is more likely to pass this information onto a friend who purchases this product on a regular basis (Argan, 2006).''

Thus, the aim of this study is to explore the importance of WOM in the medical products related with painkiller and derma-cosmetics. This case study is to show consumer decision making process, why and how often the consumer purchase of painkillers and derma-cosmetics in the Famagusta market in Fall 2014.

1.2 Problem Statement

TRNC is a small island and there are numerous companies in the pharmaceutical sector and all medical products are imported from Turkey or other countries. Advertising on products are not done in the TRNC, also advertising and other marketing tools do not have much effect in small places. People are more confident and rely more on personal opinion. This makes WOM a more effective marketing tool, so locals depend more on international advertising, for this reason companies use WOMC. This causes conflicts in consumers' perception and there has not been much research based on consumers' decision making process during purchasing pharmaceutical products. There is also an increased demand for derma cosmetic products in the health sector. Consequently most of these companies enter into this market to produce these products which have made them more market driven. The companies have had to develop new strategies in this market such as WOMC and promotional products.

1.3 Importance of the Study

This study aims to show the companies operating in the pharmaceutical sector and how negative and positive WOMC effect the consumer purchasing decision. The study shows the influence which a company has on customer purchase and how sales force can effect their sales of products in the medical sector.

These strategies are effective access and quick sales on products. This research will show how the strategies in the health sector of marketing and communication will effect consumer perception. Thus, this study contributes to the literature about the impacts of WOM to create awareness in Famagusta population as a developing market.

1.4 Motivation for the Study

The reason I chose this topic as a research study was because this topic had not been previously researched in the TRNC. I feel that it will motivate researchers in further studies and show the effect of WOMC in consumers' decision making for the products. I was also affected after reading the book written by George Silverman about WOM.

My main influence on choosing WOM as a research topic was after reading a book written by George Silverman. The book focuses on when and how WOM came about and mentions how it started to effect the sales of products not just in the medical sector but other areas aswell. This I found interesting which made me aware of the importance of WOM on product purchase decisions.

1.5 Background Information

WOM has effect positive and negative on a person's decision making process on a product. Although some consumers can resist negative word of mouth on brands they are very likely to choose whereas others resist positive word of mouth on brands they are very unlikely to choose. TRNC is a small island all derma-cosmetic, painkiller and medical products are imported. Because of this companies do not use advertising and find that WOM is more effective, this can mean either negative or positive.

A research done by Haywood, examines the importance of the verbal exchange of positive and negative information about a firm's products and services. Presents suggestions for learning what is being said and how to gain systematic control over the word of mouth process (Haywood, 1989).

WOM has a significant effect on consumer purchasing behavior, WOM is an informal mode of communication between noncommercial parties concerning the evaluation of products and services. As WOM is a low cost and reliable way of transmitting information about products and services, WOM plays an important role in information diffusion in consumer markets and shaping consumers' attitudes (Lim & Chung, 2011).

WOM is informal information passed through consumers; there are two methods of WOM, positive and negative. The impact of positive WOM is greater than negative WOM. To measure the impact of positive and negative word of mouth on brand purchase probability.

According to East, Hommond, & Lomax : Brand purchase probability will be affected by the relative incidence of PWOM and NWOM about the brand and also by the relative impact of instances of PWOM and NWOM. Here, we are concerned with the impact of PWOM compared with NWOM. There is little evidence on this matter, which may relate to the difficulty of making (East, Hommond, & Lomax, 2008).

1.6 Research Questions

This study, seek to answer questions. This research took place in 15 different districts in the Famagusta area in the summer of 2014. The research questions are:

RQ 1: How WOM communication influences the attitude of people who have routine periodic checkups?

RQ 2: How WOM communication influence people's attitudes during the purchase of personal care products?

RQ 3: What is the decision making process of people when buying painkillers products and the important criteria's that influence them to buy the product?

RQ 4: What is the important criterious that influence people to buy painkiller product

RQ 4: What is the decision making process of people when buying derma-cosmetic products and the important criteria's that influence them to buy the product?

1.7 Assumptions of the Study

North Cyprus is a small country where people know each other and use WOM communication frequently. People follow products through TV programes and magazines but people in North Cyprus do not use this form of publicity and rely more on Word Of Mouth Communication. Most products are imported and not produced in North Cyprus so people do not require advertising as most of the advertising is done by the county it is imported from.

1.8 Limitations of the Study

This research was done in the Famagusta region in TRNC during summer 2014. The focus on the study is ; only on painkillers and derma-cosmetic products in the TRNC market.

1.9 Definitions of the Study Terms

Word of Mouth (WOM): Examines the importance of the verbal exchange of positive and negative information about firm's products and services (Haywood, 1989).

Marketing Communication: Marketing Communication covers all contemporary forms of marcoms - brand advertising and direct-response advertising, sales promotions, corporate image advertising, sponsorship, PR, personal selling and

telemarketing - and includes a special chapter on social marketing campaigns (Rossiter & Bellman, 2005).

Promotional mix: The promotional mix is a term used to describe the set of tools that a business can use to communicate effectively the benefits of its products or services to its customers (<http://www.cim.co.uk/files/promotionalmix.pdf>).

Sales force: The job of a sales person is to explain the features and use of a product or service. Or to use a common image, salespeople are little more than “talking brochures” (<http://www.kcapital-us.com/neil/downloads/Summary.pdf>).

Integrated Marketing Communication: Integrated marketing communication emerges as a powerful tool that guides practitioners in developing and implementing marketing communications more consistently and effectively (Rehman, 2011).

Chapter 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

In this chapter there are six sections does not fit with content the importance of WOM, relationship marketing and customer loyalty in the medical sector around the world and the importance of WOM communication and other promotional mix elements

2.1 The Importance of Word of Mouth Communication

Word of mouth communication means when, one person gives information about products or services to others. It can be good or bad. This method of marketing is the most effective and powerful marketing.

“Viral marketing describes any strategy that encourages people to pass on a marketing message to others, demonstrating an important potential for exponential growth in message’s exposure and influence. Viral marketing has become one of the most effective and cost – efficient ways create a ‘buzz’ about firms’ products and services (Argan, 2006).”

Thus viral marketing is a type of WOM communication on the internet where people share their ideas and these ideas diffuse very quickly as viruses. Therefore the positive message diffusion gives advantages for firms as costless, fast, and easy learned message. Hence WOM communication is not only done by face to face communication it can be done using the internet as new media as well.

The effect of word-of-mouth (WOM) communications on product judgments is investigated. WOM influences short-term and long-term judgments. This influence is

greater when a consumer faces a disconfirmation experience and when the WOM communication is presented by an expert (Bone,1995).

Viral marketing is best done through the internet. In modern life more than 2 hours per day is spent on the internet, almost everyone spends time on the internet and most people have an email address. People, especially companies with other companies on the other side of the world can pass information easily.

‘Email is one of the most widely used means over the internet, 90% of internet users use email more, 50% of the online population as a group use the average daily mail. Forrester Research states (2004), “a person who has your e-mail address, by e-mail, on an average day 9 of the year 3285 sends their marketing message.’ (Argan, 2006).

Nowadays the improvement in technology has brought along new marketing strategies. These improvements have brought new marketing opportunities to providers. One of these advantages is viral marketing. Viral marketing is the most effective weapon the Internet. This means trusting your friends. If there is something we like we send this onto our friends. Through this way, information on services or products are passed on more quickly and effectively spread from person to person.

“Has a high rate of potential customers who are knowledgeable about the products and use social trademarks. Internet, viral marketing and motion network was created in the same logic as a word of mouth communication technique (Argan, 2006).”

WOM, has a major factor in the influence of customer purchasing decisions. It has an impact on the social environment and consumers. It effects the value creation of the product before product purchase decision. As people are passed on messages through friends or close groups they become familiar with the companies and this attracts more attention than the companies’ incoming messages (Argan, 2006).

WOM has an effect on high-tech products as well, especially in the acquisition phase plays an important role in cases of buying home or car. In such cases, very close friends influence to buy with hints and information received from the Internet.

Resources such as information passed on from family, friends, neighbors and people close by are important. This means when a retailer starts discount sales on any products or services, positive or negative dissatisfaction effects the consumer's purchase decision. (Babaoglu, Sener, & Bugday, 2007)

“A satisfied consumer will pass information onto 3-5 people about their experience with a product, whereas on the other hand a dissatisfied consumers will pass information onto 5, 7 or 10 people about their dissatisfaction with a product (Babaoğlu, Şener, & Buğday, 2014).”

2.1.1 The Importance of WOM Communication in a Social Life

Negative communication about products and services via WOM are more likely to spread faster and more effectively and therefore are more powerful.

Word of Mouth Communication: negative communication is passed on more quickly than positive Word of Mouth Communication this is a fact. Word of Mouth Communication can also be a loss of products to companies. This proves the power of the effect of Word of Mouth Communication (Argan, 2006).

The creation of the health care community and keeping a healthy lifestyle is one of the most important factors in the maintaining of the drug produced according to the rules which make sure that it is delivered to anyone in need, this is the state's most important responsibility. On the other hand, the competition in the globalizing world economy along with the increasing state intervention controls conditions in the pharmaceutical sector, this has led to differentiation.

Turkey in the pharmaceutical industry meets the needs of many from abroad. Also leading the world in drug consumption Turkey is among those countries. According to Turkey pharmaceutical industry report (Türkiye İlaç ve Sanayi Sektörü Raporu), October 2008, “In 2013 the world's 10th largest drug consumption market, estimated to be a part of the country's drug needs to be met by imports. Existing policies and practices changed will be inevitable. In addition, domestic production is strong in periods of drug consumption per capital from \$ 35 to \$ 126 to come out, and who prefers to import existing production is the result of misguided policies. (Meclisi, 2008).

According to the Turkey pharmaceutical industry report, October 2008, There are about 300 companies in this sector in Turkey, 42 of the manufacturing facility is available, 56 are foreign companies operating 14 productions in its own facilities. (Meclisi, 2008).

2.2 Word of Mouth Communication in the Service Sector

Word of mouth communication has a positive or negative impact on the consumer purchasing behavior. The consumer has a strong impact positive or negative on other consumers in the short or long term. These effects make it a more powerful effect on other consumers with the feelings of individuals.

One study conducted by the US Office of Consumer Affairs indicated that, on average, one dissatisfied customer can be expected to tell nine other people and relate their story to an average of five other people (Lovelock, 1999).

With the development of technology traditional sales techniques have been replaced with interactive relationship based selling techniques. This means experienced sales force opinions on products are more important and reliable.

Jurvetso set up an e-mail link on the website to advertise new products in order to benefit from the rapid spread which went from zero subscribers to 12 million subscribers on Hotmail (Argan, 2006).

2.3 The WOM Communication and Other Promotional Mix Elements

There are some promotional mix elements like advertising, public relations, sales promotions, sales force, direct marketing, POP, sponsorship which all works together and WOM has a role in each promotional mix elements in current century.

2.3.1 Word of Mouth on Brands

Word Of Mouth communication involves the passing of information between non commercial communicator and a receiver concerning a brand product or service. WOM is known to be an effective source of information for both consumers and organizations.

WOM on brand evaluations is based on brand familiarity. This way consumer evaluation become less favorable for familiar and unfamiliar brands which means that negative Word of Mouth has a damaging effect on unfamiliar brands, while positive Word of Mouth has benefits on familiar and unfamiliar brands. There is also consumer's prior knowledge of the product category, although brand familiarity does not necessarily mean having good knowledge of a product category.

“The popular brands in the market tend to be the big brands (e.g. market leaders) which survive the competitive market by providing good value to the consumers. Unfamiliar brands are typical new brands that have not been tested by consumers yet. Hence, brand familiarity is often confounded with brand appeal (Lim & Chung, 2014).”

Many marketers are using marketing communications to make consumers aware of a brand and reason for buying although not a lot of information can be passed onto consumers through commercial messages. Also taking into consideration brand name and price has a considerable effect on consumer judgments about a product before purchasing.

Today, pharmaceutical companies have introduced marketing methods into our lives. Promotion of drugs made in some studies there were legal or illegal. These promotional items given to doctors, expensive gifts or as a reputable doctor to make propaganda about the drug. In these studies together is unethical been causing problems. In addition, the doctor - patient relationship is thought to affect adversely. There are several marketing methods in the pharmaceutical industry;

Increase in spending: Nowadays many are due to increased drug charges. In 2001 in the United States according to a survey conducted drug expenditures increased by 20.8% compared to the previous year 156.5 million dollars per year and reached approximately. This is the reasons for expensive drug prescriptions which are being prescribed (Civaner, 2012).

Profit rate of: Pharmaceutical industry profit rates are higher than other exposed to the importance of marketing. Drug companies' profit rate is more than 4 times compared to other companies.

Importance in the field of Marketing: The importance of the marketing department: marketing departments are very important for pharmaceutical

companies. The total number of employees of a pharmaceutical company expires in: 39% consist of people in the marketing department. ‘Between 1999 - 2000 the proportion of employees in the AR-GE decreased by 2 % but the proportion of employees in the marketing field increased by % 59 (Civaner, 2012).

Promotional events: The introduction of the drug companies spending budget expenditures for most uses. In 2002, the U.S. pharmaceutical industry spent \$ 21 billion to introduce activities. A portion of it was given to doctors to give promotional products and free samples of the drug distributed (Civaner, 2012).

The increasing number of ads: The pharmaceutical industry has seen an increase in advertising related to society. In 2000 in the United States the community-oriented health sector amounts to \$ 2.5 billion was spent on advertising. Also, society for the advertisements 40% of it is about drug companies. In the same year the Pepsi company spent \$ 125, whilst Merck's Vioxx company spent 161 million dollars on ads (Civaner, 2012).

2.3.2 Relationship Between Marketing and Customer Loyalty

It was revealed that there was a significant positive connection between relationship marketing and WOM. The construct of Relationship Marketing consist of trust, commitment, communication and satisfaction. Satisfaction was the one which contributed to the connection between relationship marketing and WOM.

Satisfaction as a relationship marketing construct, contributed more to the strength of relationship between relationship marketing and word of mouth. This was followed by communication, reciprocity, trust and commitment. This was also consistent with earlier researchers (Dithan, Ngoma, & Musiime, 2013).

In one research findings revealed that there is a significant positive relationship which exists between relationship marketing and WOM which in this case means that positive WOM will result in customer loyalty. According to results the variables indicate that there is a significant positive relationship between relationship marketing and customer loyalty. This also proves that loyalty is based on trust, commitment, communication and satisfaction between the service provider and the customer (Dithan, Ngoma, & Musiime, 2013).

2.3.3 Online Marketing

Online consumer product review, a type of Word of Mouth information is becoming very popular in consumer purchase decisions. The internet provides opportunities for consumers to share their product evaluations online, this way online sellers are inviting users to post personal opinions on their website. Consumer reviews are very important for consumer purchase and product sales, this also effects seller's strategic decisions regarding consumer review information.

Most of the WOM about WOM marketing is about blogging, MySpace, YouTube, etc. We understand why-these innovative technologies are exciting and promising. The real power of WOM is offline, where most conversations still occur. Face-to-face interaction accounts for the vast majority of WOM (72%), and phone conversations rank second (at 18%) (Keller And Berry, 2006).

‘‘A based on the data from Amazon.com and BN.com, Chevalierand Mayzlin (2006) find that online book reviews have a significant impact on book sales. Liu (2006) shows that consumer reviews at the Yahoo Movies website has a significant effect on box office revenue (Chen & Xie, 2008).’’

There are also online sellers that do not give the opportunity for online customers to leave their comments and suggestions, this maybe because of the negative reviews that can affect the sales of their products and services.

“Three product categories: MP3 players, PDAs, and video games. They identify a list of 68 online sellers from the referral list of the leading shopping agent mySimon.com in June 18, 2003, and found that 46 out of 68 online sellers did not offer consumer reviews (Chen & Xie, 2008).”

There are two types of online consumer selling consumers created information and seller created information, each attract two types of customer potential. Consumer created information is for less sophisticated as seller created information is more for sophisticated customers.

The effect of word-of-mouth (WOM) communications on product judgments is investigated. WOM influences short-term and long-term judgments. This influence is greater when a consumer faces a disconfirmation experience and when the WOM communication is presented by an expert (Choffray, 1980).

WOM is different from other marketing techniques in health the care with various qualities. These are reliability, experience transfer based on the customer, saving time and money, both positive and negative WOM marketing.

Reliability: WOMM is one of the most powerful uses of marketing. People prefer recommendations for a product or service from others who have used the product before hand.. Another reason is the reduction of people's confidence in advertising.

“People don’t believe in ads because Advertising is pre-planned and paid for. Thus most customers do not see the advertisement to be a reliable source of information (Gökhan ABA).

Experience Transfer: The transfer of experience is important in WOM Communication. Also we can see two kinds of transfer of experience. Firstly, she or he will purchase the product and uses it, then passes on their experience; secondly, people around you can also share their idea about the product.

Health services have been satisfied with the number of people who would use a patients reference, this also vital if we want the health sector to provide a higher or better service in the industry (Gökhan ABA).

Customer-Oriented: Customer orientation is important in WOM communication not company orientation. Also it is based on maximum customer contact form. The customer decides on who to talk about to about the product and what questions about the product is to be asked based maximum customer contact forms. If your friend's recommend a product, this would also answer questions asked by the consumer (Gökhan ABA).

Saving Time and Money: When customers want to buy a product they like to have as much information about the product as possible: this is the best way by getting information from someone who has used that used that product before. Thus, it also time-saving. A person's opinion about a product or service, with favorable recommendation can be made to someone else and advertising can be made at a much lower cost or even zero on advertising and promotional activities. It is also a fact that WOMM is cheaper and more effective (Gökhan ABA).

Both Positive And Negative WOM Marketing: WOMM positive occurs when transferred to others and is not cause of drop in business marketing or spenditure. New customers are convinced that time allows the increase of income. People buy

their products if they do not like veauserviceto others desire to hear it. This will adversely affect a company's reputation and structure (Gökhan ABA).

2.4 The Importance of WOM Communication in the Painkiller and Derma-cosmetic Products

The table below shows the leading 10 firms in the medical sector in Turkey.

2.4.1 Medical Sector

Table 1: Pharmaceutical Market Leading Companies In Turkey. (TOBBA, Turkey Health Sector Report page 4)

| 10 LEADING FIRMS | 2007(BILLION TL) | GROWTH % |
|-------------------------|-------------------------|-----------------|
| ABDİ İBRAHİM | 623,1 | 30,6 |
| NOVARTİS | 589,3 | 24,9 |
| SANOFİ AVENTİS | 511,6 | 16,4 |
| BİLİM | 412,4 | 31,6 |
| PFİZER | 404,1 | 31,3 |
| GLAXOSMİTHKLİNE | 377,9 | 23,2 |
| ROCHE | 369,5 | 30,7 |
| BAYER | 339,8 | 24,3 |
| ASTRAZENECA | 314 | 26,1 |
| SANOVEL | 284,5 | 30,5 |

Increased competition in the market, it is observed that the concentration decreases.

In competition with entering a new market, research or market research have been used to improve existing cause.

Table 2: World Marketplace 2003 - 2007 Rate Of Value And Regional.
(TOBB, Turkey medication sector report page 13)

| | 2003 | 2004 | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 |
|-----------------------------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| World Market | 604,6 | 560,1 | 604,4 | 649 | 713,3 |
| Growth according to previous year | | 12,2% | 7,9% | 7,3% | 9,9% |
| North America | 231,3 | 252,5 | 267,7 | 291,3 | 304,5 |
| Europe | 137,4 | 160,6 | 171,6 | 183,8 | 213,1 |
| Africa & Asia & Australia | 107,4 | 120,8 | 134,1 | 137,5 | 153 |
| Latin America | 23,0 | 26,1 | 31,3 | 36,3 | 42,3 |
| Billion (USD) | | | | | |

Rapidly developing new treatment methods, population growth and increasing commercial strength of the market has led to spell exponentially.

Table 3: World Pharmaceutical Market.
(TOBB, Turkey medication sector report page 14)

| | 2003 | 2007 |
|----------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| COUNTRY | Billion(dolar) | Billion(dolar) |
| USA | 221,6 | 286,9 |
| JAPAN | 59,7 | 65,7 |
| FRANCE | 25,6 | 39,4 |
| GERMANY | 6,3 | 36,9 |
| UNITED UNITED | 6,5 | 23,5 |
| ITALY | 6,6 | 22,6 |
| SPAIN | 1,4 | 18,1 |
| CANADA | 9,6 | 17,6 |
| CHINA | 7,4 | 16,4 |
| BRAZIL | 6,4 | 15,9 |
| MEXICO | 8 | 11,2 |
| SOUTH KOREA | 5 | 10,4 |
| TURKEY | 3,7 | 9,5 |
| INDIA | 5,3 | 9,3 |
| AUSTRALIA | 4,9 | 6,4 |
| RUSSIA | 2,1 | 7,9 |

| | | |
|---------|-----|-----|
| GREECE | 2,9 | 6,3 |
| POLAND | 3,5 | 6,1 |
| BELGIUM | 3,8 | 5,5 |
| HOLLAND | 4,2 | 5,5 |

Turkey, Norway and Switzerland, which includes the total pharmaceutical market of 29 European countries, as the value is € 138.6. (2006) that the market 3.8% (5.2 billion euros) Turkey, Europe 6 largest market is located.

Finally, in the graphs shown above, Turkey is an important position in the pharmaceutical market and many strong companies that will compete is a fact. After the competition proper and effective use of advertising and marketing tactics will bring. These marketing techniques mouth marketing in the healthcare industry is using what degree. How marketing and communication techniques in the health sector towards what extent using.

2.4.2 Word of Mouth Marketing In the Health Sector

Health is an important sector of the field. But nowadays people go to the doctor instead of consulting a spouse, friend. Their advice is important. Nowadays, the use of prescription drugs is increasing. In particular, headaches, many people also use beauty products and listen to advice from those around them.

Word-of-mouth communication measures two forms of customer commitment and service quality as potential antecedents. Affective commitment is positively related to word-of-mouth communication but that high sacrifice commitment is not related to word-of-mouth communication. Interestingly, the effect of service quality on word-of-mouth communication appears to be industry dependent. A distinction is made between word-of-mouth activity and word-of-mouth praise (Walker, 2001).

Word of mouth communication (WOM) is important in the marketplace for services. However, the current body of research provides little insight into the nature of WOM in the service marketplace. The aim is to capture a series of “grounded events” from which broader patterns could be discerned. These grounded events were actual incidents of WOM as described by the recipients of a communication (Mangold, Miller, Brockway, 1999).

It is defined that other people’s recommendations are not important for use of drugs without prescription (% 4.6). 88.5 % of the participant explain how they are not satisfied with the health service while 90.4 % of them pass on their satisfaction to others. 18.6 % of them have followed the improvements in health service from their family, friends and close relatives (Gökhan ABA).

WOM, using certain goods and services or other of these properties in our environment is transmitted to people by word of mouth communication. Other viral or buzz marketing is a kind of a name which is exceptionally growing and spreading quickly among consumers as a kind of marketing. Nowadays, video, e-mail, using tools such as social networking sites and blogs are performed. Especially in recent years, health-related experiences of people sharing sites frequently to socialize. In this way, they are very impressed.

The effects of word of mouth (WOM) on the receiver's attitudes and intentions have been studied at length, but the question under which conditions WOM leads to a behavioural outcome (such as a purchase or switching decision) has received less attention. An empirical study is presented which researches whether perceived

influence of a switching referral is related to subsequent switching behaviour, and whether the variables that have an effect on perceived influence of the switching referral also predicts switching. Results show that the strength of WOM influence is determined by perceived communicator characteristics. Perceived risk dimensions, in turn, moderate these effects (Wangenheim and Bayón, 2004).

The behavior of WOM communication on consumer buying is an important concept. According to the American Customer Relations Office if a customer is not satisfied with the goods or services will pass on their dissatisfaction to an average of nine people, on the other hand satisfied customers will pass on their satisfaction with products and services to an average of five people (Gökhan ABA, 2011).

As can be seen in the example of WOM both short and long term time decision affects the buying behavior of the customers and is a powerful communication tool. WOM, in the field of health care is the most widely used source of information. Patients, his treatment of others, they want to know how they evaluate the methods in this area is the most effective marketing communications.

Experts or doctors rather than patients or their family members primarily rely on the advice of friends. In addition, there are limitations in health services for advertising and marketing techniques WOM communication is good. Effective use in the health sector of WOM another reason is that; non-profit director for health care institutions are good. So this can be an effective and inexpensive method (Gökhan ABA, 2011).

The selection of patients in primary health care is the most important factor has been determined by WOM. Besides this, the family physicians in their choice of specialist

physicians shipped first place, while the WOM has taken second place. Also has a vast effect on cosmetic surgery with ladies, psychiatry or obstetrics. Women preferred getting recommendation regarding sexual topics from close friends around them today, as the largest pharmaceutical company marketing tactics, especially in the field of celebrities and experts, doctors do their ads using. Such persons are considered to be trusted by the consumer (Gökhan ABA, 2011).

2.4.3 The Effects of WOM Communication on The Consumers In Service Sector

Consumers in the purchase decision making process, they resort to various sources. They are: family, friends and neighborhoods. The WOM is very effective in this process. The importance of this research in consumer decision making process of the importance of word of mouth communication is indicated. Word of mouth communication among consumers is an important advantage of the advice and services. Also, word of mouth communication between consumers and independent experts define positive or negative verbal communication.

It is extremely important, especially in the service sector. Because of consumers' cultural condition based on previous experience may be different views on the quality of the services they receive. Thus, consumers in the same conditions and have the same culture are influenced by those around them close. WOM affecting customers is important in shaping their attitudes and behaviors.

Word of mouth communication about the services received or dissatisfied with the product spreads very quickly among consumers. If the consumer is not happy about you in a matter that spreads more quickly and effectively than those who are

satisfied. This also happens in human's cause's poor perception of your brand or service.

The term WOM is used to describe verbal communication between groups such as the product provider, independent experts, family and friends and actual or potential consumers (Cakir and Çetin, 2013).

Academic experts on the customers through word of mouth communication factors play a great role in persuasion for the people. WOM, especially for firms to gain new customers is an important element.

“Word Of Mouth Marketing Association, 92 % of consumer worldwide trust recommendations from friends and family more than any form of advertising and 2007 Nielsen Global Survey, 78 % of people found “ recommendations from consumers” is the form of advertising that they trust most (Cakir and Çetin, 2013).”

2.5 Related Marketing Theories

As seen in the pharmaceutical industry is an industry that is profitable and huge market share. As well as pharmaceutical companies that advertises and market the work while they get help from PR Office. In marketing people believe that personality has an effect on consumer decision making, consumers with various personality profiles are more likely to prefer certain brands or stores and choose specific colours or styles (Brody and Cunnigham 1968).

The winners in the field of health care services in the U.S. top five PR company's annual revenues are more than \$ 300 million (Civaner, 2012).

2.5.1 Third-party technique: this marketing method, respected company message 3 of by the art of giving. For example, a new drug market with views when we will

have respect in society. (Key Opinion Leader) People are referred to the liaison committee and its opinions. Respected and largest PR Company used this tactic certainly.

2.5.2 Effects for scientific research: In order to do a large amount of scientific research is needed financial resources. In the USA 70% of clinical research expenses are paid by pharmaceutical companies. Thus, companies and research methods, interpretation and publication of results can intervene in such matters, may direct (Civaner, 2012).

This way, they can be all they want about the research in favor of the company's products and they can use them company's products. A survey conducted in 16 clinical research center supported by pharmaceutical companies, 13 have reported results in favor of the sponsor's products. Company-sponsored research a new treatment, according to research other 5.2% times more support (Civaner, 2012).

2.5.3 Medical Publications: The companies use to increase sales rates other is a marketing method. The respected medical publications and scientific journals provides earnings with the road. Companies can access these journals easier thanks to the doctors. Can you provide information about products. Also thanks to the way the information provided by the company representative trademarked happening. Trust's gotten.

ICC European H. Cook in an article that clearly stated the following; Distributed article can be a very strong sales vehicle. Because it is considered to be independent and competent (Civaner, 2012).

2.5.4 In Relationships with Guide author: Professional practice guide authors are known to be associated with the industrial sector. In a study guide which was attended by 200 authors, 87% of respondents with one or more pharmaceutical companies are reported to be linked (Civaner, 2012).

2.5.5 Relationships with patient groups: It is important to impress patients and patient groups in terms of marketing. Therefore, physicians, pharmaceutical companies have missed colliding to this group. Normally Prohibit advertisements for the drug does not directly to the community in this area mean that advertising can not be done. Pharmaceutical companies can affect rid of these limits and potential of using the Internet (Civaner, 2012).

2.5.6 Crisis management: PR companies in this area, especially this negative situation of the company is showing cab to return the favor. Pharmaceutical companies' consisting of about a negative situation is prevented from leaking to the press. Pharmaceutical companies about the negative news media could adversely affect the other with the doctors thought it would and for intervention in this case. PR companies, especially in this way activate to 3.person (Key Opinion Leader) (Civaner, 2012).

The marketing strategies that affect doctors' prescriptions to what extent can be seen in the above information. All company does not invest in non-productive areas stand to gain. But nowadays it seems that doctors do not still believe in this truth. When it comes to the doctor is a fact that ideas can changed.

Before starting my thesis a mini-survey was conducted. Survey did not apply to doctors working in a private hospital. 15 questions were asked about the relationship

between pharmaceutical companies and doctors. 15 doctors agreed marketing strategies of pharmaceutical companies, but the doctors said they are not affected by any pharmaceutical companies. In this research showed that, marketing strategy and tactics can be effective to doctors idea but doctors don' want believe to admit it.

A survey of 230 hospitals in the United Kingdom was made. Research subject information about new drugs that were prescribed to 42% of the acquired company is determined by the representatives. In a survey of 181 physicians participated, namely that the physicians that moment on them belong to at least one or more pharmaceutical companies are found to carry a promotional product (Civaner, 2012).

Consequently, all these data show that; The pharmaceutical industry is very large and profitable market industry area. So in order to increase the profit margin promotion, marketing and PR tactics is also of great importance. It is important for marketing and sales force in this industry. Doctors in without accepting it, all promotion and marketing efforts can rate to doctors' prescribing.

2.6 Related Communication Theories

In this study three Communication Theories were applied as follow Interpersonal Communication, diffusion of innovation and WOM Theory.

2.6.1 Interpersonal Theory Communication

Interpersonal communication being able to communicate effectively and to be able to understand and to be understood by others. It is the process when people exchange information through verbal and non-verbal messages. This can take place between two people faced with each other in a particular situation, their communication behaviors are determined by a set of communication rules or norms. Some rules are

understood although not clearly stated and some individuals may not be able to verbalize them or indicate where they are acquired but other individuals may (Berger, and. Calabrese, 1975).

Interpersonal Communication is used widely around the world in every day life, there are several forms of Interpersonal Communication. This normally occurs between two individuals and also refers to the contents of a message between them and the possibility of further developments in their relationship. In this research Interpersonal Communication plays a very important role as it involves the interaction between people in order to pass on negative or positive information about a product.

In the health sector interpersonal communication is seen between the provider-patient encounter. The theory in healthcare interpersonal communication is used to predict health beliefs, understand, explain, intentions, attitudes and behaviors of individual and mass audiences. The above statement mentions the relationship differences between provider – patient and family and friends.

The term provider which we have used firstly describes the healthcare practitioners which care for patients. Secondly is patient encounter, in this case some theories were developed for understanding social interaction. Provider – patient relationships are different than relationships between family and friends, especially when considering equality, specific interests or expected outcomes. We can also mention that not all existing interpersonal communication theories have been mentioned (Bylund, Peterson, & Cameron, 2012).

The statement above mentions how interpersonal communications can effect changes in ones emotional state depending on the situation.

In general we also enjoy personal interaction although interpersonal communication has been shown to contribute to positive changes in ones emotional state, dealings can sometimes be problematic although we can also gain rewards from social interaction (Hargie, 2011).

2.6.2 Word of Mouth Communication Theory

Word Of Mouth Communicaiton plays an important role in consumer purchasing decisions and also proves that it is the most attractive and effective form of communication.

Word Of Mouth Communication is very important on the marketplace, this is where consumers gain information relating to organizations and what they have to offer, it also thought to have powerful influence on consumers evaluations rather than information recieved through cemmercial sources such as advertising. Although in previous researches it shows that negative WOMC has a stronger influence on consumer purchasing than positive WOMC. It has been proven that WOMC is more effective than advertising, in passing on positive or negative feedback about a product or service and is thought to be a product sucess factor. (Gheorghe, 2012).

The transmission of of negative WOMC involves interpersonal and informal process this heps to understand the recievers interpretaion of a senders motives in communicating in such information . Previous researches have shown that recievers are more likely to act against the consequences on the negativity in WOMC. The

information contained in negative WOMC using this type of of configuration will likely be veiwed by recievers as more logical and well developed. (Laczniak, De Carlo, & Ramaswarmi, 2001)

2.6.3 Diffusion of Innovation Theory

Diffusion of Innovation Theory originated in communication to explain how, over time, an idea or product gains momentum and diffuses (or spreads) through a specific population or social system. The end result of this diffusion is that people, as part of a social system, adopt a new idea, behavior, or product (<http://sphweb.bumc.bu.edu>) The four key components of Diffusion of Innovation are: Innovation, Communication Channels, time and social system;

Innovation: This is something that may have been invented a long time ago or a new idea or Project thought of by an individual. The innovation decision process involves knowledge persuasion and decision.

Communication Channels: This process is when individuals create and share information between one another and come to a conclusion. Mass media involves TV or radio whereas Interpersonal communication is communication between tow or more people.

Time: Time aspect is not taken into consideration in most researches although time dimension in diffusion research illustrates its strength.

Social System: This is the last element of the diffusion process. Diffusion of Innovation also plays a part in the social system and is also influenced by the structure (Şahin, 2006).

In order for practitioners to guide their practice and research Cole (1995) stressed that all healthcare practioners should be introduced to theoretical concepts in their

formal education. In order to guide a field Antonovsky (1996) also emphasized that theory is needed in order to provide direction to practice, guide the field and structure program evaluation. He believes that good theories result in good ideas which are incorporated into practice (Healey & Zimmerman,2010).

Chapter 3

METHODOLOGY

This chapter consist of seven parts as research survey, research procedures, research design, data collection, population, sampling and data analysis.

3.1 Research Methodology

In this study the quantitative research survey was used. This method was based on the general database. This research investigates the importance of WOM in the health sector. The quantitative research is collecting material data which brings about specific results about specific population (Harwell, 2011).

Quantitative research was applied in the first section of this study, it was used the population of 15 streets in Famagusta. The surveys were given out according to the population of these streets as shown in the research results.

3.2 Research Procedures

Before the research was conducted a pilot test was given and the information of population count of 15 streets in Famagusta were taken from the local council. At first, quantitative research was used and surveys distributed to the local streets of Famagusta. The results of this survey, information was gained on whether locals were more interested in personal care or health care.

In the third part quantitative research was used to find out the effect of WOM on painkillers and derma-cosmetic products. The research focused on the sales force of painkillers and derma-cosmetic products by doctors and pharmacists.

3.3 Research Design

In this research quantitative research methodologies were applied. First the quantitative research methodology was used and a questionnaire was prepared. The questionnaire was prepared to find out the effects of WOM on the sales of painkillers and derma-cosmetics. The survey was handed out to 15 different streets and was filled out by a different variety of people.

Before this research was prepared a pilot test was administered for 50 people. With the response of the survey results the questionnaire was revised and finalized. There are 33 questions in the second questionnaire

3.4 Data Collection and Instrument

The information for this survey was gained from the local council. The information gained was the exact number of streets in the local area and the number of people which lived there. The number of surveys was prepared according to the population of each street. The population details are shown in the section below.

3.5 Population

According to the Gazimağusa Council there are 15 different streets and 39.187 people on the population list. This study was applied according to the population count of each street. The streets and number of polls are as follows: Anadolu mahallesi 1508 (questionnaire applied to 14 people), Baykal mahallesi 2574 (questionnaire applied to 24 people), Canbolat mahallesi 2460 (questionnaire applied to 22 people), Çanakkale mahallesi 4114 (questionnaire applied to 38 people),

Dumlupınar mahallesi 2940 (questionnaire applied to 27 people), Harika mahallesi 651 (questionnaire applied to 8), Karakol mahallesi 7046 questionnaire applied to 67 people), Lala Mustafa Paşa mahallesi 1836 (questionnaire applied to 19 people), Namık Kemal mahallesi 1117 (questionnaire applied to 19 people), Pertev mahallesi 1026 questionnaire applied to 11 people), Piyale Paşa mahallesi 1220 (questionnaire applied to 11 people), Sakarya mahallesi 7647 (questionnaire applied to 12 people), Suriçi mahallesi 1476 (questionnaire applied to 15 people), Tuzla mahallesi 2645 (questionnaire applied to 21 people), Zafer mahallesi 2027 (questionnaire applied to 19 people) in total the questionnaire applied to 319 people.

3.6 Sample Size

Sampling is the representative of people, among the population. As mentioned earlier, 320 questions were distributed according to the stratified random sampling method. This method was applied to decide on how many questionnaires (population of districts) were to be distributed for each area, some ratio analysis was conducted.

3.7 Data Analysis

In the analysis of this study, SPSS 18.0 package was used to analyze the research questions in this study. Thus in this analysis descriptive statistic and cross-tab analyses was applied.

The study was conducted to understand the effect of WOM on the sales of painkillers and derma-cosmetic products. The survey was distributed to 15 different streets in the region of Famagusta. As mentioned previously a test pilot survey was prepared to finalize the final survey, the results were revised and finalized for the original survey. The test pilot consisted of 50 questions, whereas the final survey consisted of 33 questions.

Chapter 4

FINDINGS

In first section of this chapter concentrate on, descriptive statistic where focus on demographic structure of people and then focus on the usage of painkillers and derma cosmetics products in TRNC Famagusta market. Also in first section, period checkups, the importance of personal care, the respondent's attitude in decision making process for such products was described. In the second section cross tab analysis was analyzed to understand the relationship between WOM communication and medical products purchasing process.

4.1 Descriptive Statistic

The data collected in this part of the research will be shown in tables as statistics. The aim here is to show the data obtained using graphics. At the end of the research you should have knowledge about showing the reader data in graphics by using SPSS.

Table 4: Frequency table distribution of nationality

| Nationality | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|-------------|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Valid TRNC | 135 | 42,2 | 42,2 | 42,2 |
| TR | 118 | 36,9 | 36,9 | 79,1 |
| TRNC - TR | 67 | 20,9 | 20,9 | 100,0 |
| Total | 320 | 100,0 | 100,0 | |

The nationality of the respondent's as shown in table 4, 135 (%42.2) participants' nationality is Turkish Cypriot, 20.9 % percentage is of nationality, 67 people are both

Turkish Cypriot and – Turkish, and the lowest rate is Turkish with percentage of 20.9 % as a number 118 people.

Table 5: Frequency table of Sex

| Sex | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|--------------|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Valid Female | 179 | 55,9 | 55,9 | 55,9 |
| Male | 141 | 44,1 | 44,1 | 100,0 |
| Total | 320 | 100,0 | 100,0 | |

The sex statuses are shown in table 5 female participants' percentage is 179 (55.9 %), male participants' percentage is 141 (44.1 %).

Table 6: Frequency table of distribution of area

| Area | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|-------------------|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Valid Anadolu Bol | 15 | 4,7 | 4,7 | 4,7 |
| Baykal | 19 | 5,9 | 5,9 | 10,6 |
| Canbulat | 19 | 5,9 | 5,9 | 16,6 |
| Canakkale | 63 | 19,7 | 19,7 | 36,3 |
| Dumlupinar | 20 | 6,3 | 6,3 | 42,5 |
| Harika | 12 | 3,8 | 3,8 | 46,3 |
| Karakol | 103 | 32,2 | 32,2 | 78,4 |
| Lala Mustafa Pasa | 6 | 1,9 | 1,9 | 80,3 |
| Naimik Kemal | 6 | 1,9 | 1,9 | 82,2 |
| Pertev Pasa | 8 | 2,5 | 2,5 | 84,7 |
| Piyale Pasa | 4 | 1,3 | 1,3 | 85,9 |
| Sakarya | 20 | 6,3 | 6,3 | 92,2 |
| Surici | 13 | 4,1 | 4,1 | 96,3 |
| Tuzla | 10 | 3,1 | 3,1 | 99,4 |
| Zafer | 2 | ,6 | ,6 | 100,0 |
| Total | 320 | 100,0 | 100,0 | |

Table 6 shows areas most crowded is the Karakol area 103 (32,2%), the least crowded being the Zafer area 2 (0,6%).

Table 7: Frequency of income

| Income | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|-----------------|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Valid 1500-2000 | 188 | 58,8 | 58,8 | 58,8 |
| 2000- 2500 | 94 | 29,4 | 29,4 | 88,1 |
| 2600 – 3000 | 19 | 5,9 | 5,9 | 94,1 |
| 3000 and above | 19 | 5,9 | 5,9 | 100,0 |
| Total | 320 | 100,0 | 100,0 | |

Table 7, shows the amount of income per participant 118 (58,8%) the income is between 1500 - 2000, 94 (29,4%) the income is between 2000 – 2500, 19 (5,9%) the income is between 2600 – 3000, 19 (5,9%) the income is 3000 and above.

Table 8: Frequency of occupation

| Occupation | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|----------------------------|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Valid Public sector worker | 52 | 16,3 | 16,3 | 16,3 |
| Private sector worker | 178 | 55,6 | 55,6 | 71,9 |
| Owner of company | 26 | 8,1 | 8,1 | 80,0 |
| Housewife | 19 | 5,9 | 5,9 | 85,9 |
| Others | 45 | 14,1 | 14,1 | 100,0 |
| Total | 320 | 100,0 | 100,0 | |

As shown in the table, the occupation of the participants, 178 (55,6%) Private Sector worker, 52 (16,3%) public Sector worker, 45 (14,1%) Others, 26 (8,1%) Company owner, 19 (5,9%) House wife's.

Table 9: Frequency of period checkup

| Period checkup | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|----------------|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Valid Yes | 110 | 34,4 | 34,4 | 34,4 |
| No | 165 | 51,6 | 51,6 | 85,9 |
| Undecided | 45 | 14,1 | 14,1 | 100,0 |
| Total | 320 | 100,0 | 100,0 | |

To understand how much participants caring their health, it was asked whether they are doing routine check up and as seen in Table 9. 165 (51,6%) participants did not have annual checkups, 110 (34,4%) participants had annual checkups, 45 (14,1%) participants were undecided.

Table 10 Frequency of personal care

| Personal care | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|---------------|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Valid Yes | 212 | 66,3 | 66,3 | 66,3 |
| No | 72 | 22,5 | 22,5 | 88,8 |
| Undecided | 36 | 11,3 | 11,3 | 100,0 |
| Total | 320 | 100,0 | 100,0 | |

Table 10 shows 212 (66,3%) participants showed interest in personal care, 72 (22,5%) participants did not show interest in personal care, 36 (11,3%) participants were undecided.

Table 11 Frequency of how often painkillers are used

| How often painkillers are used | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|------------------------------------|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Valid As Soon As I Have A Headache | 101 | 31,6 | 31,6 | 31,6 |
| Wait To The Last Minute | 126 | 39,4 | 39,4 | 70,9 |
| Undecided | 54 | 16,9 | 16,9 | 87,8 |
| Other | 33 | 10,3 | 10,3 | 98,1 |
| Total | 320 | 100,0 | 100,0 | |

Table 11 shows the frequency of when painkillers are taken 126 (39,4%) wait until the last minute, 101 (31,6%) participants take a painkiller as soon as they have a headache, 54 (16,9%) were undecided, 33 (10,3%) participants used other methods.

Table 12: Frequency of how often derma-cosmetic products are used

| How often derma-cosmetic products are used | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|--|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Valid When Needed | 148 | 46,3 | 46,3 | 46,3 |
| Upon Recommendation | 75 | 23,4 | 23,4 | 69,7 |
| Sale | 56 | 17,5 | 17,5 | 87,2 |
| Other | 41 | 12,8 | 12,8 | 100,0 |
| Total | 320 | 100,0 | 100,0 | |

Table 12 shows, how when and how often Derma-cosmetic products are used 148 (46,3%) participants used when required, 75 (23,4%) participants when recommended, 56 (17,5%) participants when products were in the sale, 41 (12,8%) participants chose other.

Table 13: Frequency of what participants look at when purchasing derma-cosmetic products

| What participants look at when purchasing derma-cosmetic products | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|---|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Valid Price | 69 | 21,6 | 21,6 | 21,6 |
| Quality | 104 | 32,5 | 32,5 | 54,1 |
| Brand | 68 | 21,3 | 21,3 | 75,3 |
| Recommendation | 37 | 11,6 | 11,6 | 86,9 |
| Advertising | 36 | 11,3 | 11,3 | 98,1 |
| Other | 6 | 1,9 | 1,9 | 100,0 |
| Total | 320 | 100,0 | 100,0 | |

Table 13 shows, what participants look at when purchasing Derma-cosmetic products 104 (32, 5%) participants look for quality, 69 (21,6%) participants look at price, 68 (21,3%) participants look at brand name, 37 (11,6%) participants buy on recommendation, 36 (11,3%) participants look at advertising, 6 (1,9%) participants chose other.

Table 14: Frequency of the effect of advertising on painkillers

| Advertising effect on painkillers | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|-----------------------------------|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Valid Yes | 86 | 26,9 | 26,9 | 26,9 |
| No | 170 | 53,1 | 53,1 | 80,0 |
| Undecided | 64 | 20,0 | 20,0 | 100,0 |
| Total | 320 | 100,0 | 100,0 | |

Table 14 shows how effective advertising is on painkiller sales 170 (53,1%) participants said no, 86 (26,9%) participants said yes, 64 (20,0%) participants were undecided.

Table 15: Frequency of the effect of advertising on derma-cosmetics

| Advertising effect on derma-cosmetics | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|---------------------------------------|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Valid Yes | 128 | 40,0 | 40,0 | 40,0 |
| No | 125 | 39,1 | 39,1 | 79,1 |
| Undecided | 67 | 20,9 | 20,9 | 100,0 |
| Total | 320 | 100,0 | 100,0 | |

Table 15 shows how effective advertising is on Derma-cosmetic sales 128 (40,0%) participants said yes, 125 (39,1%) participants said no, 67 (20,9%) participants were undecided.

Table 16: Frequency of how often medication was used without prescription

| How often medication was used without prescription | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|--|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Valid Once A Month | 54 | 16,9 | 16,9 | 16,9 |
| Once Every Three Months | 58 | 18,1 | 18,1 | 35,0 |
| Once Every Six Months | 40 | 12,5 | 12,5 | 47,5 |
| Once A Year | 42 | 13,1 | 13,1 | 60,6 |
| Never | 126 | 39,4 | 39,4 | 100,0 |
| Total | 320 | 100,0 | 100,0 | |

Table 16 shows the frequency of how often medication was used without prescription 126 (39,4%) participants said never, 58 (18,1%) participants said once every three months, 54 (16,9%) participants said once a month, 42 (13,1%) participants said once a year, 40 (12,5%) participants said never.

Table 17: Frequency of how you decide on buying medication without prescription

| How do you decide on buying medication without prescription | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|---|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Valid Previous Experiences | 75 | 23,4 | 23,4 | 23,4 |
| Friend Recommendation | 41 | 12,8 | 12,8 | 36,3 |
| Pharmacy Recommendation | 65 | 20,3 | 20,3 | 56,6 |
| Without Prescription | 137 | 42,8 | 42,8 | 99,4 |
| Other | 2 | ,6 | ,6 | 100,0 |
| Total | 320 | 100,0 | 100,0 | |

Table 17 shows the decision on buying medication without prescription 137 (42,8%) participants said without prescription, 75 (23,4%) participants preferred previous experiences, 65 (20,3%) participants preferred pharmacy recommendation, 41 (12,8%) participants preferred recommendation by friends, 2 (0,6%) participants said other.

Table 18: Frequency of what kind of products you would buy without prescription

| What kind of products | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|-----------------------|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Valid Painkillers | 78 | 24,4 | 24,4 | 24,4 |
| Derma-Cosmetics | 41 | 12,8 | 12,8 | 37,2 |
| Antibiotics | 47 | 14,7 | 14,7 | 51,9 |
| All | 27 | 8,4 | 8,4 | 60,3 |
| Neither | 125 | 39,1 | 39,1 | 99,4 |
| Total | 320 | 100,0 | 100,0 | |

Table 18 shows what kind of products you would buy without prescription 125 (39,1%) participants said neither, 78 (24,4%) participants said painkillers, 47 (14,7%) participants said antibiotics, 41 (12,8%) participants said Derma-cosmetics, 27 (8,4%) participants said all.

Table 19: Frequency of buying medication on recommendation

| Buying medication on recommendation | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|-------------------------------------|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Valid Yes | 79 | 24,7 | 24,7 | 24,7 |
| No | 194 | 60,6 | 60,6 | 85,3 |
| Undecided | 47 | 14,7 | 14,7 | 100,0 |
| Total | 320 | 100,0 | 100,0 | |

Table 19 shows the frequency of buying medication on recommendation 194 (60,6%) participants said no, 79 (24,7%) participants said yes, 47 (14,7%) participants were undecided

Table 20: Frequency of reasons for buying medication without prescription

| Reasons for buying medication without prescription | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|--|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Valid Recommendation | 60 | 18,8 | 18,8 | 18,8 |
| Emergency | 76 | 23,8 | 23,8 | 42,5 |
| Not To Pay For Checkup | 25 | 7,8 | 7,8 | 50,3 |
| Previous Experiences | 22 | 6,9 | 6,9 | 57,2 |
| Other | 137 | 42,8 | 42,8 | 100,0 |
| Total | 320 | 100,0 | 100,0 | |

Table 20 shows the frequency of reasons for buying medication without prescription 137 (42,8%) participants chose other, 76 (23,8%) participants said in an emergency, 60 (18,8%) participants said upon recommendation, 25 (7,8%) said not to pay for checkups, 22 (6,9%) said previous experiences.

Table 21: Frequency of where you follow derma-cosmetics

| Where you follow derma-cosmetic products | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|--|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Valid Social Media | 84 | 26,3 | 26,3 | 26,3 |
| Magazines | 48 | 15,0 | 15,0 | 41,3 |
| Doctors | 88 | 27,5 | 27,5 | 68,8 |
| Friends | 57 | 17,8 | 17,8 | 86,6 |
| Other | 43 | 13,4 | 13,4 | 100,0 |
| Total | 320 | 100,0 | 100,0 | |

Table 21 shows where Derma-cosmetic products are followed 88 (27,5%) participants said doctors advice, 84 (26,3%) participants said social media, 57 (17,8) participants said friends, 48 (15,0%) participants said magazines, 43 (13,4%) participants said other.

Table 22: Frequency of where you follow painkillers

| Where you follow painkillers | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|------------------------------|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Valid Social Media | 65 | 20,3 | 20,3 | 20,3 |
| Magazine | 55 | 17,2 | 17,2 | 37,5 |
| Doctor | 129 | 40,3 | 40,3 | 77,8 |
| Friends | 33 | 10,3 | 10,3 | 88,1 |
| Other | 38 | 11,9 | 11,9 | 100,0 |
| Total | 320 | 100,0 | 100,0 | |

Table 22 shows where painkillers are followed 129 (40,3%) participants said through a doctor, 65 (20,3%) participants said social media, 55 (17,2%) participants said magazines, 38 (11,9%) participants said other, 33 (10,3%) participants said through friends.

Table 23: Frequency of painkillers on recommendation

| Painkillers on recommendation | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|-------------------------------|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Valid Yes | 115 | 35,9 | 35,9 | 35,9 |
| No | 134 | 41,9 | 41,9 | 77,8 |
| Undecided | 71 | 22,2 | 22,2 | 100,0 |
| Total | 320 | 100,0 | 100,0 | |

Table 23 shows the frequency of painkillers bought on recommendation 134 (41,9%) participants said no, 115 (35,9%) participants said yes, 71 (22,2%) participants were undecided.

Table 24: Frequency of doctors prescribing too much medication

| Do doctors prescribe to much medication | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|---|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Valid Yes | 128 | 40,0 | 40,0 | 40,0 |
| No | 120 | 37,5 | 37,5 | 77,5 |
| Undecided | 72 | 22,5 | 22,5 | 100,0 |
| Total | 320 | 100,0 | 100,0 | |

Table 24 shows the decision on doctors prescribing too much medication 128 (40,0%) participants said Yes, 120 (37,5%) participants said No, 72 (22,5%) participants were undecided.

Table 25: Frequency of product promotion with doctors

| Product promotion with doctors | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|--------------------------------|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Valid Yes | 117 | 36,6 | 36,6 | 36,6 |
| No | 135 | 42,2 | 42,2 | 78,8 |
| Undecided | 68 | 21,3 | 21,3 | 100,0 |
| Total | 320 | 100,0 | 100,0 | |

Table 25 shows the decision on promotion by doctors on products 135 (42,2%) participants said No, 117 (36,6%) participants were undecided

Table 26: Frequency of the first person you would consult

| First person to consult | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|-------------------------|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Valid Family Member | 134 | 41,9 | 41,9 | 41,9 |
| Medics | 107 | 33,4 | 33,4 | 75,3 |
| Friend | 28 | 8,8 | 8,8 | 84,1 |
| Pharmacy | 44 | 13,8 | 13,8 | 97,8 |
| Other | 7 | 2,2 | 2,2 | 100,0 |
| Total | 320 | 100,0 | 100,0 | |

Table 26 shows the result of who the first person of contact would be for medical advice 134 (41,9%) participants would contact a family member, 107 (33,4%) participants would contact medics, 44 (13,8%) participants would contact a pharmacist, 28(8,8%) participants would contact a friend, 7 (2,2%) participants said other.

Table 27: Frequency of whether you would pass on negative or positive feedback about the health service

| Would you pass on negative/positive feedback about the health service | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|---|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Valid Yes | 241 | 75,3 | 75,3 | 75,3 |
| No | 40 | 12,5 | 12,5 | 87,8 |
| Undecided | 39 | 12,2 | 12,2 | 100,0 |
| Total | 320 | 100,0 | 100,0 | |

Table 27 shows the results of passing on negative or positive feedback about the Health Service 241 (75,1%) participants said yes, 40 (12,5%) participants said no, 39 (12,2%) participants were indecisive.

Table 28: Frequency of would you consult a doctor straight away

| Would you consult a doctor straight away | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|--|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Valid Strongly Agree | 83 | 25,9 | 25,9 | 25,9 |
| Agree | 86 | 26,9 | 26,9 | 52,8 |
| Not Sure | 75 | 23,4 | 23,4 | 76,3 |
| Disagree | 65 | 20,3 | 20,3 | 96,6 |
| Strongly disagree | 11 | 3,4 | 3,4 | 100,0 |
| Total | 320 | 100,0 | 100,0 | |

Table 28 shows whether you would contact a Doctor straight away 86 (26,9%) participants agreed, 83 (25,9) participants definitely agreed, 75 (23,4%) were not sure, 65 (20,3%) participants did not agree, 11 (3,4%) participants did not agree definitely.

Table 29: Frequency of painkiller recommendation by pharmacists

| Painkillers recommendation by pharmacist | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|--|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Valid Strongly Agree | 50 | 15,6 | 15,6 | 15,6 |
| Agree | 117 | 36,6 | 36,6 | 52,2 |
| Not Sure | 62 | 19,4 | 19,4 | 71,6 |
| Disagree | 61 | 19,1 | 19,1 | 90,6 |
| Strongly disagree | 30 | 9,4 | 9,4 | 100,0 |
| Total | 320 | 100,0 | 100,0 | |

Table 29 shows whether painkillers would be used recommended by pharmacists 117 (36,6%) participants agreed, 62 (19,4%) participants were not sure, 61 (19,1%) participants did not agree, 50 (15,6%) participants definitely agreed, 30 (9,4%) did not agree definitely.

Table 30: Frequency of derma-cosmetics recommended by pharmacists

| Recommendation by pharmacist on derma-cosmetic | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|--|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Valid Strongly Agree | 26 | 8,1 | 8,1 | 8,1 |
| Agree | 111 | 34,7 | 34,7 | 42,8 |
| Not Sure | 70 | 21,9 | 21,9 | 64,7 |
| Disagree | 75 | 23,4 | 23,4 | 88,1 |
| Strongly disagree | 38 | 11,9 | 11,9 | 100,0 |
| Total | 320 | 100,0 | 100,0 | |

Table 30 shows the number of people that would use Derma-cosmetic products recommended by pharmacists 111 (34,7%) participants agreed, 75(23,%) participants did not agree, 70(21,9%) participants were not sure, 38(11,9%) participants did not agree definitely, 26(8,1%) participants definitely agreed.

Table 31: Frequency of derma-cosmetics recommended by friends

| Recommendation from friends on derma-cosmetic | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|---|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Valid Strongly Agree | 32 | 10,0 | 10,0 | 10,0 |
| Agree | 100 | 31,3 | 31,3 | 41,3 |
| Not Sure | 83 | 25,9 | 25,9 | 67,2 |
| Disagree | 67 | 20,9 | 20,9 | 88,1 |
| Strongly disagree | 38 | 11,9 | 11,9 | 100,0 |
| Total | 320 | 100,0 | 100,0 | |

Table 31 shows the number of people that would use Derma-cosmetic products recommended by friends 100 (31,3%) participants agreed, 83(25,9%) participants were not sure, 67(20,9%) participants did not agree, 38(11,9%) participants did not agree definitely, 32(10,0%) participants definitely agreed.

Table 32: Frequency of how important recommendation is on painkillers

| Recommendation is important painkillers | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|--|-----------|---------|------------------|-----------------------|
| Valid Strongly Agree | 49 | 15,3 | 15,3 | 15,3 |
| Agree | 97 | 30,3 | 30,3 | 45,6 |
| Not Sure | 71 | 22,2 | 22,2 | 67,8 |
| Disagree | 66 | 20,6 | 20,6 | 88,4 |
| Strongly disagree | 37 | 11,6 | 11,6 | 100,0 |
| Total | 320 | 100,0 | 100,0 | |

Table 32 shows the number of people that feel recommendation is important on painkillers 97(30,3%) participants agreed, 71(22,2%) participants were not sure, 66(20,6%) participants did not agree, 49(15,3%) participants definitely agreed, 37(11,6%) participants did not agree definitely.

4.2 Reliability Test

Case Processing Summary

| | | N | % |
|-------|-----------------------|-----|-------|
| Cases | Valid | 320 | 100,0 |
| | Excluded ^a | 0 | ,0 |
| | Total | 320 | 100,0 |

a. Listwise deletion based on all variables in the procedure.

Reliability Statistics

| Cronbach's Alpha | Cronbach's Alpha Based on Standardized Items | N of Items |
|------------------|--|------------|
| ,811 | ,812 | 6 |

According to reliability test for likert and likert scale questions, Cronbach's Alpha value is 0,811 > 0.70 thus it is an acceptable limit.

4.3 Crosstabulation

Crosstabs analysis was used to find the relationship between two variables by doing that it helps to answer the research question of this study.

Table 33: Annual routine checkups & sex cross-tabulation

| | | | Sex (%) | | Total (%) |
|------------------|-----------|---|---------|-------|-----------|
| | | | Female | Male | |
| routine checkups | Yes | count | 76 | 34 | 110 |
| | | % within do you have yearly routine check ups | 69,1 | 30,9 | 100 |
| | | % within sex | 42,5 | 24,1% | 34,4 |
| | | % of total | 23,8 | 10,6 | 34,4 |
| | No | count | 84 | 81 | 165 |
| | | % within do you have yearly routine check ups | 50,9 | 49,1 | 100 |
| | | % within sex | 46,9 | 57,4 | 51,6 |
| | | % of total | 26,3 | 25,3 | 51,6 |
| | Undecided | count | 19 | 26 | 45 |
| | | % within do you have yearly routine check ups | 42,2 | 57,8 | 100 |
| | | % within sex | 10,6 | 18,4 | 14,1 |
| | | % of total | 5,9 | 8,1 | 14,1 |
| Total | | count | 179 | 141 | 320 |
| | | % within do you have yearly routine check ups | 55,9 | 44,1 | 100 |
| | | % within sex | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| | | % of total | 55,9 | 44,1 | 100 |

There is a close relationship between sex and period check up as Pearson Chi- square value is 12.848^a, df=2, p=,002<0.005. As seen in Table 33, 34.4% people had yearly routine checkups, 23.8% were female and 10.6% were male. Out of 179 females 76 of them had yearly routine checkup whereas 84 females did not have yearly routine

checkups, on the other hand out of 141 males only 34 males had yearly routine checkups.

Table 34: Annual routine checkups & age cross-tabulation

| | | | Age (%) | | | | Total (%) |
|------------------|-----------|-----------------------------------|---------|-------|-------|---------|-----------|
| | | | 18-28 | 29-39 | 40-50 | 50 over | |
| routine checkups | Yes | Count | 42 | 23 | 27 | 18 | 110 |
| | | % within yearly routine check ups | 38,2 | 20,9 | 24,5 | 16,4 | 100 |
| | | % within age | 29,6 | 23,0 | 48,2 | 81,8 | 34,4 |
| | | % of total | 13,1 | 7,2 | 8,4 | 5,6 | 34,4 |
| | No | Count | 80 | 65 | 18 | 2 | 165 |
| | | % within yearly routine check ups | 48,5 | 39,4 | 10,9 | 1,2 | 100 |
| | | % within age | 56,3 | 65,0 | 32,1 | 9,1 | 51,6 |
| | | % of total | 25,0 | 20,3 | 5,6 | ,6 | 51,6 |
| | Undecided | Count | 20 | 12 | 11 | 2 | 45 |
| | | % within yearly routine check ups | 44,4 | 26,7 | 24,4 | 4,4 | 100 |
| | | % within age | 14,1 | 12,0 | 19,6 | 9,1 | 14,1 |
| | | % of total | 6,3 | 3,8 | 3,4 | ,6 | 14,1 |
| Total | | Count | 142 | 100 | 56 | 22 | 320 |
| | | % within yearly routine check ups | 44,4 | 31,3 | 17,5 | 6,9 | 100 |
| | | % within age | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |

As you can see in Table 34 the most yearly routine checkups were done between the ages of 18-28 year olds. The results of this table show that the older you get yearly routine checkups decrease.

Pearson Chi- square value is 40.092, df=6, p=, 000<0.005.

Table 35: Annual routine checkups & uses of derma-cosmetic products cross-tabulation

| | | | How Often Do You Use Derma-cosmetic Product (%) | | | | Total (%) |
|------------------|-----------|---|---|--------------|--------------|-------|-----------|
| | | | When Need | When recomm. | In the Sales | Other | |
| routine checkups | Yes | count | 50 | 36 | 12 | 12 | 110 |
| | | % within do you have yearly routine checkups? | 45,5 | 32,7 | 10,9 | 10,9 | 100 |
| | | % within how often derma-cosmetic | 33,8 | 48,0 | 21,4 | 29,3 | 34,4 |
| | | % of total | 15,6 | 11,3 | 3,8 | 3,8 | 34,4 |
| | No | count | 84 | 24 | 36 | 21 | 165 |
| | | % within do you have yearly routine checkups? | 50,9 | 14,5 | 21,8 | 12,7 | 100 |
| | | % within how often derma-cosmetic | 56,8 | 32, | 64,3 | 51,2 | 51,6 |
| | | % of total | 26,3 | 7,5 | 11,3 | 6,6 | 51,6 |
| | Undecided | count | 14 | 15 | 8 | 8 | 45 |
| | | % within do you have yearly routine checkups? | 31,1 | 33,3 | 17,8 | 17,8 | 100 |
| | | % within how often derma-cosmetic | 9,5 | 20,0 | 14,3 | 19,5 | 14,1 |
| | | % of total | 4,4 | 4,7 | 2,5 | 2,5 | 14,1 |
| | Total | | count | 148 | 75 | 56 | 41 |

| | | | | | | |
|--|---|-------|-------|-------|-------|-----|
| | % within do you have yearly routine checkups? | 46,3 | 23,4 | 17,5 | 12,8 | 100 |
| | % within how often derma-cosmetic | 100,0 | 100,0 | 100,0 | 100,0 | 100 |
| | % of total | 46,3 | 23,4 | 17,5 | 12,8 | 100 |

Table 35 shows 50 people who have routine checkups use derma-cosmetic products when necessary, 84 people who do not have routine checkups also use derma-cosmetic products when necessary.

Table 36: Annual routine checkups & purchasing Derma-cosmetic products cross-tabulation

| | | | When purchasing derma-cosmetic (%) | | | | | | Total |
|------------------|-----|---|------------------------------------|---------|-------|---------|------|-------|-------|
| | | | Price | Quality | Brand | Recomm. | Ads. | Other | |
| routine checkups | Yes | count | 27 | 51 | 15 | 7 | 9 | 1 | 110 |
| | | % within yearly routine checkups | 24,5 | 46,4 | 13,6 | 6,4 | 8,2 | ,9 | 100 |
| | | % within when purchasing derma-cosmetic | 39,1 | 49,0 | 22,1 | 18,9 | 25,0 | 16,7 | 34,4 |
| | | % of total | 8,4 | 15,9 | 4,7 | 2,2 | 2,8 | ,3 | 34,4 |
| | No | count | 38 | 45 | 40 | 22 | 18 | 2 | 165 |
| | | % within yearly routine checkups | 23 | 27,3 | 24,2 | 13,3 | 10,9 | 1,2 | 100 |

| | | | | | | | | | |
|-------|--------|---|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| | | % within when purchasing derma-cosmetic | 55,1 | 43,3 | 58,8 | 59,5 | 50,0 | 33,3 | 51,6 |
| | | % of total | 11,9 | 14, | 12,5 | 6,9 | 5,6 | ,6 | 51,6 |
| | Undec. | count | 4 | 8 | 13 | 8 | 9 | 3 | 45 |
| | | % within yearly routine checkups | 8,9 | 17,8 | 28,9 | 17,8 | 20, | 6,7 | 100 |
| | | % within when purchasing derma-cosmetic | 5,8 | 7,7 | 19,1 | 21,6 | 25 | 50 | 14,1 |
| | | % of total | 1,3 | 2,5 | 4,1 | 2,5 | 2,8 | ,9 | 14,1 |
| Total | | count | 69 | 104 | 68 | 37 | 36 | 6 | 320 |
| | | % within yearly routine checkups | 21,6 | 32,5 | 21,3 | 11,6 | 11,3 | 1,9 | 100 |
| | | % within when purchasing derma-cosmetic | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100, | 100 |
| | | % of total | 21,6 | 32,5 | 21,3 | 11,6 | 11,3 | 1,9 | 100 |

Table 36 shows people who have routine checkups firstly pay more attention to quality and then to price. When buying Derma-cosmetic products people who have routine checkups, 51 people (46.4%) look at quality, 27 people (24.5%) look at the price. People who do not have routine checkups 45 people (27.3%) when buying derma-cosmetic products for the first time look at quality.

Table 37: Annual routine checkups advertising effect painkillers cross-tabulation

| | | | Advertising effect Painkillers (%) | | | Total |
|---|--------|---|---------------------------------------|--------|-----------|-------|
| | | | Yes | No | Undecided | |
| Do you have yearly routine checkups? | Yes | Count | 31 | 62 | 17 | 110 |
| | | % within do you have yearly routine checkups? | 28,2 | 56,4 | 15,5 | 100 |
| | | % within advertising effect painkillers | 36,0 | 36,5 | 26,6 | 34,4 |
| | | % of total | 9,7 | 19,4 | 5,3 | 34,4 |
| | No | Count | 41 | 95 | 29 | 165 |
| | | % within period checkup | 24,8 | 57,6 | 17,6 | 100 |
| | | % within advertising effect painkillers | 47,7 | 55,9 | 45,3 | 51,6 |
| | | % of total | 12,8 | 29,7 | 9,1 | 51,6 |
| | Undec. | Count | 14 | 13 | 18 | 45 |
| | | % within period checkup | 31,1 | 28,9 | 40,0 | 100 |
| | | % within advertising effect painkillers | 16,3 | 7,6 | 28,1 | 14,1 |
| | | % of total | 4,4 | 4,1 | 5,6 | 14,1 |
| | Total | | Count | 86 | 170 | 64 |
| % within period checkup | | | 26,9 | 53,1 | 20,0 | 100 |
| % within advertising effect painkillers | | | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| % of total | | | 26,9 % | 53,1 % | 20,0 | 100 |

Table 37 shows that 31 people feel advertising has an effect on the purchase of painkillers, 62 people who do not have routine checkups feel that advertising does not have an effect on the purchase of painkiller products.

Table 38: Periodical checkup and How do you decided cross-tabulation

| | | | How Do You Decided (%) | | | | | Total |
|----------------------------|--------|----------------------------|------------------------|---------|---------------|-------------------|-------|-------|
| | | | Prev. Exper. | Recomm. | Phar. Recomm. | Without Prescript | Other | |
| Period Checkup | Yes | count | 23 | 12 | 12 | 62 | 1 | 110 |
| | | % within period checkup | 20,9 | 10,9 | 10,9 | 56,4 | ,9 | 100 |
| | | % within how do you decide | 30,7 | 29,3 | 18,5% | 45,3 | 50,0 | 34,4 |
| | | % of total | 7,2 | 3,8 | 3,8% | 19,4 | ,3 | 34,4 |
| | No | count | 37 | 21 | 46 | 60 | 1 | 165 |
| | | % within period checkup | 22,4 | 12,7 | 27,9 | 36,4 | ,6 | 100 |
| | | % within how do you decide | 49,3 | 51,2 | 70,8 | 43,8 | 50 | 51,6 |
| | | % of total | 11,6 | 6,6 | 14,4 | 18,8 | ,3 | 51,6 |
| | Undec. | count | 15 | 8 | 7 | 15 | 0 | 45 |
| | | % within period checkup | 33,3 | 17,8 | 15,6 | 33,3 | ,0 | 100 |
| | | % within how do you decide | 20 | 19,5 | 10,8 | 10,9 | ,0 | 14,1 |
| | | % of total | 4,7 | 2,5 | 2,2 | 4,7 | ,0 | 14,1 |
| | Total | | count | 75 | 41 | 65 | 137 | 2 |
| % within period checkup | | | 23,4 | 12,8 | 20,3 | 42,8 | ,6 | 100 |
| % within how do you decide | | | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| % of total | | | 23,4% | 12,8 | 20,3 | 42,8 | ,6 | 100 |

Table 38 shows that 62 people who have routine prefer to buy medication without prescription, 37 people who do not have routine checkups rely on previous experiences.

Table 39: Periodical checkup and What kind of products cross-tabulation

| | | | Pain Killers | Derma-Cosmetic | Antibiotic | All | Non. | Total | |
|----------------|--------|--------------------------------|--------------|----------------|------------|------|------|-------|-----|
| Period Checkup | Yes | Count | 25 | 15 | 9 | 1 | 59 | 110 | |
| | | % within period checkup | 22,7 | 13,6 | 8,2 | ,9 | 53,6 | 100 | |
| | | % within what kind of products | 32,1 | 36,6 | 19,1 | 3,7 | 47,2 | 34,4 | |
| | | % of total | 7,8 | 4,7 | 2,8 | ,3 | 18,4 | 34,4 | |
| | No | Count | 41 | 20 | 30 | 22 | 51 | 165 | |
| | | % within period checkup | 24,8 | 12,1 | 18,2 | 13,3 | 30,9 | 100 | |
| | | % within what kind of products | 52,6 | 48,8 | 63,8 | 81,5 | 40,8 | 51,6 | |
| | | % of total | 12,8 | 6,3 | 9,4 | 6,9 | 15,9 | 51,6 | |
| | Undec. | Count | 12 | 6 | 8 | 4 | 15 | 45 | |
| | | % within period checkup | 26,7 | 13,3 | 17,8 | 8,9 | 33,3 | 100 | |
| | | % within what kind of products | 15,4 | 14,6 | 17,0 | 14,8 | 12,0 | 14,1 | |
| | | % of total | 3,8 | 1,9 | 2,5 | 1,3 | 4,7 | 14,1 | |
| | Total | | count | 78 | 41 | 47 | 27 | 125 | 320 |

| | | | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------------|------|------|------|-----|------|-----|
| | % within period checkup | 24,4 | 12,8 | 14,7 | 8,4 | 39,1 | 100 |
| | % within what kind of products | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| | % of total | 24,4 | 12,8 | 14,7 | 8,4 | 39,1 | 100 |

Table 39 shows that when 25 people who have routine checkups are buying painkiller products 15 people are buying derma-cosmetic products, 41 people who do not have routine checkups are buying painkiller products.

Table 40: Periodical checkup and on suggestion cross-tabulation

| | | | On suggestion (%) | | | Total |
|----------------|--------|-------------------------|-------------------|------|-----------|-------|
| | | | Yes | No | Undecided | |
| Period checkup | Yes | Count | 19 | 84 | 7 | 110 |
| | | % within period Checkup | 17,3 | 76,4 | 6,4 | 100 |
| | | % within on suggestion | 24,1 | 43,3 | 14,9 | 34,4 |
| | | % of total | 5,9 | 26,3 | 2,2 | 34,4 |
| | No | Count | 48 | 86 | 31 | 165 |
| | | % within period Checkup | 29,1 | 52,1 | 18,8 | 100 |
| | | % within on suggestion | 60,8 | 44,3 | 66,0 | 51,6 |
| | | % of total | 15,0 | 26,9 | 9,7 | 51,6 |
| | Undec. | Count | 12 | 24 | 9 | 45 |
| | | % within period Checkup | 26,7 | 53,3 | 20,0 | 100 |
| | | % within on suggestion | 15,2 | 12,4 | 19,1 | 14,1 |
| | | % of total | 3,8 | 7,5 | 2,8 | 14,1 |
| Total | | Count | 79 | 194 | 47 | 320 |
| | | % within period Checkup | 24,7 | 60,6 | 14,7 | 100 |
| | | % within on suggestion | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |

| | | | On suggestion (%) | | | Total |
|-------------------|--------|----------------------------|-------------------|------|-----------|-------|
| | | | Yes | No | Undecided | |
| Period checkup | Yes | Count | 19 | 84 | 7 | 110 |
| | | % within period Checkup | 17,3 | 76,4 | 6,4 | 100 |
| | | % within on suggestion | 24,1 | 43,3 | 14,9 | 34,4 |
| | | % of total | 5,9 | 26,3 | 2,2 | 34,4 |
| | No | Count | 48 | 86 | 31 | 165 |
| | | % within period Checkup | 29,1 | 52,1 | 18,8 | 100 |
| | | % within on suggestion | 60,8 | 44,3 | 66,0 | 51,6 |
| | | % of total | 15,0 | 26,9 | 9,7 | 51,6 |
| | Undec. | Count | 12 | 24 | 9 | 45 |
| | | % within period Checkup | 26,7 | 53,3 | 20,0 | 100 |
| | | % within on suggestion | 15,2 | 12,4 | 19,1 | 14,1 |
| | | % of total | 3,8 | 7,5 | 2,8 | 14,1 |
| Total | | Count | 79 | 194 | 47 | 320 |
| | | % within period Checkup | 24,7 | 60,6 | 14,7 | 100 |
| | | % within on suggestion | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| | | % of total | 24,7 | 60,6 | 14,7 | 100 |

Table 40 shows that 19 people who have routine checkups buy medication on recommendation, 84 people who have routine checkups do not buy medication on recommendation, 86 people who do not have routine checkups have not purchased medication on recommendation, 48 people who do not have routine checkups buy medication on recommendation.

Table 41: Periodical checkup and Reasons cross-tabulation

| | | | Reasons (%) | | | | | Total |
|----------------|--------|-------------------------|-------------|-----------|---------------|--------------|-------|-------|
| | | | Recomm. | Emergency | Free Check-up | Prev. Exper. | Other | |
| Period checkup | Yes | Count | 14 | 17 | 7 | 7 | 65 | 110 |
| | | % within period checkup | 12,7 | 15,5 | 6,4 | 6,4 | 59,1 | 100 |
| | | % within reasons | 23,3 | 22,4 | 28,0 | 31,8 | 47,4 | 34,4 |
| | | % of total | 4,4 | 5,3 | 2,2 | 2,2 | 20,3 | 34,4 |
| | No | Count | 38 | 47 | 11 | 12 | 57 | 165 |
| | | % within period checkup | 23 | 28,5 | 6,7 | 7,3 | 34,5 | 100 |
| | | % within reasons | 63,3 | 61,8 | 44,0 | 54,5 | 41,6 | 51,6 |
| | | % of total | 11,9 | 14,7 | 3,4 | 3,8 | 17,8 | 51,6 |
| | Undec. | count | 8 | 12 | 7 | 3 | 15 | 45 |
| | | % within period checkup | 17,8 | 26,7 | 15,6 | 6,7 | 33,3 | 100 |
| | | % within reasons | 13,3 | 15,8 | 28,0 | 13,6 | 10,9 | 14,1 |
| | | % of total | 2,5 | 3,8 | 2,2 | ,9 | 4,7 | 14,1 |
| | Total | Count | 60 | 76 | 25 | 22 | 137 | 320 |
| | | % within period checkup | 18,8 | 23,8 | 7,8 | 6,9 | 42,8 | 100 |
| | | % within reasons | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |

| | | | Reasons (%) | | | | | Total | |
|-------------------|--------|----------------------------|----------------------------|-----------|---------------|--------------|-------|-------|-----|
| | | | Recomm. | Emergency | Free Check-up | Prev. Exper. | Other | | |
| Period checkup | Yes | Count | 14 | 17 | 7 | 7 | 65 | 110 | |
| | | % within period checkup | 12,7 | 15,5 | 6,4 | 6,4 | 59,1 | 100 | |
| | | % within reasons | 23,3 | 22,4 | 28,0 | 31,8 | 47,4 | 34,4 | |
| | | % of total | 4,4 | 5,3 | 2,2 | 2,2 | 20,3 | 34,4 | |
| | No | Count | 38 | 47 | 11 | 12 | 57 | 165 | |
| | | % within period checkup | 23 | 28,5 | 6,7 | 7,3 | 34,5 | 100 | |
| | | % within reasons | 63,3 | 61,8 | 44,0 | 54,5 | 41,6 | 51,6 | |
| | | % of total | 11,9 | 14,7 | 3,4 | 3,8 | 17,8 | 51,6 | |
| | Undec. | count | 8 | 12 | 7 | 3 | 15 | 45 | |
| | | % within period checkup | 17,8 | 26,7 | 15,6 | 6,7 | 33,3 | 100 | |
| | | % within reasons | 13,3 | 15,8 | 28,0 | 13,6 | 10,9 | 14,1 | |
| | | % of total | 2,5 | 3,8 | 2,2 | ,9 | 4,7 | 14,1 | |
| | Total | | Count | 60 | 76 | 25 | 22 | 137 | 320 |
| | | | % within period checkup | 18,8 | 23,8 | 7,8 | 6,9 | 42,8 | 100 |
| % within reasons | | | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | |
| % of total | | | 18,8 | 23,8 | 7,8 | 6,9 | 42,8 | 100 | |

Table 41 shows that 17 people who have routine checkups only buy medication without prescription in an emergency, 47 people who do not have routine checkups buy medication in an emergency.

Table 42: Periodical checkup and Where you follow dermo cosmetic cross-tabulation

| | | | Where you follow derma-cosmetic (%) | | | | | Total |
|----------------|--------|--|-------------------------------------|----------|--------|---------|-------|-------|
| | | | Social Media | Magazine | Doctor | Friends | Other | |
| Period checkup | Yes | Count | 32 | 16 | 37 | 13 | 12 | 110 |
| | | % within period checkup | 29,1 | 14,5 | 33,6 | 11,8 | 10,9 | 100 |
| | | % within where you follow derma-cosmetic | 38,1 | 33,3 | 42,0 | 22,8 | 27,9 | 34,4 |
| | | % of total | 10,0 | 5,0 | 11,6 | 4,1 | 3,8 | 34,4 |
| | No | Count | 36 | 23 | 48 | 30 | 28 | 165 |
| | | % within period checkup | 21,8 | 13,9 | 29,1 | 18,2 | 17,0 | 100 |
| | | % within where you follow derma-cosmetic | 42,9 | 47,9 | 54,5 | 52,6 | 65,1 | 51,6 |
| | | % of total | 11,3 | 7,2 | 15,0 | 9,4 | 8,8 | 51,6 |
| | Undec. | Count | 16 | 9 | 3 | 14 | 3 | 45 |
| | | % within period checkup | 35,6 | 20,0 | 6,7 | 31,1 | 6,7 | 100 |
| | | % within where you follow derma-cosmetic | 19,0 | 18,8 | 3,4 | 24,6 | 7,0 | 14,1 |
| | | % of total | 5,0 | 2,8 | ,9 | 4,4 | ,9 | 14,1 |
| | Total | | Count | 84 | 48 | 88 | 57 | 43 |

| | | | | | | | |
|--|--|------|------|------|------|------|-----|
| | % within period checkup | 26,3 | 15,0 | 27,5 | 17,8 | 13,4 | 100 |
| | % within where you follow derma-cosmetic | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| | % of total | 26,3 | 15,0 | 27,5 | 17,8 | 13,4 | 100 |

Table 42 shows 37 people who have routine checkups and 48 people who do not have routine checkups follow derma-cosmetic products through their doctor.

Table 43: Periodical checkup and Where you follow painkillers cross-tabulation

| | | | Where you follow Painkillers (%) | | | | | Total |
|----------------|--------|---------------------------------------|----------------------------------|----------|--------|---------|-------|-------|
| | | | Social Media | Magazine | Doctor | Friends | Other | |
| Period checkup | Yes | Count | 29 | 13 | 55 | 6 | 7 | 110 |
| | | % within period Checkup | 26,4 | 11,8 | 50,0 | 5,5 | 6,4 | 100 |
| | | % within where you follow painkillers | 44,6 | 23,6 | 42,6 | 18,2 | 18,4 | 34,4 |
| | | % of total | 9,1 | 4,1 | 17,2 | 1,9 | 2,2 | 34,4 |
| | No | Count | 28 | 35 | 56 | 21 | 25 | 165 |
| | | % within period Checkup | 17,0 | 21,2 | 33,9 | 12,7 | 15,2 | 100 |
| | | % within where you follow painkillers | 43,1 | 63,6 | 43,4 | 63,6 | 65,8 | 51,6 |
| | | % of total | 8,8 | 10,9 | 17,5 | 6,6 | 7,8 | 51,6 |
| | Undec. | Count | 8 | 7 | 18 | 6 | 6 | 45 |
| | | % within period Checkup | 17,8 | 15,6 | 40,0 | 13,3 | 13,3 | 100 |

| | | | | | | | | |
|-------|--|---------------------------------------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| | | % within where you follow painkillers | 12,3 | 12,7 | 14,0 | 18,2 | 15,8 | 14,1 |
| | | % of total | 2,5 | 2,2 | 5,6 | 1,9 | 1,9 | 14,1 |
| Total | | Count | 65 | 55 | 129 | 33 | 38 | 320 |
| | | % within period Checkup | 20,3 | 17,2 | 40,3 | 10,3 | 11,9 | 100 |
| | | % within where you follow painkillers | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| | | % of total | 20,3 | 17,2 | 40,3 | 10,3 | 11,9 | 100 |

Table 43 shows that 55 people who have and 56 people who do not have routine checkups follow up on painkillers products through their doctor. 55 (50%) people who have routine checkups and 56 (33.9%) people who do not have routine checkups when buying painkiller products buy on recommendation.

Table 44: Periodical checkup and Suggested derma-cosmetics cross-tabulation

| | | | Suggested Derma-Cosmetics (%) | | | Total |
|----------------|--------|------------------------------------|-------------------------------|------|-----------|-------|
| | | | Yes | No | Undecided | |
| Period checkup | Yes | count | 37 | 57 | 16 | 110 |
| | | % within period checkup | 33,6 | 51,8 | 14,5 | 100 |
| | | % within suggested derma-cosmetics | 36,3 | 42,5 | 19,0 | 34,4 |
| | | % of total | 11,6 | 17,8 | 5,0 | 34,4 |
| | No | count | 50 | 68 | 47 | 165 |
| | | % within period checkup | 30,3 | 41,2 | 28,5 | 100 |
| | | % within suggested derma-cosmetics | 49,0 | 50,7 | 56,0 | 51,6 |
| | | % of total | 15,6 | 21,3 | 14,7 | 51,6 |
| | Undec. | count | 15 | 9 | 21 | 45 |
| | | % within period checkup | 33,3 | 20,0 | 46,7 | 100 |
| | | % within suggested derma-cosmetics | 14,7 | 6,7 | 25,0 | 14,1 |
| | | % of total | 4,7 | 2,8 | 6,6 | 14,1 |
| Total | | count | 102 | 134 | 84 | 320 |
| | | % within period checkup | 31,9 | 41,9 | 26,3 | 100 |
| | | % within suggested derma-cosmetics | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| | | % of total | 31,9 | 41,9 | 26,3 | 100 |

Table 44 shows 37 people who have routine checkup buy derma-cosmetic products upon recommendation, 57 people who do not have routine checkups do not buy derma-cosmetic products upon recommendation.

Table 45: Periodical checkup and Suggested painkillers cross-tabulation

| | | | Suggested Painkillers | | | Total |
|-------------------|--------|--------------------------------------|-----------------------|------|-----------|-------|
| | | | Yes | No | Undecided | |
| Period checkup | Yes | count | 38 | 55 | 17 | 110 |
| | | % within period checkup | 34,5 | 50 | 15,5 | 100 |
| | | % within suggested painkillers | 33,0 | 41 | 23,9 | 34,4 |
| | | % of total | 11,9 | 17,2 | 5,3 | 34,4 |
| | No | count | 62 | 69 | 34 | 165 |
| | | % within period checkup | 37,6 | 41,8 | 20,6 | 100 |
| | | % within suggested painkillers | 53,9 | 51,5 | 47,9 | 51,6 |
| | | % of total | 19,4 | 21,6 | 10,6 | 51,6 |
| | Undec. | count | 15 | 10 | 20 | 45 |
| | | % within period checkup | 33,3 | 22,2 | 44,4 | 100 |
| | | % within suggested painkillers | 13 | 7,5 | 28,2 | 14,1 |
| | | % of total | 4,7 | 3,1 | 6,3 | 14,1 |
| Total | | count | 115 | 134 | 71 | 320 |
| | | % within period checkup | 35,9 | 41,9 | 22,2 | 100 |
| | | % within suggested painkillers | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| | | % of total | 35,9 | 41,9 | 22,2 | 100, |

Table 45 shows that 38 people who have routine checkups will purchase painkillers products upon recommendation, 55 people who have routine checkups will not purchase painkillers upon recommendation.

Table 46: Periodical checkup and Too much medication cross-tabulation

| | | | Too much Medication (%) | | | Total |
|-------------------|--------|---------------------------------|-------------------------|------|-----------|-------|
| | | | Yes | No | Undecided | |
| Period checkup | Yes | count | 45 | 50 | 15 | 110 |
| | | % within period checkup | 40,9 | 45,5 | 13,6 | 100 |
| | | % within too much medication | 35,2 | 41,7 | 20,8 | 34,4 |
| | | % of total | 14,1 | 15,6 | 4,7 | 34,4 |
| | No | Count | 65 | 58 | 42 | 165 |
| | | % within period checkup | 39,4 | 35,2 | 25,5 | 100 |
| | | % within too much medication | 50,8 | 48,3 | 58,3 | 51,6 |
| | | % of total | 20,3 | 18,1 | 13,1 | 51,6 |
| | Undec. | Count | 18 | 12 | 15 | 45 |
| | | % within period checkup | 40 | 26,7 | 33,3 | 100 |
| | | % within too much medication | 14,1 | 10 | 20,8 | 14,1 |
| | | % of total | 5,6 | 3,8 | 4,7 | 14,1 |
| Total | | Count | 128 | 120 | 72 | 320 |
| | | % within period checkup | 40 | 37,5 | 22,5 | 100 |
| | | % within too much medication | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| | | % of total | 40,0 | 37,5 | 22,5 | 100 |

Table 46 shows 50 people who have routine checkups feel that doctors do not prescribe unnecessary medication, 65 people who do not have routine checkups feel that doctors to prescribe unnecessary medication.

Table 47: Periodical checkup and Promotion with doctors cross-tabulation

| | | | Promotion with doctors | | | Total |
|-------------------|--------|---------------------------------------|------------------------|------|-----------|-------|
| | | | Yes | No | Undecided | |
| Period checkup | Yes | count | 44 | 44 | 22 | 110 |
| | | % within period checkup | 40 | 40 | 20 | 100 |
| | | % within promotion with doctors | 37,6 | 32,6 | 32,4 | 34,4 |
| | | % of total | 13,8 | 13,8 | 6,9 | 34,4 |
| | No | count | 66 | 72 | 27 | 165 |
| | | % within period checkup | 40 | 43,6 | 16,4 | 100 |
| | | % within promotion with doctors | 56,4 | 53,3 | 39,7 | 51,6 |
| | | % of total | 20,6 | 22,5 | 8,4 | 51,6 |
| | Undec. | count | 7 | 19 | 19 | 45 |
| | | % within period checkup | 15,6 | 42,2 | 42,2 | 100 |
| | | % within promotion with doctors | 6,0 | 14,1 | 27,9 | 14,1 |
| | | % of total | 2,2 | 5,9 | 5,9 | 14,1 |
| Total | | count | 117 | 135 | 68 | 320 |
| | | % within period checkup | 36,6 | 42,2 | 21,3 | 100 |
| | | % within promotion with doctors | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| | | % of total | 36,6 | 42,2 | 21,3 | 100 |

Table 47 shows that 44 people who have and 44 people who do not have routine checkups agree on promotional offers given to doctors. People who have routine checkups' 44 people (40%) agree on doctors buying promotional products whereas 44 people (40%) do not agree. People who do not have routine checkups 66 people (40%) agree to doctors buying promotional products, whereas 72 people (43.6%) do not agree.

Table 48: Periodical checkup and Consult doctor straight away cross-tabulation

| | | | Consult doctor straight away | | | | | Total | |
|----------------|-------|---------------------------------------|------------------------------|--------|------|-------|------|--------|-------|
| | | | SA | A | U | D | SD | | |
| Period checkup | Yes | Count | 36 | 29 | 27 | 14 | 4 | 110 | |
| | | % within period checkup | 32,7 | 26,4 | 24,5 | 12,7 | 3,6 | 100 | |
| | | % within consult doctor straight away | 43,4 | 33,7 | 36,0 | 21,5 | 36,4 | 34,4 | |
| | | % of total | 11,3 | 9,1 | 8,4 | 4,4 | 1,3 | 34,4 | |
| | No | Count | 39 | 48 | 31 | 42 | 5 | 165 | |
| | | % within period checkup | 23,6 | 29,1 | 18,8 | 25,5 | 3 | 100 | |
| | | % within consult doctor straight away | 47 | 55,8 | 41,3 | 64,6 | 45,5 | 51,6 | |
| | | % of total | 12,2% | 15,0 % | 9,7% | 13,1% | 1,6% | 51,6 % | |
| | Unde. | Count | 8 | 9 | 17 | 9 | 2 | 45 | |
| | | % within period checkup | 17,8 | 20 | 37,8 | 20 | 4,4 | 100 | |
| | | % within consult doctor straight away | 9,6 | 10,5 | 22,7 | 13,8 | 18,2 | 14,1 | |
| | | % of total | 2,5 | 2,8 | 5,3 | 2,8 | ,6 | 14,1 | |
| | Total | | Count | 83 | 86 | 75 | 65 | 11 | 320 |
| | | | % within period checkup | 25,9 | 26,9 | 23,4 | 20,3 | 3,4 | 100,0 |

| | | | | | | | |
|--|---------------------------------------|------|------|-------|------|-----|-----|
| | % within consult doctor straight away | 100 | 100 | 100,0 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| | % of total | 25,9 | 26,9 | 23,4 | 20,3 | 3,4 | 100 |

Table 48 show people who do and do not have routine checkups pass on their satisfaction and dissatisfaction to others. People who have routine checkups 65 people consult a doctor as soon as they get a headache, whereas people who do not have routine checkups also consult a doctor straight away.

Table 49: Personal care and Sex cross-tabulation

| | | | | Sex (%) | | Total |
|---------------|-----------|------------------------|--|---------|------|-------|
| | | | | Female | Male | |
| Personal care | Yes | count | | 152 | 60 | 212 |
| | | % within personal care | | 71,7 | 28,3 | 100 |
| | | % within sex | | 84,9 | 42,6 | 66,3 |
| | | % of total | | 47,5 | 18,8 | 66,3 |
| | No | count | | 15 | 57 | 72 |
| | | % within personal care | | 20,8 | 79,2 | 100 |
| | | % within sex | | 8,4 | 40,4 | 22,5 |
| | | % of total | | 4,7 | 17,8 | 22,5 |
| | Undecided | count | | 12 | 24 | 36 |
| | | % within personal care | | 33,3 | 66,7 | 100 |
| | | % within sex | | 6,7 | 17 | 11,3 |
| | | % of total | | 3,8 | 7,5 | 11,3 |
| Total | | count | | 179 | 141 | 320 |
| | | % within personal care | | 55,9 | 44,1 | 100 |
| | | % within sex | | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| | | % of total | | 55,9 | 44,1 | 100 |

Table 49 shows that 152 (71, 7%) females pay more attention to personal care, 107 people aged between 18-28 pay attention to personal care. People who pay attention

to personal care 152 are female and 60 are male. People who do not pay attention to personal care 15 are female and 57 are male.

Table 50: Personal care and Age cross-tabulation

| | | | Age | | | | Total |
|---------------|-----------|------------------------|-------|-------|-------|------|-------|
| | | | 18-28 | 29-39 | 40-50 | 50 + | |
| Personal care | Yes | count | 107 | 62 | 31 | 12 | 212 |
| | | % within personal care | 50,5 | 29,2 | 14,6 | 5,7 | 100 |
| | | % within age | 75,4 | 62, | 55,4 | 54,5 | 66,3 |
| | | % of total | 33,4 | 19,4 | 9,7 | 3,8 | 66,3 |
| | No | count | 19 | 30 | 20 | 3 | 72 |
| | | % within personal care | 26,4 | 41,7 | 27,8 | 4,2 | 100 |
| | | % within age | 13,4 | 30 | 35,7 | 13,6 | 22,5 |
| | | % of total | 5,9 | 9,4 | 6,3 | ,9 | 22,5 |
| | Undecided | count | 16 | 8 | 5 | 7 | 36 |
| | | % within personal care | 44,4 | 22,2 | 13,9 | 19,4 | 100 |
| | | % within age | 11,3 | 8,0 | 8,9 | 31,8 | 11,3 |
| | | % of total | 5 | 2,5 | 1,6 | 2,2 | 11, |
| Total | | count | 142 | 100 | 56 | 22 | 320 |
| | | % within personal care | 44,4 | 31,3 | 17,5 | 6,9 | 100 |
| | | % within age | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| | | % of total | 44,4 | 31,3% | 17,5% | 6,9 | 100 |

Table 50, When we look at the crosstables people who pay attention to personal care and the people who were surveyed particularly the young generation aged between 18-28, 107 people show importance to personal care but as the age increases the ratio decreases.

Table 51: Personal Care and Period Checkup cross-tabulation

| | | | Period checkup (%) | | | Total |
|---------------|-----------|-------------------------|--------------------|------|-----------|-------|
| | | | Yes | No | Undecided | |
| Personal care | Yes | count | 86 | 108 | 18 | 212 |
| | | % within personal care | 40,6 | 50,9 | 8,5 | 100 |
| | | % within period checkup | 78,2 | 65,5 | 40 | 66,3 |
| | | % of total | 26,9 | 33,8 | 5,6 | 66,3 |
| | No | Count | 18 | 46 | 8 | 72 |
| | | % within personal care | 25,0 | 63,9 | 11,1 | 100 |
| | | % within period checkup | 16,4 | 27,9 | 17,8 | 22,5 |
| | | % of total | 5,6 | 14,4 | 2,5 | 22,5 |
| | Undecided | Count | 6 | 11 | 19 | 36 |
| | | % within personal care | 16,7 | 30,6 | 52,8 | 100 |
| | | % within period checkup | 5,5 | 6,7 | 42,2 | 11,3 |
| | | % of total | 1,9 | 3,4 | 5,9 | 11,3 |
| Total | | Count | 110 | 165 | 45 | 320 |
| | | % within personal care | 34,4 | 51,6 | 14,1 | 100 |
| | | % within period checkup | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| | | % of total | 34,4 | 51,6 | 14,1 | 100 |

Table 51 shows 108 (50,9%) people pay attention to their personal care but do not have routine checkups, 48 people do not pay attention to personal care and do not have routine checkups. People who pay attention to personal care 86 people have routine checkups whereas 108 people do not. People who do not pay attention to personal care 18 people have routine checkups whereas 46 people do not.

Table 52: Personal care and How Often Derma-cosmetic cross-tabulation

| | | | How often Derma-cosmetic | | | | Total |
|-----------------------------------|--------|-----------------------------------|--------------------------|------------|---------|-------|-------|
| | | | When Needed | On Recomm. | On Sale | Other | |
| Personal care | Yes | count | 115 | 48 | 27 | 22 | 212 |
| | | % within personal care | 54,2 | 22,6 | 12,7 | 10,4 | 100 |
| | | % within how often derma-cosmetic | 77,7 | 64 | 48,2 | 53,7 | 66,3 |
| | | % of total | 35,9 | 15 | 8,4 | 6,9 | 66,3 |
| | No | count | 24 | 20 | 23 | 5 | 72 |
| | | % within personal care | 33,3 | 27,8 | 31,9 | 6,9 | 100 |
| | | % within how often derma-cosmetic | 16,2 | 26,7 | 41,1 | 12,2 | 22,5 |
| | | % of total | 7,5 | 6,3 | 7,2 | 1,6 | 22,5 |
| | Undec. | count | 9 | 7 | 6 | 14 | 36 |
| | | % within personal care | 25 | 19,4 | 16,7 | 38,9 | 100 |
| | | % within how often derma-cosmetic | 6,1 | 9,3 | 10,7 | 34,1 | 11,3 |
| | | % of total | 2,8 | 2,2 | 1,9 | 4,4 | 11,3 |
| | Total | | count | 148 | 75 | 56 | 41 |
| % within personal care | | | 46,3 | 23,4 | 17,5 | 12,8 | 100 |
| % within how often derma-cosmetic | | | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| % of total | | | 46,3 | 23,4 | 17,5 | 12,8 | 100 |

Table 52 shows 115 people who pay attention to personal care only purchase derma-cosmetic products when necessary. People who have personal care 115 people buy derma-cosmetic products when required, people who do not have personal care 23 people purchase derma-cosmetic products based on quality.

Table 53: Personal care and When Purchasing Derma-cosmetic cross-tabulation

| | | | When Purchasing Derma-cosmetic | | | | | | Total |
|---------------|--------|---|--------------------------------|---------|-------|---------|------|-------|-------|
| | | | Prices | Quality | Brand | Recomm. | Adv | Other | |
| Personal care | Yes | Count | 52 | 71 | 45 | 23 | 19 | 2 | 212 |
| | | % within personal care | 24,5 | 33,5 | 21,2 | 10,8 | 9 | ,9 | 100 |
| | | % within when purchasing derma-cosmetic | 75,4 | 68,3 | 66,2 | 62,2 | 52,8 | 33,3 | 66,3 |
| | | % of total | 16,3 | 22,2 | 14,1 | 7,2 | 5,9 | ,6 | 66,3 |
| | No | Count | 13 | 26 | 18 | 9 | 5 | 1 | 72 |
| | | % within personal care | 18,1 | 36,1 | 25 | 12,5 | 6,9 | 1,4 | 100 |
| | | % within when purchasing derma-cosmetic | 18,8 | 25 | 26,5 | 24,3 | 13,9 | 16,7 | 22,5 |
| | | % of total | 4,1 | 8,1 | 5,6 | 2,8 | 1,6 | ,3 | 22,5 |
| | Undec. | Count | 4 | 7 | 5 | 5 | 12 | 3 | 36 |
| | | % within personal care | 11,1 | 19,4 | 13,9 | 13,9 | 33,3 | 8,3 | 100 |
| | | % within when purchasing derma-cosmetic | 5,8 | 6,7 | 7,4 | 13,5 | 33,3 | 50 | 11,3 |
| | | % of total | 1,3 | 2,2 | 1,6 | 1,6 | 3,8 | ,9 | 11,3 |

| | | | | | | | | |
|-------|---|------|------|------|------|------|-----|-----|
| Total | Count | 69 | 104 | 68 | 37 | 36 | 6 | 320 |
| | % within personal care | 21,6 | 32,5 | 21,3 | 11,6 | 11,3 | 1,9 | 100 |
| | % Within when purchasing derma-cosmetic | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| | % Of Total | 21,6 | 32,5 | 21,3 | 11,6 | 11,3 | 1,9 | 100 |

Table 53 shows 71 people who pay attention to personal care focus on quality when purchasing derma-cosmetic products. People who pay attention to personal care 71 people and people who do not pay attention to personal care 26 people when purchasing derma-cosmetic products look at quality.

Table 54: Personal care and Advertising Effect On Derma-cosmetic cross-tabulation

| | | | Advertising Effect On Derma-cosmetic (%) | | | Total |
|---|--------|---|--|------|-----------|-------|
| | | | Yes | No | Undecided | |
| Personal care | Yes | Count | 93 | 86 | 33 | 212 |
| | | % within personal care | 43,9 | 40,6 | 15,6 | 100 |
| | | % within advertising effect on derma-cosmetic | 72,7 | 68,8 | 49,3 | 66,3 |
| | | % of total | 29,1 | 26,9 | 10,3 | 66,3 |
| | No | Count | 25 | 28 | 19 | 72 |
| | | % within personal care | 34,7 | 38,9 | 26,4 | 100 |
| | | % within advertising effect on derma-cosmetic | 19,5 | 22,4 | 28,4 | 22,5 |
| | | % of total | 7,8 | 8,8 | 5,9 | 22,5 |
| | Undec. | Count | 10 | 11 | 15 | 36 |
| | | % within personal care | 27,8 | 30,6 | 41,7 | 100 |
| | | % within advertising effect on derma-cosmetic | 7,8 | 8,8 | 22,4 | 11,3 |
| | | % of total | 3,1 | 3,4 | 4,7 | 11,3 |
| | Total | | count | 128 | 125 | 67 |
| % within personal care | | | 40,0 | 39,1 | 20,9 | 100 |
| % within advertising effect on derma-cosmetic | | | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| % of total | | | 40 | 39,1 | 20,9 | 100 |

Table 54 shows 93 people who pay attention to personal care feel that advertising effects their purchasing decision on derma-cosmetic products. People who pay attention to personal care 93 people are effected by advertising when purchasing

derma-cosmetic products, 86 people are not effected by advertising, people who do not pay attention to personal care 25 people are effected 28 people are not.

Table 55: Personal care and How do you decide cross-tabulation

| | | | How do you Decide | | | | | Total |
|------------------------|--------|----------------------------|---------------------|-----------------|---------------|------------------|-------|-------|
| | | | Previous Experience | Recomm. Friends | Pharm Recomm. | Without Prescrip | Other | |
| Personal care | Yes | count | 52 | 20 | 37 | 102 | 1 | 212 |
| | | % within personal care | 24,5 | 9,4 | 17,5 | 48,1 | ,5 | 100 |
| | | % within how do you decide | 69,3 | 48,8 | 56,9 | 74,5 | 50 | 66,3 |
| | | % of total | 16,3 | 6,3 | 11,6 | 31,9 | ,3 | 66,3 |
| | No | count | 20 | 14 | 19 | 18 | 1 | 72 |
| | | % within personal care | 27,8 | 19,4 | 26,4 | 25,0 | 1,4 | 100 |
| | | % within how do you decide | 26,7 | 34,1 | 29,2 | 13,1 | 50 | 22,5 |
| | | % of total | 6,3 | 4,4 | 5,9 | 5,6 | ,3 | 22,5 |
| | Undec. | count | 3 | 7 | 9 | 17 | 0 | 36 |
| | | % within personal care | 8,3 | 19,4 | 25 | 47,2 | ,0 | 100 |
| | | % within how do you decide | 4,0 | 17,1 | 13,8 | 12,4 | ,0 | 11,3 |
| | | % of total | ,9 | 2,2 | 2,8 | 5,3% | ,0 | 11,3 |
| | Total | | count | 75 | 41 | 65 | 137 | 2 |
| % within personal care | | | 23,4 | 12,8 | 20,3 | 42,8 | ,6 | 100 |

| | | | | | | | |
|--|-------------------------------------|------|------|------|------|-----|-----|
| | % within how do you decide | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| | % of total | 23,4 | 12,8 | 20,3 | 42,8 | ,6 | 100 |

Table 55, 102 people who pay attention to personal care purchase medication without prescription. The majority of the people who do and do not pay attention to personal care base their purchase on previous experiences.

Table 56: Personal care and to much medication cross-tabulation

| | | | Too Much Medication (%) | | | Total |
|---------------|--------|------------------------------|-------------------------|--------|-----------|--------|
| | | | Yes | No | Undecided | |
| Personal care | Yes | Count | 91 | 85 | 36 | 212 |
| | | % within personal care | 42,9% | 40,1% | 17,0% | 100,0% |
| | | % within too much medication | 71,1% | 70,8% | 50,0% | 66,3% |
| | | % of total | 28,4% | 26,6% | 11,3% | 66,3% |
| | No | Count | 26 | 24 | 22 | 72 |
| | | % within personal care | 36,1% | 33,3% | 30,6% | 100,0% |
| | | % within too much medication | 20,3% | 20,0% | 30,6% | 22,5% |
| | | % of total | 8,1% | 7,5% | 6,9% | 22,5% |
| | Undec. | Count | 11 | 11 | 14 | 36 |
| | | % within personal care | 30,6% | 30,6% | 38,9% | 100,0% |
| | | % within too much medication | 8,6% | 9,2% | 19,4% | 11,3% |
| | | % of total | 3,4% | 3,4% | 4,4% | 11,3% |
| Total | | Count | 128 | 120 | 72 | 320 |
| | | % within personal care | 40,0% | 37,5% | 22,5% | 100,0% |
| | | % within too much medication | 100,0% | 100,0% | 100,0% | 100,0% |
| | | % of total | 40,0% | 37,5% | 22,5% | 100,0% |

Table 56 shows 91 people who pay attention to personal care feel that too much medication is being prescribed. People who pay attention to personal care 91 people agree on doctors prescribing too much medication 85 people do not agree. People who do not pay attention to personal care 26 people agree on doctors prescribing too much medication 24 people do not agree.

Table 57: Personal care and First person to consult cross-tabulation

| | | | First Person To Consult | | | | | Total |
|---------------|--------|----------------------------------|-------------------------|---------------|--------|-------|-------|-------|
| | | | Family | Medical Staff | Friend | Pharm | Other | |
| Personal care | Yes | Count | 82 | 77 | 14 | 37 | 2 | 212 |
| | | % Within personal care | 38,7 | 36,3 | 6,6 | 17,5 | ,9 | 100 |
| | | % Within first person to consult | 61,2 | 72 | 50 | 84,1 | 28,6 | 66,3 |
| | | % of Total | 25,6 | 24,1 | 4,4 | 11,6 | ,6 | 66,3 |
| | No | Count | 40 | 17 | 8 | 5 | 2 | 72 |
| | | % Within personal care | 55,6 | 23,6 | 11,1 | 6,9 | 2,8 | 100 |
| | | % Within first person to consult | 29,9 | 15,9 | 28,6 | 11,4 | 28,6 | 22,5 |
| | | % of Total | 12,5 | 5,3 | 2,5 | 1,6 | ,6 | 22,5 |
| | Undec. | Count | 12 | 13 | 6 | 2 | 3 | 36 |
| | | % Within personal care | 33,3 | 36,1 | 16,7 | 5,6 | 8,3 | 100 |
| | | % Within first person to consult | 9 | 12,1 | 21,4 | 4,5 | 42,9 | 11,3 |
| | | % Of Total | 3,8 | 4,1 | 1,9 | ,6 | ,9 | 11,3 |
| Total | | Count | 134 | 107 | 28 | 44 | 7 | 320 |
| | | % Within personal care | 41,9 | 33,4 | 8,8 | 13,8 | 2,2 | 100 |
| | | % Within first person to consult | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| | | % Of Total | 41,9 | 33,4 | 8,8 | 13,8 | 2,2 | 100 |

Table 57 shows, 82 people who pay attention to personal care consult family members first. People who do and do not pay attention to personal care consult their families first about health related issues.

Table 58: Personal care and Passon Negative Positive Feedback cross-tabulation

| | | | Passion Negative Positive Feedback | | | Total |
|---|--------|---|------------------------------------|------|-----------|-------|
| | | | Yes | No | Undecided | |
| Personal care | Yes | Count | 172 | 24 | 16 | 212 |
| | | % Within personal care | 81,1 | 11,3 | 7,5 | 100 |
| | | % Within passion negative positive feedback | 71,4 | 60,0 | 41,0 | 66,3 |
| | | % Of Total | 53,8 | 7,5 | 5,0 | 66,3 |
| | No | Count | 48 | 14 | 10 | 72 |
| | | % Within personal care | 66,7 | 19,4 | 13,9 | 100 |
| | | % Within passion negative positive feedback | 19,9 | 35 | 25,6 | 22,5 |
| | | % Of Total | 15 | 4,4 | 3,1 | 22,5 |
| | Undec. | Count | 21 | 2 | 13 | 36 |
| | | % Within personal care | 58,3 | 5,6 | 36,1 | 100 |
| | | % Within passion negative positive feedback | 8,7 | 5 | 33,3 | 11,3 |
| | | % of Total | 6,6 | ,6 | 4,1 | 11,3 |
| | Total | | Count | 241 | 40 | 39 |
| % Within personal care | | | 75,3 | 12,5 | 12,2 | 100 |
| % Within passion negative positive feedback | | | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| % of Total | | | 75,3 | 12,5 | 12,2 | 100 |

Table 58 shows 172 people who pay attention to personal care passes on their satisfaction and dissatisfaction in the health sector. People who pay attention attention to personal care 172 people pass on positive or negative information onto

others 24 people do not. People who do not pay attention to personal care 48 people pass on positive or negative information onto others 14 people do not.

Table 59: Personal care and Recommendation by pharmacist on painkillers cross-tabulation

| | | | Recommendation By Pharmacist On Painkillers | | | | | Total |
|--|-------|--|---|------|------|------|------|-------|
| | | | SA | A | U | D | SD | |
| Personal care | Yes | Count | 39 | 87 | 36 | 33 | 17 | 212 |
| | | % Within personal care | 18,4 | 41 | 17 | 15,6 | 8 | 100 |
| | | % Within recommendation by pharmacist on painkillers | 78,0 | 74,4 | 58,1 | 54,1 | 56,7 | 66,3 |
| | | % of Total | 12,2% | 27,2 | 11,3 | 10,3 | 5,3 | 66,3 |
| | No | Count | 6 | 18 | 19 | 23 | 6 | 72 |
| | | % Within personal care | 8,3 | 25 | 26,4 | 31,9 | 8,3 | 100 |
| | | % Within recommendation by pharmacist on painkillers | 12 | 15,4 | 30,6 | 37,7 | 20 | 22,5 |
| | | % of total | 1,9 | 5,6 | 5,9 | 7,2 | 1,9 | 22,5 |
| | Undec | Count | 5 | 12 | 7 | 5 | 7 | 36 |
| | | % Within personal care | 13,9 | 33,3 | 19,4 | 13,9 | 19,4 | 100 |
| | | % Within recommendation by pharmacist on painkillers | 10 | 10,3 | 11,3 | 8,2 | 23,3 | 11,3 |
| | | % of total | 1,6 | 3,8 | 2,2 | 1,6 | 2,2 | 11,3 |
| | Total | Count | 50 | 117 | 62 | 61 | 30 | 320 |
| % Within personal care | | 15,6 | 36,6 | 19,4 | 19,1 | 9,4 | 100 | |
| % Within recommendation by pharmacist on painkillers | | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | |
| % of total | | 15,6 | 36,6 | 19,4 | 19,1 | 9,4 | 100 | |

Table 59, 126 people who pay attention to personal care agree on pharmacist painkiller recommendation whereas 29 people who do not pay attention to personal care do not agree.

Table 60: Personal care and Recommendation by pharmacist on derma-cosmetic cross-tabulation

| | | | Recommendation by Pharmacist on Derma-cosmetic | | | | | Total |
|---------------|-------|---|--|------|------|------|------|-------|
| | | | SA | A | U | D | SD | |
| Personal care | Yes | Count | 17 | 84 | 50 | 39 | 22 | 212 |
| | | % Within personal care | 8 | 39,6 | 23,6 | 18,4 | 10,4 | 100 |
| | | % Within recommendation by pharmacist on derma-cosmetic | 65,4 | 75,7 | 71,4 | 52 | 57,9 | 66,3 |
| | | % Of Total | 5,3 | 26,3 | 15,6 | 12,2 | 6,9 | 66,3 |
| | No | Count | 7 | 14 | 12 | 29 | 10 | 72 |
| | | % Within personal care | 9,7 | 19,4 | 16,7 | 40,3 | 13,9 | 100 |
| | | % Within recommendation by pharmacist on derma-cosmetic | 26,9 | 12,6 | 17,1 | 38,7 | 26,3 | 22,5 |
| | | % Of Total | 2,2 | 4,4 | 3,8 | 9,1 | 3,1 | 22,5 |
| | Undec | Count | 2 | 13 | 8 | 7 | 6 | 36 |
| | | % Within personal care | 5,6 | 36,1 | 22,2 | 19,4 | 16,7 | 100 |
| | | % Within recommendation by pharmacist on derma-cosmetic | 7,7 | 11,7 | 11,4 | 9,3 | 15,8 | 11,3 |
| | | % Of Total | ,6 | 4,1 | 2,5 | 2,2 | 1,9 | 11,3 |
| | Total | | Count | 26 | 111 | 70 | 75 | 38 |

| | | | | | | | |
|--|---|-----|------|------|-------|------|-----|
| | % Within personal care | 8,1 | 34,7 | 21,9 | 23,4% | 11,9 | 100 |
| | % Within recommendation by pharmacist on derma-cosmetic | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| | | 8,1 | 34,7 | 21,9 | 23,4 | 11,9 | 100 |

Table 60, 101 people who pay attention to personal care agree on Derma-cosmetic pharmacist recommendation whereas 39 people who do not pay attention to personal care do not agree

Table 61: What Kind of products and How do you decide cross-tabulation

| | | | How Do You Decide | | | | | Total |
|---------|----------------|-----------------------------|-------------------|---------------|-------------|----------|-------|-------|
| | | | Prev. Exper. | Recomm Friend | Pharm Recom | Unpresc. | Other | |
| Product | Painkillers | Count | 32 | 17 | 23 | 5 | 1 | 78 |
| | | % Within products | 41 | 21,8 | 29,5 | 6,4 | 1,3 | 100 |
| | | % Within how do you decided | 42,7 | 41,5 | 35,4 | 3,6 | 50 | 24,4 |
| | | % Of Total | 10 | 5,3 | 7,2 | 1,6 | ,3 | 24,4 |
| | Derma-cosmetic | Count | 13 | 12 | 11 | 5 | 0 | 41 |
| | | % Within product | 31,7 | 29,3 | 26,8 | 12,2 | ,0 | 100 |
| | | % Within how do you decided | 17,3 | 29,3 | 16,9 | 3,6 | ,0 | 12,8 |
| | | % Of Total | 4,1 | 3,8 | 3,4 | 1,6 | ,0 | 12,8 |
| | Antibiotic | Count | 19 | 7 | 16 | 4 | 1 | 47 |
| | | % Within product | 40,4 | 14,9 | 34 | 8,5 | 2,1 | 100 |
| | | % Within how do you decided | 25,3 | 17,1 | 24,6 | 50 | 14,7 | 100 |
| | | % Of Total | 5,9 | 2,2 | 5,0 | 1,3 | ,3 | 14,7 |
| | All | Count | 7 | 5 | 14 | 1 | 0 | 27 |
| | | % Within product | 25,9 | 18,5 | 51,9 | 3,7 | ,0 | 100 |
| | | % Within how do you decided | 9,3 | 12,2 | 21,5 | ,7 | ,0 | 8,4 |
| | | % Of Total | 2,2 | 1,6 | 4,4 | ,3 | ,0 | 8,4 |
| | None | Count | 2 | 0 | 1 | 122 | 0 | 125 |
| | | % Within product | 1,6 | ,0 | ,8 | 97,6 | ,0 | 100 |

| | | | | | | | | |
|-------|--|-----------------------------------|------|------|------|------|-----|------|
| | | % Within how do you decided | 2,7 | ,0 | 1,5 | 89,1 | ,0 | 39,1 |
| | | % Of Total | ,6 | ,0 | ,3 | 38,1 | ,0 | 39,1 |
| Total | | Count | 75 | 41 | 65 | 137 | 2 | 320 |
| | | % Within product | 23,4 | 12,8 | 20,3 | 42,8 | ,6 | 100 |
| | | % Within how do you decided | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| | | % Of Total | 23,4 | 12,8 | 20,3 | 42,8 | ,6 | 100 |

Table 61, Painkillers when purchasing painkillers products 32 people go by previous experiences, 17 people friend recommendation, 23 people pharmacy recommendation and 5 people buy without prescription. Derma-cosmetics, when purchasing Derma-cosmetic products 13 people go by previous experiences, 12 people friend recommendation, 11 people pharmacy recommendation and 5 people buy without prescription. Antibiotics, when purchasing Antibiotics 19 people go by previous experiences, 7 people friend recommendation, 16 people pharmacy recommendation and 4 people buy without prescription.

Table 62: What kind of products and First person to consult cross-tabulation

| | | | First Person To Consult | | | | | Total |
|----------|----------------|----------------------------------|-------------------------|---------------|--------|-------|-------|-------|
| | | | Family | Health Worker | Friend | Phar. | Other | |
| Products | Painkillers | Count | 49 | 13 | 5 | 10 | 1 | 78 |
| | | % Within product | 62,8 | 16,7 | 6,4 | 12,8 | 1,3 | 100 |
| | | % Within first person to consult | 36,6 | 12,1 | 17,9 | 22,7 | 14,3 | 24,4 |
| | | % Of Total | 15,3 | 4,1 | 1,6 | 3,1 | ,3 | 24,4 |
| | Derma-cosmetic | Count | 19 | 8 | 10 | 4 | 0 | 41 |
| | | % Within product | 46,3 | 19,5 | 24,4 | 9,8 | ,0 | 100 |
| | | % Within first person to consult | 14,2 | 7,5 | 35,7 | 9,1 | ,0 | 12,8 |
| | | % Of Total | 5,9 | 2,5 | 3,1 | 1,3 | ,0 | 12,8 |
| | Antibiotic | Count | 24 | 12 | 6 | 5 | 0 | 47 |
| | | % Within product | 51,1 | 25,5 | 12,8 | 10,6 | ,0 | 100 |
| | | % Within first person to consult | 17,9 | 11,2 | 21,4 | 11,4 | ,0 | 14,7 |
| | | % Of Total | 7,5 | 3,8 | 1,9 | 1,6 | ,0 | 14,7 |
| | All | Count | 11 | 2 | 3 | 9 | 2 | 27 |
| | | % Within product | 40,7 | 7,4 | 11,1 | 33,3 | 7,4 | 100 |
| | | % Within first person to consult | 8,2 | 1,9 | 10,7 | 20,5 | 28,6 | 8,4 |
| | | % Of Total | 3,4 | ,6 | ,9 | 2,8 | ,6 | 8,4 |
| | None | Count | 30 | 71 | 4 | 16 | 4 | 125 |
| | | % Within product | 24,0 | 56,8 | 3,2 | 12,8 | 3,2 | 100 |
| | | % Within first person to consult | 22,4 | 66,4 | 14,3 | 36,4 | 57,1 | 39,1 |
| | | % Of Total | 9,4 | 22,2 | 1,3 | 5,0 | 1,3 | 39,1 |
| Total | | Count | 134 | 107 | 28 | 44 | 7 | 320 |
| | | % Within product | 41,9 | 33,4 | 8,8 | 13,8 | 2,2 | 100 |

| | | | | | | | |
|--|----------------------------------|------|------|-----|------|-----|-----|
| | % Within first person to consult | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| | % Of Total | 41,9 | 33,4 | 8,8 | 13,8 | 2,2 | 100 |

Table 62, Painkillers; when purchasing painkillers 49 people consult family members, 13 people contact health workers, 5 people contact friends and 10 people contact pharmacists. Derma-cosmetics; when purchasing Derma-cosmetic products 19 people consult family members, 8 people contact health workers, 10 people contact friends and 4 people contact pharmacists. Antibiotics; when purchasing Antibiotics; 24 people consult family members, 12 people contact health workers, 6 people contact friends and 5 people contact pharmacists.

Chapter 5

CONCLUSION

This chapter includes three sections; summary of the research, conclusion drawn for the study and recommendations for further research. All these sections give information about the results of the research and answers of the research questions in a detailed manner.

5.1 Summary of the Research

The Importance of WOM Communication in the Medical Sector in the TRNC Market. Therefore in this research Interpersonal Communication and Word of Mouth Communication theory was used.

In this study, quantitative research, survey method was conducted as primary resources and it was limited only to the painkiller and derma-cosmetic products in Famagusta TRNC market. Before collecting the accurate data 50 questionnaires were distributed as a pilot test and according to the feedback the pilot test questionnaire was renewed. Data collection was done by 320 respondents in 15 different areas in Famagusta. There were 33 questions in the questionnaire and it was prepared as in-house to explore the study.

The 135 (42.2%) respondents which contributed in this research nationality is Turkish Cypriot, 67 (20.9%) both Turkish Cypriot and Turkish and 118 (20.9%) are Turkish. The sex statuses are female participants' percentage is 179 (55.9 %), male participants'

percentage is 141 (44.1 %). Most of the participants, 178 (55,6%) Private Sector worker.

To understand how much participants caring their health. it was asked whether they are doing routine checkup and 165 (51,6%) participants did not have annual checkups, 110 (34,4%) participants had annual checkups. Also 212 (66,3%) participants show interest in their personal care, 72 (22,5%) participants do not show interest in their personal care, 36 (11,3%) participants were undecided. Before taking painkillers 126 (39,4%) wait until the last minute, 126 (39,4%) participants take a painkiller as soon as they have a headache but 148 (46,3%) participants use Derma-cosmetic products when required.

When purchasing Derma-cosmetic products 104 (32,5%) participants look for quality. Advertising is not effective on the purchasing behavior on painkiller products but is effective in the purchasing behavior of Derma-cosmetics products. This research shows that 126 (39,4%) participants do not use medication without prescription however 75 (23,4%) participants rely on previous experiences, 78 (24,4%) participants would buy painkillers without prescription. 194 (60,6%) would not buy medication on recommendation, 76 (23,8%) would only use medication without prescription in an emergency situation.

Doctors are effective in the purchase of derma-cosmetic and painkillers products, but 128 (40,0%) agree that doctors prescribe to much medication Also the second most effective method in the purchasing of derma-cosmetic and painkillers products is social media.

134 (41,9%) would contact a family member as first contact for medical advice.

The passing on negative or positive feedback about the Health Service 241 (75,1%) would pass onto others, 40 (12,5%) would not.

86 (25,9%) would contact a doctor straight away. 117 (36,6%) would use painkillers recommended by their pharmacist but 50 (15,6%) would not. 111 (34,7%) would use Derma-cosmetics recommended by their pharmacist, 75 (23%) would not. This survey shows that participants would definitely buy derma-cosmetic and painkiller products on recommendation.

As a conclusion people who have period checkups and people interested in personal care are connected. In general people who have periodic checkups are less than people who do not, despite this 86 of these people pay attention to their personal care, but 18 people do not, on the other hand most of the people who do not have yearly periodic checkups, 108 people pay attention to personal care. When deciding on derma-cosmetic products with routine checkup or not first they rely on quality than on brand.

5.2 Conclusion Drawn for The Study

This research shows that there is a connection between people who have routine annual checkups and people who pay attention to personal care. Before buying personal care products and medication in general purchase medication without a prescription and during the purchasing process are influenced by pharmacist and friend opinions. People who pay attention to personal care are the ones that are considered to have annual routine checkups. The ones who do and do not have annual routine checkups when purchasing derma-cosmetic products pay more

attention to quality and brand. The increase in age shows the increase of people who have annual routine checkups.

In general the number of people who have annual routine checkups are less, 86 people who do have annual routine checkups also pay attention to personal care, 18 people do not. This shows that people who have annual routine checkups pay attention to personal care which makes them equal.

5.3 Suggestion for Further Research

As WOM is a powerful mean of marketing in the health sector. No matter how much medical staffs do not agree to this, it had a significant role in the promotion and advertising of medical products.

Further research can be applied in different regions in TRNC like Nicosia, Kyrenia and compare the attitudes of people according geographical segmentation and generalize this study in TRNC market.

REFERENCES

- Aba, G. (2011). Saęlık Hizmetlerinde Aęızdan Aęıza Pazarlama: Bir Alan Arařtırması, *Fırat Saęlık Hizmetleri Dergisi*, Cilt:6, Sayı:16.
- Argan, M. (2006). Viral Marketing or Word Of Mouth Advertising on Internet: A Theoretical Framework, *Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 2006/2 P234.
- Babaoęul, M., řener, A. & Buęday, E.(2007). *Tüketici Yazıları (III)*, Hacettepe Üniversitesi, Tüketici - Pazar - Arařtırma - Danıřma, Test ve Eęitim Merkezi.
- Bauer, G., Davies, J. K., Pelikan, J., Noack, H., Broesskamp, U., & Hill, C. (2003). Advancing a Theoretical Model for Public Health and Health Promotion Indicator Development. *European Journal of Public Health*, 12(3), 107-113.
- Berger, C.R, and Calabrese J.R. (1975). Some Explorations In Initial Interaction And Beyond: Toward A Developmental Theory Of Interpersonal Communication, *Human Communication Research*, December.
- Bylund, L. C., Peterson, B. E. & Cameron, A. K (2012). A practitioner's guide to interpersonal communication theory: An overview and exploration of selected theories, *Patient Educ Couns.* 87(3): 261–267.
- Bone, F. P. (1995). Word-of-mouth effects on short-term and long-term product judgments, *Journal of Business Research*, Volume 32, Issue 3, March.

- Choffray, M. J. (1980). Industrial market segmentation by the structure of the purchasing process, *Industrial Marketing Management*, Volume 9, Issue 4, Pages 331–342.
- Brody, P. R. and Cuunigham, M. S. (1968). Personality Variables and the Consumer Decision Process, *Journal of Marketing Research*, Vol.5, No.1,pp50-57.
- Çakır, M. (2013). The Effects of Word Of Mouth Communication on the Consumers’ Travel Agency Choices, Fatma Cakir, Aysenur Cetin, *International Journal Of Business and Managament Studies*, Vol 5, No 1, 172-181.
- Chen, Y. & Xie, J. (2008). Online Consumer Review: Word-of-Mouth as a New Element of Marketing Communication Mix, *Management Science*, Vol. 54, No. 3, March 2008, pp. 477–491.
- Christopher H. Lovelock, (1999) "Developing marketing strategies for transnational service "operations", *Journal of Services Marketing*, Vol. 13 Iss: 4/5, pp.278 – 295.
- Civaner, M. (2012). Sale strategies of pharmaceutical companies in a “pharmerging” country: The problems will not improve If the gaps remain, *Health Policy* 106, 225– 232.

East, R., Hammond, K., & Lomax, W. (2008). Measuring the impact of positive and negative word of mouth on brand purchase probability, Kingston Business School, Kingston, KT2 7LB, UK. *Intern. J. of Research in Marketing* 25.

Keller, E. and Berry, J. (2006). Word-of-mouth: The real action is offline.

Haywood, K.M. (1989). Managing Word of Mouth Communication, *Journal of Services Marketing*, Vol. 3 Iss: 2, pp.55 – 67.

Hargie, O. (2011). Skilled Interpersonal Communication.

Harwell, M.R. (2011). Research Design In Qualitative/ Quantitative / Mixed Methods. C.F. Conrad, & R.C Serlin, *The Sage Handbook For Research In Education* (s.147-163). Chile: Sage Publications.

Healey, B. J. & Zimmerman, R. S. (2010). Program development. In *The new world of health promotion: New program development, implementation, and evaluation*, (pp. 57–71). Sudbury, MA: Jones and Bartlett. Heidegger, M. (1962). *Being and time*. New York, NY: Harper and Row.

Laczniak, N. R., DeCarlo, E. T. and Ramaswami, N. S. (2001). Consumers' Responses to Negative Word-of-Mouth Communication: An Attribution Theory Perspective, *Journal of Consumer Psychology*, Volume 11, Issue 1, Pages 57–73.

- Lim, C. B. & Chung, C. (2014). Word-of-mouth, The use of source expertise in the evaluation of familiar and unfamiliar brands, *Asia Pacific Journal of Marketing and Logistics*, Vol. 26 No. 1, 2014, pp. 39-53.
- Lim, B. C, & Cindy M.Y. (2011). The impact of word-of-mouth communication on attribute evaluation, *Journal of Business Research* 64.
- Mangold, G. W., Miller, F. & Brockway, R. G. (1999). "Word of mouth communication in the service marketplace", *Journal of Services Marketing*, Vol. 13 Iss: 1, pp.73 – 89.
- Ntale, D. P., Ngoma M., and Musiime, A., (2013). Academic Journals, Relationship marketing, word of mouth communication and consumer loyalty in the Ugandan mobile telecommunication industry 2013, Vol.7(5), pp. 354-359.
- Raluca, Iuliana.G. (2012). Word-Of-Mouth Communication: A Theoretical Review, PhD student of Marketing Faculty at Academy of Economic Studies.
- Rethinking, N. R. (1999). Rethinking the Sales Force: Redefining Selling to Create and Capture Customer Value.
- Rossiter, J.R. and Bellman, S. (2005) Marketing communications: Theory and applications, *Interactive Television Research Institute* Prentice-Hall, Frenchs Forest.

Rehman, U. S.(2011). World, Journal of Arts, Science & Commerce, International
Refereed Research Journal, Vol. II, Issue 4,Oct.

Sahin, İ. (2006). Detailed Review Of Rogers' Diffusion Of Innovations Theory And
Educational Technology-Related Studies Based On Rogers, The Turkish
Online *Journal of Educational Technology* – TOJET April 2006 ISSN: 1303-
6521 volume 5 Issue.

Türkiye İlaç ve Sanayi Sektörü Raporu.(2008). Türkiye Odalar ve Borsalar Birliği
Türkiye İlaç Sanayi Meclisi.

Wangenheim, F. & Bayón, T. (2004). "The effect of word of mouth on services
switching: Measurement and moderating variables", *European Journal of
Marketing*, Vol. 38 Iss: 9/10, pp.1173 – 1185.

Walker, H. J. (2001). The Measurement of Word-of-Mouth Communication and an
Investigation of Service Quality and Customer Commitment As Potential
Antecedents, *Journal of Service Research*, vol. 4 no. 1 60-75.

<http://www.cim.co.uk/files/promotionalmix.pdf> (30.06.2014 Monday)

<http://www.kcapital-us.com/neil/downloads/Summary.pdf> (30.06.2014 Monday)

<http://news.msn.com/us/dr-oz-scolded-at-hearing-on-weight-loss-scams>, 30.06.2014
Monday)

<http://sphweb.bumc.bu.edu/otlt/MPH-Modules/SB/SB721-Models/SB721-Models4.html>(30.06.2014 Monday)

<http://www.tobb.org.tr/Documents/yayinlar/ilac%20rapor.pdf> (30.06.2014 Monday)

APPENDICES

Appendix A: Pilot Test

This research was conducted by the Communication Faculty at The Eastern Mediterranean University. All information will be kept confidential. Thank you for your time.

1) Nationality?

- a)TRNC b)TR c)TRNC and TR

2) Sex?

- Female b) Male

3) Age?

- a) 18-28 b) 29-39 c) 40-50 d)50+

4) What area in Famagusta do you live?

- a) Anadolu Area
- b) Baykal Area
- c) Canbolat Area
- d) Çanakkale Area
- e) Dumlupınar Area
- f) Harika Area
- g) Karakol Area
- h) Lala Mustafa Paşa Area
- ı) Namık kemal Area
- i) Pertev Paşa Area
- j) Piyale Paşa Area
- k) Sakarya Area
- l) Sur içi Area
- m) Tuzla Area
- n) Zafer Area

5) Monthly Salary?

- 1500 - 1999 b) 2000 - 2500 c) 2600 -3000 d)3001+

6) Occupation?

- a) Civil Servant b) Private Sector c) Local e)Housewife f)Others.....

- 7) Do you have annual routine checkups?
 Yes b) No c) Undecided
- 8) Are you Interest in Personal Care?
 Yes b) No c) Undecided
- 9) How often do you use painkillers?
 Straight Away b) Last minute c) Undecided d)Others.....
- 10) How often do you use Dema-cosmetic products?
 When needed b) When recommended c) In the sale d) Others.....
- 11) What do you look for when buying Derma-cosmetic products?
 a) Price b) Quality c) Brand d) Recommendation
 e)Advertising/Promotion f)Others.....
- 12) Is advertising effective when buying painkiller products?
 Yes b) No c) Undecided
- 13) Is advertising effective when buying derma-cosmetic products?
 a)Yes b) No c) Undecided
- 14) How often do you use medication without prescription?
 a) Once a month b) Once every three months c) Once every six months
 d) Once a year e) Neither
- 15) How do you decide on medication without prescription?
 a) Previous Experiences b) Friend recommendation c) Pharmacy Recommendation
 d) Others.....
- 16) Which products would you buy without prescription?
 Painkillers b) Derma-cosmetic c) Antibiotic d) All e) Neither
- 17) Have you bought medication on recommendation?
 Yes b) No c) Undecided
- 18) What is the reason for using medication without prescription?

- 19) Where do you follow Derma-cosmetic products?
 Social Media b) Magazine c) Doctor e) Friends f)Others.....
- 20) Where do you follow painkiller products?
 a) Social Media b) Magazine c) Doctors e) Friends f)Others
- 21) Have you bought Derma-cosmetic products on recommendation?
 Yes b) No c) Undecided

22) Have you bought Painkiller products on recommendation?

a)Yes b) No c) Undecided

23) Do you feel doctors prescribe too much medication?

Yes b) No c) Undecided

24) Do you think that doctors in the health sector should be given promotional products?

Yes b) No c) Undecided

25) Who is your first person of contact about a health problem?

Family members b) Medical Staff c)Friends d) Pharmacist e)Others.....

26) Would you pass on your satisfaction/dissatisfaction in the health sector onto others?

Yes b) No c) Undecided


27) Please mark the answers below

| | Strongly Agree | Agree | Not Sure | Disagree | Strongly Disagree |
|---|----------------|-------|----------|----------|-------------------|
| Doctor is my first point of contact when I'm in pain | | | | | |
| If the medication prescribed by your doctor is not available would you buy what the pharmacist recommends | | | | | |
| If the Dermo-cosmetic prescribed by your doctor is not available would you buy what the pharmacist recommends | | | | | |
| Before buying dermo-cosmetic products I always ask for recommendations | | | | | |
| Before buying | | | | | |

| | | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|--|--|
| <p>painkiller products I always ask for recommendations</p> | | | | | |
| <p>Positive/negative recommendations effect purchase on dermo-cosmetic products</p> | | | | | |
| <p>Positive/negative recommendations effect purchase on painkiller products</p> | | | | | |

Appendix B: The population distribution of the region of Famagusa

Population count table taken from the Famagusta Council in April 2014.


KUZEY KIBRIS TÜRK CUMHURİYETİ
İÇİŞLERİ BAKANLIĞI
GAZİMAĞUSA KAYMAKAMLIĞI


Sayı: Mkl - 2630
Konu: Nüfus Dağılımı Hk.

21 Nisan 2014

Sn. Yrd. Prof.Dr.Anıl Kemal Kaya
Tez Danışmanı
DAÜ

İlgi 18/4/2014 tarihli dilekçeniz.

İlgi dilekçenizde belirtilen bölgelerin nüfus dağılımı aşağıda verilmiştir.
Bilgilerinize saygılarımla rica ederim.


Şifa ÇOLAKOĞLU
Kaymakam

| Sıra No: | Mahalle | Nüfus |
|----------|-----------------------------|-------|
| 1 | Anadolu Mahallesi | 1,508 |
| 2 | Baykal Mahallesi | 2,574 |
| 3 | Canbolat Mahallesi | 2,460 |
| 4 | Çanakkale Mahallesi | 4,114 |
| 5 | Dumlupınar Mahallesi | 2,940 |
| 6 | Harika Mahallesi | 651 |
| 7 | Karakol Mahallesi | 7,046 |
| 8 | Lala Mustafa Paşa Mahallesi | 1,836 |
| 9 | Namık Kemal Mahallesi | 1,117 |
| 10 | Perteve Paşa Mahallesi | 1,026 |
| 11 | Piyale Paşa Mahallesi | 1,220 |
| 12 | Sakarya Mahallesi | 7,647 |
| 13 | Suriçi Mahallesi | 1,476 |
| 14 | Tuzla Mahallesi | 2,645 |
| 15 | Zafer Mahallesi | 2,027 |

NG/SA

Appendix C: Survey

This research was conducted by the Communication Faculty at The Eastern Mediterranean University. All information will be kept confidential. Thank you for your time.

1. Nationality?
 - a)TRNC b)TR c)TRNC-TR
 2. Sex?
 - a)Female b) Male
 3. Age?
 - a) 18-28 b) 29-39 c) 40-50 d)50+
 4. Which area in Famagusta do you live?
 - a) Anadolu Area
 - b) Baykal Area
 - c) Canbolat Area
 - d) Çanakkale Area
 - e) Dumlupınar Area
 - f) Harika Area
 - g) Karakol Area
 - h) Lala Mustafa Paşa Area
 - i) Namık kemal Area
 - j) Pertev Paşa Area
 - k) Piyale Paşa Area
 - k) Sakarya Area
 - l) Sur içi Area
 - m) Tuzla Area
 - n) Zafer Area
 - 5) Monthly Salary?
 - a)1500 - 2000 b) 2000 - 2500 c) 2600 -3000 d)3000+
 - 6) What is your occupation?
 - a) Civil Servant b) Private Sector c) Locals e)House wife f)
- Others.....
- 7) Do you have annual routine checkups?
 - a)Yes b) No c)Undecided

- 8) Are you Interest in Personal Care?
a)Yes b) No C)Undecided
- 9) How often do you use painkillers?
a) Straight away b) At the last minute c) Undecided d)Other.....
- 10) How often do you use derma-cosmetic products?
a) When needed b) When recommended c) In the sale d) Other.....
- 11) What do you look for when buying Derma-cosmetic products?
a) Price b) Quality c) Brand d) Recommendation
e)Advertising/Promotion f)Other.....
- 12) Is advertising effective when buying painkillers?
a) Yes b) No c) Undecided
- 13) Is advertising effective when buying derma-cosmetic products.
a) Yes b) No c) Undecided
- 14) How often do you use medication without prescription? (If you do not use medication without prescription please go to question 19)
a) Once a month b) Once every three months c) Once every six months d) Once a year e) Neither
- 15) How would you decide when buying medication without prescription?
a) Previous experiences b) Friend recommendation c) Pharmacist recommendation d) Other.....
- 16) What products would you buy without prescription?
a) Painkillers b) Derma-cosmetic c) Antibiotics d) All e) Neither
- 17) Have you bought medication on recommendation?
a) Yes b) No c)Undecided
- 18) What is the reason for using medication without prescription?
On recommendation
b) In an Emergency
c) Free checkup
d) Previous experiences
e) Others.....
- 19) Where do you follow derma-cosmetic products?
a) Social Media b) Magazine c) Doctor e) Friends f)
Other.....

- 20) Where do you follow painkiller products?
 a) Social media b) Magazine c) Doctor e) Friends f) Other.....
- 21) Have you bought derma-cosmetic products on recommendation?
 a) Yes b) No c) Undecided
- 22) Have you bought painkillers on recommendation?
 a) Yes b) No c) Undecided
- 23) Do you feel that doctors prescribe to much medication?
 a) Yes b) No c) Undecided
- 24) Do you think that doctors in the health sector should be given promotional products?
 a) Yes b) No c) Undecided
- 25) Who would be your first point of contact about a health problem?
 a) Family members b) Medical staff c) Friends d) Pharmacist e) Other.....
- 26) Would you pass on your satisfaction/dissatisfaction in the health sector onto others?
 Yes b) No c) Undecided

Please mark the answers below

| | Strongly Agree | Agree | Not Sure | Disagree | Strongly Disagree |
|--|----------------|-------|----------|----------|-------------------|
| Doctor is my first point of contact when I'm in pain | | | | | |
| If the medication prescribed by your doctor is not available would you buy what your pharmacist recommends | | | | | |
| If the Derma-cosmetic prescribed by your | | | | | |

| | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| doctor is not available would you buy what your pharmacist recommends | | | | | |
| Before buying derma- cosmetic products I always ask for recommendations | | | | | |
| Before buying painkiller products I always ask for recommendations | | | | | |
| Positive/negative recommendations effect purchase on derma- cosmetic products | | | | | |
| Positive/negative recommendations effect purchase on painkiller products | | | | | |

Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION

Customers get numerous messages from the environment; some of these reach them accurately but some do not. Furthermore, companies cannot control all the messages related with them. No matter If they are positive or negative messages, all these messages can definitely diffuse very quickly in the environment. Customers rely more on personal opinions about a company or brand rather than company commercials. This does not mean that advertising or other promotional mix elements are not important.

According to Robert East, “Under these circumstances, we would expect negative information to have more effect on judgment. Studies have supported this negativity effect (East, Hommond, & Lomax, 2008).”

Word of Mouth (WOM) especially positive wording related to brands or companies is the most effective and cost efficient marketing method for companies when they try to persuade their customers instead of non-personal communication. The customers rely more on what other people say about the company or brand rather than the company commercials. This does not mean that advertising or other promotional mix elements are not important. This means that they are not enough to change the customers’ attitudes, beliefs or lifestyles. Sometimes one negative word of mouth communication related with the company or brand, stops consumers from

purchasing that product. Shortly, it can be said that, WOM has a great impact on other peoples' choices on purchasing behavior and this can be the most effective and fastest marketing managements strategy.

According to Argan; People start to spend more time on the Internet rather than other mass media tools. They read online newspapers, read blogs, social media more willingly than watching TV advertising and reading newspaper as hard copy. For instance; Mary Kary and Amway are well known brands used to attract potential customers. Virtual Marketing is a logical technique used on the Internet similar to WOM. The Internet is a faster and easier way of passing on information to others (Argan, 2006, p.234).

1.1 Aims of the Study

This study highlights the importance of WOMC on the sales of painkillers and derma-cosmetic products. The study aims to explore how WOMC is effective in the medical products related to painkiller and derma-cosmetic in the TRNC market in 2014.

According to Argan; WOM is one of the oldest methods of marketing on consumer purchasing. For example, if a customer has had good experiences when s/he has purchased a product: s/he is more likely to pass this information onto a friend who purchases this product on a regular basis (Argan, 2006).''

Thus, the aim of this study is to explore the importance of WOM in the medical products related with painkiller and derma-cosmetics. This case study is to show consumer decision making process, why and how often the consumer purchase of painkillers and derma-cosmetics in the Famagusta market in Fall 2014.

1.2 Problem Statement

TRNC is a small island and there are numerous companies in the pharmaceutical sector and all medical products are imported from Turkey or other countries. Advertising on products are not done in the TRNC, also advertising and other marketing tools do not have much effect in small places. People are more confident and rely more on personal opinion. This makes WOM a more effective marketing tool, so locals depend more on international advertising, for this reason companies use WOMC. This causes conflicts in consumers' perception and there has not been much research based on consumers' decision making process during purchasing pharmaceutical products. There is also an increased demand for derma cosmetic products in the health sector. Consequently most of these companies enter into this market to produce these products which have made them more market driven. The companies have had to develop new strategies in this market such as WOMC and promotional products.

1.3 Importance of the Study

This study aims to show the companies operating in the pharmaceutical sector and how negative and positive WOMC effect the consumer purchasing decision. The study shows the influence which a company has on customer purchase and how sales force can effect their sales of products in the medical sector.

These strategies are effective access and quick sales on products. This research will show how the strategies in the health sector of marketing and communication will effect consumer perception. Thus, this study contributes to the literature about the impacts of WOM to create awareness in Famagusta population as a developing market.

1.4 Motivation for the Study

The reason I chose this topic as a research study was because this topic had not been previously researched in the TRNC. I feel that it will motivate researchers in further studies and show the effect of WOMC in consumers' decision making for the products. I was also affected after reading the book written by George Silverman about WOM.

My main influence on choosing WOM as a research topic was after reading a book written by George Silverman. The book focuses on when and how WOM came about and mentions how it started to effect the sales of products not just in the medical sector but other areas aswell. This I found interesting which made me aware of the importance of WOM on product purchase decisions.

1.5 Background Information

WOM has effect positive and negative on a person's decision making process on a product. Although some consumers can resist negative word of mouth on brands they are very likely to choose whereas others resist positive word of mouth on brands they are very unlikely to choose. TRNC is a small island all derma-cosmetic, painkiller and medical products are imported. Because of this companies do not use advertising and find that WOM is more effective, this can mean either negative or positive.

A research done by Haywood, examines the importance of the verbal exchange of positive and negative information about a firm's products and services. Presents suggestions for learning what is being said and how to gain systematic control over the word of mouth process (Haywood, 1989).

WOM has a significant effect on consumer purchasing behavior, WOM is an informal mode of communication between noncommercial parties concerning the evaluation of products and services. As WOM is a low cost and reliable way of transmitting information about products and services, WOM plays an important role in information diffusion in consumer markets and shaping consumers' attitudes (Lim & Chung, 2011).

WOM is informal information passed through consumers; there are two methods of WOM, positive and negative. The impact of positive WOM is greater than negative WOM. To measure the impact of positive and negative word of mouth on brand purchase probability.

According to East, Hommond, & Lomax : Brand purchase probability will be affected by the relative incidence of PWOM and NWOM about the brand and also by the relative impact of instances of PWOM and NWOM. Here, we are concerned with the impact of PWOM compared with NWOM. There is little evidence on this matter, which may relate to the difficulty of making (East, Hommond, & Lomax, 2008).

1.6 Research Questions

This study, seek to answer questions. This research took place in 15 different districts in the Famagusta area in the summer of 2014. The research questions are:

RQ 1: How WOM communication influences the attitude of people who have routine periodic checkups?

RQ 2: How WOM communication influence people's attitudes during the purchase of personal care products?

RQ 3: What is the decision making process of people when buying painkillers products and the important criteria's that influence them to buy the product?

RQ 4: What is the important criterious that influence people to buy painkiller product

RQ 4: What is the decision making process of people when buying derma-cosmetic products and the important criteria's that influence them to buy the product?

1.7 Assumptions of the Study

North Cyprus is a small country where people know each other and use WOM communication frequently. People follow products through TV programes and magazines but people in North Cyprus do not use this form of publicity and rely more on Word Of Mouth Communication. Most products are imported and not produced in North Cyprus so people do not require advertising as most of the advertising is done by the county it is imported from.

1.8 Limitations of the Study

This research was done in the Famagusta region in TRNC during summer 2014. The focus on the study is ; only on painkillers and derma-cosmetic products in the TRNC market.

1.9 Definitions of the Study Terms

Word of Mouth (WOM): Examines the importance of the verbal exchange of positive and negative information about firm's products and services (Haywood, 1989).

Marketing Communication: Marketing Communication covers all contemporary forms of marcoms - brand advertising and direct-response advertising, sales promotions, corporate image advertising, sponsorship, PR, personal selling and

telemarketing - and includes a special chapter on social marketing campaigns (Rossiter & Bellman, 2005).

Promotional mix: The promotional mix is a term used to describe the set of tools that a business can use to communicate effectively the benefits of its products or services to its customers (<http://www.cim.co.uk/files/promotionalmix.pdf>).

Sales force: The job of a sales person is to explain the features and use of a product or service. Or to use a common image, salespeople are little more than “talking brochures (<http://www.kcapital-us.com/neil/downloads/Summary.pdf>).

Integrated Marketing Communication: Integrated marketing communication emerges as a powerful tool that guides practitioners in developing and implementing marketing communications more consistently and effectively (Rehman, 2011).

Chapter 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

In this chapter there are six sections does not fit with content the importance of WOM, relationship marketing and customer loyalty in the medical sector around the world and the importance of WOM communication and other promotional mix elements

2.1 The Importance of Word of Mouth Communication

Word of mouth communication means when, one person gives information about products or services to others. It can be good or bad. This method of marketing is the most effective and powerful marketing.

“Viral marketing describes any strategy that encourages people to pass on a marketing message to others, demonstrating an important potential for exponential growth in message’s exposure and influence. Viral marketing has become one of the most effective and cost – efficient ways create a ‘buzz’ about firms’ products and services (Argan, 2006).”

Thus viral marketing is a type of WOM communication on the internet where people share their ideas and these ideas diffuse very quickly as viruses. Therefore the positive message diffusion gives advantages for firms as costless, fast, and easy learned message. Hence WOM communication is not only done by face to face communication it can be done using the internet as new media as well.

The effect of word-of-mouth (WOM) communications on product judgments is investigated. WOM influences short-term and long-term judgments. This influence is

greater when a consumer faces a disconfirmation experience and when the WOM communication is presented by an expert (Bone,1995).

Viral marketing is best done through the internet. In modern life more than 2 hours per day is spent on the internet, almost everyone spends time on the internet and most people have an email address. People, especially companies with other companies on the other side of the world can pass information easily.

‘Email is one of the most widely used means over the internet, 90% of internet users use email more, 50% of the online population as a group use the average daily mail. Forrester Research states (2004), “a person who has your e-mail address, by e-mail, on an average day 9 of the year 3285 sends their marketing message.’ (Argan, 2006).

Nowadays the improvement in technology has brought along new marketing strategies. These improvements have brought new marketing opportunities to providers. One of these advantages is viral marketing. Viral marketing is the most effective weapon the Internet. This means trusting your friends. If there is something we like we send this onto our friends. Through this way, information on services or products are passed on more quickly and effectively spread from person to person.

“Has a high rate of potential customers who are knowledgeable about the products and use social trademarks. Internet, viral marketing and motion network was created in the same logic as a word of mouth communication technique (Argan, 2006).”

WOM, has a major factor in the influence of customer purchasing decisions. It has an impact on the social environment and consumers. It effects the value creation of the product before product purchase decision. As people are passed on messages through friends or close groups they become familiar with the companies and this attracts more attention than the companies’ incoming messages (Argan, 2006).

WOM has an effect on high-tech products as well, especially in the acquisition phase plays an important role in cases of buying home or car. In such cases, very close friends influence to buy with hints and information received from the Internet.

Resources such as information passed on from family, friends, neighbors and people close by are important. This means when a retailer starts discount sales on any products or services, positive or negative dissatisfaction effects the consumer's purchase decision. (Babaoglu, Sener, & Bugday, 2007)

“A satisfied consumer will pass information onto 3-5 people about their experience with a product, whereas on the other hand a dissatisfied consumers will pass information onto 5, 7 or 10 people about their dissatisfaction with a product (Babaoğlu, Şener, & Buğday, 2014).”

2.1.1 The Importance of WOM Communication in a Social Life

Negative communication about products and services via WOM are more likely to spread faster and more effectively and therefore are more powerful.

Word of Mouth Communication: negative communication is passed on more quickly than positive Word of Mouth Communication this is a fact. Word of Mouth Communication can also be a loss of products to companies. This proves the power of the effect of Word of Mouth Communication (Argan, 2006).

The creation of the health care community and keeping a healthy lifestyle is one of the most important factors in the maintaining of the drug produced according to the rules which make sure that it is delivered to anyone in need, this is the state's most important responsibility. On the other hand, the competition in the globalizing world economy along with the increasing state intervention controls conditions in the pharmaceutical sector, this has led to differentiation.

Turkey in the pharmaceutical industry meets the needs of many from abroad. Also leading the world in drug consumption Turkey is among those countries. According to Turkey pharmaceutical industry report (Türkiye İlaç ve Sanayi Sektörü Raporu), October 2008, “In 2013 the world's 10th largest drug consumption market, estimated to be a part of the country's drug needs to be met by imports. Existing policies and practices changed will be inevitable. In addition, domestic production is strong in periods of drug consumption per capital from \$ 35 to \$ 126 to come out, and who prefers to import existing production is the result of misguided policies. (Meclisi, 2008).

According to the Turkey pharmaceutical industry report, October 2008, There are about 300 companies in this sector in Turkey, 42 of the manufacturing facility is available, 56 are foreign companies operating 14 productions in its own facilities. (Meclisi, 2008).

2.2 Word of Mouth Communication in the Service Sector

Word of mouth communication has a positive or negative impact on the consumer purchasing behavior. The consumer has a strong impact positive or negative on other consumers in the short or long term. These effects make it a more powerful effect on other consumers with the feelings of individuals.

One study conducted by the US Office of Consumer Affairs indicated that, on average, one dissatisfied customer can be expected to tell nine other people and relate their story to an average of five other people (Lovelock, 1999).

With the development of technology traditional sales techniques have been replaced with interactive relationship based selling techniques. This means experienced sales force opinions on products are more important and reliable.

Jurvetso set up an e-mail link on the website to advertise new products in order to benefit from the rapid spread which went from zero subscribers to 12 million subscribers on Hotmail (Argan, 2006).

2.3 The WOM Communication and Other Promotional Mix Elements

There are some promotional mix elements like advertising, public relations, sales promotions, sales force, direct marketing, POP, sponsorship which all works together and WOM has a role in each promotional mix elements in current century.

2.3.1 Word of Mouth on Brands

Word Of Mouth communication involves the passing of information between non commercial communicator and a receiver concerning a brand product or service. WOM is known to be an effective source of information for both consumers and organizations.

WOM on brand evaluations is based on brand familiarity. This way consumer evaluation become less favorable for familiar and unfamiliar brands which means that negative Word of Mouth has a damaging effect on unfamiliar brands, while positive Word of Mouth has benefits on familiar and unfamiliar brands. There is also consumer's prior knowledge of the product category, although brand familiarity does not necessarily mean having good knowledge of a product category.

“The popular brands in the market tend to be the big brands (e.g. market leaders) which survive the competitive market by providing good value to the consumers. Unfamiliar brands are typical new brands that have not been tested by consumers yet. Hence, brand familiarity is often confounded with brand appeal (Lim & Chung, 2014).”

Many marketers are using marketing communications to make consumers aware of a brand and reason for buying although not a lot of information can be passed onto consumers through commercial messages. Also taking into consideration brand name and price has a considerable effect on consumer judgments about a product before purchasing.

Today, pharmaceutical companies have introduced marketing methods into our lives. Promotion of drugs made in some studies there were legal or illegal. These promotional items given to doctors, expensive gifts or as a reputable doctor to make propaganda about the drug. In these studies together is unethical been causing problems. In addition, the doctor - patient relationship is thought to affect adversely. There are several marketing methods in the pharmaceutical industry;

Increase in spending: Nowadays many are due to increased drug charges. In 2001 in the United States according to a survey conducted drug expenditures increased by 20.8% compared to the previous year 156.5 million dollars per year and reached approximately. This is the reasons for expensive drug prescriptions which are being prescribed (Civaner, 2012).

Profit rate of: Pharmaceutical industry profit rates are higher than other exposed to the importance of marketing. Drug companies' profit rate is more than 4 times compared to other companies.

Importance in the field of Marketing: The importance of the marketing department: marketing departments are very important for pharmaceutical

companies. The total number of employees of a pharmaceutical company expires in: 39% consist of people in the marketing department. ‘Between 1999 - 2000 the proportion of employees in the AR-GE decreased by 2 % but the proportion of employees in the marketing field increased by % 59 (Civaner, 2012).

Promotional events: The introduction of the drug companies spending budget expenditures for most uses. In 2002, the U.S. pharmaceutical industry spent \$ 21 billion to introduce activities. A portion of it was given to doctors to give promotional products and free samples of the drug distributed (Civaner, 2012).

The increasing number of ads: The pharmaceutical industry has seen an increase in advertising related to society. In 2000 in the United States the community-oriented health sector amounts to \$ 2.5 billion was spent on advertising. Also, society for the advertisements 40% of it is about drug companies. In the same year the Pepsi company spent \$ 125, whilst Merck's Vioxx company spent 161 million dollars on ads (Civaner, 2012).

2.3.2 Relationship Between Marketing and Customer Loyalty

It was revealed that there was a significant positive connection between relationship marketing and WOM. The construct of Relationship Marketing consist of trust, commitment, communication and satisfaction. Satisfaction was the one which contributed to the connection between relationship marketing and WOM.

Satisfaction as a relationship marketing construct, contributed more to the strength of relationship between relationship marketing and word of mouth. This was followed by communication, reciprocity, trust and commitment. This was also consistent with earlier researchers (Dithan, Ngoma, & Musiime, 2013).

In one research findings revealed that there is a significant positive relationship which exists between relationship marketing and WOM which in this case means that positive WOM will result in customer loyalty. According to results the variables indicate that there is a significant positive relationship between relationship marketing and customer loyalty. This also proves that loyalty is based on trust, commitment, communication and satisfaction between the service provider and the customer (Dithan, Ngoma, & Musiime, 2013).

2.3.3 Online Marketing

Online consumer product review, a type of Word of Mouth information is becoming very popular in consumer purchase decisions. The internet provides opportunities for consumers to share their product evaluations online, this way online sellers are inviting users to post personal opinions on their website. Consumer reviews are very important for consumer purchase and product sales, this also effects seller's strategic decisions regarding consumer review information.

Most of the WOM about WOM marketing is about blogging, MySpace, YouTube, etc. We understand why-these innovative technologies are exciting and promising. The real power of WOM is offline, where most conversations still occur. Face-to-face interaction accounts for the vast majority of WOM (72%), and phone conversations rank second (at 18%) (Keller And Berry, 2006).

‘‘A based on the data from Amazon.com and BN.com, Chevalierand Mayzlin (2006) find that online book reviews have a significant impact on book sales. Liu (2006) shows that consumer reviews at the Yahoo Movies website has a significant effect on box office revenue (Chen & Xie, 2008).’’

There are also online sellers that do not give the opportunity for online customers to leave their comments and suggestions, this maybe because of the negative reviews that can affect the sales of their products and services.

“Three product categories: MP3 players, PDAs, and video games. They identify a list of 68 online sellers from the referral list of the leading shopping agent mySimon.com in June 18, 2003, and found that 46 out of 68 online sellers did not offer consumer reviews (Chen & Xie, 2008).”

There are two types of online consumer selling consumers created information and seller created information, each attract two types of customer potential. Consumer created information is for less sophisticated as seller created information is more for sophisticated customers.

The effect of word-of-mouth (WOM) communications on product judgments is investigated. WOM influences short-term and long-term judgments. This influence is greater when a consumer faces a disconfirmation experience and when the WOM communication is presented by an expert (Choffray, 1980).

WOM is different from other marketing techniques in health the care with various qualities. These are reliability, experience transfer based on the customer, saving time and money, both positive and negative WOM marketing.

Reliability: WOMM is one of the most powerful uses of marketing. People prefer recommendations for a product or service from others who have used the product before hand.. Another reason is the reduction of people's confidence in advertising.

“People don’t believe in ads because Advertising is pre-planned and paid for. Thus most customers do not see the advertisement to be a reliable source of information (Gökhan ABA).

Experience Transfer: The transfer of experience is important in WOM Communication. Also we can see two kinds of transfer of experience. Firstly, she or he will purchase the product and uses it, then passes on their experience; secondly, people around you can also share their idea about the product.

Health services have been satisfied with the number of people who would use a patients reference, this also vital if we want the health sector to provide a higher or better service in the industry (Gökhan ABA).

Customer-Oriented: Customer orientation is important in WOM communication not company orientation. Also it is based on maximum customer contact form. The customer decides on who to talk about to about the product and what questions about the product is to be asked based maximum customer contact forms. If your friend's recommend a product, this would also answer questions asked by the consumer (Gökhan ABA).

Saving Time and Money: When customers want to buy a product they like to have as much information about the product as possible: this is the best way by getting information from someone who has used that used that product before. Thus, it also time-saving. A person's opinion about a product or service, with favorable recommendation can be made to someone else and advertising can be made at a much lower cost or even zero on advertising and promotional activities. It is also a fact that WOMM is cheaper and more effective (Gökhan ABA).

Both Positive And Negative WOM Marketing: WOMM positive occurs when transferred to others and is not cause of drop in business marketing or spenditure. New customers are convinced that time allows the increase of income. People buy

their products if they do not like veauserviceto others desire to hear it. This will adversely affect a company's reputation and structure (Gökhan ABA).

2.4 The Importance of WOM Communication in the Painkiller and Derma-cosmetic Products

The table below shows the leading 10 firms in the medical sector in Turkey.

2.4.1 Medical Sector

Table 1: Pharmaceutical Market Leading Companies In Turkey. (TOBBA, Turkey Health Sector Report page 4)

| 10 LEADING FIRMS | 2007(BILLION TL) | GROWTH % |
|-------------------------|-------------------------|-----------------|
| ABDİ İBRAHİM | 623,1 | 30,6 |
| NOVARTİS | 589,3 | 24,9 |
| SANOFİ AVENTİS | 511,6 | 16,4 |
| BİLİM | 412,4 | 31,6 |
| PFİZER | 404,1 | 31,3 |
| GLAXOSMİTHKLİNE | 377,9 | 23,2 |
| ROCHE | 369,5 | 30,7 |
| BAYER | 339,8 | 24,3 |
| ASTRAZENECA | 314 | 26,1 |
| SANOVEL | 284,5 | 30,5 |

Increased competition in the market, it is observed that the concentration decreases.

In competition with entering a new market, research or market research have been used to improve existing cause.

Table 2: World Marketplace 2003 - 2007 Rate Of Value And Regional.
(TOBB, Turkey medication sector report page 13)

| | 2003 | 2004 | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 |
|-----------------------------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| World Market | 604,6 | 560,1 | 604,4 | 649 | 713,3 |
| Growth according to previous year | | 12,2% | 7,9% | 7,3% | 9,9% |
| North America | 231,3 | 252,5 | 267,7 | 291,3 | 304,5 |
| Europe | 137,4 | 160,6 | 171,6 | 183,8 | 213,1 |
| Africa & Asia & Australia | 107,4 | 120,8 | 134,1 | 137,5 | 153 |
| Latin America | 23,0 | 26,1 | 31,3 | 36,3 | 42,3 |
| Billion (USD) | | | | | |

Rapidly developing new treatment methods, population growth and increasing commercial strength of the market has led to spell exponentially.

Table 3: World Pharmaceutical Market.
(TOBB, Turkey medication sector report page 14)

| | 2003 | 2007 |
|----------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| COUNTRY | Billion(dolar) | Billion(dolar) |
| USA | 221,6 | 286,9 |
| JAPAN | 59,7 | 65,7 |
| FRANCE | 25,6 | 39,4 |
| GERMANY | 6,3 | 36,9 |
| UNITED UNITED | 6,5 | 23,5 |
| ITALY | 6,6 | 22,6 |
| SPAIN | 1,4 | 18,1 |
| CANADA | 9,6 | 17,6 |
| CHINA | 7,4 | 16,4 |
| BRAZIL | 6,4 | 15,9 |
| MEXICO | 8 | 11,2 |
| SOUTH KOREA | 5 | 10,4 |
| TURKEY | 3,7 | 9,5 |
| INDIA | 5,3 | 9,3 |
| AUSTRALIA | 4,9 | 6,4 |
| RUSSIA | 2,1 | 7,9 |

| | | |
|---------|-----|-----|
| GREECE | 2,9 | 6,3 |
| POLAND | 3,5 | 6,1 |
| BELGIUM | 3,8 | 5,5 |
| HOLLAND | 4,2 | 5,5 |

Turkey, Norway and Switzerland, which includes the total pharmaceutical market of 29 European countries, as the value is € 138.6. (2006) that the market 3.8% (5.2 billion euros) Turkey, Europe 6 largest market is located.

Finally, in the graphs shown above, Turkey is an important position in the pharmaceutical market and many strong companies that will compete is a fact. After the competition proper and effective use of advertising and marketing tactics will bring. These marketing techniques mouth marketing in the healthcare industry is using what degree. How marketing and communication techniques in the health sector towards what extent using.

2.4.2 Word of Mouth Marketing In the Health Sector

Health is an important sector of the field. But nowadays people go to the doctor instead of consulting a spouse, friend. Their advice is important. Nowadays, the use of prescription drugs is increasing. In particular, headaches, many people also use beauty products and listen to advice from those around them.

Word-of-mouth communication measures two forms of customer commitment and service quality as potential antecedents. Affective commitment is positively related to word-of-mouth communication but that high sacrifice commitment is not related to word-of-mouth communication. Interestingly, the effect of service quality on word-of-mouth communication appears to be industry dependent. A distinction is made between word-of-mouth activity and word-of-mouth praise (Walker, 2001).

Word of mouth communication (WOM) is important in the marketplace for services. However, the current body of research provides little insight into the nature of WOM in the service marketplace. The aim is to capture a series of “grounded events” from which broader patterns could be discerned. These grounded events were actual incidents of WOM as described by the recipients of a communication (Mangold, Miller, Brockway, 1999).

It is defined that other people’s recommendations are not important for use of drugs without prescription (% 4.6). 88.5 % of the participant explain how they are not satisfied with the health service while 90.4 % of them pass on their satisfaction to others. 18.6 % of them have followed the improvements in health service from their family, friends and close relatives (Gökhan ABA).

WOM, using certain goods and services or other of these properties in our environment is transmitted to people by word of mouth communication. Other viral or buzz marketing is a kind of a name which is exceptionally growing and spreading quickly among consumers as a kind of marketing. Nowadays, video, e-mail, using tools such as social networking sites and blogs are performed. Especially in recent years, health-related experiences of people sharing sites frequently to socialize. In this way, they are very impressed.

The effects of word of mouth (WOM) on the receiver's attitudes and intentions have been studied at length, but the question under which conditions WOM leads to a behavioural outcome (such as a purchase or switching decision) has received less attention. An empirical study is presented which researches whether perceived

influence of a switching referral is related to subsequent switching behaviour, and whether the variables that have an effect on perceived influence of the switching referral also predicts switching. Results show that the strength of WOM influence is determined by perceived communicator characteristics. Perceived risk dimensions, in turn, moderate these effects (Wangenheim and Bayón, 2004).

The behavior of WOM communication on consumer buying is an important concept. According to the American Customer Relations Office if a customer is not satisfied with the goods or services will pass on their dissatisfaction to an average of nine people, on the other hand satisfied customers will pass on their satisfaction with products and services to an average of five people (Gökhan ABA, 2011).

As can be seen in the example of WOM both short and long term time decision affects the buying behavior of the customers and is a powerful communication tool. WOM, in the field of health care is the most widely used source of information. Patients, his treatment of others, they want to know how they evaluate the methods in this area is the most effective marketing communications.

Experts or doctors rather than patients or their family members primarily rely on the advice of friends. In addition, there are limitations in health services for advertising and marketing techniques WOM communication is good. Effective use in the health sector of WOM another reason is that; non-profit director for health care institutions are good. So this can be an effective and inexpensive method (Gökhan ABA, 2011).

The selection of patients in primary health care is the most important factor has been determined by WOM. Besides this, the family physicians in their choice of specialist

physicians shipped first place, while the WOM has taken second place. Also has a vast effect on cosmetic surgery with ladies, psychiatry or obstetrics. Women preferred getting recommendation regarding sexual topics from close friends around them today, as the largest pharmaceutical company marketing tactics, especially in the field of celebrities and experts, doctors do their ads using. Such persons are considered to be trusted by the consumer (Gökhan ABA, 2011).

2.4.3 The Effects of WOM Communication on The Consumers In Service Sector

Consumers in the purchase decision making process, they resort to various sources. They are: family, friends and neighborhoods. The WOM is very effective in this process. The importance of this research in consumer decision making process of the importance of word of mouth communication is indicated. Word of mouth communication among consumers is an important advantage of the advice and services. Also, word of mouth communication between consumers and independent experts define positive or negative verbal communication.

It is extremely important, especially in the service sector. Because of consumers' cultural condition based on previous experience may be different views on the quality of the services they receive. Thus, consumers in the same conditions and have the same culture are influenced by those around them close. WOM affecting customers is important in shaping their attitudes and behaviors.

Word of mouth communication about the services received or dissatisfied with the product spreads very quickly among consumers. If the consumer is not happy about you in a matter that spreads more quickly and effectively than those who are

satisfied. This also happens in human's cause's poor perception of your brand or service.

The term WOM is used to describe verbal communication between groups such as the product provider, independent experts, family and friends and actual or potential consumers (Cakir and Çetin, 2013).

Academic experts on the customers through word of mouth communication factors play a great role in persuasion for the people. WOM, especially for firms to gain new customers is an important element.

“Word Of Mouth Marketing Association, 92 % of consumer worldwide trust recommendations from friends and family more than any form of advertising and 2007 Nielsen Global Survey, 78 % of people found “ recommendations from consumers” is the form of advertising that they trust most (Cakir and Çetin, 2013).”

2.5 Related Marketing Theories

As seen in the pharmaceutical industry is an industry that is profitable and huge market share. As well as pharmaceutical companies that advertises and market the work while they get help from PR Office. In marketing people believe that personality has an effect on consumer decision making, consumers with various personality profiles are more likely to prefer certain brands or stores and choose specific colours or styles (Brody and Cunnigham 1968).

The winners in the field of health care services in the U.S. top five PR company's annual revenues are more than \$ 300 million (Civaner, 2012).

2.5.1 Third-party technique: this marketing method, respected company message 3 of by the art of giving. For example, a new drug market with views when we will

have respect in society. (Key Opinion Leader) People are referred to the liaison committee and its opinions. Respected and largest PR Company used this tactic certainly.

2.5.2 Effects for scientific research: In order to do a large amount of scientific research is needed financial resources. In the USA 70% of clinical research expenses are paid by pharmaceutical companies. Thus, companies and research methods, interpretation and publication of results can intervene in such matters, may direct (Civaner, 2012).

This way, they can be all they want about the research in favor of the company's products and they can use them company's products. A survey conducted in 16 clinical research center supported by pharmaceutical companies, 13 have reported results in favor of the sponsor's products. Company-sponsored research a new treatment, according to research other 5.2% times more support (Civaner, 2012).

2.5.3 Medical Publications: The companies use to increase sales rates other is a marketing method. The respected medical publications and scientific journals provides earnings with the road. Companies can access these journals easier thanks to the doctors. Can you provide information about products. Also thanks to the way the information provided by the company representative trademarked happening. Trust's gotten.

ICC European H. Cook in an article that clearly stated the following; Distributed article can be a very strong sales vehicle. Because it is considered to be independent and competent (Civaner, 2012).

2.5.4 In Relationships with Guide author: Professional practice guide authors are known to be associated with the industrial sector. In a study guide which was attended by 200 authors, 87% of respondents with one or more pharmaceutical companies are reported to be linked (Civaner, 2012).

2.5.5 Relationships with patient groups: It is important to impress patients and patient groups in terms of marketing. Therefore, physicians, pharmaceutical companies have missed colliding to this group. Normally Prohibit advertisements for the drug does not directly to the community in this area mean that advertising can not be done. Pharmaceutical companies can affect rid of these limits and potential of using the Internet (Civaner, 2012).

2.5.6 Crisis management: PR companies in this area, especially this negative situation of the company is showing cab to return the favor. Pharmaceutical companies' consisting of about a negative situation is prevented from leaking to the press. Pharmaceutical companies about the negative news media could adversely affect the other with the doctors thought it would and for intervention in this case. PR companies, especially in this way activate to 3.person (Key Opinion Leader) (Civaner, 2012).

The marketing strategies that affect doctors' prescriptions to what extent can be seen in the above information. All company does not invest in non-productive areas stand to gain. But nowadays it seems that doctors do not still believe in this truth. When it comes to the doctor is a fact that ideas can changed.

Before starting my thesis a mini-survey was conducted. Survey did not apply to doctors working in a private hospital. 15 questions were asked about the relationship

between pharmaceutical companies and doctors. 15 doctors agreed marketing strategies of pharmaceutical companies, but the doctors said they are not affected by any pharmaceutical companies. In this research showed that, marketing strategy and tactics can be effective to doctors idea but doctors don' want believe to admit it.

A survey of 230 hospitals in the United Kingdom was made. Research subject information about new drugs that were prescribed to 42% of the acquired company is determined by the representatives. In a survey of 181 physicians participated, namely that the physicians that moment on them belong to at least one or more pharmaceutical companies are found to carry a promotional product (Civaner, 2012).

Consequently, all these data show that; The pharmaceutical industry is very large and profitable market industry area. So in order to increase the profit margin promotion, marketing and PR tactics is also of great importance. It is important for marketing and sales force in this industry. Doctors in without accepting it, all promotion and marketing efforts can rate to doctors' prescribing.

2.6 Related Communication Theories

In this study three Communication Theories were applied as follow Interpersonal Communication, diffusion of innovation and WOM Theory.

2.6.1 Interpersonal Theory Communication

Interpersonal communication being able to communicate effectively and to be able to understand and to be understood by others. It is the process when people exchange information through verbal and non-verbal messages. This can take place between two people faced with each other in a particular situation, their communication behaviors are determined by a set of communication rules or norms. Some rules are

understood although not clearly stated and some individuals may not be able to verbalize them or indicate where they are acquired but other individuals may (Berger, and. Calabrese, 1975).

Interpersonal Communication is used widely around the world in every day life, there are several forms of Interpersonal Communication. This normally occurs between two individuals and also refers to the contents of a message between them and the possibility of further developments in their relationship. In this research Interpersonal Communication plays a very important role as it involves the interaction between people in order to pass on negative or positive information about a product.

In the health sector interpersonal communication is seen between the provider-patient encounter. The theory in healthcare interpersonal communication is used to predict health beliefs, understand, explain, intentions, attitudes and behaviors of individual and mass audiences. The above statement mentions the relationship differences between provider – patient and family and friends.

The term provider which we have used firstly describes the healthcare practitioners which care for patients. Secondly is patient encounter, in this case some theories were developed for understanding social interaction. Provider – patient relationships are different than relationships between family and friends, especially when considering equality, specific interests or expected outcomes. We can also mention that not all existing interpersonal communication theories have been mentioned (Bylund, Peterson, & Cameron, 2012).

The statement above mentions how interpersonal communications can effect changes in ones emotional state depending on the situation.

In general we also enjoy personal interaction although interpersonal communication has been shown to contribute to positive changes in ones emotional state, dealings can sometimes be problematic although we can also gain rewards from social interaction (Hargie, 2011).

2.6.2 Word of Mouth Communication Theory

Word Of Mouth Communicaiton plays an important role in consumer purchasing decisions and also proves that it is the most attractive and effective form of communication.

Word Of Mouth Communication is very important on the marketplace, this is where consumers gain information relating to organizations and what they have to offer, it also thought to have powerful influence on consumers evaluations rather than information recieved through cemmercial sources such as advertising. Although in previous researches it shows that negative WOMC has a stronger influence on consumer purchasing than positive WOMC. It has been proven that WOMC is more effective than advertising, in passing on positive or negative feedback about a product or service and is thought to be a product sucess factor. (Gheorghe, 2012).

The transmission of of negative WOMC involves interpersonal and informal process this heps to understand the recievers interpretaion of a senders motives in communicating in such information . Previous researches have shown that recievers are more likely to act against the consequences on the negativity in WOMC. The

information contained in negative WOMC using this type of of configuration will likely be veiwed by recievers as more logical and well developed. (Laczniak, De Carlo, & Ramaswarmi, 2001)

2.6.3 Diffusion of Innovation Theory

Diffusion of Innovation Theory originated in communication to explain how, over time, an idea or product gains momentum and diffuses (or spreads) through a specific population or social system. The end result of this diffusion is that people, as part of a social system, adopt a new idea, behavior, or product (<http://sphweb.bumc.bu.edu>)

The four key components of Diffusion of Innovation are: Innovation, Communication Channels, time and social system;

Innovation: This is something that may have been invented a long time ago or a new idea or Project thought of by an individual. The innovation decision process involves knowledge persuasion and decision.

Communication Channels: This process is when individuals create and share information between one another and come to a conclusion. Mass media involves TV or radio whereas Interpersonal communication is communication between tow or more people.

Time: Time aspect is not taken into consideration in most researches although time dimension in diffusion research illustrates its strength.

Social System: This is the last element of the diffusion process. Diffusion of Innovation also plays a part in the social system and is also influenced by the structure (Şahin, 2006).

In order for practitioners to guide their practice and research Cole (1995) stressed that all healthcare practioners should be introduced to theoretical concepts in their

formal education. In order to guide a field Antonovsky (1996) also emphasized that theory is needed in order to provide direction to practice, guide the field and structure program evaluation. He believes that good theories result in good ideas which are incorporated into practice (Healey & Zimmerman,2010).

Chapter 3

METHODOLOGY

This chapter consist of seven parts as research survey, research procedures, research design, data collection, population, sampling and data analysis.

3.1 Research Methodology

In this study the quantitative research survey was used. This method was based on the general database. This research investigates the importance of WOM in the health sector. The quantitative research is collecting material data which brings about specific results about specific population (Harwell, 2011).

Quantitative research was applied in the first section of this study, it was used the population of 15 streets in Famagusta. The surveys were given out according to the population of these streets as shown in the research results.

3.2 Research Procedures

Before the research was conducted a pilot test was given and the information of population count of 15 streets in Famagusta were taken from the local council. At first, quantitative research was used and surveys distributed to the local streets of Famagusta. The results of this survey, information was gained on whether locals were more interested in personal care or health care.

In the third part quantitative research was used to find out the effect of WOM on painkillers and derma-cosmetic products. The research focused on the sales force of painkillers and derma-cosmetic products by doctors and pharmacists.

3.3 Research Design

In this research quantitative research methodologies were applied. First the quantitative research methodology was used and a questionnaire was prepared. The questionnaire was prepared to find out the effects of WOM on the sales of painkillers and derma-cosmetics. The survey was handed out to 15 different streets and was filled out by a different variety of people.

Before this research was prepared a pilot test was administered for 50 people. With the response of the survey results the questionnaire was revised and finalized. There are 33 questions in the second questionnaire

3.4 Data Collection and Instrument

The information for this survey was gained from the local council. The information gained was the exact number of streets in the local area and the number of people which lived there. The number of surveys was prepared according to the population of each street. The population details are shown in the section below.

3.5 Population

According to the Gazimağusa Council there are 15 different streets and 39.187 people on the population list. This study was applied according to the population count of each street. The streets and number of polls are as follows: Anadolu mahallesi 1508 (questionnaire applied to 14 people), Baykal mahallesi 2574 (questionnaire applied to 24 people), Canbolat mahallesi 2460 (questionnaire applied to 22 people), Çanakkale mahallesi 4114 (questionnaire applied to 38 people),

Dumlupınar mahallesi 2940 (questionnaire applied to 27 people), Harika mahallesi 651 (questionnaire applied to 8), Karakol mahallesi 7046 questionnaire applied to 67 people), Lala Mustafa Paşa mahallesi 1836 (questionnaire applied to 19 people), Namık Kemal mahallesi 1117 (questionnaire applied to 19 people), Pertev mahallesi 1026 questionnaire applied to 11 people), Piyale Paşa mahallesi 1220 (questionnaire applied to 11 people), Sakarya mahallesi 7647 (questionnaire applied to 12 people), Suriçi mahallesi 1476 (questionnaire applied to 15 people), Tuzla mahallesi 2645 (questionnaire applied to 21 people), Zafer mahallesi 2027 (questionnaire applied to 19 people) in total the questionnaire applied to 319 people.

3.6 Sample Size

Sampling is the representative of people, among the population. As mentioned earlier, 320 questions were distributed according to the stratified random sampling method. This method was applied to decide on how many questionnaires (population of districts) were to be distributed for each area, some ratio analysis was conducted.

3.7 Data Analysis

In the analysis of this study, SPSS 18.0 package was used to analyze the research questions in this study. Thus in this analysis descriptive statistic and cross-tab analyses was applied.

The study was conducted to understand the effect of WOM on the sales of painkillers and derma-cosmetic products. The survey was distributed to 15 different streets in the region of Famagusta. As mentioned previously a test pilot survey was prepared to finalize the final survey, the results were revised and finalized for the original survey. The test pilot consisted of 50 questions, whereas the final survey consisted of 33 questions.

Chapter 4

FINDINGS

In first section of this chapter concentrate on, descriptive statistic where focus on demographic structure of people and then focus on the usage of painkillers and derma cosmetics products in TRNC Famagusta market. Also in first section, period checkups, the importance of personal care, the respondent's attitude in decision making process for such products was described. In the second section cross tab analysis was analyzed to understand the relationship between WOM communication and medical products purchasing process.

4.1 Descriptive Statistic

The data collected in this part of the research will be shown in tables as statistics. The aim here is to show the data obtained using graphics. At the end of the research you should have knowledge about showing the reader data in graphics by using SPSS.

Table 4: Frequency table distribution of nationality

| Nationality | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|-------------|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Valid TRNC | 135 | 42,2 | 42,2 | 42,2 |
| TR | 118 | 36,9 | 36,9 | 79,1 |
| TRNC - TR | 67 | 20,9 | 20,9 | 100,0 |
| Total | 320 | 100,0 | 100,0 | |

The nationality of the respondent's as shown in table 4, 135 (%42.2) participants' nationality is Turkish Cypriot, 20.9 % percentage is of nationality, 67 people are both

Turkish Cypriot and – Turkish, and the lowest rate is Turkish with percentage of 20.9 % as a number 118 people.

Table 5: Frequency table of Sex

| Sex | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|--------------|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Valid Female | 179 | 55,9 | 55,9 | 55,9 |
| Male | 141 | 44,1 | 44,1 | 100,0 |
| Total | 320 | 100,0 | 100,0 | |

The sex statuses are shown in table 5 female participants' percentage is 179 (55.9 %), male participants' percentage is 141 (44.1 %).

Table 6: Frequency table of distribution of area

| Area | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|-------------------|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Valid Anadolu Bol | 15 | 4,7 | 4,7 | 4,7 |
| Baykal | 19 | 5,9 | 5,9 | 10,6 |
| Canbulat | 19 | 5,9 | 5,9 | 16,6 |
| Canakkale | 63 | 19,7 | 19,7 | 36,3 |
| Dumlupinar | 20 | 6,3 | 6,3 | 42,5 |
| Harika | 12 | 3,8 | 3,8 | 46,3 |
| Karakol | 103 | 32,2 | 32,2 | 78,4 |
| Lala Mustafa Pasa | 6 | 1,9 | 1,9 | 80,3 |
| Naimik Kemal | 6 | 1,9 | 1,9 | 82,2 |
| Pertev Pasa | 8 | 2,5 | 2,5 | 84,7 |
| Piyale Pasa | 4 | 1,3 | 1,3 | 85,9 |
| Sakarya | 20 | 6,3 | 6,3 | 92,2 |
| Surici | 13 | 4,1 | 4,1 | 96,3 |
| Tuzla | 10 | 3,1 | 3,1 | 99,4 |
| Zafer | 2 | ,6 | ,6 | 100,0 |
| Total | 320 | 100,0 | 100,0 | |

Table 6 shows areas most crowded is the Karakol area 103 (32,2%), the least crowded being the Zafer area 2 (0,6%).

Table 7: Frequency of income

| Income | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|-----------------|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Valid 1500-2000 | 188 | 58,8 | 58,8 | 58,8 |
| 2000- 2500 | 94 | 29,4 | 29,4 | 88,1 |
| 2600 – 3000 | 19 | 5,9 | 5,9 | 94,1 |
| 3000 and above | 19 | 5,9 | 5,9 | 100,0 |
| Total | 320 | 100,0 | 100,0 | |

Table 7, shows the amount of income per participant 118 (58,8%) the income is between 1500 - 2000, 94 (29,4%) the income is between 2000 – 2500, 19 (5,9%) the income is between 2600 – 3000, 19 (5,9%) the income is 3000 and above.

Table 8: Frequency of occupation

| Occupation | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|----------------------------|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Valid Public sector worker | 52 | 16,3 | 16,3 | 16,3 |
| Private sector worker | 178 | 55,6 | 55,6 | 71,9 |
| Owner of company | 26 | 8,1 | 8,1 | 80,0 |
| Housewife | 19 | 5,9 | 5,9 | 85,9 |
| Others | 45 | 14,1 | 14,1 | 100,0 |
| Total | 320 | 100,0 | 100,0 | |

As shown in the table, the occupation of the participants, 178 (55,6%) Private Sector worker, 52 (16,3%) public Sector worker, 45 (14,1%) Others, 26 (8,1%) Company owner, 19 (5,9%) House wife's.

Table 9: Frequency of period checkup

| Period checkup | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|----------------|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Valid Yes | 110 | 34,4 | 34,4 | 34,4 |
| No | 165 | 51,6 | 51,6 | 85,9 |
| Undecided | 45 | 14,1 | 14,1 | 100,0 |
| Total | 320 | 100,0 | 100,0 | |

To understand how much participants caring their health, it was asked whether they are doing routine check up and as seen in Table 9. 165 (51,6%) participants did not have annual checkups, 110 (34,4%) participants had annual checkups, 45 (14,1%) participants were undecided.

Table 10 Frequency of personal care

| Personal care | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|---------------|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Valid Yes | 212 | 66,3 | 66,3 | 66,3 |
| No | 72 | 22,5 | 22,5 | 88,8 |
| Undecided | 36 | 11,3 | 11,3 | 100,0 |
| Total | 320 | 100,0 | 100,0 | |

Table 10 shows 212 (66,3%) participants showed interest in personal care, 72 (22,5%) participants did not show interest in personal care, 36 (11,3%) participants were undecided.

Table 11 Frequency of how often painkillers are used

| How often painkillers are used | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|------------------------------------|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Valid As Soon As I Have A Headache | 101 | 31,6 | 31,6 | 31,6 |
| Wait To The Last Minute | 126 | 39,4 | 39,4 | 70,9 |
| Undecided | 54 | 16,9 | 16,9 | 87,8 |
| Other | 33 | 10,3 | 10,3 | 98,1 |
| Total | 320 | 100,0 | 100,0 | |

Table 11 shows the frequency of when painkillers are taken 126 (39,4%) wait until the last minute, 101 (31,6%) participants take a painkiller as soon as they have a headache, 54 (16,9%) were undecided, 33 (10,3%) participants used other methods.

Table 12: Frequency of how often derma-cosmetic products are used

| How often derma-cosmetic products are used | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|--|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Valid When Needed | 148 | 46,3 | 46,3 | 46,3 |
| Upon Recommendation | 75 | 23,4 | 23,4 | 69,7 |
| Sale | 56 | 17,5 | 17,5 | 87,2 |
| Other | 41 | 12,8 | 12,8 | 100,0 |
| Total | 320 | 100,0 | 100,0 | |

Table 12 shows, how when and how often Derma-cosmetic products are used 148 (46,3%) participants used when required, 75 (23,4%) participants when recommended, 56 (17,5%) participants when products were in the sale, 41 (12,8%) participants chose other.

Table 13: Frequency of what participants look at when purchasing derma-cosmetic products

| What participants look at when purchasing derma-cosmetic products | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|---|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Valid Price | 69 | 21,6 | 21,6 | 21,6 |
| Quality | 104 | 32,5 | 32,5 | 54,1 |
| Brand | 68 | 21,3 | 21,3 | 75,3 |
| Recommendation | 37 | 11,6 | 11,6 | 86,9 |
| Advertising | 36 | 11,3 | 11,3 | 98,1 |
| Other | 6 | 1,9 | 1,9 | 100,0 |
| Total | 320 | 100,0 | 100,0 | |

Table 13 shows, what participants look at when purchasing Derma-cosmetic products 104 (32, 5%) participants look for quality, 69 (21,6%) participants look at price, 68 (21,3%) participants look at brand name, 37 (11,6%) participants buy on recommendation, 36 (11,3%) participants look at advertising, 6 (1,9%) participants chose other.

Table 14: Frequency of the effect of advertising on painkillers

| Advertising effect on painkillers | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|-----------------------------------|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Valid Yes | 86 | 26,9 | 26,9 | 26,9 |
| No | 170 | 53,1 | 53,1 | 80,0 |
| Undecided | 64 | 20,0 | 20,0 | 100,0 |
| Total | 320 | 100,0 | 100,0 | |

Table 14 shows how effective advertising is on painkiller sales 170 (53,1%) participants said no, 86 (26,9%) participants said yes, 64 (20,0%) participants were undecided.

Table 15: Frequency of the effect of advertising on derma-cosmetics

| Advertising effect on derma-cosmetics | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|---------------------------------------|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Valid Yes | 128 | 40,0 | 40,0 | 40,0 |
| No | 125 | 39,1 | 39,1 | 79,1 |
| Undecided | 67 | 20,9 | 20,9 | 100,0 |
| Total | 320 | 100,0 | 100,0 | |

Table 15 shows how effective advertising is on Derma-cosmetic sales 128 (40,0%) participants said yes, 125 (39,1%) participants said no, 67 (20,9%) participants were undecided.

Table 16: Frequency of how often medication was used without prescription

| How often medication was used without prescription | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|--|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Valid Once A Month | 54 | 16,9 | 16,9 | 16,9 |
| Once Every Three Months | 58 | 18,1 | 18,1 | 35,0 |
| Once Every Six Months | 40 | 12,5 | 12,5 | 47,5 |
| Once A Year | 42 | 13,1 | 13,1 | 60,6 |
| Never | 126 | 39,4 | 39,4 | 100,0 |
| Total | 320 | 100,0 | 100,0 | |

Table 16 shows the frequency of how often medication was used without prescription 126 (39,4%) participants said never, 58 (18,1%) participants said once every three months, 54 (16,9%) participants said once a month, 42 (13,1%) participants said once a year, 40 (12,5%) participants said never.

Table 17: Frequency of how you decide on buying medication without prescription

| How do you decide on buying medication without prescription | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|---|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Valid Previous Experiences | 75 | 23,4 | 23,4 | 23,4 |
| Friend Recommendation | 41 | 12,8 | 12,8 | 36,3 |
| Pharmacy Recommendation | 65 | 20,3 | 20,3 | 56,6 |
| Without Prescription | 137 | 42,8 | 42,8 | 99,4 |
| Other | 2 | ,6 | ,6 | 100,0 |
| Total | 320 | 100,0 | 100,0 | |

Table 17 shows the decision on buying medication without prescription 137 (42,8%) participants said without prescription, 75 (23,4%) participants preferred previous experiences, 65 (20,3%) participants preferred pharmacy recommendation, 41 (12,8%) participants preferred recommendation by friends, 2 (0,6%) participants said other.

Table 18: Frequency of what kind of products you would buy without prescription

| What kind of products | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|-----------------------|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Valid Painkillers | 78 | 24,4 | 24,4 | 24,4 |
| Derma-Cosmetics | 41 | 12,8 | 12,8 | 37,2 |
| Antibiotics | 47 | 14,7 | 14,7 | 51,9 |
| All | 27 | 8,4 | 8,4 | 60,3 |
| Neither | 125 | 39,1 | 39,1 | 99,4 |
| Total | 320 | 100,0 | 100,0 | |

Table 18 shows what kind of products you would buy without prescription 125 (39,1%) participants said neither, 78 (24,4%) participants said painkillers, 47 (14,7%) participants said antibiotics, 41 (12,8%) participants said Derma-cosmetics, 27 (8,4%) participants said all.

Table 19: Frequency of buying medication on recommendation

| Buying medication on recommendation | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|-------------------------------------|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Valid Yes | 79 | 24,7 | 24,7 | 24,7 |
| No | 194 | 60,6 | 60,6 | 85,3 |
| Undecided | 47 | 14,7 | 14,7 | 100,0 |
| Total | 320 | 100,0 | 100,0 | |

Table 19 shows the frequency of buying medication on recommendation 194 (60,6%) participants said no, 79 (24,7%) participants said yes, 47 (14,7%) participants were undecided

Table 20: Frequency of reasons for buying medication without prescription

| Reasons for buying medication without prescription | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|--|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Valid Recommendation | 60 | 18,8 | 18,8 | 18,8 |
| Emergency | 76 | 23,8 | 23,8 | 42,5 |
| Not To Pay For Checkup | 25 | 7,8 | 7,8 | 50,3 |
| Previous Experiences | 22 | 6,9 | 6,9 | 57,2 |
| Other | 137 | 42,8 | 42,8 | 100,0 |
| Total | 320 | 100,0 | 100,0 | |

Table 20 shows the frequency of reasons for buying medication without prescription 137 (42,8%) participants chose other, 76 (23,8%) participants said in an emergency, 60 (18,8%) participants said upon recommendation, 25 (7,8%) said not to pay for checkups, 22 (6,9%) said previous experiences.

Table 21: Frequency of where you follow derma-cosmetics

| Where you follow derma-cosmetic products | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|--|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Valid Social Media | 84 | 26,3 | 26,3 | 26,3 |
| Magazines | 48 | 15,0 | 15,0 | 41,3 |
| Doctors | 88 | 27,5 | 27,5 | 68,8 |
| Friends | 57 | 17,8 | 17,8 | 86,6 |
| Other | 43 | 13,4 | 13,4 | 100,0 |
| Total | 320 | 100,0 | 100,0 | |

Table 21 shows where Derma-cosmetic products are followed 88 (27,5%) participants said doctors advice, 84 (26,3%) participants said social media, 57 (17,8) participants said friends, 48 (15,0%) participants said magazines, 43 (13,4%) participants said other.

Table 22: Frequency of where you follow painkillers

| Where you follow painkillers | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|------------------------------|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Valid Social Media | 65 | 20,3 | 20,3 | 20,3 |
| Magazine | 55 | 17,2 | 17,2 | 37,5 |
| Doctor | 129 | 40,3 | 40,3 | 77,8 |
| Friends | 33 | 10,3 | 10,3 | 88,1 |
| Other | 38 | 11,9 | 11,9 | 100,0 |
| Total | 320 | 100,0 | 100,0 | |

Table 22 shows where painkillers are followed 129 (40,3%) participants said through a doctor, 65 (20,3%) participants said social media, 55 (17,2%) participants said magazines, 38 (11,9%) participants said other, 33 (10,3%) participants said through friends.

Table 23: Frequency of painkillers on recommendation

| Painkillers on recommendation | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|-------------------------------|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Valid Yes | 115 | 35,9 | 35,9 | 35,9 |
| No | 134 | 41,9 | 41,9 | 77,8 |
| Undecided | 71 | 22,2 | 22,2 | 100,0 |
| Total | 320 | 100,0 | 100,0 | |

Table 23 shows the frequency of painkillers bought on recommendation 134 (41,9%) participants said no, 115 (35,9%) participants said yes, 71 (22,2%) participants were undecided.

Table 24: Frequency of doctors prescribing too much medication

| Do doctors prescribe to much medication | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|---|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Valid Yes | 128 | 40,0 | 40,0 | 40,0 |
| No | 120 | 37,5 | 37,5 | 77,5 |
| Undecided | 72 | 22,5 | 22,5 | 100,0 |
| Total | 320 | 100,0 | 100,0 | |

Table 24 shows the decision on doctors prescribing too much medication 128 (40,0%) participants said Yes, 120 (37,5%) participants said No, 72 (22,5%) participants were undecided.

Table 25: Frequency of product promotion with doctors

| Product promotion with doctors | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|--------------------------------|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Valid Yes | 117 | 36,6 | 36,6 | 36,6 |
| No | 135 | 42,2 | 42,2 | 78,8 |
| Undecided | 68 | 21,3 | 21,3 | 100,0 |
| Total | 320 | 100,0 | 100,0 | |

Table 25 shows the decision on promotion by doctors on products 135 (42,2%) participants said No, 117 (36,6%) participants were undecided

Table 26: Frequency of the first person you would consult

| First person to consult | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|-------------------------|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Valid Family Member | 134 | 41,9 | 41,9 | 41,9 |
| Medics | 107 | 33,4 | 33,4 | 75,3 |
| Friend | 28 | 8,8 | 8,8 | 84,1 |
| Pharmacy | 44 | 13,8 | 13,8 | 97,8 |
| Other | 7 | 2,2 | 2,2 | 100,0 |
| Total | 320 | 100,0 | 100,0 | |

Table 26 shows the result of who the first person of contact would be for medical advice 134 (41,9%) participants would contact a family member, 107 (33,4%) participants would contact medics, 44 (13,8%) participants would contact a pharmacist, 28(8,8%) participants would contact a friend, 7 (2,2%) participants said other.

Table 27: Frequency of whether you would pass on negative or positive feedback about the health service

| Would you pass on negative/positive feedback about the health service | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|---|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Valid Yes | 241 | 75,3 | 75,3 | 75,3 |
| No | 40 | 12,5 | 12,5 | 87,8 |
| Undecided | 39 | 12,2 | 12,2 | 100,0 |
| Total | 320 | 100,0 | 100,0 | |

Table 27 shows the results of passing on negative or positive feedback about the Health Service 241 (75,1%) participants said yes, 40 (12,5%) participants said no, 39 (12,2%) participants were indecisive.

Table 28: Frequency of would you consult a doctor straight away

| Would you consult a doctor straight away | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|--|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Valid Strongly Agree | 83 | 25,9 | 25,9 | 25,9 |
| Agree | 86 | 26,9 | 26,9 | 52,8 |
| Not Sure | 75 | 23,4 | 23,4 | 76,3 |
| Disagree | 65 | 20,3 | 20,3 | 96,6 |
| Strongly disagree | 11 | 3,4 | 3,4 | 100,0 |
| Total | 320 | 100,0 | 100,0 | |

Table 28 shows whether you would contact a Doctor straight away 86 (26,9%) participants agreed, 83 (25,9) participants definitely agreed, 75 (23,4%) were not sure, 65 (20,3%) participants did not agree, 11 (3,4%) participants did not agree definitely.

Table 29: Frequency of painkiller recommendation by pharmacists

| Painkillers recommendation by pharmacist | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|--|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Valid Strongly Agree | 50 | 15,6 | 15,6 | 15,6 |
| Agree | 117 | 36,6 | 36,6 | 52,2 |
| Not Sure | 62 | 19,4 | 19,4 | 71,6 |
| Disagree | 61 | 19,1 | 19,1 | 90,6 |
| Strongly disagree | 30 | 9,4 | 9,4 | 100,0 |
| Total | 320 | 100,0 | 100,0 | |

Table 29 shows whether painkillers would be used recommended by pharmacists 117 (36,6%) participants agreed, 62 (19,4%) participants were not sure, 61 (19,1%) participants did not agree, 50 (15,6%) participants definitely agreed, 30 (9,4%) did not agree definitely.

Table 30: Frequency of derma-cosmetics recommended by pharmacists

| Recommendation by pharmacist on derma-cosmetic | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|--|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Valid Strongly Agree | 26 | 8,1 | 8,1 | 8,1 |
| Agree | 111 | 34,7 | 34,7 | 42,8 |
| Not Sure | 70 | 21,9 | 21,9 | 64,7 |
| Disagree | 75 | 23,4 | 23,4 | 88,1 |
| Strongly disagree | 38 | 11,9 | 11,9 | 100,0 |
| Total | 320 | 100,0 | 100,0 | |

Table 30 shows the number of people that would use Derma-cosmetic products recommended by pharmacists 111 (34,7%) participants agreed, 75(23,%) participants did not agree, 70(21,9%) participants were not sure, 38(11,9%) participants did not agree definitely, 26(8,1%) participants definitely agreed.

Table 31: Frequency of derma-cosmetics recommended by friends

| Recommendation from friends on derma-cosmetic | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|---|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Valid Strongly Agree | 32 | 10,0 | 10,0 | 10,0 |
| Agree | 100 | 31,3 | 31,3 | 41,3 |
| Not Sure | 83 | 25,9 | 25,9 | 67,2 |
| Disagree | 67 | 20,9 | 20,9 | 88,1 |
| Strongly disagree | 38 | 11,9 | 11,9 | 100,0 |
| Total | 320 | 100,0 | 100,0 | |

Table 31 shows the number of people that would use Derma-cosmetic products recommended by friends 100 (31,3%) participants agreed, 83(25,9%) participants were not sure, 67(20,9%) participants did not agree, 38(11,9%) participants did not agree definitely, 32(10,0%) participants definitely agreed.

Table 32: Frequency of how important recommendation is on painkillers

| Recommendation is important painkillers | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|--|-----------|---------|------------------|-----------------------|
| Valid Strongly Agree | 49 | 15,3 | 15,3 | 15,3 |
| Agree | 97 | 30,3 | 30,3 | 45,6 |
| Not Sure | 71 | 22,2 | 22,2 | 67,8 |
| Disagree | 66 | 20,6 | 20,6 | 88,4 |
| Strongly disagree | 37 | 11,6 | 11,6 | 100,0 |
| Total | 320 | 100,0 | 100,0 | |

Table 32 shows the number of people that feel recommendation is important on painkillers 97(30,3%) participants agreed, 71(22,2%) participants were not sure, 66(20,6%) participants did not agree, 49(15,3%) participants definitely agreed, 37(11,6%) participants did not agree definitely.

4.2 Reliability Test

Case Processing Summary

| | | N | % |
|-------|-----------------------|-----|-------|
| Cases | Valid | 320 | 100,0 |
| | Excluded ^a | 0 | ,0 |
| | Total | 320 | 100,0 |

a. Listwise deletion based on all variables in the procedure.

Reliability Statistics

| Cronbach's Alpha | Cronbach's Alpha Based on Standardized Items | N of Items |
|------------------|--|------------|
| ,811 | ,812 | 6 |

According to reliability test for likert and likert scale questions, Cronbach's Alpha value is 0,811 > 0.70 thus it is an acceptable limit.

4.3 Crosstabulation

Crosstabs analysis was used to find the relationship between two variables by doing that it helps to answer the research question of this study.

Table 33: Annual routine checkups & sex cross-tabulation

| | | | Sex (%) | | Total (%) |
|------------------|-----------|---|---------|-------|-----------|
| | | | Female | Male | |
| routine checkups | Yes | count | 76 | 34 | 110 |
| | | % within do you have yearly routine check ups | 69,1 | 30,9 | 100 |
| | | % within sex | 42,5 | 24,1% | 34,4 |
| | | % of total | 23,8 | 10,6 | 34,4 |
| | No | count | 84 | 81 | 165 |
| | | % within do you have yearly routine check ups | 50,9 | 49,1 | 100 |
| | | % within sex | 46,9 | 57,4 | 51,6 |
| | | % of total | 26,3 | 25,3 | 51,6 |
| | Undecided | count | 19 | 26 | 45 |
| | | % within do you have yearly routine check ups | 42,2 | 57,8 | 100 |
| | | % within sex | 10,6 | 18,4 | 14,1 |
| | | % of total | 5,9 | 8,1 | 14,1 |
| Total | | count | 179 | 141 | 320 |
| | | % within do you have yearly routine check ups | 55,9 | 44,1 | 100 |
| | | % within sex | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| | | % of total | 55,9 | 44,1 | 100 |

There is a close relationship between sex and period check up as Pearson Chi- square value is 12.848^a, df=2, p=,002<0.005. As seen in Table 33, 34.4% people had yearly routine checkups, 23.8% were female and 10.6% were male. Out of 179 females 76 of them had yearly routine checkup whereas 84 females did not have yearly routine

checkups, on the other hand out of 141 males only 34 males had yearly routine checkups.

Table 34: Annual routine checkups & age cross-tabulation

| | | | Age (%) | | | | Total (%) |
|------------------|-----------|-----------------------------------|---------|-------|-------|---------|-----------|
| | | | 18-28 | 29-39 | 40-50 | 50 over | |
| routine checkups | Yes | Count | 42 | 23 | 27 | 18 | 110 |
| | | % within yearly routine check ups | 38,2 | 20,9 | 24,5 | 16,4 | 100 |
| | | % within age | 29,6 | 23,0 | 48,2 | 81,8 | 34,4 |
| | | % of total | 13,1 | 7,2 | 8,4 | 5,6 | 34,4 |
| | No | Count | 80 | 65 | 18 | 2 | 165 |
| | | % within yearly routine check ups | 48,5 | 39,4 | 10,9 | 1,2 | 100 |
| | | % within age | 56,3 | 65,0 | 32,1 | 9,1 | 51,6 |
| | | % of total | 25,0 | 20,3 | 5,6 | ,6 | 51,6 |
| | Undecided | Count | 20 | 12 | 11 | 2 | 45 |
| | | % within yearly routine check ups | 44,4 | 26,7 | 24,4 | 4,4 | 100 |
| | | % within age | 14,1 | 12,0 | 19,6 | 9,1 | 14,1 |
| | | % of total | 6,3 | 3,8 | 3,4 | ,6 | 14,1 |
| Total | | Count | 142 | 100 | 56 | 22 | 320 |
| | | % within yearly routine check ups | 44,4 | 31,3 | 17,5 | 6,9 | 100 |
| | | % within age | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |

As you can see in Table 34 the most yearly routine checkups were done between the ages of 18-28 year olds. The results of this table show that the older you get yearly routine checkups decrease.

Pearson Chi- square value is 40.092, df=6, p=, 000<0.005.

Table 35: Annual routine checkups & uses of derma-cosmetic products cross-tabulation

| | | | How Often Do You Use Derma-cosmetic Product (%) | | | | Total (%) | |
|------------------|-----------|---|---|--------------|--------------|-------|-----------|-----|
| | | | When Need | When recomm. | In the Sales | Other | | |
| routine checkups | Yes | count | 50 | 36 | 12 | 12 | 110 | |
| | | % within do you have yearly routine checkups? | 45,5 | 32,7 | 10,9 | 10,9 | 100 | |
| | | % within how often derma-cosmetic | 33,8 | 48,0 | 21,4 | 29,3 | 34,4 | |
| | | % of total | 15,6 | 11,3 | 3,8 | 3,8 | 34,4 | |
| | No | count | 84 | 24 | 36 | 21 | 165 | |
| | | % within do you have yearly routine checkups? | 50,9 | 14,5 | 21,8 | 12,7 | 100 | |
| | | % within how often derma-cosmetic | 56,8 | 32, | 64,3 | 51,2 | 51,6 | |
| | | % of total | 26,3 | 7,5 | 11,3 | 6,6 | 51,6 | |
| | Undecided | count | 14 | 15 | 8 | 8 | 45 | |
| | | % within do you have yearly routine checkups? | 31,1 | 33,3 | 17,8 | 17,8 | 100 | |
| | | % within how often derma-cosmetic | 9,5 | 20,0 | 14,3 | 19,5 | 14,1 | |
| | | % of total | 4,4 | 4,7 | 2,5 | 2,5 | 14,1 | |
| | Total | | count | 148 | 75 | 56 | 41 | 320 |

| | | | | | | |
|--|---|-------|-------|-------|-------|-----|
| | % within do you have yearly routine checkups? | 46,3 | 23,4 | 17,5 | 12,8 | 100 |
| | % within how often derma-cosmetic | 100,0 | 100,0 | 100,0 | 100,0 | 100 |
| | % of total | 46,3 | 23,4 | 17,5 | 12,8 | 100 |

Table 35 shows 50 people who have routine checkups use derma-cosmetic products when necessary, 84 people who do not have routine checkups also use derma-cosmetic products when necessary.

Table 36: Annual routine checkups & purchasing Derma-cosmetic products cross-tabulation

| | | | When purchasing derma-cosmetic (%) | | | | | | Total |
|------------------|-----|---|------------------------------------|---------|-------|---------|------|-------|-------|
| | | | Price | Quality | Brand | Recomm. | Ads. | Other | |
| routine checkups | Yes | count | 27 | 51 | 15 | 7 | 9 | 1 | 110 |
| | | % within yearly routine checkups | 24,5 | 46,4 | 13,6 | 6,4 | 8,2 | ,9 | 100 |
| | | % within when purchasing derma-cosmetic | 39,1 | 49,0 | 22,1 | 18,9 | 25,0 | 16,7 | 34,4 |
| | | % of total | 8,4 | 15,9 | 4,7 | 2,2 | 2,8 | ,3 | 34,4 |
| | No | count | 38 | 45 | 40 | 22 | 18 | 2 | 165 |
| | | % within yearly routine checkups | 23 | 27,3 | 24,2 | 13,3 | 10,9 | 1,2 | 100 |

| | | | | | | | | | |
|-------|--------|---|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| | | % within when purchasing derma-cosmetic | 55,1 | 43,3 | 58,8 | 59,5 | 50,0 | 33,3 | 51,6 |
| | | % of total | 11,9 | 14, | 12,5 | 6,9 | 5,6 | ,6 | 51,6 |
| | Undec. | count | 4 | 8 | 13 | 8 | 9 | 3 | 45 |
| | | % within yearly routine checkups | 8,9 | 17,8 | 28,9 | 17,8 | 20, | 6,7 | 100 |
| | | % within when purchasing derma-cosmetic | 5,8 | 7,7 | 19,1 | 21,6 | 25 | 50 | 14,1 |
| | | % of total | 1,3 | 2,5 | 4,1 | 2,5 | 2,8 | ,9 | 14,1 |
| Total | | count | 69 | 104 | 68 | 37 | 36 | 6 | 320 |
| | | % within yearly routine checkups | 21,6 | 32,5 | 21,3 | 11,6 | 11,3 | 1,9 | 100 |
| | | % within when purchasing derma-cosmetic | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100, | 100 |
| | | % of total | 21,6 | 32,5 | 21,3 | 11,6 | 11,3 | 1,9 | 100 |

Table 36 shows people who have routine checkups firstly pay more attention to quality and then to price. When buying Derma-cosmetic products people who have routine checkups, 51 people (46.4%) look at quality, 27 people (24.5%) look at the price. People who do not have routine checkups 45 people (27.3%) when buying derma-cosmetic products for the first time look at quality.

Table 37: Annual routine checkups advertising effect painkillers cross-tabulation

| | | | Advertising effect Painkillers (%) | | | Total |
|---|--------|---|---------------------------------------|--------|-----------|-------|
| | | | Yes | No | Undecided | |
| Do you have yearly routine checkups? | Yes | Count | 31 | 62 | 17 | 110 |
| | | % within do you have yearly routine checkups? | 28,2 | 56,4 | 15,5 | 100 |
| | | % within advertising effect painkillers | 36,0 | 36,5 | 26,6 | 34,4 |
| | | % of total | 9,7 | 19,4 | 5,3 | 34,4 |
| | No | Count | 41 | 95 | 29 | 165 |
| | | % within period checkup | 24,8 | 57,6 | 17,6 | 100 |
| | | % within advertising effect painkillers | 47,7 | 55,9 | 45,3 | 51,6 |
| | | % of total | 12,8 | 29,7 | 9,1 | 51,6 |
| | Undec. | Count | 14 | 13 | 18 | 45 |
| | | % within period checkup | 31,1 | 28,9 | 40,0 | 100 |
| | | % within advertising effect painkillers | 16,3 | 7,6 | 28,1 | 14,1 |
| | | % of total | 4,4 | 4,1 | 5,6 | 14,1 |
| | Total | | Count | 86 | 170 | 64 |
| % within period checkup | | | 26,9 | 53,1 | 20,0 | 100 |
| % within advertising effect painkillers | | | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| % of total | | | 26,9 % | 53,1 % | 20,0 | 100 |

Table 37 shows that 31 people feel advertising has an effect on the purchase of painkillers, 62 people who do not have routine checkups feel that advertising does not have an effect on the purchase of painkiller products.

Table 38: Periodical checkup and How do you decided cross-tabulation

| | | | How Do You Decided (%) | | | | | Total | |
|----------------|--------|----------------------------|----------------------------|---------|---------------|-------------------|-------|-------|-----|
| | | | Prev. Exper. | Recomm. | Phar. Recomm. | Without Prescript | Other | | |
| Period Checkup | Yes | count | 23 | 12 | 12 | 62 | 1 | 110 | |
| | | % within period checkup | 20,9 | 10,9 | 10,9 | 56,4 | ,9 | 100 | |
| | | % within how do you decide | 30,7 | 29,3 | 18,5% | 45,3 | 50,0 | 34,4 | |
| | | % of total | 7,2 | 3,8 | 3,8% | 19,4 | ,3 | 34,4 | |
| | No | count | 37 | 21 | 46 | 60 | 1 | 165 | |
| | | % within period checkup | 22,4 | 12,7 | 27,9 | 36,4 | ,6 | 100 | |
| | | % within how do you decide | 49,3 | 51,2 | 70,8 | 43,8 | 50 | 51,6 | |
| | | % of total | 11,6 | 6,6 | 14,4 | 18,8 | ,3 | 51,6 | |
| | Undec. | count | 15 | 8 | 7 | 15 | 0 | 45 | |
| | | % within period checkup | 33,3 | 17,8 | 15,6 | 33,3 | ,0 | 100 | |
| | | % within how do you decide | 20 | 19,5 | 10,8 | 10,9 | ,0 | 14,1 | |
| | | % of total | 4,7 | 2,5 | 2,2 | 4,7 | ,0 | 14,1 | |
| | Total | | count | 75 | 41 | 65 | 137 | 2 | 320 |
| | | | % within period checkup | 23,4 | 12,8 | 20,3 | 42,8 | ,6 | 100 |
| | | | % within how do you decide | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| % of total | | | 23,4% | 12,8 | 20,3 | 42,8 | ,6 | 100 | |

Table 38 shows that 62 people who have routine prefer to buy medication without prescription, 37 people who do not have routine checkups rely on previous experiences.

Table 39: Periodical checkup and What kind of products cross-tabulation

| | | | Pain Killers | Derma-Cosmetic | Antibiotic | All | Non. | Total | |
|----------------|--------|--------------------------------|--------------|----------------|------------|------|------|-------|-----|
| Period Checkup | Yes | Count | 25 | 15 | 9 | 1 | 59 | 110 | |
| | | % within period checkup | 22,7 | 13,6 | 8,2 | ,9 | 53,6 | 100 | |
| | | % within what kind of products | 32,1 | 36,6 | 19,1 | 3,7 | 47,2 | 34,4 | |
| | | % of total | 7,8 | 4,7 | 2,8 | ,3 | 18,4 | 34,4 | |
| | No | Count | 41 | 20 | 30 | 22 | 51 | 165 | |
| | | % within period checkup | 24,8 | 12,1 | 18,2 | 13,3 | 30,9 | 100 | |
| | | % within what kind of products | 52,6 | 48,8 | 63,8 | 81,5 | 40,8 | 51,6 | |
| | | % of total | 12,8 | 6,3 | 9,4 | 6,9 | 15,9 | 51,6 | |
| | Undec. | Count | 12 | 6 | 8 | 4 | 15 | 45 | |
| | | % within period checkup | 26,7 | 13,3 | 17,8 | 8,9 | 33,3 | 100 | |
| | | % within what kind of products | 15,4 | 14,6 | 17,0 | 14,8 | 12,0 | 14,1 | |
| | | % of total | 3,8 | 1,9 | 2,5 | 1,3 | 4,7 | 14,1 | |
| | Total | | count | 78 | 41 | 47 | 27 | 125 | 320 |

| | | | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------------|------|------|------|-----|------|-----|
| | % within period checkup | 24,4 | 12,8 | 14,7 | 8,4 | 39,1 | 100 |
| | % within what kind of products | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| | % of total | 24,4 | 12,8 | 14,7 | 8,4 | 39,1 | 100 |

Table 39 shows that when 25 people who have routine checkups are buying painkiller products 15 people are buying derma-cosmetic products, 41 people who do not have routine checkups are buying painkiller products.

Table 40: Periodical checkup and on suggestion cross-tabulation

| | | | On suggestion (%) | | | Total |
|----------------|--------|-------------------------|-------------------|------|-----------|-------|
| | | | Yes | No | Undecided | |
| Period checkup | Yes | Count | 19 | 84 | 7 | 110 |
| | | % within period Checkup | 17,3 | 76,4 | 6,4 | 100 |
| | | % within on suggestion | 24,1 | 43,3 | 14,9 | 34,4 |
| | | % of total | 5,9 | 26,3 | 2,2 | 34,4 |
| | No | Count | 48 | 86 | 31 | 165 |
| | | % within period Checkup | 29,1 | 52,1 | 18,8 | 100 |
| | | % within on suggestion | 60,8 | 44,3 | 66,0 | 51,6 |
| | | % of total | 15,0 | 26,9 | 9,7 | 51,6 |
| | Undec. | Count | 12 | 24 | 9 | 45 |
| | | % within period Checkup | 26,7 | 53,3 | 20,0 | 100 |
| | | % within on suggestion | 15,2 | 12,4 | 19,1 | 14,1 |
| | | % of total | 3,8 | 7,5 | 2,8 | 14,1 |
| Total | | Count | 79 | 194 | 47 | 320 |
| | | % within period Checkup | 24,7 | 60,6 | 14,7 | 100 |
| | | % within on suggestion | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |

| | | | On suggestion (%) | | | Total |
|-------------------|--------|----------------------------|-------------------|------|-----------|-------|
| | | | Yes | No | Undecided | |
| Period checkup | Yes | Count | 19 | 84 | 7 | 110 |
| | | % within period Checkup | 17,3 | 76,4 | 6,4 | 100 |
| | | % within on suggestion | 24,1 | 43,3 | 14,9 | 34,4 |
| | | % of total | 5,9 | 26,3 | 2,2 | 34,4 |
| | No | Count | 48 | 86 | 31 | 165 |
| | | % within period Checkup | 29,1 | 52,1 | 18,8 | 100 |
| | | % within on suggestion | 60,8 | 44,3 | 66,0 | 51,6 |
| | | % of total | 15,0 | 26,9 | 9,7 | 51,6 |
| | Undec. | Count | 12 | 24 | 9 | 45 |
| | | % within period Checkup | 26,7 | 53,3 | 20,0 | 100 |
| | | % within on suggestion | 15,2 | 12,4 | 19,1 | 14,1 |
| | | % of total | 3,8 | 7,5 | 2,8 | 14,1 |
| Total | | Count | 79 | 194 | 47 | 320 |
| | | % within period Checkup | 24,7 | 60,6 | 14,7 | 100 |
| | | % within on suggestion | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| | | % of total | 24,7 | 60,6 | 14,7 | 100 |

Table 40 shows that 19 people who have routine checkups buy medication on recommendation, 84 people who have routine checkups do not buy medication on recommendation, 86 people who do not have routine checkups have not purchased medication on recommendation, 48 people who do not have routine checkups buy medication on recommendation.

Table 41: Periodical checkup and Reasons cross-tabulation

| | | | Reasons (%) | | | | | Total | |
|----------------|--------|-------------------------|-------------------------|-----------|---------------|--------------|-------|-------|-----|
| | | | Recomm. | Emergency | Free Check-up | Prev. Exper. | Other | | |
| Period checkup | Yes | Count | 14 | 17 | 7 | 7 | 65 | 110 | |
| | | % within period checkup | 12,7 | 15,5 | 6,4 | 6,4 | 59,1 | 100 | |
| | | % within reasons | 23,3 | 22,4 | 28,0 | 31,8 | 47,4 | 34,4 | |
| | | % of total | 4,4 | 5,3 | 2,2 | 2,2 | 20,3 | 34,4 | |
| | No | Count | 38 | 47 | 11 | 12 | 57 | 165 | |
| | | % within period checkup | 23 | 28,5 | 6,7 | 7,3 | 34,5 | 100 | |
| | | % within reasons | 63,3 | 61,8 | 44,0 | 54,5 | 41,6 | 51,6 | |
| | | % of total | 11,9 | 14,7 | 3,4 | 3,8 | 17,8 | 51,6 | |
| | Undec. | count | 8 | 12 | 7 | 3 | 15 | 45 | |
| | | % within period checkup | 17,8 | 26,7 | 15,6 | 6,7 | 33,3 | 100 | |
| | | % within reasons | 13,3 | 15,8 | 28,0 | 13,6 | 10,9 | 14,1 | |
| | | % of total | 2,5 | 3,8 | 2,2 | ,9 | 4,7 | 14,1 | |
| | Total | | Count | 60 | 76 | 25 | 22 | 137 | 320 |
| | | | % within period checkup | 18,8 | 23,8 | 7,8 | 6,9 | 42,8 | 100 |
| | | | % within reasons | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |

| | | | Reasons (%) | | | | | Total | |
|-------------------|--------|-------------------------|-------------------------|-----------|---------------|--------------|-------|-------|-----|
| | | | Recomm. | Emergency | Free Check-up | Prev. Exper. | Other | | |
| Period checkup | Yes | Count | 14 | 17 | 7 | 7 | 65 | 110 | |
| | | % within period checkup | 12,7 | 15,5 | 6,4 | 6,4 | 59,1 | 100 | |
| | | % within reasons | 23,3 | 22,4 | 28,0 | 31,8 | 47,4 | 34,4 | |
| | | % of total | 4,4 | 5,3 | 2,2 | 2,2 | 20,3 | 34,4 | |
| | No | Count | 38 | 47 | 11 | 12 | 57 | 165 | |
| | | % within period checkup | 23 | 28,5 | 6,7 | 7,3 | 34,5 | 100 | |
| | | % within reasons | 63,3 | 61,8 | 44,0 | 54,5 | 41,6 | 51,6 | |
| | | % of total | 11,9 | 14,7 | 3,4 | 3,8 | 17,8 | 51,6 | |
| | Undec. | count | 8 | 12 | 7 | 3 | 15 | 45 | |
| | | % within period checkup | 17,8 | 26,7 | 15,6 | 6,7 | 33,3 | 100 | |
| | | % within reasons | 13,3 | 15,8 | 28,0 | 13,6 | 10,9 | 14,1 | |
| | | % of total | 2,5 | 3,8 | 2,2 | ,9 | 4,7 | 14,1 | |
| | Total | | Count | 60 | 76 | 25 | 22 | 137 | 320 |
| | | | % within period checkup | 18,8 | 23,8 | 7,8 | 6,9 | 42,8 | 100 |
| % within reasons | | | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | |
| % of total | | | 18,8 | 23,8 | 7,8 | 6,9 | 42,8 | 100 | |

Table 41 shows that 17 people who have routine checkups only buy medication without prescription in an emergency, 47 people who do not have routine checkups buy medication in an emergency.

Table 42: Periodical checkup and Where you follow dermo cosmetic cross-tabulation

| | | | Where you follow derma-cosmetic (%) | | | | | Total |
|-------------------|--------|---|-------------------------------------|----------|--------|---------|-------|-------|
| | | | Social Media | Magazine | Doctor | Friends | Other | |
| Period checkup | Yes | Count | 32 | 16 | 37 | 13 | 12 | 110 |
| | | % within period checkup | 29,1 | 14,5 | 33,6 | 11,8 | 10,9 | 100 |
| | | % within where you follow derma- cosmetic | 38,1 | 33,3 | 42,0 | 22,8 | 27,9 | 34,4 |
| | | % of total | 10,0 | 5,0 | 11,6 | 4,1 | 3,8 | 34,4 |
| | No | Count | 36 | 23 | 48 | 30 | 28 | 165 |
| | | % within period checkup | 21,8 | 13,9 | 29,1 | 18,2 | 17,0 | 100 |
| | | % within where you follow derma- cosmetic | 42,9 | 47,9 | 54,5 | 52,6 | 65,1 | 51,6 |
| | | % of total | 11,3 | 7,2 | 15,0 | 9,4 | 8,8 | 51,6 |
| | Undec. | Count | 16 | 9 | 3 | 14 | 3 | 45 |
| | | % within period checkup | 35,6 | 20,0 | 6,7 | 31,1 | 6,7 | 100 |
| | | % within where you follow derma- cosmetic | 19,0 | 18,8 | 3,4 | 24,6 | 7,0 | 14,1 |
| | | % of total | 5,0 | 2,8 | ,9 | 4,4 | ,9 | 14,1 |
| | Total | | Count | 84 | 48 | 88 | 57 | 43 |

| | | | | | | | |
|--|--|------|------|------|------|------|-----|
| | % within period checkup | 26,3 | 15,0 | 27,5 | 17,8 | 13,4 | 100 |
| | % within where you follow derma-cosmetic | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| | % of total | 26,3 | 15,0 | 27,5 | 17,8 | 13,4 | 100 |

Table 42 shows 37 people who have routine checkups and 48 people who do not have routine checkups follow derma-cosmetic products through their doctor.

Table 43: Periodical checkup and Where you follow painkillers cross-tabulation

| | | | Where you follow Painkillers (%) | | | | | Total |
|----------------|--------|---------------------------------------|----------------------------------|----------|--------|---------|-------|-------|
| | | | Social Media | Magazine | Doctor | Friends | Other | |
| Period checkup | Yes | Count | 29 | 13 | 55 | 6 | 7 | 110 |
| | | % within period Checkup | 26,4 | 11,8 | 50,0 | 5,5 | 6,4 | 100 |
| | | % within where you follow painkillers | 44,6 | 23,6 | 42,6 | 18,2 | 18,4 | 34,4 |
| | | % of total | 9,1 | 4,1 | 17,2 | 1,9 | 2,2 | 34,4 |
| | No | Count | 28 | 35 | 56 | 21 | 25 | 165 |
| | | % within period Checkup | 17,0 | 21,2 | 33,9 | 12,7 | 15,2 | 100 |
| | | % within where you follow painkillers | 43,1 | 63,6 | 43,4 | 63,6 | 65,8 | 51,6 |
| | | % of total | 8,8 | 10,9 | 17,5 | 6,6 | 7,8 | 51,6 |
| | Undec. | Count | 8 | 7 | 18 | 6 | 6 | 45 |
| | | % within period Checkup | 17,8 | 15,6 | 40,0 | 13,3 | 13,3 | 100 |

| | | | | | | | | |
|-------|--|---------------------------------------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| | | % within where you follow painkillers | 12,3 | 12,7 | 14,0 | 18,2 | 15,8 | 14,1 |
| | | % of total | 2,5 | 2,2 | 5,6 | 1,9 | 1,9 | 14,1 |
| Total | | Count | 65 | 55 | 129 | 33 | 38 | 320 |
| | | % within period Checkup | 20,3 | 17,2 | 40,3 | 10,3 | 11,9 | 100 |
| | | % within where you follow painkillers | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| | | % of total | 20,3 | 17,2 | 40,3 | 10,3 | 11,9 | 100 |

Table 43 shows that 55 people who have and 56 people who do not have routine checkups follow up on painkillers products through their doctor. 55 (50%) people who have routine checkups and 56 (33.9%) people who do not have routine checkups when buying painkiller products buy on recommendation.

Table 44: Periodical checkup and Suggested derma-cosmetics cross-tabulation

| | | | Suggested Derma-Cosmetics (%) | | | Total |
|----------------|--------|------------------------------------|-------------------------------|------|-----------|-------|
| | | | Yes | No | Undecided | |
| Period checkup | Yes | count | 37 | 57 | 16 | 110 |
| | | % within period checkup | 33,6 | 51,8 | 14,5 | 100 |
| | | % within suggested derma-cosmetics | 36,3 | 42,5 | 19,0 | 34,4 |
| | | % of total | 11,6 | 17,8 | 5,0 | 34,4 |
| | No | count | 50 | 68 | 47 | 165 |
| | | % within period checkup | 30,3 | 41,2 | 28,5 | 100 |
| | | % within suggested derma-cosmetics | 49,0 | 50,7 | 56,0 | 51,6 |
| | | % of total | 15,6 | 21,3 | 14,7 | 51,6 |
| | Undec. | count | 15 | 9 | 21 | 45 |
| | | % within period checkup | 33,3 | 20,0 | 46,7 | 100 |
| | | % within suggested derma-cosmetics | 14,7 | 6,7 | 25,0 | 14,1 |
| | | % of total | 4,7 | 2,8 | 6,6 | 14,1 |
| Total | | count | 102 | 134 | 84 | 320 |
| | | % within period checkup | 31,9 | 41,9 | 26,3 | 100 |
| | | % within suggested derma-cosmetics | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| | | % of total | 31,9 | 41,9 | 26,3 | 100 |

Table 44 shows 37 people who have routine checkup buy derma-cosmetic products upon recommendation, 57 people who do not have routine checkups do not buy derma-cosmetic products upon recommendation.

Table 45: Periodical checkup and Suggested painkillers cross-tabulation

| | | | Suggested Painkillers | | | Total |
|-------------------|--------|--------------------------------------|-----------------------|------|-----------|-------|
| | | | Yes | No | Undecided | |
| Period checkup | Yes | count | 38 | 55 | 17 | 110 |
| | | % within period checkup | 34,5 | 50 | 15,5 | 100 |
| | | % within suggested painkillers | 33,0 | 41 | 23,9 | 34,4 |
| | | % of total | 11,9 | 17,2 | 5,3 | 34,4 |
| | No | count | 62 | 69 | 34 | 165 |
| | | % within period checkup | 37,6 | 41,8 | 20,6 | 100 |
| | | % within suggested painkillers | 53,9 | 51,5 | 47,9 | 51,6 |
| | | % of total | 19,4 | 21,6 | 10,6 | 51,6 |
| | Undec. | count | 15 | 10 | 20 | 45 |
| | | % within period checkup | 33,3 | 22,2 | 44,4 | 100 |
| | | % within suggested painkillers | 13 | 7,5 | 28,2 | 14,1 |
| | | % of total | 4,7 | 3,1 | 6,3 | 14,1 |
| Total | | count | 115 | 134 | 71 | 320 |
| | | % within period checkup | 35,9 | 41,9 | 22,2 | 100 |
| | | % within suggested painkillers | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| | | % of total | 35,9 | 41,9 | 22,2 | 100, |

Table 45 shows that 38 people who have routine checkups will purchase painkillers products upon recommendation, 55 people who have routine checkups will not purchase painkillers upon recommendation.

Table 46: Periodical checkup and Too much medication cross-tabulation

| | | | Too much Medication (%) | | | Total |
|-------------------|--------|---------------------------------|-------------------------|------|-----------|-------|
| | | | Yes | No | Undecided | |
| Period checkup | Yes | count | 45 | 50 | 15 | 110 |
| | | % within period checkup | 40,9 | 45,5 | 13,6 | 100 |
| | | % within too much medication | 35,2 | 41,7 | 20,8 | 34,4 |
| | | % of total | 14,1 | 15,6 | 4,7 | 34,4 |
| | No | Count | 65 | 58 | 42 | 165 |
| | | % within period checkup | 39,4 | 35,2 | 25,5 | 100 |
| | | % within too much medication | 50,8 | 48,3 | 58,3 | 51,6 |
| | | % of total | 20,3 | 18,1 | 13,1 | 51,6 |
| | Undec. | Count | 18 | 12 | 15 | 45 |
| | | % within period checkup | 40 | 26,7 | 33,3 | 100 |
| | | % within too much medication | 14,1 | 10 | 20,8 | 14,1 |
| | | % of total | 5,6 | 3,8 | 4,7 | 14,1 |
| Total | | Count | 128 | 120 | 72 | 320 |
| | | % within period checkup | 40 | 37,5 | 22,5 | 100 |
| | | % within too much medication | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| | | % of total | 40,0 | 37,5 | 22,5 | 100 |

Table 46 shows 50 people who have routine checkups feel that doctors do not prescribe unnecessary medication, 65 people who do not have routine checkups feel that doctors to prescribe unnecessary medication.

Table 47: Periodical checkup and Promotion with doctors cross-tabulation

| | | | Promotion with doctors | | | Total |
|-------------------|--------|---------------------------------------|------------------------|------|-----------|-------|
| | | | Yes | No | Undecided | |
| Period checkup | Yes | count | 44 | 44 | 22 | 110 |
| | | % within period checkup | 40 | 40 | 20 | 100 |
| | | % within promotion with doctors | 37,6 | 32,6 | 32,4 | 34,4 |
| | | % of total | 13,8 | 13,8 | 6,9 | 34,4 |
| | No | count | 66 | 72 | 27 | 165 |
| | | % within period checkup | 40 | 43,6 | 16,4 | 100 |
| | | % within promotion with doctors | 56,4 | 53,3 | 39,7 | 51,6 |
| | | % of total | 20,6 | 22,5 | 8,4 | 51,6 |
| | Undec. | count | 7 | 19 | 19 | 45 |
| | | % within period checkup | 15,6 | 42,2 | 42,2 | 100 |
| | | % within promotion with doctors | 6,0 | 14,1 | 27,9 | 14,1 |
| | | % of total | 2,2 | 5,9 | 5,9 | 14,1 |
| Total | | count | 117 | 135 | 68 | 320 |
| | | % within period checkup | 36,6 | 42,2 | 21,3 | 100 |
| | | % within promotion with doctors | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| | | % of total | 36,6 | 42,2 | 21,3 | 100 |

Table 47 shows that 44 people who have and 44 people who do not have routine checkups agree on promotional offers given to doctors. People who have routine checkups' 44 people (40%) agree on doctors buying promotional products whereas 44 people (40%) do not agree. People who do not have routine checkups 66 people (40%) agree to doctors buying promotional products, whereas 72 people (43.6%) do not agree.

Table 48: Periodical checkup and Consult doctor straight away cross-tabulation

| | | | Consult doctor straight away | | | | | Total | |
|----------------|-------|---------------------------------------|------------------------------|--------|------|-------|------|--------|-------|
| | | | SA | A | U | D | SD | | |
| Period checkup | Yes | Count | 36 | 29 | 27 | 14 | 4 | 110 | |
| | | % within period checkup | 32,7 | 26,4 | 24,5 | 12,7 | 3,6 | 100 | |
| | | % within consult doctor straight away | 43,4 | 33,7 | 36,0 | 21,5 | 36,4 | 34,4 | |
| | | % of total | 11,3 | 9,1 | 8,4 | 4,4 | 1,3 | 34,4 | |
| | No | Count | 39 | 48 | 31 | 42 | 5 | 165 | |
| | | % within period checkup | 23,6 | 29,1 | 18,8 | 25,5 | 3 | 100 | |
| | | % within consult doctor straight away | 47 | 55,8 | 41,3 | 64,6 | 45,5 | 51,6 | |
| | | % of total | 12,2% | 15,0 % | 9,7% | 13,1% | 1,6% | 51,6 % | |
| | Unde. | Count | 8 | 9 | 17 | 9 | 2 | 45 | |
| | | % within period checkup | 17,8 | 20 | 37,8 | 20 | 4,4 | 100 | |
| | | % within consult doctor straight away | 9,6 | 10,5 | 22,7 | 13,8 | 18,2 | 14,1 | |
| | | % of total | 2,5 | 2,8 | 5,3 | 2,8 | ,6 | 14,1 | |
| | Total | | Count | 83 | 86 | 75 | 65 | 11 | 320 |
| | | | % within period checkup | 25,9 | 26,9 | 23,4 | 20,3 | 3,4 | 100,0 |

| | | | | | | | |
|--|---------------------------------------|------|------|-------|------|-----|-----|
| | % within consult doctor straight away | 100 | 100 | 100,0 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| | % of total | 25,9 | 26,9 | 23,4 | 20,3 | 3,4 | 100 |

Table 48 show people who do and do not have routine checkups pass on their satisfaction and dissatisfaction to others. People who have routine checkups 65 people consult a doctor as soon as they get a headache, whereas people who do not have routine checkups also consult a doctor straight away.

Table 49: Personal care and Sex cross-tabulation

| | | | | Sex (%) | | Total |
|---------------|-----------|------------------------|--|---------|------|-------|
| | | | | Female | Male | |
| Personal care | Yes | count | | 152 | 60 | 212 |
| | | % within personal care | | 71,7 | 28,3 | 100 |
| | | % within sex | | 84,9 | 42,6 | 66,3 |
| | | % of total | | 47,5 | 18,8 | 66,3 |
| | No | count | | 15 | 57 | 72 |
| | | % within personal care | | 20,8 | 79,2 | 100 |
| | | % within sex | | 8,4 | 40,4 | 22,5 |
| | | % of total | | 4,7 | 17,8 | 22,5 |
| | Undecided | count | | 12 | 24 | 36 |
| | | % within personal care | | 33,3 | 66,7 | 100 |
| | | % within sex | | 6,7 | 17 | 11,3 |
| | | % of total | | 3,8 | 7,5 | 11,3 |
| Total | | count | | 179 | 141 | 320 |
| | | % within personal care | | 55,9 | 44,1 | 100 |
| | | % within sex | | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| | | % of total | | 55,9 | 44,1 | 100 |

Table 49 shows that 152 (71, 7%) females pay more attention to personal care, 107 people aged between 18-28 pay attention to personal care. People who pay attention

to personal care 152 are female and 60 are male. People who do not pay attention to personal care 15 are female and 57 are male.

Table 50: Personal care and Age cross-tabulation

| | | | Age | | | | Total |
|---------------|-----------|------------------------|-------|-------|-------|------|-------|
| | | | 18-28 | 29-39 | 40-50 | 50 + | |
| Personal care | Yes | count | 107 | 62 | 31 | 12 | 212 |
| | | % within personal care | 50,5 | 29,2 | 14,6 | 5,7 | 100 |
| | | % within age | 75,4 | 62, | 55,4 | 54,5 | 66,3 |
| | | % of total | 33,4 | 19,4 | 9,7 | 3,8 | 66,3 |
| | No | count | 19 | 30 | 20 | 3 | 72 |
| | | % within personal care | 26,4 | 41,7 | 27,8 | 4,2 | 100 |
| | | % within age | 13,4 | 30 | 35,7 | 13,6 | 22,5 |
| | | % of total | 5,9 | 9,4 | 6,3 | ,9 | 22,5 |
| | Undecided | count | 16 | 8 | 5 | 7 | 36 |
| | | % within personal care | 44,4 | 22,2 | 13,9 | 19,4 | 100 |
| | | % within age | 11,3 | 8,0 | 8,9 | 31,8 | 11,3 |
| | | % of total | 5 | 2,5 | 1,6 | 2,2 | 11, |
| Total | | count | 142 | 100 | 56 | 22 | 320 |
| | | % within personal care | 44,4 | 31,3 | 17,5 | 6,9 | 100 |
| | | % within age | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| | | % of total | 44,4 | 31,3% | 17,5% | 6,9 | 100 |

Table 50, When we look at the crosstables people who pay attention to personal care and the people who were surveyed particularly the young generation aged between 18-28, 107 people show importance to personal care but as the age increases the ratio decreases.

Table 51: Personal Care and Period Checkup cross-tabulation

| | | | Period checkup (%) | | | Total |
|---------------|-----------|-------------------------|--------------------|------|-----------|-------|
| | | | Yes | No | Undecided | |
| Personal care | Yes | count | 86 | 108 | 18 | 212 |
| | | % within personal care | 40,6 | 50,9 | 8,5 | 100 |
| | | % within period checkup | 78,2 | 65,5 | 40 | 66,3 |
| | | % of total | 26,9 | 33,8 | 5,6 | 66,3 |
| | No | Count | 18 | 46 | 8 | 72 |
| | | % within personal care | 25,0 | 63,9 | 11,1 | 100 |
| | | % within period checkup | 16,4 | 27,9 | 17,8 | 22,5 |
| | | % of total | 5,6 | 14,4 | 2,5 | 22,5 |
| | Undecided | Count | 6 | 11 | 19 | 36 |
| | | % within personal care | 16,7 | 30,6 | 52,8 | 100 |
| | | % within period checkup | 5,5 | 6,7 | 42,2 | 11,3 |
| | | % of total | 1,9 | 3,4 | 5,9 | 11,3 |
| Total | | Count | 110 | 165 | 45 | 320 |
| | | % within personal care | 34,4 | 51,6 | 14,1 | 100 |
| | | % within period checkup | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| | | % of total | 34,4 | 51,6 | 14,1 | 100 |

Table 51 shows 108 (50,9%) people pay attention to their personal care but do not have routine checkups, 48 people do not pay attention to personal care and do not have routine checkups. People who pay attention to personal care 86 people have routine checkups whereas 108 people do not. People who do not pay attention to personal care 18 people have routine checkups whereas 46 people do not.

Table 52: Personal care and How Often Derma-cosmetic cross-tabulation

| | | | How often Derma-cosmetic | | | | Total |
|-----------------------------------|--------|-----------------------------------|--------------------------|------------|---------|-------|-------|
| | | | When Needed | On Recomm. | On Sale | Other | |
| Personal care | Yes | count | 115 | 48 | 27 | 22 | 212 |
| | | % within personal care | 54,2 | 22,6 | 12,7 | 10,4 | 100 |
| | | % within how often derma-cosmetic | 77,7 | 64 | 48,2 | 53,7 | 66,3 |
| | | % of total | 35,9 | 15 | 8,4 | 6,9 | 66,3 |
| | No | count | 24 | 20 | 23 | 5 | 72 |
| | | % within personal care | 33,3 | 27,8 | 31,9 | 6,9 | 100 |
| | | % within how often derma-cosmetic | 16,2 | 26,7 | 41,1 | 12,2 | 22,5 |
| | | % of total | 7,5 | 6,3 | 7,2 | 1,6 | 22,5 |
| | Undec. | count | 9 | 7 | 6 | 14 | 36 |
| | | % within personal care | 25 | 19,4 | 16,7 | 38,9 | 100 |
| | | % within how often derma-cosmetic | 6,1 | 9,3 | 10,7 | 34,1 | 11,3 |
| | | % of total | 2,8 | 2,2 | 1,9 | 4,4 | 11,3 |
| | Total | | count | 148 | 75 | 56 | 41 |
| % within personal care | | | 46,3 | 23,4 | 17,5 | 12,8 | 100 |
| % within how often derma-cosmetic | | | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| % of total | | | 46,3 | 23,4 | 17,5 | 12,8 | 100 |

Table 52 shows 115 people who pay attention to personal care only purchase derma-cosmetic products when necessary. People who have personal care 115 people buy derma-cosmetic products when required, people who do not have personal care 23 people purchase derma-cosmetic products based on quality.

Table 53: Personal care and When Purchasing Derma-cosmetic cross-tabulation

| | | | When Purchasing Derma-cosmetic | | | | | | Total |
|---------------|--------|---|--------------------------------|---------|-------|---------|------|-------|-------|
| | | | Prices | Quality | Brand | Recomm. | Adv | Other | |
| Personal care | Yes | Count | 52 | 71 | 45 | 23 | 19 | 2 | 212 |
| | | % within personal care | 24,5 | 33,5 | 21,2 | 10,8 | 9 | ,9 | 100 |
| | | % within when purchasing derma-cosmetic | 75,4 | 68,3 | 66,2 | 62,2 | 52,8 | 33,3 | 66,3 |
| | | % of total | 16,3 | 22,2 | 14,1 | 7,2 | 5,9 | ,6 | 66,3 |
| | No | Count | 13 | 26 | 18 | 9 | 5 | 1 | 72 |
| | | % within personal care | 18,1 | 36,1 | 25 | 12,5 | 6,9 | 1,4 | 100 |
| | | % within when purchasing derma-cosmetic | 18,8 | 25 | 26,5 | 24,3 | 13,9 | 16,7 | 22,5 |
| | | % of total | 4,1 | 8,1 | 5,6 | 2,8 | 1,6 | ,3 | 22,5 |
| | Undec. | Count | 4 | 7 | 5 | 5 | 12 | 3 | 36 |
| | | % within personal care | 11,1 | 19,4 | 13,9 | 13,9 | 33,3 | 8,3 | 100 |
| | | % within when purchasing derma-cosmetic | 5,8 | 6,7 | 7,4 | 13,5 | 33,3 | 50 | 11,3 |
| | | % of total | 1,3 | 2,2 | 1,6 | 1,6 | 3,8 | ,9 | 11,3 |

| | | | | | | | | |
|-------|---|------|------|------|------|------|-----|-----|
| Total | Count | 69 | 104 | 68 | 37 | 36 | 6 | 320 |
| | % within personal care | 21,6 | 32,5 | 21,3 | 11,6 | 11,3 | 1,9 | 100 |
| | % Within when purchasing derma-cosmetic | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| | % Of Total | 21,6 | 32,5 | 21,3 | 11,6 | 11,3 | 1,9 | 100 |

Table 53 shows 71 people who pay attention to personal care focus on quality when purchasing derma-cosmetic products. People who pay attention to personal care 71 people and people who do not pay attention to personal care 26 people when purchasing derma-cosmetic products look at quality.

Table 54: Personal care and Advertising Effect On Derma-cosmetic cross-tabulation

| | | | Advertising Effect On Derma-cosmetic (%) | | | Total |
|---|--------|---|--|------|-----------|-------|
| | | | Yes | No | Undecided | |
| Personal care | Yes | Count | 93 | 86 | 33 | 212 |
| | | % within personal care | 43,9 | 40,6 | 15,6 | 100 |
| | | % within advertising effect on derma-cosmetic | 72,7 | 68,8 | 49,3 | 66,3 |
| | | % of total | 29,1 | 26,9 | 10,3 | 66,3 |
| | No | Count | 25 | 28 | 19 | 72 |
| | | % within personal care | 34,7 | 38,9 | 26,4 | 100 |
| | | % within advertising effect on derma-cosmetic | 19,5 | 22,4 | 28,4 | 22,5 |
| | | % of total | 7,8 | 8,8 | 5,9 | 22,5 |
| | Undec. | Count | 10 | 11 | 15 | 36 |
| | | % within personal care | 27,8 | 30,6 | 41,7 | 100 |
| | | % within advertising effect on derma-cosmetic | 7,8 | 8,8 | 22,4 | 11,3 |
| | | % of total | 3,1 | 3,4 | 4,7 | 11,3 |
| | Total | | count | 128 | 125 | 67 |
| % within personal care | | | 40,0 | 39,1 | 20,9 | 100 |
| % within advertising effect on derma-cosmetic | | | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| % of total | | | 40 | 39,1 | 20,9 | 100 |

Table 54 shows 93 people who pay attention to personal care feel that advertising effects their purchasing decision on derma-cosmetic products. People who pay attention to personal care 93 people are effected by advertising when purchasing

derma-cosmetic products, 86 people are not effected by advertising, people who do not pay attention to personal care 25 people are effected 28 people are not.

Table 55: Personal care and How do you decide cross-tabulation

| | | | How do you Decide | | | | | Total |
|------------------------|--------|----------------------------|---------------------|-----------------|---------------|------------------|-------|-------|
| | | | Previous Experience | Recomm. Friends | Pharm Recomm. | Without Prescrip | Other | |
| Personal care | Yes | count | 52 | 20 | 37 | 102 | 1 | 212 |
| | | % within personal care | 24,5 | 9,4 | 17,5 | 48,1 | ,5 | 100 |
| | | % within how do you decide | 69,3 | 48,8 | 56,9 | 74,5 | 50 | 66,3 |
| | | % of total | 16,3 | 6,3 | 11,6 | 31,9 | ,3 | 66,3 |
| | No | count | 20 | 14 | 19 | 18 | 1 | 72 |
| | | % within personal care | 27,8 | 19,4 | 26,4 | 25,0 | 1,4 | 100 |
| | | % within how do you decide | 26,7 | 34,1 | 29,2 | 13,1 | 50 | 22,5 |
| | | % of total | 6,3 | 4,4 | 5,9 | 5,6 | ,3 | 22,5 |
| | Undec. | count | 3 | 7 | 9 | 17 | 0 | 36 |
| | | % within personal care | 8,3 | 19,4 | 25 | 47,2 | ,0 | 100 |
| | | % within how do you decide | 4,0 | 17,1 | 13,8 | 12,4 | ,0 | 11,3 |
| | | % of total | ,9 | 2,2 | 2,8 | 5,3% | ,0 | 11,3 |
| | Total | | count | 75 | 41 | 65 | 137 | 2 |
| % within personal care | | | 23,4 | 12,8 | 20,3 | 42,8 | ,6 | 100 |

| | | | | | | | |
|--|-------------------------------------|------|------|------|------|-----|-----|
| | % within how do you decide | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| | % of total | 23,4 | 12,8 | 20,3 | 42,8 | ,6 | 100 |

Table 55, 102 people who pay attention to personal care purchase medication without prescription. The majority of the people who do and do not pay attention to personal care base their purchase on previous experiences.

Table 56: Personal care and to much medication cross-tabulation

| | | | Too Much Medication (%) | | | Total |
|---------------|--------|------------------------------|-------------------------|--------|-----------|--------|
| | | | Yes | No | Undecided | |
| Personal care | Yes | Count | 91 | 85 | 36 | 212 |
| | | % within personal care | 42,9% | 40,1% | 17,0% | 100,0% |
| | | % within too much medication | 71,1% | 70,8% | 50,0% | 66,3% |
| | | % of total | 28,4% | 26,6% | 11,3% | 66,3% |
| | No | Count | 26 | 24 | 22 | 72 |
| | | % within personal care | 36,1% | 33,3% | 30,6% | 100,0% |
| | | % within too much medication | 20,3% | 20,0% | 30,6% | 22,5% |
| | | % of total | 8,1% | 7,5% | 6,9% | 22,5% |
| | Undec. | Count | 11 | 11 | 14 | 36 |
| | | % within personal care | 30,6% | 30,6% | 38,9% | 100,0% |
| | | % within too much medication | 8,6% | 9,2% | 19,4% | 11,3% |
| | | % of total | 3,4% | 3,4% | 4,4% | 11,3% |
| Total | | Count | 128 | 120 | 72 | 320 |
| | | % within personal care | 40,0% | 37,5% | 22,5% | 100,0% |
| | | % within too much medication | 100,0% | 100,0% | 100,0% | 100,0% |
| | | % of total | 40,0% | 37,5% | 22,5% | 100,0% |

Table 56 shows 91 people who pay attention to personal care feel that too much medication is being prescribed. People who pay attention to personal care 91 people agree on doctors prescribing too much medication 85 people do not agree. People who do not pay attention to personal care 26 people agree on doctors prescribing too much medication 24 people do not agree.

Table 57: Personal care and First person to consult cross-tabulation

| | | | First Person To Consult | | | | | Total |
|---------------|--------|----------------------------------|-------------------------|---------------|--------|-------|-------|-------|
| | | | Family | Medical Staff | Friend | Pharm | Other | |
| Personal care | Yes | Count | 82 | 77 | 14 | 37 | 2 | 212 |
| | | % Within personal care | 38,7 | 36,3 | 6,6 | 17,5 | ,9 | 100 |
| | | % Within first person to consult | 61,2 | 72 | 50 | 84,1 | 28,6 | 66,3 |
| | | % of Total | 25,6 | 24,1 | 4,4 | 11,6 | ,6 | 66,3 |
| | No | Count | 40 | 17 | 8 | 5 | 2 | 72 |
| | | % Within personal care | 55,6 | 23,6 | 11,1 | 6,9 | 2,8 | 100 |
| | | % Within first person to consult | 29,9 | 15,9 | 28,6 | 11,4 | 28,6 | 22,5 |
| | | % of Total | 12,5 | 5,3 | 2,5 | 1,6 | ,6 | 22,5 |
| | Undec. | Count | 12 | 13 | 6 | 2 | 3 | 36 |
| | | % Within personal care | 33,3 | 36,1 | 16,7 | 5,6 | 8,3 | 100 |
| | | % Within first person to consult | 9 | 12,1 | 21,4 | 4,5 | 42,9 | 11,3 |
| | | % Of Total | 3,8 | 4,1 | 1,9 | ,6 | ,9 | 11,3 |
| Total | | Count | 134 | 107 | 28 | 44 | 7 | 320 |
| | | % Within personal care | 41,9 | 33,4 | 8,8 | 13,8 | 2,2 | 100 |
| | | % Within first person to consult | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| | | % Of Total | 41,9 | 33,4 | 8,8 | 13,8 | 2,2 | 100 |

Table 57 shows, 82 people who pay attention to personal care consult family members first. People who do and do not pay attention to personal care consult their families first about health related issues.

Table 58: Personal care and Passon Negative Positive Feedback cross-tabulation

| | | | Passion Negative Positive Feedback | | | Total |
|---|--------|---|------------------------------------|------|-----------|-------|
| | | | Yes | No | Undecided | |
| Personal care | Yes | Count | 172 | 24 | 16 | 212 |
| | | % Within personal care | 81,1 | 11,3 | 7,5 | 100 |
| | | % Within passion negative positive feedback | 71,4 | 60,0 | 41,0 | 66,3 |
| | | % Of Total | 53,8 | 7,5 | 5,0 | 66,3 |
| | No | Count | 48 | 14 | 10 | 72 |
| | | % Within personal care | 66,7 | 19,4 | 13,9 | 100 |
| | | % Within passion negative positive feedback | 19,9 | 35 | 25,6 | 22,5 |
| | | % Of Total | 15 | 4,4 | 3,1 | 22,5 |
| | Undec. | Count | 21 | 2 | 13 | 36 |
| | | % Within personal care | 58,3 | 5,6 | 36,1 | 100 |
| | | % Within passion negative positive feedback | 8,7 | 5 | 33,3 | 11,3 |
| | | % of Total | 6,6 | ,6 | 4,1 | 11,3 |
| | Total | | Count | 241 | 40 | 39 |
| % Within personal care | | | 75,3 | 12,5 | 12,2 | 100 |
| % Within passion negative positive feedback | | | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| % of Total | | | 75,3 | 12,5 | 12,2 | 100 |

Table 58 shows 172 people who pay attention to personal care passes on their satisfaction and dissatisfaction in the health sector. People who pay attention attention to personal care 172 people pass on positive or negative information onto

others 24 people do not. People who do not pay attention to personal care 48 people pass on positive or negative information onto others 14 people do not.

Table 59: Personal care and Recommendation by pharmacist on painkillers cross-tabulation

| | | | Recommendation By Pharmacist On Painkillers | | | | | Total |
|--|-------|--|---|------|------|------|------|-------|
| | | | SA | A | U | D | SD | |
| Personal care | Yes | Count | 39 | 87 | 36 | 33 | 17 | 212 |
| | | % Within personal care | 18,4 | 41 | 17 | 15,6 | 8 | 100 |
| | | % Within recommendation by pharmacist on painkillers | 78,0 | 74,4 | 58,1 | 54,1 | 56,7 | 66,3 |
| | | % of Total | 12,2% | 27,2 | 11,3 | 10,3 | 5,3 | 66,3 |
| | No | Count | 6 | 18 | 19 | 23 | 6 | 72 |
| | | % Within personal care | 8,3 | 25 | 26,4 | 31,9 | 8,3 | 100 |
| | | % Within recommendation by pharmacist on painkillers | 12 | 15,4 | 30,6 | 37,7 | 20 | 22,5 |
| | | % of total | 1,9 | 5,6 | 5,9 | 7,2 | 1,9 | 22,5 |
| | Undec | Count | 5 | 12 | 7 | 5 | 7 | 36 |
| | | % Within personal care | 13,9 | 33,3 | 19,4 | 13,9 | 19,4 | 100 |
| | | % Within recommendation by pharmacist on painkillers | 10 | 10,3 | 11,3 | 8,2 | 23,3 | 11,3 |
| | | % of total | 1,6 | 3,8 | 2,2 | 1,6 | 2,2 | 11,3 |
| | Total | Count | 50 | 117 | 62 | 61 | 30 | 320 |
| % Within personal care | | 15,6 | 36,6 | 19,4 | 19,1 | 9,4 | 100 | |
| % Within recommendation by pharmacist on painkillers | | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | |
| % of total | | 15,6 | 36,6 | 19,4 | 19,1 | 9,4 | 100 | |

Table 59, 126 people who pay attention to personal care agree on pharmacist painkiller recommendation whereas 29 people who do not pay attention to personal care do not agree.

Table 60: Personal care and Recommendation by pharmacist on derma-cosmetic cross-tabulation

| | | | Recommendation by Pharmacist on Derma-cosmetic | | | | | Total |
|---------------|-------|---|--|------|------|------|------|-------|
| | | | SA | A | U | D | SD | |
| Personal care | Yes | Count | 17 | 84 | 50 | 39 | 22 | 212 |
| | | % Within personal care | 8 | 39,6 | 23,6 | 18,4 | 10,4 | 100 |
| | | % Within recommendation by pharmacist on derma-cosmetic | 65,4 | 75,7 | 71,4 | 52 | 57,9 | 66,3 |
| | | % Of Total | 5,3 | 26,3 | 15,6 | 12,2 | 6,9 | 66,3 |
| | No | Count | 7 | 14 | 12 | 29 | 10 | 72 |
| | | % Within personal care | 9,7 | 19,4 | 16,7 | 40,3 | 13,9 | 100 |
| | | % Within recommendation by pharmacist on derma-cosmetic | 26,9 | 12,6 | 17,1 | 38,7 | 26,3 | 22,5 |
| | | % Of Total | 2,2 | 4,4 | 3,8 | 9,1 | 3,1 | 22,5 |
| | Undec | Count | 2 | 13 | 8 | 7 | 6 | 36 |
| | | % Within personal care | 5,6 | 36,1 | 22,2 | 19,4 | 16,7 | 100 |
| | | % Within recommendation by pharmacist on derma-cosmetic | 7,7 | 11,7 | 11,4 | 9,3 | 15,8 | 11,3 |
| | | % Of Total | ,6 | 4,1 | 2,5 | 2,2 | 1,9 | 11,3 |
| Total | | Count | 26 | 111 | 70 | 75 | 38 | 320 |

| | | | | | | | |
|--|---|-----|------|------|-------|------|-----|
| | % Within personal care | 8,1 | 34,7 | 21,9 | 23,4% | 11,9 | 100 |
| | % Within recommendation by pharmacist on derma-cosmetic | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| | | 8,1 | 34,7 | 21,9 | 23,4 | 11,9 | 100 |

Table 60, 101 people who pay attention to personal care agree on Derma-cosmetic pharmacist recommendation whereas 39 people who do not pay attention to personal care do not agree

Table 61: What Kind of products and How do you decide cross-tabulation

| | | | How Do You Decide | | | | | Total |
|---------|----------------|-----------------------------|-------------------|---------------|-------------|----------|-------|-------|
| | | | Prev. Exper. | Recomm Friend | Pharm Recom | Unpresc. | Other | |
| Product | Painkillers | Count | 32 | 17 | 23 | 5 | 1 | 78 |
| | | % Within products | 41 | 21,8 | 29,5 | 6,4 | 1,3 | 100 |
| | | % Within how do you decided | 42,7 | 41,5 | 35,4 | 3,6 | 50 | 24,4 |
| | | % Of Total | 10 | 5,3 | 7,2 | 1,6 | ,3 | 24,4 |
| | Derma-cosmetic | Count | 13 | 12 | 11 | 5 | 0 | 41 |
| | | % Within product | 31,7 | 29,3 | 26,8 | 12,2 | ,0 | 100 |
| | | % Within how do you decided | 17,3 | 29,3 | 16,9 | 3,6 | ,0 | 12,8 |
| | | % Of Total | 4,1 | 3,8 | 3,4 | 1,6 | ,0 | 12,8 |
| | Antibiotic | Count | 19 | 7 | 16 | 4 | 1 | 47 |
| | | % Within product | 40,4 | 14,9 | 34 | 8,5 | 2,1 | 100 |
| | | % Within how do you decided | 25,3 | 17,1 | 24,6 | 50 | 14,7 | 100 |
| | | % Of Total | 5,9 | 2,2 | 5,0 | 1,3 | ,3 | 14,7 |
| | All | Count | 7 | 5 | 14 | 1 | 0 | 27 |
| | | % Within product | 25,9 | 18,5 | 51,9 | 3,7 | ,0 | 100 |
| | | % Within how do you decided | 9,3 | 12,2 | 21,5 | ,7 | ,0 | 8,4 |
| | | % Of Total | 2,2 | 1,6 | 4,4 | ,3 | ,0 | 8,4 |
| | None | Count | 2 | 0 | 1 | 122 | 0 | 125 |
| | | % Within product | 1,6 | ,0 | ,8 | 97,6 | ,0 | 100 |

| | | | | | | | | |
|-------|--|-----------------------------------|------|------|------|------|-----|------|
| | | % Within how do you decided | 2,7 | ,0 | 1,5 | 89,1 | ,0 | 39,1 |
| | | % Of Total | ,6 | ,0 | ,3 | 38,1 | ,0 | 39,1 |
| Total | | Count | 75 | 41 | 65 | 137 | 2 | 320 |
| | | % Within product | 23,4 | 12,8 | 20,3 | 42,8 | ,6 | 100 |
| | | % Within how do you decided | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| | | % Of Total | 23,4 | 12,8 | 20,3 | 42,8 | ,6 | 100 |

Table 61, Painkillers when purchasing painkillers products 32 people go by previous experiences, 17 people friend recommendation, 23 people pharmacy recommendation and 5 people buy without prescription. Derma-cosmetics, when purchasing Derma-cosmetic products 13 people go by previous experiences, 12 people friend recommendation, 11 people pharmacy recommendation and 5 people buy without prescription. Antibiotics, when purchasing Antibiotics 19 people go by previous experiences, 7 people friend recommendation, 16 people pharmacy recommendation and 4 people buy without prescription.

Table 62: What kind of products and First person to consult cross-tabulation

| | | | First Person To Consult | | | | | Total |
|----------|----------------|----------------------------------|-------------------------|---------------|--------|-------|-------|-------|
| | | | Family | Health Worker | Friend | Phar. | Other | |
| Products | Painkillers | Count | 49 | 13 | 5 | 10 | 1 | 78 |
| | | % Within product | 62,8 | 16,7 | 6,4 | 12,8 | 1,3 | 100 |
| | | % Within first person to consult | 36,6 | 12,1 | 17,9 | 22,7 | 14,3 | 24,4 |
| | | % Of Total | 15,3 | 4,1 | 1,6 | 3,1 | ,3 | 24,4 |
| | Derma-cosmetic | Count | 19 | 8 | 10 | 4 | 0 | 41 |
| | | % Within product | 46,3 | 19,5 | 24,4 | 9,8 | ,0 | 100 |
| | | % Within first person to consult | 14,2 | 7,5 | 35,7 | 9,1 | ,0 | 12,8 |
| | | % Of Total | 5,9 | 2,5 | 3,1 | 1,3 | ,0 | 12,8 |
| | Antibiotic | Count | 24 | 12 | 6 | 5 | 0 | 47 |
| | | % Within product | 51,1 | 25,5 | 12,8 | 10,6 | ,0 | 100 |
| | | % Within first person to consult | 17,9 | 11,2 | 21,4 | 11,4 | ,0 | 14,7 |
| | | % Of Total | 7,5 | 3,8 | 1,9 | 1,6 | ,0 | 14,7 |
| | All | Count | 11 | 2 | 3 | 9 | 2 | 27 |
| | | % Within product | 40,7 | 7,4 | 11,1 | 33,3 | 7,4 | 100 |
| | | % Within first person to consult | 8,2 | 1,9 | 10,7 | 20,5 | 28,6 | 8,4 |
| | | % Of Total | 3,4 | ,6 | ,9 | 2,8 | ,6 | 8,4 |
| | None | Count | 30 | 71 | 4 | 16 | 4 | 125 |
| | | % Within product | 24,0 | 56,8 | 3,2 | 12,8 | 3,2 | 100 |
| | | % Within first person to consult | 22,4 | 66,4 | 14,3 | 36,4 | 57,1 | 39,1 |
| | | % Of Total | 9,4 | 22,2 | 1,3 | 5,0 | 1,3 | 39,1 |
| Total | | Count | 134 | 107 | 28 | 44 | 7 | 320 |
| | | % Within product | 41,9 | 33,4 | 8,8 | 13,8 | 2,2 | 100 |

| | | | | | | | |
|--|----------------------------------|------|------|-----|------|-----|-----|
| | % Within first person to consult | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| | % Of Total | 41,9 | 33,4 | 8,8 | 13,8 | 2,2 | 100 |

Table 62, Painkillers; when purchasing painkillers 49 people consult family members, 13 people contact health workers, 5 people contact friends and 10 people contact pharmacists. Derma-cosmetics; when purchasing Derma-cosmetic products 19 people consult family members, 8 people contact health workers, 10 people contact friends and 4 people contact pharmacists. Antibiotics; when purchasing Antibiotics; 24 people consult family members, 12 people contact health workers, 6 people contact friends and 5 people contact pharmacists.

Chapter 5

CONCLUSION

This chapter includes three sections; summary of the research, conclusion drawn for the study and recommendations for further research. All these sections give information about the results of the research and answers of the research questions in a detailed manner.

5.1 Summary of the Research

The Importance of WOM Communication in the Medical Sector in the TRNC Market. Therefore in this research Interpersonal Communication and Word of Mouth Communication theory was used.

In this study, quantitative research, survey method was conducted as primary resources and it was limited only to the painkiller and derma-cosmetic products in Famagusta TRNC market. Before collecting the accurate data 50 questionnaires were distributed as a pilot test and according to the feedback the pilot test questionnaire was renewed. Data collection was done by 320 respondents in 15 different areas in Famagusta. There were 33 questions in the questionnaire and it was prepared as in-house to explore the study.

The 135 (42.2%) respondents which contributed in this research nationality is Turkish Cypriot, 67 (20.9%) both Turkish Cypriot and Turkish and 118 (20.9%) are Turkish. The sex statuses are female participants' percentage is 179 (55.9 %), male participants'

percentage is 141 (44.1 %). Most of the participants, 178 (55,6%) Private Sector worker.

To understand how much participants caring their health. it was asked whether they are doing routine checkup and 165 (51,6%) participants did not have annual checkups, 110 (34,4%) participants had annual checkups. Also 212 (66,3%) participants show interest in their personal care, 72 (22,5%) participants do not show interest in their personal care, 36 (11,3%) participants were undecided. Before taking painkillers 126 (39,4%) wait until the last minute, 126 (39,4%) participants take a painkiller as soon as they have a headache but 148 (46,3%) participants use Derma-cosmetic products when required.

When purchasing Derma-cosmetic products 104 (32,5%) participants look for quality. Advertising is not effective on the purchasing behavior on painkiller products but is effective in the purchasing behavior of Derma-cosmetics products. This research shows that 126 (39,4%) participants do not use medication without prescription however 75 (23,4%) participants rely on previous experiences, 78 (24,4%) participants would buy painkillers without prescription. 194 (60,6%) would not buy medication on recommendation, 76 (23,8%) would only use medication without prescription in an emergency situation.

Doctors are effective in the purchase of derma-cosmetic and painkillers products, but 128 (40,0%) agree that doctors prescribe to much medication Also the second most effective method in the purchasing of derma-cosmetic and painkillers products is social media.

134 (41,9%) would contact a family member as first contact for medical advice.

The passing on negative or positive feedback about the Health Service 241 (75,1%) would pass onto others, 40 (12,5%) would not.

86 (25,9%) would contact a doctor straight away. 117 (36,6%) would use painkillers recommended by their pharmacist but 50 (15,6%) would not. 111 (34,7%) would use Derma-cosmetics recommended by their pharmacist, 75 (23%) would not. This survey shows that participants would definitely buy derma-cosmetic and painkiller products on recommendation.

As a conclusion people who have period checkups and people interested in personal care are connected. In general people who have periodic checkups are less than people who do not, despite this 86 of these people pay attention to their personal care, but 18 people do not, on the other hand most of the people who do not have yearly periodic checkups, 108 people pay attention to personal care. When deciding on derma-cosmetic products with routine checkup or not first they rely on quality than on brand.

5.2 Conclusion Drawn for The Study

This research shows that there is a connection between people who have routine annual checkups and people who pay attention to personal care. Before buying personal care products and medication in general purchase medication without a prescription and during the purchasing process are influenced by pharmacist and friend opinions. People who pay attention to personal care are the ones that are considered to have annual routine checkups. The ones who do and do not have annual routine checkups when purchasing derma-cosmetic products pay more

attention to quality and brand. The increase in age shows the increase of people who have annual routine checkups.

In general the number of people who have annual routine checkups are less, 86 people who do have annual routine checkups also pay attention to personal care, 18 people do not. This shows that people who have annual routine checkups pay attention to personal care which makes them equal.

5.3 Suggestion for Further Research

As WOM is a powerful mean of marketing in the health sector. No matter how much medical staffs do not agree to this, it had a significant role in the promotion and advertising of medical products.

Further research can be applied in different regions in TRNC like Nicosia, Kyrenia and compare the attitudes of people according geographical segmentation and generalize this study in TRNC market.

REFERENCES

- Aba, G. (2011). Saęlık Hizmetlerinde Aęızdan Aęıza Pazarlama: Bir Alan Arařtırması, *Fırat Saęlık Hizmetleri Dergisi*, Cilt:6, Sayı:16.
- Argan, M. (2006). Viral Marketing or Word Of Mouth Advertising on Internet: A Theoretical Framework, *Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 2006/2 P234.
- Babaoęul, M., řener, A. & Buęday, E.(2007). *Tüketici Yazıları (III)*, Hacettepe Üniversitesi, Tüketici - Pazar - Arařtırma - Danıřma, Test ve Eęitim Merkezi.
- Bauer, G., Davies, J. K., Pelikan, J., Noack, H., Broesskamp, U., & Hill, C. (2003). Advancing a Theoretical Model for Public Health and Health Promotion Indicator Development. *European Journal of Public Health*, 12(3), 107-113.
- Berger, C.R, and Calabrese J.R. (1975). Some Explorations In Initial Interaction And Beyond: Toward A Developmental Theory Of Interpersonal Communication, *Human Communication Research*, December.
- Bylund, L. C., Peterson, B. E. & Cameron, A. K (2012). A practitioner's guide to interpersonal communication theory: An overview and exploration of selected theories, *Patient Educ Couns.* 87(3): 261–267.
- Bone, F. P. (1995). Word-of-mouth effects on short-term and long-term product judgments, *Journal of Business Research*, Volume 32, Issue 3, March.

- Choffray, M. J. (1980). Industrial market segmentation by the structure of the purchasing process, *Industrial Marketing Management*, Volume 9, Issue 4, Pages 331–342.
- Brody, P. R. and Cuunigham, M. S. (1968). Personality Variables and the Consumer Decision Process, *Journal of Marketing Research*, Vol.5, No.1,pp50-57.
- Çakır, M. (2013). The Effects of Word Of Mouth Communication on the Consumers' Travel Agency Choices, Fatma Cakir, Aysenur Cetin, *International Journal Of Business and Managament Studies*, Vol 5, No 1, 172-181.
- Chen, Y. & Xie, J. (2008). Online Consumer Review: Word-of-Mouth as a New Element of Marketing Communication Mix, *Management Science*, Vol. 54, No. 3, March 2008, pp. 477–491.
- Christopher H. Lovelock, (1999) "Developing marketing strategies for transnational service "operations", *Journal of Services Marketing*, Vol. 13 Iss: 4/5, pp.278 – 295.
- Civaner, M. (2012). Sale strategies of pharmaceutical companies in a “pharmerging” country: The problems will not improve If the gaps remain, *Health Policy* 106, 225– 232.

East, R., Hammond, K., & Lomax, W. (2008). Measuring the impact of positive and negative word of mouth on brand purchase probability, Kingston Business School, Kingston, KT2 7LB, UK. *Intern. J. of Research in Marketing* 25.

Keller, E. and Berry, J. (2006). Word-of-mouth: The real action is offline.

Haywood, K.M. (1989). Managing Word of Mouth Communication, *Journal of Services Marketing*, Vol. 3 Iss: 2, pp.55 – 67.

Hargie, O. (2011). Skilled Interpersonal Communication.

Harwell, M.R. (2011). Research Design In Qualitative/ Quantitative / Mixed Methods. C.F. Conrad, & R.C Serlin, *The Sage Handbook For Research In Education* (s.147-163). Chile: Sage Publications.

Healey, B. J. & Zimmerman, R. S. (2010). Program development. In *The new world of health promotion: New program development, implementation, and evaluation*, (pp. 57–71). Sudbury, MA: Jones and Bartlett. Heidegger, M. (1962). *Being and time*. New York, NY: Harper and Row.

Laczniak, N. R., DeCarlo, E. T. and Ramaswami, N. S. (2001). Consumers' Responses to Negative Word-of-Mouth Communication: An Attribution Theory Perspective, *Journal of Consumer Psychology*, Volume 11, Issue 1, Pages 57–73.

- Lim, C. B. & Chung, C. (2014). Word-of-mouth, The use of source expertise in the evaluation of familiar and unfamiliar brands, *Asia Pacific Journal of Marketing and Logistics*, Vol. 26 No. 1, 2014, pp. 39-53.
- Lim, B. C, & Cindy M.Y. (2011). The impact of word-of-mouth communication on attribute evaluation, *Journal of Business Research* 64.
- Mangold, G. W., Miller, F. & Brockway, R. G. (1999). "Word of mouth communication in the service marketplace", *Journal of Services Marketing*, Vol. 13 Iss: 1, pp.73 – 89.
- Ntale, D. P., Ngoma M., and Musiime, A., (2013). Academic Journals, Relationship marketing, word of mouth communication and consumer loyalty in the Ugandan mobile telecommunication industry 2013, Vol.7(5), pp. 354-359.
- Raluca, Iuliana.G. (2012). Word-Of-Mouth Communication: A Theoretical Review, PhD student of Marketing Faculty at Academy of Economic Studies.
- Rethinking, N. R. (1999). Rethinking the Sales Force: Redefining Selling to Create and Capture Customer Value.
- Rossiter, J.R. and Bellman, S. (2005) Marketing communications: Theory and applications, *Interactive Television Research Institute* Prentice-Hall, Frenchs Forest.

Rehman, U. S.(2011). World, Journal of Arts, Science & Commerce, International
Refereed Research Journal, Vol. II, Issue 4,Oct.

Sahin, İ. (2006). Detailed Review Of Rogers' Diffusion Of Innovations Theory And
Educational Technology-Related Studies Based On Rogers, The Turkish
Online *Journal of Educational Technology* – TOJET April 2006 ISSN: 1303-
6521 volume 5 Issue.

Türkiye İlaç ve Sanayi Sektörü Raporu.(2008). Türkiye Odalar ve Borsalar Birliği
Türkiye İlaç Sanayi Meclisi.

Wangenheim, F. & Bayón, T. (2004). "The effect of word of mouth on services
switching: Measurement and moderating variables", *European Journal of
Marketing*, Vol. 38 Iss: 9/10, pp.1173 – 1185.

Walker, H. J. (2001). The Measurement of Word-of-Mouth Communication and an
Investigation of Service Quality and Customer Commitment As Potential
Antecedents, *Journal of Service Research*, vol. 4 no. 1 60-75.

<http://www.cim.co.uk/files/promotionalmix.pdf> (30.06.2014 Monday)

<http://www.kcapital-us.com/neil/downloads/Summary.pdf> (30.06.2014 Monday)

<http://news.msn.com/us/dr-oz-scolded-at-hearing-on-weight-loss-scams>, 30.06.2014
Monday)

<http://sphweb.bumc.bu.edu/otlt/MPH-Modules/SB/SB721-Models/SB721-Models4.html>(30.06.2014 Monday)

<http://www.tobb.org.tr/Documents/yayinlar/ilac%20rapor.pdf> (30.06.2014 Monday)

APPENDICES

Appendix A: Pilot Test

This research was conducted by the Communication Faculty at The Eastern Mediterranean University. All information will be kept confidential. Thank you for your time.

1) Nationality?

- a)TRNC b)TR c)TRNC and TR

2) Sex?

- Female b) Male

3) Age?

- a) 18-28 b) 29-39 c) 40-50 d)50+

4) What area in Famagusta do you live?

- a) Anadolu Area
- b) Baykal Area
- c) Canbolat Area
- d) Çanakkale Area
- e) Dumlupınar Area
- f) Harika Area
- g) Karakol Area
- h) Lala Mustafa Paşa Area
- ı) Namık kemal Area
- i) Pertev Paşa Area
- j) Piyale Paşa Area
- k) Sakarya Area
- l) Sur içi Area
- m) Tuzla Area
- n) Zafer Area

5) Monthly Salary?

- 1500 - 1999 b) 2000 - 2500 c) 2600 -3000 d)3001+

6) Occupation?

- a) Civil Servant b) Private Sector c) Local e)Housewife f)Others.....

22) Have you bought Painkiller products on recommendation?

a)Yes b) No c) Undecided

23) Do you feel doctors prescribe too much medication?

Yes b) No c) Undecided

24) Do you think that doctors in the health sector should be given promotional products?

Yes b) No c) Undecided

25) Who is your first person of contact about a health problem?

Family members b) Medical Staff c)Friends d) Pharmacist e)Others.....

26) Would you pass on your satisfaction/dissatisfaction in the health sector onto others?

Yes b) No c) Undecided


27) Please mark the answers below

| | Strongly Agree | Agree | Not Sure | Disagree | Strongly Disagree |
|---|----------------|-------|----------|----------|-------------------|
| Doctor is my first point of contact when I'm in pain | | | | | |
| If the medication prescribed by your doctor is not available would you buy what the pharmacist recommends | | | | | |
| If the Dermo-cosmetic prescribed by your doctor is not available would you buy what the pharmacist recommends | | | | | |
| Before buying dermo-cosmetic products I always ask for recommendations | | | | | |
| Before buying | | | | | |

| | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| painkiller products I always ask for recommendations | | | | | |
| Positive/negative recommendations effect purchase on dermo-cosmetic products | | | | | |
| Positive/negative recommendations effect purchase on painkiller products | | | | | |

Appendix B: The population distribution of the region of Famagusa

Population count table taken from the Famagusta Council in April 2014.


KUZEY KIBRIS TÜRK CUMHURİYETİ
İÇİŞLERİ BAKANLIĞI
GAZİMAĞUSA KAYMAKAMLIĞI


Sayı: Mkl - 2630
Konu: Nüfus Dağılımı Hk.

21 Nisan 2014

Sn. Yrd. Prof.Dr.Anıl Kemal Kaya
Tez Danışmanı
DAÜ

İlgi 18/4/2014 tarihli dilekçeniz.

İlgi dilekçenizde belirtilen bölgelerin nüfus dağılımı aşağıda verilmiştir.
Bilgilerinize saygılarımla rica ederim.


Şifa ÇOLAKOĞLU
Kaymakam

| Sıra No: | Mahalle | Nüfus |
|----------|-----------------------------|-------|
| 1 | Anadolu Mahallesi | 1,508 |
| 2 | Baykal Mahallesi | 2,574 |
| 3 | Canbolat Mahallesi | 2,460 |
| 4 | Çanakkale Mahallesi | 4,114 |
| 5 | Dumlupınar Mahallesi | 2,940 |
| 6 | Harika Mahallesi | 651 |
| 7 | Karakol Mahallesi | 7,046 |
| 8 | Lala Mustafa Paşa Mahallesi | 1,836 |
| 9 | Namık Kemal Mahallesi | 1,117 |
| 10 | Pertev Paşa Mahallesi | 1,026 |
| 11 | Piyale Paşa Mahallesi | 1,220 |
| 12 | Sakarya Mahallesi | 7,647 |
| 13 | Suriçi Mahallesi | 1,476 |
| 14 | Tuzla Mahallesi | 2,645 |
| 15 | Zafer Mahallesi | 2,027 |

NG/SA

Appendix C: Survey

This research was conducted by the Communication Faculty at The Eastern Mediterranean University. All information will be kept confidential. Thank you for your time.

1. Nationality?
 - a)TRNC b)TR c)TRNC-TR
 2. Sex?
 - a)Female b) Male
 3. Age?
 - a) 18-28 b) 29-39 c) 40-50 d)50+
 4. Which area in Famagusta do you live?
 - a) Anadolu Area
 - b) Baykal Area
 - c) Canbolat Area
 - d) Çanakkale Area
 - e) Dumlupınar Area
 - f) Harika Area
 - g) Karakol Area
 - h) Lala Mustafa Paşa Area
 - i) Namık kemal Area
 - j) Pertev Paşa Area
 - k) Piyale Paşa Area
 - k) Sakarya Area
 - l) Sur içi Area
 - m) Tuzla Area
 - n) Zafer Area
 - 5) Monthly Salary?
 - a)1500 - 2000 b) 2000 - 2500 c) 2600 -3000 d)3000+
 - 6) What is your occupation?
 - a) Civil Servant b) Private Sector c) Locals e)House wife f)
- Others.....
- 7) Do you have annual routine checkups?
 - a)Yes b) No c)Undecided

- 8) Are you Interest in Personal Care?
a)Yes b) No C)Undecided
- 9) How often do you use painkillers?
a) Straight away b) At the last minute c) Undecided d)Other.....
- 10) How often do you use derma-cosmetic products?
a) When needed b) When recommended c) In the sale d) Other.....
- 11) What do you look for when buying Derma-cosmetic products?
a) Price b) Quality c) Brand d) Recommendation
e)Advertising/Promotion f)Other.....
- 12) Is advertising effective when buying painkillers?
a) Yes b) No c) Undecided
- 13) Is advertising effective when buying derma-cosmetic products.
a) Yes b) No c) Undecided
- 14) How often do you use medication without prescription? (If you do not use medication without prescription please go to question 19)
a) Once a month b) Once every three months c) Once every six months d) Once a year e) Neither
- 15) How would you decide when buying medication without prescription?
a) Previous experiences b) Friend recommendation c) Pharmacist recommendation d) Other.....
- 16) What products would you buy without prescription?
a) Painkillers b) Derma-cosmetic c) Antibiotics d) All e) Neither
- 17) Have you bought medication on recommendation?
a) Yes b) No c)Undecided
- 18) What is the reason for using medication without prescription?
On recommendation
b) In an Emergency
c) Free checkup
d) Previous experiences
e) Others.....
- 19) Where do you follow derma-cosmetic products?
a) Social Media b) Magazine c) Doctor e) Friends f)
Other.....

- 20) Where do you follow painkiller products?
 a) Social media b) Magazine c) Doctor e) Friends f) Other.....
- 21) Have you bought derma-cosmetic products on recommendation?
 a) Yes b) No c) Undecided
- 22) Have you bought painkillers on recommendation?
 a) Yes b) No c) Undecided
- 23) Do you feel that doctors prescribe to much medication?
 a) Yes b) No c) Undecided
- 24) Do you think that doctors in the health sector should be given promotional products?
 a) Yes b) No c) Undecided
- 25) Who would be your first point of contact about a health problem?
 a) Family members b) Medical staff c) Friends d) Pharmacist e) Other.....
- 26) Would you pass on your satisfaction/dissatisfaction in the health sector onto others?
 Yes b) No c) Undecided

Please mark the answers below

| | Strongly Agree | Agree | Not Sure | Disagree | Strongly Disagree |
|--|----------------|-------|----------|----------|-------------------|
| Doctor is my first point of contact when I'm in pain | | | | | |
| If the medication prescribed by your doctor is not available would you buy what your pharmacist recommends | | | | | |
| If the Derma-cosmetic prescribed by your | | | | | |

| | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| doctor is not available would you buy what your pharmacist recommends | | | | | |
| Before buying derma- cosmetic products I always ask for recommendations | | | | | |
| Before buying painkiller products I always ask for recommendations | | | | | |
| Positive/negative recommendations effect purchase on derma- cosmetic products | | | | | |
| Positive/negative recommendations effect purchase on painkiller products | | | | | |