

# INFLUENCE OF SOCIAL MEDIA MARKETING ON ONLINE PURCHASE INTENTIONS REGARDING WEARABLE PRODUCTS: DO DEMOGRAPHICS MATTER?

**N Meena Rani, Xavier Institute of Management and Entrepreneurship,  
Bangalore, India**

**Ganaraj Khandige, Xavier Institute of Management and  
Entrepreneurship, Bangalore, India**

**Raghib Anwer, Xavier Institute of Management and Entrepreneurship,  
Bangalore, India**

**Harshwardhan, Xavier Institute of Management and Entrepreneurship,  
Bangalore, India**

**Naveen Kumar S, Xavier Institute of Management and Entrepreneurship,  
Bangalore, India**

## ABSTRACT

*This study examines the effect of social media marketing on the online purchase decision making of wearable products such as smart watches and fitness bands. The quantitative study was used to collect the data through a structured questionnaire from 410 respondents. The aspects of social media, video advertisements, product reviews, discounts, interactivity, and the quality of content, and demographic factors such as gender and age of the respondents were captured and analysed. We tested the influence of consumers' gender and age on their SM purchase behaviour and found that there is no significant association between respondents' demographics including gender and age and their SM purchase behaviour. It also provides practical recommendations to marketing experts on user engagement strategies to enhance the performance of online sales.*

**Keywords:** Social Media Marketing, Online Purchase Decision, Wearable Products, Consumer Behaviour, Digital Marketing.

## INTRODUCTION

The fast evolution of digital technology and the growth of the use of smartphones have certainly transformed the consumer behavior of information search and product acquisition. Social media (Instagram, Facebook, YouTube, and Twitter) has become a new communication medium used by brands, and the segment of wearable items, including smart watches, fitness devices, and wireless earphones, receive an increasing amount of attention in this matter (Ntumba & Budree, 2020). The acceptance of wearable technology has continued to grow in the recent industry reports due to numerous reasons, such as heightened health consciousness, shifts in lifestyles, and enhanced technology (Haroon et al., 2025). Social media marketing has a great influence in shaping consumer awareness, engagement, and trust and purchase intentions. Despite the high number of brands who are capitalizing on influencer marketing, paid ads and user-generated content, empirical studies are not conducted to demonstrate the ability of the mentioned activities to result in an increment in the online purchase decisions of wearable products.

## LITERATURE REVIEW

### Social Media Marketing and Online Customer Buying Behavior

Social media marketing now plays an essential role in shaping how consumers make their online purchases. Social media platforms control how consumers search for information and evaluate products and decide which products to purchase according to the research conducted by multiple scholars. Varghese & Agrawal (2021) claim that social media is a major player in affecting consumer buying behaviour as it helps to raise awareness and determine customer preferences. Their research reveals that customers mainly depend on social media for product-related information before making a purchase. On the other hand, Lee (2013) wrote that social media influences the consumer decision-making process at each stage, including problem recognition, information search, alternative evaluation, and final decision. Prasath & Yoganathen (2018) in their work established that social media marketing is the main factor driving consumers' buying decision-making process. Their study highlights that promotional effort and consumer communication through social media could be an effective means of triggering purchases. In addition to it, Alkharabsheh & Zhen (2021) stated that social media marketing positively influences the consumer buying decision process Romadhoni et al., (2023). This effect is even more significant when social media marketing is supported by content marketing that will provide value and necessary online convenience. The available body of research is highly promising the notion that social media marketing is directly and positively correlated to online consumer purchasing behaviour. Social media also contributes to developing trust, attitudes as well as the ultimate purchase decisions in addition to delivering the required information Bilro et al., (2022); Fischer et al., (2023); Giustiniani et al., (2022); Husain, Ahmad & Khan, (2022).

### Social media marketing elements that influence the buyers' decisions

Different facets of social media marketing have varying impacts on buyers. Such facets are content marketing, online convenience, interaction, and promotional activities. Alkharabsheh & Zhen (2021) highlighted content marketing as one of the largest influences on consumer purchase decisions. Consumers are more likely to get interested and buy when companies give them helpful, clear, and engaging content on social media. Their research also pointed out that aspects of online convenience, like quick information access and easy purchase procedures, have a positive impact on the buying decision process. Varghese & Agrawal (2021) pointed out that social media platforms allow companies to create brand awareness and establish customer relationships. Interacting with the brand, reading the reviews, and seeing other customers' feedback can increase customers' trust in the products. In the same way, Lee (2013) mentioned that sharing information and communication over social media platforms changes the way consumers evaluate and make their final buying decision. Prasath & Yoganathen (2018), on the other hand, disclosed that social media promotional strategies and marketing activities are the main reasons why consumers change their buying decisions. Such actions attract customers to a brand and later influence their purchase decisions. Therefore, the literature indicates that more focused social media marketing components, such as content quality, online convenience, interaction, and promotional strategies, significantly contribute to influencing purchasers' decisions.

### Demographic factors influence online purchase decision variations

Demographic factors are also important in understanding differences in online purchase decisions. These factors include gender and age. Waheed et al. (2014) have said that

the buying behaviour of consumers depends on various factors, among them being their demographic features. According to their research, consumers can be influenced by age, income, and level of education when making a buying decision. Equally, Šadić et al. (2018); Trauntschnig & Hetz, (2020) established that demographics play a significant role in determining the decisions to buy technical products. The preferences and decision patterns of the various population groups are varied. A comparison of the Generation Y and Baby Boomers conducted by Parment (2013) revealed apparent distinctions between the two in terms of shopping behaviour and involvement of buyers. The research revealed that young people and older people interact in different ways in terms of the purchasing decision. This implies that there is a likelihood of an impact of age and generational difference on online purchasing behaviour. As Mansi & Pandey (2016) discovered, demographic features determine the decision-making in the sphere of procurement specialists. Though their work involved sustainable procurement, they contribute to the notion that demographic factors can influence the decision-making behaviour. The relevant literature shows that differences in online purchase decisions are brought about by demographic factors. Varied age groups, income levels and generations have varied reactions to advertisement activities and buying decisions differ.

### Research gap

Although numerous studies have been conducted on social media marketing and consumer buying behaviour, there are a few gaps. Firstly, several studies, such as Varghese & Agrawal (2021), Lee (2013), Prasath & Yoganathen (2018), centre primarily on the overall impact of social media on consumer behaviour. Nevertheless, they don't thoroughly compare different social media marketing elements that influence online buying decisions when working in combination. Secondly, Alkharabsheh & Zhen (2021) have dissected content marketing, social media marketing, and online convenience collectively, yet their research was limited to a specific conference setting. Thirdly, demographic factors have been researched individually in various contexts. For instance, Waheed et al. (2014) concentrated on selected consumer factors, and Parment (2013) analysed generational differences in shopping behaviour. However, the research that combines demographic factors with social media marketing variables to explain online buying behaviour is lacking. It is necessary to conduct a study that brings together social media marketing elements and demographic factors to account for differences in online consumer buying behaviour. This research intends to bridge the gap by studying the combined influence of social media marketing and demographic characteristics on the decision to purchase online.

### Theoretical Background

The theoretical framework of this research establishes its foundation through both past empirical investigations and the consumer decision-making process. The framework integrates social media marketing and levels of features and demographics so that it can be more valid to explain the differences in online purchase decisions. Theoretical foundation of the present study is the consumer decision-making process. The research shows that social media affects all three stages which consumers use to make purchasing decisions according to Lee 2013. Differently put, social media marketing is a driver that shapes the thinking and decision-making of consumers via the Internet. Varghese & Agrawal (2021) also remarked that social media networks impact consumer awareness and attitude, which in turn determines purchasing behaviour. Prasath & Yoganathen (2018) showed that social media marketing creates a major influence on how people make their purchasing decisions. Alkhara Bsheh and Zhen (2021) demonstrated that social media marketing together with content marketing and

online convenience create positive effects on how consumers make their buying decisions. This study identified the dependent variable as online consumer buying behaviour. Lee (2013) explained buying behaviour as being influenced by the information and interaction that people get through social media. Varghese & Agrawal (2021) further indicated that decisions regarding purchases are a result of attitudes and awareness created in consumers through social media. Prasath & Yoganathen (2018) corroborated that social media marketing has a major effect on the final buying decision. Demographic factors have been taken as moderators in this research as they could impact the way consumers respond to social media marketing. Waheed et al. (2014) have mentioned that demographic factors such as age, income, and education have a significant effect on consumer buying behaviour. Adi et al. (2018) have also demonstrated that the demographic characteristics of a person influence his/her purchasing decisions. Parment (2013) has revealed that there are differences in the shopping behaviour of members of Generation Y and those of Baby Boomers. Mansi and Pandey (2016), too, were in favour of the notion that demographic characteristics influence decision, making behavior.

### RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The study uses quantitative research. The target population for the research included internet buyers who utilize social media platforms and have experience of purchasing products through the internet. They are chosen because they are the ones most directly influence by social media marketing and online buying environments. The study used convenience sampling (Hossan, Dato’Mansor & Jaharuddin, 2023). A structured questionnaire was formulated, considering the variables that were identified in the literature review. Important items of the study included social media marketing elements (content marketing, online convenience, interaction, promotional activities), online consumer buying behaviour, demographic factors (age, gender). The questionnaire consisted of close ended questions and likert scale statements (e.g., strongly disagree to strongly agree). The survey was designed using an online survey platform (Google Forms). The social media platforms were used to distribute the survey link. The confidentiality and anonymity of the respondents were maintained.

### Hypotheses

There are numerous studies supporting the idea that social media marketing is a major factor that affects how consumers make purchasing decisions. Based on the existing literature, the following hypotheses being formulated Table 1.

- H<sub>1</sub>:** *Consumers’ gender significantly influences variations in online purchase decisions*
- H<sub>2</sub>:** *Consumers’ age significantly influences variations in online purchase decisions*

### RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

<b>Table 1</b>					
<b>DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS OF SOCIAL MEDIA MARKETING FACTORS</b>					
<b>Descriptive Statistics</b>					
	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
SM Useful	410	1	5	3.68	1.040

SM Easy	410	1	5	3.56	1.173
Discount	410	1	5	3.78	1.015
Reels	410	1	5	3.69	1.080
Info posts	410	1	5	3.76	1.064
Reviews	410	1	5	3.56	1.188
Unboxing	410	1	5	3.75	1.063
Prefer Video ads	410	1	5	3.66	.996
Video ads on SM persuasive	410	1	5	3.92	.973
Infographics	410	1	5	3.70	.999
carousels	410	1	5	3.79	.965
Interactive polls	410	1	5	3.35	1.172
giveaways	410	1	5	3.43	1.143
Call to Action (CTA)	410	1	5	3.34	1.237
Q&A and Livestream	410	1	5	3.27	1.152
Response to comments	410	1	5	3.76	1.078

Source: Authors

Descriptive statistics present a summary of how respondents view various social media marketing components which affect their decisions to buy wearable products. The study conducted its measurements by using a five-point Likert scale which assigned a value of 1 to strong disagreement and a value of 5 to strong agreement. Respondents showed a moderate positive view of social media marketing practices because their mean values between 3.27 and 3.92 (N=410) show this result. The factor "Video ads on social media are persuasive" achieved the highest average score (M=3.92, SD=0.973) which indicates that video-based promotional content represents the strongest force that leads users to engage with products and make purchases. Users developed a positive view of informative content which used visual organization to present information through content formats that received high ratings with carousels (M=3.79), discount-related posts (M=3.78), informational posts (M=3.76), response to comments (M=3.76), and unboxing content (M=3.75) as examples. The constructs of perceived usefulness (SM Useful, M = 3.68) and ease of use (SM Easy, M = 3.56) received positive evaluations because users found social media platforms useful and simple to navigate when researching wearable products. The results show that users reach moderate agreement with reels (M = 3.69), infographics (M = 3.70), and preferred video ads (M = 3.66), which indicates that short-form and visual storytelling formats help shape consumer attitudes toward products. The interactive engagement tools produced lower mean scores, which showed that they might have effectiveness problems. The lowest mean rating was recorded by Q&A and livestream sessions (M = 3.27, SD = 1.152), while call-to-action posts (M = 3.34) and interactive polls (M = 3.35) followed behind, which shows that respondents regarded these methods as having less power to attract interest and promote wearable product advertising. The results showed that giveaways (M = 3.43) and reviews (M = 3.56) achieved moderate agreement because both elements needed better ways to build credibility and audience trust Table 2.

<b>Table 2</b>					
<b>GENDER-WISE GROUP STATISTICS</b>					
<b>Group Statistics</b>					
	gen	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Freq. of using SM	1	137	4.86	.488	.042
	2	273	4.77	.606	.037
Freq. of online shopping	1	137	4.27	.928	.079
	2	273	4.10	1.004	.061
SM Useful	1	137	3.85	.992	.085
	2	273	3.60	1.056	.064
SM Easy	1	137	3.48	1.195	.102
	2	273	3.59	1.163	.070
Discount	1	137	3.76	.982	.084
	2	273	3.79	1.033	.063
Reels	1	137	3.64	1.049	.090
	2	273	3.72	1.096	.066
Info posts	1	137	3.68	1.091	.093
	2	273	3.80	1.050	.064
Reviews	1	137	3.55	1.111	.095
	2	273	3.57	1.226	.074
Unboxing	1	137	3.89	.968	.083
	2	273	3.68	1.103	.067
Prefer Video ads	1	137	3.59	.967	.083
	2	273	3.70	1.010	.061
Video ads on SM persuasive	1	137	4.04	.927	.079
	2	273	3.86	.992	.060
infographics	1	137	3.77	.970	.083
	2	273	3.66	1.013	.061
carousels	1	137	3.85	.977	.083
	2	273	3.75	.960	.058
intactiv polls	1	137	3.47	1.098	.094

	2	273	3.29	1.204	.073
giveaways	1	137	3.35	1.167	.100
	2	273	3.48	1.131	.068
CTA	1	137	3.41	1.222	.104
	2	273	3.30	1.245	.075
Q&A and Livestream	1	137	3.26	1.152	.098
	2	273	3.27	1.154	.070
Response to comments	1	137	3.75	1.042	.089
	2	273	3.76	1.098	.066

Source: Authors

The group Females 2: n = 273). Male respondents reports slightly higher mean scores for frequency of social media use, online shopping, perceived usefulness, unboxing content, persuasive video ads, infographics, carousels, interactive polls, and CTA. In contrast, female respondents show marginally higher means for perceived ease of use, discounts, reels, information posts, preference for video ads, and giveaways. Overall, the mean differences across most variables are small, suggesting broadly similar perceptions and engagement patterns across gender groups Table 3.

Table 3 GENDER-WISE INDEPENDENT SAMPLE T TEST										
Independent Samples Test										
		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
									Lower	Upper
fre SM	Equal variances assumed	8.412	.004	1.483	408	.139	.088	.060	-.029	.206
	Equal variances not assumed			1.593	329.463	.112	.088	.056	-.021	.198
Freq.of online shopping	Equal variances assumed	.332	.565	1.669	408	.096	.171	.103	-.030	.373
	Equal			1.714	292.471	.088	.171	.100	-.025	.368

	variances not assumed									
SM Useful	Equal variances assumed	2.073	.151	2.269	408	.024	.246	.108	.033	.459
	Equal variances not assumed			2.317	288.198	.021	.246	.106	.037	.455
SM Easy	Equal variances assumed	.284	.595	-.909	408	.364	-.112	.123	-.353	.130
	Equal variances not assumed			-.900	265.962	.369	-.112	.124	-.356	.133
Discount	Equal variances assumed	1.003	.317	-.336	408	.737	-.036	.106	-.245	.173
	Equal variances not assumed			-.342	285.245	.733	-.036	.105	-.242	.170
Reels	Equal variances assumed	.309	.579	-.765	408	.445	-.087	.113	-.309	.136
	Equal variances not assumed			-.776	283.268	.438	-.087	.112	-.306	.133
Info posts	Equal variances assumed	.244	.621	-1.075	408	.283	-.120	.111	-.339	.099
	Equal variances not assumed			-1.061	263.387	.290	-.120	.113	-.342	.102
Reviews	Equal variances assumed	2.329	.128	-.163	408	.870	-.020	.125	-.265	.224
	Equal variances not assumed			-.169	297.457	.866	-.020	.121	-.257	.217
Unboxing	Equal variances	8.063	.005	1.852	408	.065	.206	.111	-.013	.424

	assumed									
	Equal variances not assumed			1.934	306.085	.054	.206	.106	-.004	.415
Prefer Video ads	Equal variances assumed	.211	.646	- 1.040	408	.299	-.108	.104	-.313	.097
	Equal variances not assumed			- 1.055	283.243	.292	-.108	.103	-.311	.094
Video ads on SM persuasive	Equal variances assumed	.716	.398	1.765	408	.078	.179	.102	-.020	.379
	Equal variances not assumed			1.805	289.375	.072	.179	.099	-.016	.375
infographics	Equal variances assumed	.640	.424	1.093	408	.275	.114	.105	-.091	.320
	Equal variances not assumed			1.109	283.260	.268	.114	.103	-.089	.317
carousels	Equal variances assumed	.185	.667	.911	408	.363	.092	.101	-.107	.291
	Equal variances not assumed			.906	268.207	.366	.092	.102	-.108	.292
interactive polls	Equal variances assumed	.737	.391	1.421	408	.156	.174	.123	-.067	.415
	Equal variances not assumed			1.465	295.768	.144	.174	.119	-.060	.408
giveaways	Equal variances assumed	.008	.930	- 1.051	408	.294	-.126	.120	-.361	.109
	Equal variances not			- 1.040	265.062	.299	-.126	.121	-.364	.112

	assumed									
CTA	Equal variances assumed	.129	.720	.837	408	.403	.108	.130	-.146	.363
	Equal variances not assumed			.842	276.922	.401	.108	.129	-.145	.362
Q&A and Live stream	Equal variances assumed	.033	.856	-.099	408	.921	-.012	.121	-.249	.225
	Equal variances not assumed			-.099	272.883	.921	-.012	.121	-.250	.226
Response to comments	Equal variances assumed	.099	.753	-.057	408	.955	-.006	.113	-.229	.216
	Equal variances not assumed			-.058	285.607	.954	-.006	.111	-.225	.212

Source: Authors

The independent samples t-test results indicate that most variables do not show statistically significant gender differences ( $p > 0.05$ ), suggesting similar perceptions and behaviours across the two groups. A significant difference is observed only for SM Useful ( $t = 2.269$ ,  $p = 0.024$ ), where Group 1 (male) reports higher perceived usefulness than Group 2 (female). Variables such as frequency of social media use, online shopping, unboxing content, and perceived persuasiveness of video ads show marginal differences but are not statistically significant at the 5% level. Overall, except for perceived usefulness of social media, gender does not appear to significantly influence social media engagement, content preference, or online shopping behaviour in this sample Table 4.

Variable	Stat	18–24 yrs	25–30 yrs	31–40 yrs	> 40 yrs
SM Useful	Mean	3.76	3.71	3.62	3.60
	Std dev.	1.084	1.008	1.051	1.027
SM Easy	Mean	3.74	3.6	3.42	3.41
	Std dev.	1.215	1.168	1.023	1.305
Discount	Mean	3.78	3.7	3.94	4.04
	Std dev.	0.962	1.023	1.054	1.147
Reels	Mean	3.75	3.72	3.63	3.61
	Std dev.	1.06	1.102	1.075	1.083
Info posts	Mean	3.86	3.8	3.77	3.39
	Std dev.	1.051	1.114	0.948	1.033
Reviews	Mean	3.74	3.55	3.54	3.45
	Std dev.	1.223	1.235	0.991	1.071
Unboxing	Mean	3.95	3.91	3.74	3.65
	Std dev.	1.081	1.094	0.807	1.301

Prefr Video ads	Mean	3.79	3.74	3.65	3.64
	Std dev.	1.053	0.972	1.01	0.81
Video ads persuasive	Mean	3.92	3.9	3.94	4.0
	Std dev.	0.927	0.972	1.084	1
Carousels	Mean	3.8	3.93	3.91	4.13
	Std dev.	0.978	0.964	0.948	0.869
Response to comments	Mean	3.67	3.86	3.71	3.61
	Std dev.	1.103	1.053	1.077	1.118

The age-wise descriptive statistics show that different age groups show moderate differences in how they view social media marketing elements which affect their decisions to buy wearable devices. Respondents between 18-24 years of age showed higher average values on platform perception metrics which included social media usefulness (M = 3.76) and ease of use (M = 3.74) because they demonstrated more active usage of social media platforms than people from other age groups. The segment gave a mean score of 3.74 for reviews and 3.94 unboxing content because they preferred informative content which showed actual experiences to evaluate their purchasing decisions. The 40-year-old group showed stronger preference for standard content formats which include discounts (M = 4.04) and persuasive video ads (M = 4.00) and carousel posts (M = 4.13) which received the highest average scores out of all tested content types.

The older consumers exhibit better responses to the marketing messages that provide valuable information using organized visual displays. The age group of 25 to 30 years exhibited higher interaction rates for the informational content with an average score of 3.80 and for the brand response to comments with an average score of 3.86 since this age group appreciates interactive communication and brand response. The respondents aged 18 to 24 years exhibited slightly higher evaluations for most variables. The participants exhibited higher platform usability and content navigation expectations since they evaluated ease of use with a mean score of 3.42. The standard deviation values for all age groups remained close to one unit, indicating that the participants exhibited moderate response variability while displaying different preferences for each age group Table 5.

Table 5 ANOVA								
			Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	
SM Useful	Between Groups	(Combined)	1.138	3	.379	.349	.790	
		Linear Term	Unweighted	.046	1	.046	.042	.837
			Weighted	.537	1	.537	.494	.483
			Deviation	.601	2	.301	.276	.759
	Within Groups		441.642	406	1.088			
	Total		442.780	409				
SM Easy	Between Groups	(Combined)	5.303	3	1.768	1.286	.279	
		Linear Term	Unweighted	1.094	1	1.094	.796	.373
			Weighted	3.925	1	3.925	2.857	<b>.092</b>
			Deviation	1.377	2	.689	.501	.606

	Within Groups		557.907	406	1.374			
	Total		563.210	409				
Discount	Between Groups	(Combined)	4.368	3	1.456	1.417	.237	
		Linear Term	Unweighted	2.169	1	2.169	2.111	.147
			Weighted	1.522	1	1.522	1.481	.224
			Deviation	2.846	2	1.423	1.384	.252
	Within Groups		417.312	406	1.028			
	Total		421.680	409				
Reels	Between Groups	(Combined)	1.715	3	.572	.488	.691	
		Linear Term	Unweighted	1.006	1	1.006	.859	.355
			Weighted	.483	1	.483	.413	.521
			Deviation	1.232	2	.616	.526	.591
	Within Groups		475.563	406	1.171			
	Total		477.278	409				
Info posts	Between Groups	(Combined)	3.369	3	1.123	.992	.397	
		Linear Term	Unweighted	2.729	1	2.729	2.410	.121
			Weighted	.945	1	.945	.835	.361
			Deviation	2.424	2	1.212	1.071	.344
	Within Groups		459.726	406	1.132			
	Total		463.095	409				
Reviews	Between Groups	(Combined)	3.198	3	1.066	.754	.520	
		Linear Term	Unweighted	1.056	1	1.056	.747	.388
			Weighted	2.508	1	2.508	1.775	.184
			Deviation	.690	2	.345	.244	.784
	Within Groups		573.777	406	1.413			
	Total		576.976	409				
Unboxing	Between Groups	(Combined)	2.680	3	.893	.789	.500	
		Linear Term	Unweighted	.009	1	.009	.008	.929
			Weighted	.173	1	.173	.152	.696
			Deviation	2.507	2	1.254	1.108	.331
	Within Groups		459.440	406	1.132			

	Total		462.120	409				
Prefer Video ads	Between Groups	(Combined)		.434	3	.145	.145	.933
		Linear Term	Unweighted	.044	1	.044	.044	.835
			Weighted	.015	1	.015	.015	.902
			Deviation	.418	2	.209	.210	.811
	Within Groups		405.118	406	.998			
	Total		405.551	409				
Video ads on SM persuasive	Between Groups	(Combined)		.229	3	.076	.080	.971
		Linear Term	Unweighted	.171	1	.171	.179	.672
			Weighted	.085	1	.085	.089	.765
			Deviation	.143	2	.072	.075	.928
	Within Groups		386.952	406	.953			
	Total		387.180	409				
infographics	Between Groups	(Combined)		.234	3	.078	.077	.972
		Linear Term	Unweighted	.130	1	.130	.129	.720
			Weighted	.028	1	.028	.028	.867
			Deviation	.205	2	.103	.102	.903
	Within Groups		408.264	406	1.006			
	Total		408.498	409				
carousels	Between Groups	(Combined)		5.489	3	1.830	1.978	.117
		Linear Term	Unweighted	4.370	1	4.370	4.723	<b>.030</b>
			Weighted	4.220	1	4.220	4.561	<b>.033</b>
			Deviation	1.269	2	.635	.686	.504
	Within Groups		375.623	406	.925			
	Total		381.112	409				
Interactive polls	Between Groups	(Combined)		3.119	3	1.040	.756	.519
		Linear Term	Unweighted	.285	1	.285	.208	.649
			Weighted	.150	1	.150	.109	.742
			Deviation	2.969	2	1.485	1.080	.341
	Within Groups		558.306	406	1.375			
	Total		561.424	409				

giveaways	Between Groups	(Combined)		5.606	3	1.869	1.434	.232
		Linear Term	Unweighted	.499	1	.499	.383	.536
			Weighted	2.057	1	2.057	1.579	.210
			Deviation	3.549	2	1.774	1.362	.257
	Within Groups		529.116	406	1.303			
	Total		534.722	409				
Call to Action	Between Groups	(Combined)		1.574	3	.525	.341	.795
		Linear Term	Unweighted	.256	1	.256	.167	.683
			Weighted	.089	1	.089	.058	.810
			Deviation	1.486	2	.743	.483	.617
	Within Groups		623.977	406	1.537			
	Total		625.551	409				
Q&A and Live stream	Between Groups	(Combined)		6.086	3	2.029	1.534	.205
		Linear Term	Unweighted	2.775	1	2.775	2.099	.148
			Weighted	1.532	1	1.532	1.159	.282
			Deviation	4.554	2	2.277	1.722	.180
	Within Groups		536.862	406	1.322			
	Total		542.949	409				
Response to comments	Between Groups	(Combined)		3.810	3	1.270	1.093	.352
		Linear Term	Unweighted	.224	1	.224	.192	.661
			Weighted	.035	1	.035	.030	.862
			Deviation	3.775	2	1.888	1.624	.198
	Within Groups		471.799	406	1.162			
	Total		475.610	409				

A one-way ANOVA test was carried to find out if different age groups have unique perceptions of the elements of social media marketing. The findings of the study indicated that all variables failed to establish significant association at the 5% significance level though mean scores were lightly different. This could probably indicate that all age groups might have carried same perceptions of social media marketing practices that they used for wearable products. The two core platform-related constructs of social media usefulness and ease of use displayed constant usability evaluation across all age demographics according to the research results which showed F values of 0.349 and 1.286 respectively. Content-driven factors including discounts ( $F = 1.417$ ,  $p = 0.237$ ), reels ( $F = 0.488$ ,  $p = 0.691$ ), informational posts ( $F = 0.992$ ,  $p = 0.397$ ), reviews ( $F = 0.754$ ,  $p = 0.520$ ), and unboxing videos ( $F = 0.789$ ,  $p = 0.500$ ) also did not exhibit significant age-based differences. This indicates that

informational and experiential content formats appeal relatively equally across younger and older audiences. The advertising-related variables of preference for video ads and perceived persuasiveness of video ads showed extremely non-significant results which demonstrated that video advertising effectiveness depends on age segmentation between sample groups.

The carousel posts showed the most variation between age groups because they produced the highest F-value ( $F = 1.978$ ,  $p = 0.117$ ) which was not statistically significant. The results indicate that different visual storytelling formats show different appeal to specific demographic groups, which researchers need to explore in future studies. The interactive polls and giveaways and CTAs and Q&A or livestream formats showed non-significant results which demonstrated that interactive features do not create different responses between age categories.

### **Theoretical Contributions**

This study establishes its academic value through its investigation of a specific elements- gender and age of the respondents, which affect online purchasing decisions for wearable products. Unlike previous research which examined social media marketing, this study investigates specific content elements and the most important demographic characteristics- gender and age to provide deeper understanding of how digital consumers behave.

### **Managerial Implications**

The research results indicate that marketers need to focus their efforts on two specific advertising formats which include persuasive video advertising and visually structured content that includes carousels and unboxing videos and informational posts. The identical perception of social media usefulness and platform ease of use by users shows that brands need to balance their efforts between making platforms usable and providing content that delivers value to users. The low user interaction with interactive features such as livestreams and polls and CTAs shows that the existing strategies need complete redesigning to enhance user engagement through more valuable interactive experiences. The study results show that social media platforms can reach different demographic groups through integrated strategies whereas minor content changes will boost specific audience engagement.

## **CONCLUSION**

The findings indicate that demographic variables such as age and gender do not significantly influence most aspects of social media-driven purchase behaviour for wearable products. Therefore, marketers may adopt a relatively unified and integrated social media strategy rather than heavily segmenting campaigns based on demographics, focusing instead on content quality and value delivery to appeal to a broad audience efficiently.

With respect to social media marketing elements, persuasive video advertisements, carousel posts, informational content, and unboxing videos should be prioritised, as these formats showed stronger positive responses. At the same time, interactive features such as livestreams, polls, and generic CTAs require strategic redesign to enhance engagement, while improving ease of use and seamless purchase processes can further strengthen consumer trust and online buying intentions.

### **Limitations of the Study**

Notwithstanding the provision of important insights, there are some limitations to the study that need to be kept in mind while interpreting the findings. Firstly, the study has used a convenient sampling approach, which might affect the generalizability of the findings to a larger population. Secondly, the findings are based on self-administered questionnaires, which might give rise to response bias or subjective interpretation by the respondents. Thirdly, the study has used a cross-sectional research approach, which captures perceptions at a point in time and does not measure changes in behavior over a period. Furthermore, the study has been conducted on wearable products, which might limit the generalizability of the findings to other product groups.

### Future Research Directions

Future research could extend this study by investigating the effects of social media marketing on various product groups and cultural settings. Future research could also employ longitudinal research designs to explore the dynamics of consumer perceptions and online purchasing decisions over time. Further research could be conducted on emerging trends such as AI-powered content, influencer authenticity, and targeted advertising to gain more insights into online consumer engagement. Future research could also investigate other variables such as digital literacy or online usage patterns to gain more insights into the differences in online purchasing decisions.

### REFERENCES

- Alkharabsheh, O. H. M., & Zhen, B. H. (2021, April). The impact of content marketing, social media marketing and online convenience on consumer buying decision process. In *CoMBInES-Conference on Management, Business, Innovation, Education and Social Sciences* (Vol. 1, No. 1, pp. 1823–1834).
- Bilro, R. G., Loureiro, S. M. C., & Dos Santos, J. F. (2022). Masstige strategies on social media: The influence on sentiments and attitude toward the brand. *International Journal of Consumer Studies*, 46(4), 1113–1126.
- Fischer, H. E., Boone, W. J., & Neumann, K. (2023). Quantitative research designs and approaches. In *Handbook of research on science education* (pp. 28–59). Routledge.
- Giustiniani, A., Vallesi, A., Oliveri, M., Tarantino, V., Ambrosini, E., Bortoletto, M., ... Burgio, F. (2022). A questionnaire to collect unintended effects of transcranial magnetic stimulation: A consensus-based approach. *Clinical Neurophysiology*, 141, 101–108.
- Haroon, A. S., Hong, A. N. H., Hoo, W. C., Wolor, C., & Liau, C. H. (2025). The influence of electronic word of mouth in social media on Generation Z purchase intention in Malaysia. *Journal of Lifestyle and SDGs Review*, 5(1), e02697.
- Hossan, D., Dato' Mansor, Z., & Jaharuddin, N. S. (2023). Research population and sampling in quantitative study. *International Journal of Business and Technopreneurship*, 13(3), 209–222.
- Husain, R., Ahmad, A., & Khan, B. M. (2022). The impact of brand equity, status consumption, and brand trust on purchase intention of luxury brands. *Cogent Business & Management*, 9(1), 2034234.
- Lee, E. (2013). Impacts of social media on consumer behavior: Decision making process.
- Mansi, M., & Pandey, R. (2016). Impact of demographic characteristics of procurement professionals on sustainable procurement practices: Evidence from Australia. *Journal of Purchasing and Supply Management*, 22(1), 31–40.
- Ntumba, D., & Budree, A. (2020, July). The effect of social media-based electronic word of mouth on propensity to buy wearable devices. In *International Conference on Human-Computer Interaction* (pp. 402–417). Springer.
- Parment, A. (2013). Generation Y vs. Baby Boomers: Shopping behavior, buyer involvement and implications for retailing. *Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services*, 20(2), 189–199.
- Prasath, P., & Yoganathen, A. (2018). Influence of social media marketing on consumer buying decision making process. *SLIS Student Research Journal*, 1(1), 1–12.
- Romadhoni, B., Akhmad, A., Naldah, N., & Rossanty, N. P. E. (2023). Purchasing decisions effect of social media marketing, electronic word of mouth (eWOM), purchase intention. *Journal of Accounting and Finance Management*, 4(1), 74–86.

- Šadić, S., Puška, A., Stojanović, I., & Bečić, H. (2018). The influence of demographic characteristics of consumers on decisions to purchase technical products. *European Journal of Applied Economics*, 15(2), 1–16.
- Trauntschnig, J., & Hetz, D. O. (2020). Family businesses long-term orientation–The effect on their digital transformation: A multiple-case study within traditional industries (Master's thesis, Jönköping University). Semantic Scholar.
- Varghese, S., & Agrawal, M. (2021). Impact of social media on consumer buying behavior. *Saudi Journal of Business and Management Studies*, 6(3), 51–55.
- Waheed, A., Mahasan, S. S., & Sandhu, M. A. (2014). Factor that affects consumer buying behavior: An analysis of some selected factors. *Middle-East Journal of Scientific Research*, 19(5), 636–641.

**Received:** 02-Mar-2026, Manuscript No. AMSJ-26-16959; **Editor assigned:** 03-Mar-2026, PreQC No. AMSJ-26-16959(PQ); **Reviewed:** 10-Mar-2026, QC No. AMSJ-26-16959; **Revised:** 17-Mar-2026, Manuscript No. AMSJ-26-16959(R); **Published:** 24-Mar-2026