THE EFFECTS OF SOCIAL MEDIA MARKETING DETERMINANTS ON CUSTOMER PURCHASE INTENSION

N. Gajalakshmi
Research Scholar, Department of Business Administration, School of Management Studies, Vels Institute of Science, Technology and Advanced Studies, Pallavaram, Chennai-600117

Dr. K. Vinayagam
Associate professor and Research Supervisor, Department of Business Administration, School of Management Studies, Vels Institute of Science, Technology and Advanced Studies, Pallavaram, Chennai-600117

Abstract

Social media can be established anywhere with an Internet connection, and it should be considered by marketers, advertisers, and online content creators as a basic part of the communications because social media affects all aspects of the Internet and transforms the role of Internet in people's lives. The aim of this paper is to investigate the effectiveness of Social Media Marketing (SSM) determinants on customer purchase intension. The sample size required for this analysis is 216. These survey respondents were chosen using a systematic random sampling technique. It is found that the social media marketing determinants are significantly varied among the respondents based on frequency of watching. However, Influence others factors is not significantly varied among the respondents towards the social media marketing determinants

Keywords: Social Media, Marketing, Customer Intension, Social interaction

DOI Number: 10.14704/nq.2022.20.13.NQ88204 Neuro Quantology 2022; 20(13):1634-1640

Introduction

Social media marketing is a new trend and rapidly growing way in which businesses are reaching out to targeted respondents easily. Social media marketing can be simply defined as the use of social media channels to promote a company and its products. This kind of marketing can be thought of as a subset of online marketing activities that complete traditional Web-based promotion strategies, such as e-mail newsletters and online advertising campaigns (Barefoot & Szabo 2010). By encouraging users to spread messages to personal contacts, social media marketing has injected a new term of exponential dissemination and trust to mass-communication and mass marketing (Hafele, 2011). By this new approach of outreach and marketing, new tools are being developed and increased in turn for businesses. Social media marketers are now going better and more effective insight through the introduction of analytic applications by official social network site platforms (Hafele, 2011).

There are numerous different social media sites, and they take many different forms and contain different features. Undoubtedly, the most common social networking site that first comes to our mind is Facebook. Facebook was first launched in February 2004, owned and operated by Facebook, Inc. As of May 2012; Facebook has over 900 million active users. Users must register before using the site; they may create a personal profile, add other users as friends, and exchange messages, including automatic notifications when they update the profile (Facebook, 2012). In addition, users may join common-interest user groups; categorize the friends into lists such as "People From Work" or "Close Friends". Facebook‟s main mission is to give people the power to share and make the world more open and connected (Facebook, 2012).

Other social network sites such as Twitter, Google plus, and LinkedIn may differ in some ways, but essentially they work using the same principles. Marketing using social media such as these can take multiple shapes. The traditional

Facebook model, in particular, involves replacing the concept of a human "friend" with a brand or tangible product or creating a page or group (Facebook, 2011). A user who elects to "like" a product or company advertises that connection to the own private network of contacts. This concept extends to other forms of social media as well. According to Bernie Borges (2009), Twitter is combination of micro blogging and social network (Borges, 2009). Twitter, allows users to receive small updates and advertisements from favored producers as well (Hafele, 2011). Twitter gives opportunity to users to involve in real time sharing. A tweet is usually no more than 140 characters, which followers of the user can see (Borges, 2009).

These two social media channels are among the most popular and heavily used options now, but they are far from being the only ones. As observed by Kaplan and Haenlein (2010) cited by Nick Hafele (2011) have identified several channels that fall under the category of social media, each of which has opportunities and unique advantages for marketing use. Collaborative projects, such as wikis, or editable data-sources, are particularly poignant avenues of contact. In fact, trends indicate that they are quickly becoming the predominant source of information among consumer populations (Kaplan & Haenlein, 2010) cited by (Hafele, 2011).

Blogs, managed by either individuals or organizations, are another heavily used marketing forum. Through blogs, businesses can promote brand awareness by sharing insider information, updating respondents on new products, as well as providing links to the main sales channels. Fans will be updated time to time on any special events, contests or a new promotion organized by the brand or product. Blogs also facilitate the posting of comments and feedbacks, allowing fans and detractors to post opinions and questions to producers. This encourages the exchange of ideas between peers and can also promote honest discussion between individuals and companies to improve the defaults (Hafele, 2011). Social media approaches need to be considered to ensure the highest chance of success with a social media marketing. According to Ray et al. (2011) cited by Nick Hafele (2011) emphasize the need for diversifying a social media strategy to ensure that messages are reaching appropriate audiences; there is no single correct approach**.**

Research Methodology

The aim of this paper is to investigate the effectiveness of Social Media Marketing (SSM) determinants on customer purchase intension. Various literature and reviews are compiled and 11 variables framed, namely, Communities of relationship, Ease of use, Enjoyment, Attitude, Transparency, Reach, Boost website traffic Social Interaction, Influence others and Communities of transaction, Usefulness. The structured questionnaires were used for collect the data. The sample size required for this analysis is 216. These survey respondents were chosen using a systematic random sampling technique. The data analysis procedure is carried out by means of the survey questionnaire process. Responses are coded and the results are entered into a statistical kit for social science (SPSS). Descriptive statistics ANOVA statistical methods were used to evaluate the variance between the variables, the statistically significant variations and the relationship between the variables.

Analysis and Results

Table 1 Social media marketing based on the watching frequency

Social media marketing	Watching frequency	Mean	Std. Deviation	F-value	P-value.
Usefulness	Frequently a day	3.67	0.62	40.153	0.001*
	Rarely in a day	3.17	0.89		
	Always in a day	2.21	0.04		
	once in a day	3.61	0.9		

Ease of use	Frequently a day	2.85	0.99	19.507	0.001*
	Rarely in a day	3.43	1.01		
	Always in a day	4	0		
	once in a day	3.59	1.09		
Enjoyment	Frequently a day	3.95	0.86	27.847	0.001*
	Rarely in a day	3.9	0.79		
	Always in a day	4.25	0.08		
	once in a day	3.14	1.39		
Attitude	Frequently a day	4.11	0.19	17.144	0.001*
	Rarely in a day	4.11	0.75		
	Always in a day	3.07	1.3		
	once in a day	4.03	0.95		
Transparency	Frequently a day	4.05	0.23	5.084	0.002**
	Rarely in a day	4.13	0.3		
	Always in a day	4.33	0.11		
	once in a day	3.94	0.95		
Reach	Frequently a day	4.35	0.21	9.158	0.001*
	Rarely in a day	4.16	0.23		
	Always in a day	4.33	0.35		
	once in a day	4.11	0.65		
Boost website traffic	Frequently a day	3.78	0.71	27.268	0.001*
	Rarely in a day	4.07	0.5		
	Always in a day	4.22	0.11		
	once in a day	4.26	0.36		
Social Interaction	Frequently a day	4.07	0.17	64.733	0.001*
	Rarely in a day	4.22	0.17		
	Always in a day	3.21	1.18		
	once in a day	4.19	0.39		
Influence others	Frequently a day	3.26	0.61	2.416	0.066(NS)

	Rarely in a day	3.38	0.58		
	Always in a day	3.65	0.33		
	once in a day	3.37	0.99		
Communities of transaction	Frequently a day	4.3	0.09	15.58	0.001*
	Rarely in a day	3.77	0.95		
	Always in a day	4.18	0.06		
	once in a day	4.05	0.67		
Communities of relationship	Frequently a day	3.77	0.73	15.345	0.001*
	Rarely in a day	3.99	0.66		
	Always in a day	3.55	0.84		
	once in a day	4.13	0.5		

Source: Primary data computed. * Significant at 1 percent level;

** Significant at 5 percent level; NS No significant

Table 1, explains the respondents opinion towards social media marketing determinants based on the watching frequency.

Here, watching frequency of the respondents is classified into four groups, namely, frequently a day, rarely in a day, always in a day and once in a day. On the basis of watching frequency, the customer's opinion is compared with the store atmospherics factors.

Ho: Respondents' opinion towards the social media marketing determinants is not varied based on the watching frequency.

In order to examine the above stated hypothesis, one way analysis of variance is applied. From the ANOVAs result, it is noted that the social media marketing determinants like, Usefulness, Ease of use, Reach, Boost website traffic, Communities of transaction and Communities of relationship are the factors found to be significant. Hence, it is inferred that the social media marketing determinants are significantly varied among the respondents based on frequency of watching. However, Influence others factors is not significantly varied among the respondents towards the social media marketing determinants

In the case of Usefulness, Frequently a day the respondents who watch frequently a day have highly secured with the mean value of 3.67 followed by once in a day (3.61), rarely in a day (3.17) and always (2.21). The calculated F-value is 40.153 and the P-value is 0.001, which is significant at one percent level. Hence, there is a significant difference of opinion towards Usefulness factors among the respondents based on the watching frequency. It is found that frequently a day watching frequency group respondents are having the higher level of opinion towards the Usefulness atmospheric factors than the other watching frequency respondents.

With regard to Ease of using factors, Always in a day watching frequency group respondents highly secured the mean score of 4.00, followed by the once in as day (3.59), Rarely in a day (3.43) and Frequently a day (2.85). The calculated F-value is 19.507 and the P-value is 0.001, which is significant at one percent level. Hence, there is a significant difference of opinion towards Ease of using factors among the respondents based on the watching frequency. It is noted that frequently a day watching frequency respondents are highly influence towards the Ease of using factors in the shop.

In the case of Enjoyment, watching frequency of Always in a day respondents highly secured with the mean value of 4.25 followed by watching frequency of frequently a day group respondents (3.95), rarely in a day (3.90) and once in a day group respondents (3.14). The calculated F-value

is 27.847 and the P-value is 0.001, which is significant at one percent level. Hence, there is a significant difference of opinion towards enjoyment factors among the respondents based on the watching frequency. It is found that always in a day watching frequency group respondents are having the higher level of opinion towards the Enjoyment factors than the other group of respondents.

For Attitude, Frequently a day watching frequency group respondents highly secured the mean value of 4.12 followed by rarely in a day watching frequency respondents (4.11), once in a day (4.03) and frequently a day (3.07). The calculated F-value is 17.144 and P-value is 0.011, which is significant at one percent level. Hence, there is a significant difference of opinion towards Attitude factors based on the watching frequency. It is noted that watching frequency of frequently a day respondents are having the higher level of opinion towards the watching frequency.

For Transparency, watching frequency of Always in a day respondents highly secured the mean value of 4.33 followed by the watching frequency of Rarely in a day respondents (4.13), Frequently a day respondents (4.05) and once in a day respondents (3.94) . The calculated F-value is 5.084 and P-value is 0.002, which is significant at five percent level. Hence, there is a significant difference of opinion towards Transparency factors based on the watching frequency. It is noted that watching frequency of Always in a day respondents are having the higher level of opinion towards the Transparency factors.

With regard to Reach, watching frequency of frequently a day respondents secured the mean score of 4.35, followed by watching frequency of Always in a day respondents (4.33), Rarely in a day (4.16) and once in a day (4.11). The calculated F-value is 9.158 and P-value is 0.001, which is significant at one percent level. Hence, there is a significant difference of opinion towards Reach based on the watching frequency of respondents. It is found that watching frequency of frequently a day respondents are having the higher level of opinion towards the Reach.

For Boost website traffic, once in a day watching frequency respondents secured the mean value of 4.26, followed by watching frequency of Always in a day respondents (4.22), rarely in a day respondents (4.07) and frequently a day (3.78). The calculated F-value is 27.268 and P-value is 0.001, which is significant at one percent level. Hence, there is a significant difference of opinion towards Boost website traffic factors based on the watching frequency. It is found that respondents in once in a day watching frequency are having the higher level of opinion towards Boost website traffic.

For Social Interaction, Rarely in a day watching frequency respondents secured the mean value of 4.22, followed by watching frequency of once in a day respondents (4.19), Frequently a day respondents (4.07) and Always in a day (3.21). The calculated F-value is 64.733 and P-value of 0.001, which is significant at one percent level. Hence, there is a significant difference of opinion towards Boost website traffic factors based on the watching frequency. It is found that respondents in rarely in a day watching frequency are having the higher level of opinion towards Social Interaction.

For communities of transaction, frequently a day watching frequency respondents secured the mean value of 4.30, followed by watching frequency of Always in a day respondents (4.18), once in a day (4.05) and rarely in a day (3.77). The calculated F-value is 15.580 and P-value is 0.001, which is significant at one percent level. Hence, there is a significant difference of opinion towards communities of transaction factors based on the watching frequency. It is found that respondents in frequently a day watching frequency group are having the higher level of opinion towards Communities of transaction of the store.

For Communities of relationship, once in a day watching frequency respondents secured the mean value of 4.13, followed by watching frequency of rarely in a day respondents (3.99), frequently a day (3.77) and Always in a day (3.55). The calculated F-value is 15.345 and P-value of 0.001, which is significant at one percent level. Hence, there is a significant difference of opinion towards Communities of relationship factors based on the watching frequency. It is found that respondents in once in a day watching frequency are having the higher level of opinion towards Communities of relationship of the store. It is found that the social media marketing determinants are significantly varied among the respondents based on the watching frequency.

Conclusion

Today, consumers gain a new role with social media. Consumers are becoming content creators and, thus, functional consumers instead of just consuming, as in the past. Social media applications or tools that facilitate this are blogs, micro blogging applications (such as Twitter), social networking sites (such as Facebook), podcasts, and video and photo sharing sites (such as YouTube and Flickr). Given this reality, it is useful for companies, especially marketers, to integrate social media into marketing and the marketing strategies.

This study has concluded that the frequently watching or used respondents are highly influenced by buying behavior. the major advantages and disadvantages determined by the development of Internet technology in the area of social media marketing. Social media is the modern tool for marketers who try every means to get the message out to the target markets. So, before a company step into the field of social media marketing, they have to complete full research on social media practices. An organization has to master basic principles and tactics of using social media as an effective tool in order to survive in the field of social media marketing. Main goals of a company or organization have to engage respondents, to protect company reputation, to provide respondents with good quality of product and services and to satisfy customer's need.

References

Ajzen, I. (1991). The theory of planned behavior. (P. A. M. Lange, A. W. Kruglanski, & E. T. Higgins, Eds.)Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 50(2), 179–211. doi:10.1016/0749-5978(91)90020-T

Al-Qirim, N. (2007). The adoption of eCommerce communications and applications technologies in small businesses in New Zealand. Electronic Commerce Research and Applications, 6(4), 462–473. doi:10.1016/j.elerap.2007.02.012

Ayu, a. R. R., & Abrizah, a. (2011). Do you Facebook? Usage and applications of Facebook page among academic libraries in Malaysia. The International Information & Library Review, 43(4), 239–249. doi:10.1016/j.iilr.2011.10.005

Bass, F. M. (1969). A new product growth for model consumer durables. Management Science, 15(5), 215–227.

Bass, F. M., Krishnan, T. V., Jain, D. C. (1994). Why the Bass model fits without decision variables. Marketing Science, 13(3), 203–223.

Beal, G. M., & Bohlen, J. M. (1957). The diffusion process. Working paper, Agricultural Experimental Station. Iowa State College, Ames, IA.

Bruque, S., & Moyano, J. (2007). Organisational determinants of information technology adoption and implementation in SMEs: The case of family and cooperative firms. Technovation, 27(5), 241–253. doi:10.1016/j.technovation.2006.12.003

Carayannis, E. G., Popescu, D., Sipp, C., & Stewart, M. (2006). Technological learning for entrepreneurial development (TL4ED) in the knowledge economy (KE): Case studies and lessons learned, 26, 419–443. doi:10.1016/j.technovation.2005.04.003

Castronovo, C. (2012). Social Media in an Alternative Marketing Communication Model, 6(1).

Chen, S.-C., Yen, D. C., & Hwang, M. I. (2012). Factors influencing the continuance intention to the usage of Web 2.0: An empirical study. Computers in Human Behavior, 28(3), 933–941. doi:10.1016/j.chb.2011.12.014

Chong, A. Y.-L., Chan, F. T. S., & Ooi, K.-B. (2012). Predicting consumer decisions to adopt mobile commerce: Cross country empirical examination between China and Malaysia. Decision Support Systems, 53(1), 34–43. doi:10.1016/j.dss.2011.12.001

Cotter, S. (1993). TAKING THE E-MARKETING SUCCESS, 23.

Curtis, L., Edwards, C., Fraser, K. L., Gudelsky, S., Holmquist, J., Thornton, K., & Sweetser, K. D. (2010). Adoption of social media for public relations by nonprofit organizations. Public Relations Review, 36(1), 90–92. doi:10.1016/j.pubrev.2009.10.003

Davis, C. H., & Vladica, F. (2006). Use of internet technologies and e-business solutions: a structural model of sources of business value

among Canadian micro-enterprises. Proceedings of the 39th Annual HICSS Conference.

Eagleman, A. N. (2013). Acceptance , motivations , and usage of social media as a marketing communications tool amongst employees of sport national governing bodies. Sport Management Review. doi:10.1016/j.smr.2013.03.004

Morgan, A., Colebourne, D., & Thomas, B. (2006). The development of ICT advisors for SME businesses: An innovative approach. Technovation, 26(8), 980–987. doi:10.1016/j.technovation.2005.09.001

Oh, K.-Y., Cruickshank, D., & Anderson, A. R. (2009). The adoption of e-trade innovations by Korean small and medium sized firms. Technovation, 29(2), 110–121. doi:10.1016/j.technovation.2008.08.001

Pires, G.D., Aisbett, J. (2001). A dual Marketing and Informational Perspective to E-Commerce Adoption. The Newcastle University Research Publications.

Pookulangara, S., & Koesler, K. (2011). Cultural influence on consumers' usage of social networks and its' impact on online purchase intentions. Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services, 18(4), 348–354. doi:10.1016/j.jretconser.2011.03.003

Riemenschneider, C. K., Harrison, D. a., & Mykytyn, P. P. (2003). Understanding it adoption decisions in small business: integrating current theories. Information & Management, 40(4), 269–285. doi:10.1016/S0378-7206(02)00010-1

Rogers, E. M. (1995). Diffusion of Innovations (4th ed.). New York: Free Press.

Samujh, R. H. (2011). Micro-businesses need support: survival precedes sustainability. Corporate Governance, 11(1), 15–28.

Sarosa, S. (2012). Adoption of Social Media Networks by Indonesian SME: A Case Study. Procedia Economics and Finance, 4(Icsmed), 244–254. doi:10.1016/S2212-5671(12)00339-5

Stockdale, R., & Standing, C. (2006). A classification model to support SME e-commerce adoption initiatives. Journal of Small Business and Enterprise Development, 13(3), 381–394. doi:10.1108/14626000610680262

Tarafdar, M., & Vaidya, S. D. (2006). Challenges in the adoption of E-Commerce technologies in India: The role of organizational factors. International Journal of Information Management, 26(6), 428–441. doi:10.1016/j.ijinfomgt.2006.08.001

Thong, J. Y. L., & Yap, C. S. (1995). CEO characteristics, organizational characteristics and information technology adoption in small businesses. Omega, 23(4), 429–442. doi:10.1016/0305-0483(95)00017-I

Vatanasakdakul, S., & D'Ambra, J. (2007). A conceptual model for e-commerce adoption in developing countries: a task-technology fit perspective. International Journal of Information Technology and Management, 6(2-4), 343–361.

Venkatesh, V., Morris, V., Davis, G., & Davis, F. (2003). User acceptance of information technology: toward a unified view. MIS Quarterly,27(3), 425–78.

Vries, L. De, Gensler, S., & Leeflang, P. S. H. (2012). Popularity of Brand Posts on Brand Fan Pages : An Investigation of the Effects of Social Media Marketing. Journal of Interactive Marketing, 26(2), 83–91. doi:10.1016/j.intmar.2012.01.003

Yu, C.-S., & Tao, Y.-H. (2009). Understanding business-level innovation technology adoption. Technovation, 29(2), 92–109. doi:10.1016/j.technovation.2008.07.007