CU Global Management Review
Volume 6, Issue 1, January-June, 2017, pp. 39-57

Impact of Social Media on Consumer Purchase Behavior

Dr. Shamsher Singh
Associate Professor & Acting Director Banarsidas Chandiwala Institute of Professional Studies , Sector-11, Dwarka, New Delhi-110075. India' Mobile No 9810543144
Email : shamsher_1965@rediffmail.com

ABSTRACT: The purpose of the article is to find the factors influencing the impact of Social Media on consumer purchase behavior on the basis of demographic variables such as age, gender , profession, education etc.

Design/methodology/approach: The study has employed both primary and secondary data. The secondary data has been used to gain in the in depth knowledge of impact of social media on consumer buying behaviour , where as primary data has been collected from the social media user to find their responses on the various aspects of impact of social media on consumer buying behaviour. Based on the literature review on different aspects of social media a structured questionnaire was developed which was pre tested using a sample of respondents similar in nature to the final sample. The final questionnaire was administered to 200 customers who were using the one or other social media sites by means of face-to-face interviews as well as online.

Findings : The study did not find any impact on consumer buying behaviour of demographic factors on the various parameters of social media except for parameter "social media information" .

Research limitations/implications :The study has been carried out in the National Capital Region, which is metropolitan city area where the education level and income level of population is very high as compare to rest of India. Also there is high penetration of internet user especially in the young generation which uses the social media networking site for their personal as well professional uses. The finding of the study cannot be generalised for the whole country.

Practical implications: The study provide the useful insight for the marketing managers/social media managers that in case of urban metropolitan area such as NCR Delhi , they can plan a marketing campaign which targets the whole population using social media either through mobile phones or other internets means.

Key words : Consumer purchase behavior, social media, online buying demographic factors

INTRODUCTION

Social media are media for social interaction, using highly accessible and scalable publishing techniques. Social media uses web-based technologies to turn communication into interactive dialogues. Kaplan and Heinlein (2010) define social media as "a group of Internet-based applications that build on the ideological and technological foundations of Web 2.0, which allows the creation and exchange of user-generated content". Social media is the medium to socialize. They use web-based technology to quickly disseminate knowledge and information to a huge number of users. They allow creation and exchange of user-generated content. Facebook, Twitter, Hi5, Orkut and other social networking sites are collectively referred to as social media. Social media represents low-cost tools that are used to combine technology and social interaction with the use of words. These tools are typically internet or mobile based like Twitter, Facebook, MySpace and YouTube.

Social Media, today, is among the 'best opportunities available' to a brand for connecting with prospective consumers. Social Media Marketing is the new mantra for several brands since early last year. Significantly different from conventional marketing strategies, Social Media Marketing (SMM) offers three distinct advantages. One, it provides a window to marketers to not only present products / services to customers but also to listen to customers' grievances and suggestions. Two, it makes it easy for marketers to identify various peer groups or influencers among various groups, who in turn can become brand evangelist and help in organic growth of a brand. And, three, all this is done at nearly zero cost (as compared to conventional customer outreach programmes) as most of the social networking sites are free. Social media marketing helps in generating exposure to businesses, increasing traffic /subscribers, building new business partnerships, rise in search engine rankings, generating qualified leads due to better lead generation efforts, selling more products and services and reduction in overall marketing expenses.

The use of social media sites as part of a company's marketing strategy has increased significantly in the past couple years. As Swedowsky (2009) stated, businesses can not afford to ignore the benefits of using social media. In the past, consumers often just had the opinions of a few friends before making a significant purchase. The use of social media can increase

number of opinions from just a few to hundreds or even thousands. Swedowsky (2009) reiterated that social media continues to abound for both businesses and the consumer. Online access is no longer a luxury, it is a necessity. Businesses have also realized that consumers use social media because it is fun. They can easily share their ideas, photos, videos, likes and dislikes with each other. Businesses realize that importance of having increased interaction with consumers and retailers, and the use of social media gives them the opportunity to more efficiently meet the demand of their customers.

Many firms now use social media to enhance their marketing scheme. Firms also use social media for promotions and to survey groups for past purchases and interests. One has to be careful, however, when reading the reviews of any firm on a social media outlet. It is obvious that the use of social media to enhance marketing, is here to stay, so one must consider all possible avenues to positively use it to increase advertising and improve marketing. It is also obvious that there are benefits, drawbacks, and challenges associated with any social media strategy, and these must be addressed before a specific social media strategy is implemented. The purpose of social media should be to enhance a business branding and permit their biggest fans (i.e., super fans) to just talk about them. Businesses need to assist in facilitating the social media inputs and discussions.

The present article has made an attempt to find how the social media influences the consumer behaviour in general and in the urban area like Delhi in particular. The present study has used the survey method to collect the primary data from 200 respondents in Delhi who has been using the social media at least for last 6 months and are well versed with the uses of social media by the different organisations.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Social media includes online networks (e.g., Facebook, MySpace, and LinkedIn), wikis (e.g., Wikipedia), multimedia sharing sites (e.g., YouTube and Flickr), bookmarking sites (e.g., Del.icio.us and Digg), virtual worlds (e.g., Second Life), and rating sites (e.g. Yelp) (Edwards, 2011). Since the inception of social media, various studies have been conducted to examine its different aspects particularly those that drive the individuals to participate in social media. For instance, Daugherty et al. (2008) attempted to explore the factors motivating consumers to create social media content. Cheong and Morrison (2008) examined the consumers opinions about the recommendations and information implanted in user-generated content and producer generated content. Sun et al. (2009) studied the factors that support or inhibit users' knowledge sharing intentions in virtual

The distinctive characteristic of social media is that it is a personalized user generated media. Users exercise greater control over its use and content generation . Imran and Zaheer (2012) in their study of social media theories argues that if more users of the social media produce the same views in the form of blogs, posts, scraps, reviews, comments etc., about a product it makes product related information credible. This postulation is in line with the assumption of social impact theory (Latane, 1981) which proposes as the number of people increases in a social group influence on target individual's attitude and behavior increases.

Social media users (e.g. members of Facebook) often share their product or brand related experiences and information in the form of posts, comments, and ratings. Individuals are influenced by the actions of others, entertained by their performance and sometimes persuaded by their arguments (Latane, 1981). Consumers rely on multiple sources to determine the credibility of information produced by online communities and bloggers. (Flanagin et al., 2011). (Cheung, Lee, and Rabjohn, 2008; Metzger, et al 2010).In addition, they also rely on the ratings of others, the number of posts, and the usefulness of the information presented (O'Reilly and Marx, 2011). User-generated information in the form of ratings and recommendations from others helps a consumer to assess the credibility of user generated contents (UGC). People join online social networks to search for technical specification of their desired products and brands, check out the new collections in different product categories, people read product related reviews or threads on social media to make the well-considered buying decisions (Muntinga, et al., 2011).

Consumers are no more willing to listen what business organizations want them to listen rather they want business organizations to listen what they say. This attitudinal and behavioral transition in consumers is the impact of social media emergence and it is a big challenge for business firms to deal with it (Kietzmann et al., 2011). This situation signals that business firms should identify those factors of social media that affect the consumer attitude towards the product related information embedded in social media content. This may enable businesses to develop the affective social media promotional strategies. Social media has become the core of the marketing communication as some business gurus say that if business firms do not participate in social media they are not part of cyberspace anymore. Social media enables businesses to contact the end users directly and timely relatively at lower cost than traditional media (Kaplan and Haenlein, 2010).

Social media explosion has changed the communication landscape around the globe (Edwards, 2011). It had affected the marketer and consumer relationship. Consumers are no more willing to listen what business organizations want them to listen rather they want

business organizations to listen what they say (Kietzmann et al., 2011). Today young consumers believe more in the product related content or information created which other consumers generate on social networking sites, multi media sites, blogs, and so on than producer or company produced product related content, despite being personally unknown or unrelated to the user (Jonas, 2010). Nowak, et al (1990) suggested that a simple model of individual influence, operating in accordance with some general principles of social impact, if extended to reflect how individuals influence and are influenced by each other over time, can lead to plausible predictions of public opinion. Williams and Williams (1989) postulated that social impact varies depending on the underlying purpose of compliance.

Previous research has demonstrated that traditional media publicity can affect marketing outcomes (Agrawal and Kamakura 1995; Elberse 2007; Trusov et al., 2009), similarly online consumer-generated content such as online reviews can also affect sales (e.g.. Chevalier and Mayzlin 2006), and sometimes even negative publicity can have a positive marketing effect (Ahluwalia et al 2000; Berger, et al., 2010).

Customer engagement has become a “strategic imperative” for businesses since “engaged customers play a key role in viral marketing activity by providing referrals and/or recommendations for specific products, services, and/or brands to others” (Brodie et al. 2011). Customer-oriented salespeople have often sought new ways to interact and engage with customers to co-create value (Jones, et al., 2003). Bowden (2009) suggests that customer engagement involves a calculative commitment, which forms the basis for consequent buying behavior; leads to an emotional commitment, which forms the basis for buyer loyalty and increases buyers' involvement and trust.

Customer engagement is often considered to be highly correlated with trust and commitment in buyer–seller relationships. Push strategies that utilize large professional networks to disseminate referrals are likely to be more effective when customers are highly engaged. Customer engagement can be increased by providing opportunities to seek, give, and pass opinions (Chu and Kim 2011) about products and services in online communities, wikis, and creative works–sharing sites (e.g., YouTube, Flickr). Such co-created value represents a dynamic and swelling fountain of knowledge for existing and future customers, which can be used to increase buyer involvement and trust.

OBJECTIVES AND HYPOTHESES

This study seeks to find out the impact of social media on consumer buying behaviour . In pursuance of the above objectives, the following hypotheses were formulated for testing:

- $H_{01:}$ There are no significant variations in the customer response for social media
- based on respondents' age .
- H_{02}: There are no significant variations in the customer response for social media based on respondents' profession
- H_{03}: There are no significant variations in the customer response for social media based on respondents' education level.
- H_{04}: There are no significant variations in the customer response for social media based on respondents' gender .
- H_{05}: There are no significant variations in the customer response for social media based on respondents' income.

METHODOLOGY

The study has employed both primary and secondary data. The secondary data has been used to gain in the in depth knowledge of impact of social media on consumer buying behaviour , where as primary data has been collected from the social media user to find their responses on the various aspects of impact of social media on consumer buying behaviour.

Based on the literature review on different aspects of social media a well structured questionnaire was developed. Prior to the final survey, the questionnaire was pre tested using a sample of respondents similar in nature to the final sample. The goal of pilot survey was to ensure readability and logical arrangements of questions. The final questionnaire was administered to 200 customers who were using the one or other social media sites by means of face-to-face interviews as well as online .

Limitations of the Study

The study has been carried out in the National Capital Region, which is metropolitan city area where the education level and income level of population is very high as compare to rest of India. Also there is high penetration of internet user especially in the young generation which uses the social media networking site for their personal as well professional uses. The finding of the study cannot be generalised for the whole country, hence the finding of the research can be generalised only for urban areas only.

Research and Statistical Tools Employed

The research and statistical tools employed in this study is , ANOVA. SPSS 18 was used to perform statistical analysis. The reliability of the data was carried out by using Cronbach's

Alpha Value. ANOVA was employed to find the significant factor which determines the overall customer buying behaviour .

DATA ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION

The analysis of this data was divided into following sections:

(i) Demographic profile of Respondents : Table 1

(ii) Reliability and Validity : Table 2

(iii) ANOVA : Table 3 to 7

Table-1 Demographic profile of Respondents

Variable	Characteristics	Frequency	Percentage
Gender	Male	114	57
	Female	86	43
Occupation	Government service	54	27
	Private service	48	24
	Student	98	49
Education	Post Graduation	80	40
	Graduation	72	36
	10+2	40	20
	Others	8	4.0
Age group	15-25 yrs	96	48
	25-40 yrs	60	30
	40 yrs & above	44	22
Annual Income	"Less than Rs 100000"	58	29
	Rs.1000001to 300000	62	31
	Rs 300001to 500000	50	25
	Rs 500001and above	30	15
	Total	**200**	**100**

Table 1 indicates the respondent's profile. There are 57% Male and 43% female. Students are largest respondents (4 %) followed by Govt. Service (27%) and private service (24%) . Most of the respondents are either graduate (36%) or post graduate (40.%). There are 48% respondents in the 15-25 years age category, 30% in the 25-40 years category and only 22% respondents are in above 40 years. The profile of respondents indicates they are young, educated and decently employed. They belong to the new generation who are using the social networking sites for different purposes such as to connect with their friends , relatives & peers, for networking to make a opinion or to express their view point .

Reliability and Validity

Table 2 shows the result of reliability analysis- Cronbach's Alpha Value. This test measured the consistency between the survey scales. The Cronbach's Alpha score of 1.0 indicate 100 percent reliability. Cronbach's Alpha scores were all greater than the Nunnaly's (1978) generally accepted score of 0.7. In this case, the score was 0.775 for the service quality provided by the banks. Table- 2 Reliability Statistics.

Table- 2 Reliability Statistics

Cronbach's Alpha	Cronbach's Alpha Based on Standardized Items	N of Items
.775	.723	18

Table 3 Computation of ANOVA based on respondents age

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Social_Media_Browse_Frequency	Between Groups	20.189	3	6.730	1.585	.216
	Within Groups	114.650	27	4.246		
	Total	134.839	30			
Media_Time_Spent	Between Groups	.619	3	.206	.492	.691
	Within Groups	11.317	27	.419		
	Total	11.935	30			

Media_Intraction	Between Groups	10.933	3	3.644	.643	.594
	Within Groups	153.067	27	5.669		
	Total	164.000	30			
SMI_Purchase_Lag	Between Groups	13.888	3	4.629	1.488	.240
	Within Groups	83.983	27	3.110		
	Total	97.871	30			
Amount_Purchase_Online_Books	Between Groups	.150	3	.050	.063	.977
	Within Groups	4.750	6	.792		
	Total	4.900	9			
Amount_Purchase_Online_Electronics	Between Groups	2.603	3	.868	1.266	.343
	Within Groups	6.167	9	.685		
	Total	8.769	12			
Amount_Purchase_Online_Computer	Between Groups	1.000	1	1.000	1.000	.423
	Within Groups	2.000	2	1.000		
	Total	3.000	3			
Amount_Purchase_Online_Mobiles	Between Groups	.276	3	.092	.584	.641
	Within Groups	1.417	9	.157		
	Total	1.692	12			
Amount_Purchase_Online_Baby_n_Kids	Between Groups	.750	1	.750	.750	.478
	Within Groups	2.000	2	1.000		
	Total	2.750	3			
Amount_Purchase_Online_Sports_n_Fitness	Between Groups	.700	3	.233	.467	.761
	Within Groups	.500	1	.500		
	Total	1.200	4			
Amount_Purchase_Instore_Day_to_Day_Usage_items	Between Groups	1.952	3	.651	.597	.634
	Within Groups	8.714	8	1.089		
	Total	10.667	11			
Amount_Purchase_Instore_Books	Between Groups	2.667	2	1.333	1.500	.354
	Within Groups	2.667	3	.889		
	Total	5.333	5			
Amount_Purchase_Instore_Electronics	Between Groups	.762	3	.254	1.143	.458
	Within Groups	.667	3	.222		

Amount_Purchase_Instore_Computer	Between Groups	2.700	3	.900	1.800	.490
	Within Groups	.500	1	.500		
	Total	3.200	4			
Amount_Purchase_Instore_Mobiles	Between Groups	.000	1	.000	.	.
	Within Groups	.000	3	.000		
	Total	.000	4			
Amount_Purchase_Instore_Baby_n_Kids	Between Groups	.667	1	.667	.333	.667
	Within Groups	2.000	1	2.000		
	Total	2.667	2			
Amount_Purchase_Instore_Sports_n_Fitness	Between Groups	.750	2	.375	.188	.853
	Within Groups	2.000	1	2.000		
	Total	2.750	3			
SMI_Product_Discovery	Between Groups	5.772	3	1.924	1.481	.242
	Within Groups	35.067	27	1.299		
	Total	40.839	30			

Table 4 Computation of ANOVA based on respondents profession

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Social_Media_Browse_Frequency	Between Groups	8.160	2	4.080	.902	.417
	Within Groups	126.679	28	4.524		
	Total	134.839	30			
Media_Time_Spent	Between Groups	.185	2	.093	.221	.803
	Within Groups	11.750	28	.420		
	Total	11.935	30			
Media_Intraction	Between Groups	.000	2	.000	.000	1.000
	Within Groups	164.000	28	5.857		
	Total	164.000	30			

SMI_Purchase_Lag	Between Groups	6.014	2	3.007	.917	.412
	Within Groups	91.857	28	3.281		
	Total	97.871	30			
Amount_Purchase_Online_Electronics	Between Groups	1.853	1	1.853	2.946	.114
	Within Groups	6.917	11	.629		
	Total	8.769	12			
Amount_Purchase_Online_Baby_n_Kids	Between Groups	.750	1	.750	.750	.478
	Within Groups	2.000	2	1.000		
	Total	2.750	3			
Amount_Purchase_Online_Sports_n_Fitness	Between Groups	.200	1	.200	.600	.495
	Within Groups	1.000	3	.333		
	Total	1.200	4			
Amount_Purchase_Instore_Day_to_Day_Usage_items	Between Groups	2.167	2	1.083	1.147	.360
	Within Groups	8.500	9	.944		
	Total	10.667	11			
Amount_Purchase_Instore_Computer	Between Groups	2.450	1	2.450	9.800	.052
	Within Groups	.750	3	.250		
	Total	3.200	4			
SMI_Product_Discovery	Between Groups	1.089	2	.544	.383	.685
	Within Groups	39.750	28	1.420		
	Total	40.839	30			

Table 5 Computation of ANOVA based on respondents education

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Social_Media_Browse_Frequency	Between Groups	1.638	1	1.638	.357	.555
	Within Groups	133.201	29	4.593		
	Total	134.839	30			
Media_Time_Spent	Between Groups	.243	1	.243	.603	.444
	Within Groups	11.692	29	.403		
	Total	11.935	30			

Media_Intraction	Between Groups	.530	1	.530	.094	.761
	Within Groups	163.470	29	5.637		
	Total	164.000	30			
SMI_Purchase_Lag	Between Groups	2.294	1	2.294	.696	.411
	Within Groups	95.577	29	3.296		
	Total	97.871	30			
Amount_Purchase_Online_Books	Between Groups	.817	1	.817	1.600	.242
	Within Groups	4.083	8	.510		
	Total	4.900	9			
Amount_Purchase_Online_Electronics	Between Groups	.769	1	.769	1.058	.326
	Within Groups	8.000	11	.727		
	Total	8.769	12			
Amount_Purchase_Online_Computer	Between Groups	.333	1	.333	.250	.667
	Within Groups	2.667	2	1.333		
	Total	3.000	3			
Amount_Purchase_Online_Mobiles	Between Groups	.192	1	.192	1.410	.260
	Within Groups	1.500	11	.136		
	Total	1.692	12			
Amount_Purchase_Online_Baby_n_Kids	Between Groups	.750	1	.750	.750	.478
	Within Groups	2.000	2	1.000		
	Total	2.750	3			
Amount_Purchase_Online_Sports_n_Fitness	Between Groups	.033	1	.033	.086	.789
	Within Groups	1.167	3	.389		
	Total	1.200	4			
Amount_Purchase_Instore_Day_to_Day_Usage_items	Between Groups	.000	1	.000	.000	1.000
	Within Groups	10.667	10	1.067		
	Total	10.667	11			
Amount_Purchase_Instore_Books	Between Groups	.533	1	.533	.444	.541
	Within Groups	4.800	4	1.200		
	Total	5.333	5			
Amount_Purchase_Instore_Electronics	Between Groups	.095	1	.095	.357	.576
	Within Groups	1.333	5	.267		
	Total	1.429	6			
Amount_Purchase_Instore_Computer	Between Groups	1.200	1	1.200	1.800	.272
	Within Groups	2.000	3	.667		

Amount_Purchase_Instore_Mobiles	Between Groups	.000	1	.000	.	.
	Within Groups	.000	3	.000		
	Total	.000	4			
Amount_Purchase_Instore_Baby_n_Kids	Between Groups	.667	1	.667	.333	.667
	Within Groups	2.000	1	2.000		
	Total	2.667	2			
Amount_Purchase_Instore_Sports_n_Fitness	Between Groups	.750	1	.750	.750	.478
	Within Groups	2.000	2	1.000		
	Total	2.750	3			
SMI_Product_Discovery	Between Groups	4.031	1	4.031	3.176	.085
	Within Groups	36.808	29	1.269		
	Total	40.839	30			

Table 6 Computation of ANOVA based on respondents gender

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Social_Media_Browse_Frequency	Between Groups	7.116	1	7.116	1.616	.214
	Within Groups	127.722	29	4.404		
	Total	134.839	30			
Media_Time_Spent	Between Groups	.845	1	.845	2.208	.148
	Within Groups	11.091	29	.382		
	Total	11.935	30			
Media_Intraction	Between Groups	.157	1	.157	.028	.869
	Within Groups	163.843	29	5.650		
	Total	164.000	30			
SMI_Purchase_Lag	Between Groups	.028	1	.028	.008	.929
	Within Groups	97.843	29	3.374		
	Total	97.871	30			
Amount_Purchase_Online_Books	Between Groups	.067	1	.067	.110	.748
	Within Groups	4.833	8	.604		
	Total	4.900	9			

Amount_Purchase_Online_Electronics	Between Groups	.369	1	.369	.484	.501
	Within Groups	8.400	11	.764		
	Total	8.769	12			
Amount_Purchase_Online_Computer	Between Groups	.333	1	.333	.250	.667
	Within Groups	2.667	2	1.333		
	Total	3.000	3			
Amount_Purchase_Online_Mobiles	Between Groups	.192	1	.192	1.410	.260
	Within Groups	1.500	11	.136		
	Total	1.692	12			
Amount_Purchase_Online_Baby_n_Kids	Between Groups	.750	1	.750	.750	.478
	Within Groups	2.000	2	1.000		
	Total	2.750	3			
Amount_Purchase_Online_Sports_n_Fitness	Between Groups	.200	1	.200	.600	.495
	Within Groups	1.000	3	.333		
	Total	1.200	4			
Amount_Purchase_Instore_Day_to_Day_Usage_items	Between Groups	1.333	1	1.333	1.429	.260
	Within Groups	9.333	10	.933		
	Total	10.667	11			
Amount_Purchase_Instore_Books	Between Groups	.133	1	.133	.103	.765
	Within Groups	5.200	4	1.300		
	Total	5.333	5			
Amount_Purchase_Instore_Electronics	Between Groups	.095	1	.095	.357	.576
	Within Groups	1.333	5	.267		
	Total	1.429	6			
Amount_Purchase_Instore_Computer	Between Groups	.450	1	.450	.491	.534
	Within Groups	2.750	3	.917		
	Total	3.200	4			
Amount_Purchase_Instore_Mobiles	Between Groups	.000	1	.000	.	.
	Within Groups	.000	3	.000		
	Total	.000	4			
SMI_Product_Discovery	Between Groups	2.192	1	2.192	1.645	.210
	Within Groups	38.646	29	1.333		
	Total	40.839	30			

Table 7 Computation of ANOVA based on respondents income

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Social_Media_Browse_Frequency	Between Groups	10.089	4	2.522	.526	.718
	Within Groups	124.750	26	4.798		
	Total	134.839	30			
Media_Time_Spent	Between Groups	1.271	4	.318	.775	.552
	Within Groups	10.665	26	.410		
	Total	11.935	30			
Media_Intraction	Between Groups	20.019	4	5.005	.904	.476
	Within Groups	143.981	26	5.538		
	Total	164.000	30			
SMI_Purchase_Lag	Between Groups	21.294	4	5.324	1.807	.158
	Within Groups	76.577	26	2.945		
	Total	97.871	30			
Amount_Purchase_Online_Books	Between Groups	4.400	4	1.100	11.000	.011
	Within Groups	.500	5	.100		
	Total	4.900	9			
Amount_Purchase_Online_Electronics	Between Groups	2.769	4	.692	.923	.496
	Within Groups	6.000	8	.750		
	Total	8.769	12			
Amount_Purchase_Online_Computer	Between Groups	3.000	2	1.500	.	.
	Within Groups	.000	1	.000		
	Total	3.000	3			
Amount_Purchase_Online_Mobiles	Between Groups	.276	4	.069	.389	.811
	Within Groups	1.417	8	.177		
	Total	1.692	12			
Amount_Purchase_Online_Baby_n_Kids	Between Groups	2.250	2	1.125	2.250	.426
	Within Groups	.500	1	.500		
	Total	2.750	3			
Amount_Purchase_Online_Sports_n_Fitness	Between Groups	.700	3	.233	.467	.761
	Within Groups	.500	1	.500		
	Total	1.200	4			
Amount_Purchase_Instore_Day_to_Day_Usage_items	Between Groups	6.750	4	1.688	3.016	.096
	Within Groups	3.917	7	.560		
	Total	10.667	11			
Amount_Purchase_Instore_Books	Between Groups	4.833	3	1.611	6.444	.137
	Within Groups	.500	2	.250		
	Total	5.333	5			
Amount_Purchase_Instore_Electronics	Between Groups	.929	4	.232	.929	.577
	Within Groups	.500	2	.250		
	Total	1.429	6			
Amount_Purchase_Instore_Computer	Between Groups	2.700	3	.900	1.800	.490
	Within Groups	.500	1	.500		
	Total	3.200	4			
Amount_Purchase_Instore_Mobiles	Between Groups	.000	2	.000	.	.
	Within Groups	.000	2	.000		
	Total	.000	4			
Amount_Purchase_Instore_Baby_n_Kids	Between Groups	2.667	2	1.333	.	.
	Within Groups	.000	0	.		
	Total	2.667	2			
Amount_Purchase_Instore_Sports_n_Fitness	Between Groups	2.750	3	.917	.	.
	Within Groups	.000	0	.		
	Total	2.750	3			
SMI_Product_Discovery	Between Groups	6.174	4	1.544	1.158	.352
	Within Groups	34.665	26	1.333		
	Total	40.839	30			

FINDINGS AND CONCLUSION

- Effect of Age of Gender : All the P value is greater than 0.05 for all the parameters except Social media information. Therefore the Null hypothesis is accepted for and we find that there is no impact of Age on the various parameters of social media on consumer buying behaviour for factor such as browse frequency on the social media, browse time on social medium, social media interaction by the consumer, lag in purchase after social media interaction, social media interaction type, amount purchased.
- Effect of profession: All the P value is greater than 0.05 for all the parameters except social media information elicited factor. therefore the null hypothesis is accepted and we found that there is no impact of profession on the various parameters of social media on consumer buying behaviour.
- Effect of Education: All the P value is greater than 0.05 for all the parameters except Social media information factor. Therefore the Null hypothesis is accepted and we find that there is no impact of education of respondents on the various parameters of Social media on consumer buying behaviour .
- Effect of Income : All the P value is greater than 0.05 for all the parameters except Social media information therefore the Null hypothesis is accepted and we find that there is no impact of income on the various parameters of Social media engagement on consumer buying behaviour .
- Effect of Gender : All the P value is greater than 0.05 for all the parameters except Social media information factor. Therefore the Null hypothesis is accepted and we find that there is no impact of gender on the various parameters of Social media engagement on consumer buying behaviour .
- There appears a consistent indication based on the assessment of social media factors by studying their impact by 5 independent demographic variables. There seems to be no effect of demographic factors on the type of interaction which users does with social media or makes purchases after accessing it.

REFERENCES

Agrawal, J. and. Kamakura, W. A (1995), "The Electronic Worth of Celebrity Endorsers: An Event Study Analysis, "*Journal of Marketing*, 59 (July), 56-62.

Ahluwalia, R, Robert B, and Unnava, H. (2000),"Consumer Response to Negative Publicity: The Moderating Role of Commitment," *Journal of Marketing Research*, 37(May), 203-214.

Berger, Jonah, Alan T. Sorensen, and Scott J. Rasmussen (2010), "Positive Effects of Negative Publicity: When Negative Reviews Increase Sales," *Marketing Science*, 29 (5), 815-27.

Brodie, R. J., Hollebeek, L. D., Jurić, B., & Ilić, A. (2011). Customer Engagement: Conceptual domain, fundamental preposition and implication of research, *Journal of Service Research*, 14(3), 252-271.

Bowden, J. L.-H. (2009). "The Process of Customer Engagement: a Conceptual Framework". *Journal of Marketing Theory & Practice*, 17(1), 63-74.

Cheung, C. M. K., Lee, M. K. O., and Rabjohn, N. (2008). "The impact of electronic word of-mouth: The adoption of online opinions in online customer communities". *Internet Research*, 18(3), 229-247.

Cheong, H. J., and Morrison, M. A. (2008). "Consumers' reliance on product information and recommendations found in UGC" . *Journal of Interactive Advertising*, 8 (2), 38-49.

Chevalier, Judith A. and Dina Mayzlin (2006), "The Effect of Word of Mouth on Sales: Online Book Reviews," *Journal of Marketing Research*, 43 (August), 345-54.

Chu,S.C. and Kim,Y.(2011). "Determinants of Consumer engagement in electronic word of mouth (eWOM) in social networking sites" . *International Journal of Advertising*, 30(1), 47–75.

Dickey, I. J., and Lewis, W. F. (2011). "An Overview of Digital Media and Advertising," *Information Science Reference*, 1-31.

Daugherty, T., Eastin, M. S., and Bright, L. (2008). "Exploring consumer motivations for creating user-generated content". *Journal of Interactive Advertising*, 8 (2), 16 25. Edwards, S. M. (2011)."A social media mindset". *Journal of Interactive Advertising*, 12 (1), 1-3.

Elberse, Anita (2007), "The Power of Stars: Do Star Actors Drive the Success of Movies?" *Journal of Marketing*, 71 (October), 102-120.

Flanagin, A. J., Metzger, M. J., Pure, R., & Markov, A. (2011). User-generated ratings and the evaluation of credibility and product quality in ecommerce transactions. *Proceedings of the 44th Hawaii International Conference of System Sciences*, pp. 1-10. ACM Digital Library.

Imran Mir and Arshad Zaheer (2012). "Verification of social impact theory claims in social media context". *Journal of Internet Banking and Commerce*, 17, no. 1 pp1-15

Jonas, J. R. O. (2010)."Source credibility of company-produced and user generated content on the internet: an exploratory study on the Filipino youth". *Philippine Management Review*, 17, 121-132.

Jones, E., Busch, P., and Dacin, P. (2003). "Firm Market Orientation and Salesperson Customer Orientation: Interpersonal and Intrapersonal Influences on Customer Service and Retention in Business-to-Business Buyer-Seller Relationships". *Journal of Business Research*, 56(4), 323-340.

Kaplan Andreas M., Haenlein Michael (2010). "Users of the world, unite! The challenges and opportunities of social media". *Business Horizons* 53 (1). pp. 59-68.

Kietzmann, J. H., Hermkens,K., McCarthy, I. P., and Silvestre, B. S. (2011). "Social media? Get serious! Understanding the functional building blocks of social media". *Business Horizons* 54 (3): 241–251.

Latane, B. (1981)."The Psychology of Social Impact". *American Psychologist*, 36(4), 343-356.

Marshall, G.W, Moncrieff,W.C. , John M. Rudd, and Nick Lee (2012). "Revolution in Sales: The impact of Social media and Related technology on the Selling environment". *Journal of Personal Selling & Sales Management,* 32,(3), 349–363

Metzger, M.J., Flanagin, A.J. and Medders, R.B. (2010). "Social and heuristic approaches to credibility evaluation online". *Journal of Communication* , 60, 413- 439.

Muntinga, D. G., Moorman, M. and Smit, E. G. (2011). "Introducing COBRAs: Exploring motivations for brand-related social media use". *International Journal of Advertising*, 30(1),13-46.

Nowak, A., Szamrejand, J., and Latane, B. (1990). "From Private Attitude to Public Opinion: A Dynamic Theory of Social Impact". *Psychological Review*, 97 (3), 362-376.

Nunnaly, J. (1978). *Psychometric theory*. New York: McGraw-Hill

O'Reilly, K., and Marx, S. (2011). "How young, technical consumers assess online WOM credibility". *Qualitative Market Research: An International Journal*, 14 (4), 330-359.

Sun, S-Y., Ju, T. L., Chumg, H-F., Wu, C-Y., and Chao, P-J. (2009). "Influence on Willingness of Virtual Community's Knowledge Sharing: Based on Social Capital Theory and Habitual Domain". *World Academy of Science, Engineering and Technology*, 53, 142-149.

Swedowsky, M. (2009). "Improving Customer Experience by Listening and Responding to Social Media. Retrieved September 8, 2013, from http://blog.nielsen.com/ nielsenwire/consumer/improving-customer-experienceby-listening- and-responding-to-social-media/

Trusov, Michael, Randolph Bucklin, and Koen Pauwels (2009), "Effects of Word-of-Mouth Versus Traditional Marketing: Findings from an Internet Social Networking Site," *Journal of Marketing* , 73 (September), 90-102.

Williams, K.D. and Williams, K.B. (1989). "Impact of source strength on two compliance techniques" *Basic and Applied Social Psychology*, 10(2), 149-159.

CU Global Management Review
Volume 6, Issue 1, January-June, 2017, pp. 58-68

Impact of Marketing Strategies on Performance of a Firm: A Competitive Analysis

***Divya Goswami**
S.A. Jain (P.G.) College, Ambala City. (HRY)

Abstract

Consumer purchasing decision making has been of great interest to researchers and practitioners for improving strategic marketing policies and gaining a competitive advantage in the market. Marketing strategy has been a focus of organizations and a tool for attaining overall firm performance. Our study contributes to the existing study of marketing strategy by supporting a relationship between marketing strategy factors and overall firm performance. Promotion, pricing, distribution, and product standardization and adaptation have an impact on sales, customer and financial performance of firms. The study suggests that the impact is mediated by marketing strategy implementation success. At the same time the impact of moderating factors of product homogeneity, stage of product life cycle and competitive intensity are present.

Key words: Marketing strategy, marketing mix, marketing strategy implementation success, firm performance

Introduction

Marketing is one of the most significant factors of the business. For outperforming competition and taking accurate marketing decision, every company requires good marketing knowledge. The organisation's product positioning and services depend on the performance and implementation of intellectual and good strategic plans (Chicagoexec, 2011).

In the present era, market has become highly competitive. In this competitive market, a strategy is needed to offer product or service which will do better than the competition. The marketing strategy must be executed by a proper methodology. To create a marketing strategy for business a company should think about the following factors.When the market is attractive and the company is holding a strong position in that particular industry, then it must invest the best resources for supporting the offering. But if the company is not in a good position then it must focus on strengthening the company first.When the market is not that attractive and the company is holding a strong position in any industry, then the company should offer effective sales and marketing effort for creating good profit. Furthermore, in either case where company is not too strong then it should promote those offerings which will prove most profitable for business.

A marketing strategy is a method by which a firm attempts to reach its target markets. Marketing strategy starts with market research, in which needs and attitudes and