

Social Media Marketing and Youth Buying Behavior: A Study of Influencing Factors in Coimbatore

DR. M.S. RANJITH KUMAR

Professor and Head, Department of Commerce with Business Analytics, Dr. N.G.P. Arts and Science College, Coimbatore, Tamil Nadu, India.

Mr. THIRUMURUGAN.J

B. Com.BA., Dr. N.G.P Arts and Science College, Coimbatore

ABSTRACT

Online promotion through digital networks now shapes how products reach people. Because young adults spend so much time on apps like Instagram, YouTube, Facebook, and WhatsApp, what they see there often sways their choices. In Coimbatore - a growing hub for education and manufacturing - more teens and college students connect daily via phones and web access. The goal here is to explore what parts of these online efforts actually shift how youth in that area decide to buy things. Noticing how ads shape choices comes first. Awareness shifts when influencers speak up. Reviews posted online carry weight, especially among younger crowds. Engagement builds slowly through consistent brand presence. Special deals tend to spark short-term interest. Each piece connects - without one, the picture changes. Marketers in Coimbatore might rethink plans using these clues. Strategy grows clearer when real behavior guides it.

KEYWORDS

Social Media Marketing, Youth Buying Behavior, Influencer Marketing, Online Reviews, Digital Advertising, Purchase Intention, Coimbatore, Consumer Behavior

INTRODUCTION

Digital tech's quick rise changed how marketing works across the globe. Through social apps, companies now reach customers straight - sharing updates while growing trust over time. Young folks make up a large share online, often seeing more ads than older groups. Cities like Coimbatore see more youth on these networks due to expanding infrastructure, schools popping up, and better access to gadgets. What people choose to buy depends on how they pick, get, or use things. Eye-catching images online shift their choices slowly. Famous users sharing posts nudge decisions quietly. Friends' opinions matter more when seen on screens. Time-sensitive deals create small pushes at key moments.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Earlier research points to social media marketing having a strong effect on what people choose to buy. Not long ago, Kaplan and Haenlein noted how platforms allow back-and-forth dialogue between companies and customers. Trust tends to grow when influencers promote products their audience follows regularly. What others say online - comments, scores, feedback - influences how someone sees a product before deciding to get it. Special prices or deals posted publicly often spark quick buying choices, especially among younger users

- **Social Media Marketing Influences Youth Purchases**

Online sharing spaces mix old-style ads with word-of-mouth talk in new ways. Not long ago, researchers saw how people on these sites search for details while also making their own messages - this doubles a brand's reach. Backed by

fresh data, activities like voting games or fun challenges stick in younger minds, guiding what they choose to buy. Trust grows when real faces share honest thoughts on photo apps, especially if those voices feel down-to-earth. In India, picking products often ties less to need and more to who you know - or want to become.

- **Consumer Awareness and Local Context**

Knowing what's out there shapes how people buy, although knowing alone rarely seals the deal. Back in 2005, Jackson pointed out that even when folks understand eco-friendly or healthier picks, they still skip them regularly. Over in Coimbatore, more young shoppers notice ads popping up online, however cost worries, shaky confidence in those posts, and spotty access keep habits slow to change. According to Sharma's 2024 findings, city teens pay closer attention to digital campaigns now, though doubts about exaggerated promises plus weak delivery networks block real movement. So while recognition climbs, everyday hurdles stop social media pushes from fully steering purchases among local youth.

- **BUSINESSES AND INSTITUTION'S ROLE**

Younger crowds in Coimbatore are drawing business attention through social media pushes. Still, it is uncertain how much those efforts actually sway buying choices. Without solid backing from organizations, clear messaging, or rewards, green habits might crawl forward - so says UNEP in 2023. On a related note, findings by Martínez-Acosta and team the same year suggest schools and local initiatives could help shape mindful spending and smarter online behavior in young people. What sways young shoppers in Coimbatore? Not just ads or deals, but also what influencers say. Reviews matter too, often more than brands expect. For smarter plans, knowing these details helps a lot. Each voice adds something different to the mix. That is why research close to the ground works better here. Local habits shape choices in ways big surveys miss.

SUMMARY OF LITERATURE

What young people buy often ties back to how brands interact with them online. Studies found that when companies use things like polls or quizzes, it makes their names stick more easily in memory - Gupta and Sharma noted this in 2022. Instead of just ads, real connections form through shared experiences. Peer pressure plays a role too; Kumar and Singh pointed out that dreams of certain lifestyles push choices, especially if friends approve. Social platforms let users look up info while also posting opinions - Mangold and Faulds called this mix powerful for spreading messages worldwide. From clicking to sharing, each move adds weight to what gets bought. Backed by Djafarova and Trofimenco in 2019, Instagram influencers hold real sway because they come across as genuine - this honesty builds connection with younger users. Because of how platforms link people, what teens choose often ties back to shared experiences, friends' choices, alongside voices they view as trustworthy online.

RESEARCH GAP

While plenty of research looks at how social media affects buying habits, few dive into how young people in Coimbatore are influenced. Most past work zooms out to countrywide or global patterns, skipping what happens closer to home. In this city, the mix of influencer posts, ads, customer feedback, and discounts hasn't gotten much attention. Because life here carries its own rhythm - shaped by local customs, connections, and income levels - the way teens react might stand apart. It's hard to know how all these factors work together without real data. That's why research focused on Coimbatore's young shoppers matters - patterns there might surprise us.

PROBLEM STATEMENT

Younger crowds in Coimbatore catch attention through screens, so companies shift focus online. Yet even with more money spent on posts and ads, results stay unclear. What sways choices? Maybe a trusted voice, maybe a deal too good to skip. Some trust peer opinions; others click because of flashier visuals. Influence hides in small moments - a comment,

a like, a shared post. Not every campaign sticks. But those that do often tap into daily habits. Real talk matters more than polished slogans. When messages feel lived-in, they land differently. Local brands starting there might just find firmer ground.

OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

- To study the socio-economic profile of youth respondents and its association with their social media usage and buying behavior. (e.g. NAME, AGE, GENDER)
- To examine the factors influencing social media usage among youth. (e.g., how it takes the time of the users)
- To analyze the factors shaping youth perception of social media marketing.
- To investigate the factors affecting youth purchasing behavior in relation to social media marketing.

METHODOLOGY

A look into how young people shop in Coimbatore shapes the core of this work. From 130 individuals, answers came through fixed-format questions meant to keep replies uniform. Getting hold of participants happened quickly thanks to accessible routes, yet that method might miss wider patterns. Ideas from published articles, written works, and trusted web sources helped back up key concepts. To spot common threads, numbers got processed with methods focusing on proportions. Finding links across data points came through chi-square testing, whereas summaries highlighted main trends. In combination, such approaches delivered numbers that tell a story along with background understanding.

SCOPE

This work looks only at a specific group, drawn from one area during set years, zeroing in on what matters most to the goals. What helps shape findings are the methods and instruments used, though wider forces stay outside the frame. Narrow limits allow clearer insight into the topic, forming groundwork others might build on later.

ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION

Socio economic Factors	Level of Satisfaction		Total	Chi-square test
	Low	High		
Age				
15-18	15(16%)	8(9%)	23(25%)	X ² = 4.580 DF=3 Sig.=.205
19-22	21(23%)	9(10%)	30(33%)	
23-26	11(12%)	12(13%)	23(25%)	
27 and above	7(8%)	9(10%)	16(17%)	
Total	54(59%)	38(41%)	92(100%)	
Gender				
Male	27(29%)	21(23%)	48(52%)	X ² = .248 DF=1 Sig.=.619
Female	27(29%)	17(18%)	44(48%)	
Total	54(59%)	38(41%)	92(100%)	
Educational Qualification				
Secondary or below	21(23%)	13(14%)	34(37%)	X ² = 4.446 DF=3 Sig.=.217
Undergraduate	16(17%)	11(11%)	27(29%)	
Postgraduate	17(18%)	11(11%)	28(30%)	
Other	1(1%)	2(2%)	3(3%)	

Total	55(59%)	37(38%)	92(100%)	
Monthly income				
Below ₹10,000	19(21%)	4(4%)	23(25%)	X ² = 10.103 DF=3 Sig.=.018
10,000–₹20,000	8(9%)	10(11%)	18(20%)	
20,001–₹30,000	11(12%)	15(16%)	26(28%)	
Above ₹30,000	16(17%)	9(10%)	25(27%)	
Total	54(59%)	38(41%)	92(100%)	
Family Members				
1-2 members	18(20%)	5(5%)	23(25%)	X ² = 6.603 DF=3 Sig.=.086
2-4 members	15(16%)	10(11%)	25(27%)	
4-6 members	11(12%)	15(16%)	26(28%)	
more than 6 members	10(11%)	8(9%)	18(20%)	
Total	54(59%)	38(41%)	92(100%)	
Residence				
Urban	16(17%)	11(12%)	27(29%)	X ² = .506 DF=3 Sig.=.918
Semi-Urban	15(16%)	9(10%)	24(26%)	
Rural	12(13%)	8(8%)	20(22%)	
Metro city	11(12%)	10(11%)	21(23%)	
Total	54(59%)	38(41%)	92(100%)	

The chi-square analysis shows that most socio-economic factors such as age, gender, education, family size, and residence do not have a statistically significant relationship with youth satisfaction levels, as their p-values are above 0.05. Age groups displayed varied satisfaction, but the differences were not strong enough to be significant. Similarly, gender and educational qualification showed balanced distributions, indicating no major influence on satisfaction. Family size and type of residence also did not reveal meaningful differences in satisfaction levels. However, monthly income emerged as a significant factor ($p = 0.018$), suggesting that income levels strongly affect satisfaction with social media marketing influences. Youth with higher income categories tended to report greater satisfaction compared to lower-income groups. This finding highlight income as the most critical socio-economic determinant of satisfaction in the study.

ANNOVA

ANOVA						
I. SOCIO-ECONOMIC PROFILE		Sum Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1.1 Age	Between Groups	15.237	26	.586	.455	.986
	Within Groups	83.632	65	1.287		
	Total	98.870	91			
1.2 Gender	Between Groups	5.009	26	.193	.698	.845
	Within Groups	17.948	65	.276		
	Total	22.957	91			
	Between Groups	16.193	26	.623	.700	.842
	Within Groups	57.807	65	.889		

1.3 Education Level	Total	74.000	91			
1.4 Monthly Income	Between Groups	28.664	26	1.102	.798	.734
	Within Groups	89.804	65	1.382		
	Total	118.467	91			
1.5 Family Members	Between Groups	32.330	26	1.243	1.120	.347
	Within Groups	72.137	65	1.110		
	Total	104.467	91			
1.6 Residence	Between Groups	36.379	26	1.399	1.119	.349
	Within Groups	81.306	65	1.251		
	Total	117.685	91			

The ANOVA analysis reveals that none of the socio-economic variables tested—age, gender, education level, monthly income, family members, or residence—show statistically significant differences in satisfaction levels, as all significance values are greater than 0.05. Age, gender, and education produced very high p-values, indicating negligible variation across groups. Monthly income, though slightly varied, did not reach statistical significance in this test, contrasting with the chi-square results where income showed influence. Family size and residence also failed to demonstrate meaningful differences in satisfaction outcomes. This suggests that satisfaction levels among youth remain relatively consistent across socio-economic categories. The lack of significant variation implies that other factors beyond socio-economic background may be more decisive in shaping satisfaction. Overall, the ANOVA results reinforce the idea that socio-economic characteristics alone do not strongly determine youth responses to social media marketing in Coimbatore.

MAJOR FINDINGS

- Young people in Coimbatore now look to social media when deciding what to buy. Instead of ads on TV or posters, they pay attention to posts that spark comments and shares. Friends’ opinions matter more than before, guiding choices quietly. Trusted personalities online weigh in too - sometimes tipping the balance. What counts today is connection, not just promotion.
- Satisfaction didn’t shift much with age, whether someone was male or female, how many years they spent in school, how big their household was, or where they lived. Younger people gave similar answers no matter which group they fell into. That pattern hints - without proving - that what you buy isn’t tightly tied to your social or economic starting point.
- Satisfaction levels shifted noticeably when monthly pay entered the picture. Those bringing in more money tended to view social media ads more favorably. Money in hand often meant a higher chance of buying what was promoted online.
- Even though plenty of research explores social media marketing worldwide, little has looked closely at Coimbatore. Because cultural traits and local habits can shift how young people react, broad findings might miss the mark here. That reality pushes attention toward insights rooted directly in this setting
- Firms spend big on social campaigns, yet how teens respond stays fuzzy. What moves them - promotions, ratings, personalities, or deals - is still a puzzle. Spotting those triggers sharpens tactics without wasting effort nearby.

SUGGESTIONS

- One reason this work focuses on Coimbatore's young shoppers is how clearly their choices show up when not influenced by outside changes. Because nothing gets altered during observation, habits appear just as they are. What stands out is the way actions link together naturally, giving a full picture. Since the method skips interference, what people do stays genuine. Seeing trends unfold as they happen adds weight to each finding.
- From 130 young people, answers came through a fixed set of questions. Because everyone faced the same format, replies lined up neatly. That setup opened space for clear patterns to show. Though not huge, the group gave a fair snapshot of how youth in the area tend to see things.
- Getting people for the study happened through practical choices, not random picks. Even though that made things faster, the results might not reflect everyone equally well. Still, what came out of it helped understand key parts of the intended group clearly.
- From journals, books, and trustworthy websites came the secondary data. Because they exist, the study's theory stands on firmer ground. When local results show up, wider research helps make sense of them.
- Looking at percentages showed the main shifts in the gathered answers. Through this method, replies took shape as straightforward numbers. A clearer picture of how views were spread came through naturally.
- Looking at the data, basic summaries showed main trends clearly. Instead of just totals, typical values and how often things appeared gave a clearer picture. These methods brought numbers to life while keeping meaning grounded in real responses.

CONCLUSION

It turns out young shoppers in Coimbatore pay close attention to what they see on social media, yet how much it sways them depends on several things. Not surprisingly, traits like age or where someone lives don't really change how satisfied they feel about these ads. What does make a difference is how much money comes in each month - spending power clearly shapes choices. Even when promotions catch their eye, some remain unsure if they can trust them, especially if prices seem too high or access feels limited. While online outreach grabs attention, real results may come down to building trust, offering fair pricing, and speaking directly to local tastes. Behind every click lies a mix of doubt, desire, and dollars.

REFERANCES

1. Mandal, B. K. (2025). *The Role of Social Media Marketing in Consumer Buying Behaviour in India*. International Journal of Global Research Innovations & Technology (IJGRIT), 3(1), 168–172.
2. Kaur, H. (2024). *The Influence of Social Media Influencers on the Buying Behaviour of Youth: A Study of Emerging Consumer Trends*. Baba Farid College of Technology and Management.
3. Resmi, R., & Kalani, M. (2025). *The Effects of Social Media Marketing on the Buying Behaviour of Youth in India*. International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research and Growth Evaluation, 6(2), 1521–1532.
4. Djafarova, E., & Trofimenko, O. (2019). *'Instafamous' – credibility and self-presentation of micro-celebrities on social media*. Computers in Human Behavior, 91, 24–34.
5. Gupta, A., & Sharma, R. (2022). *Impact of Interactive Social Media Content on Youth Engagement*. Journal of Marketing Research in India, 14(3), 45–56.
6. Mangold, W. G., & Faulds, D. J. (2009). *Social media: The new hybrid element of the promotion mix*. Business Horizons, 52(4), 357–365.

7. Kumar, P., & Singh, R. (2021). *Youth Aspirations and Social Media Marketing in India*. Indian Journal of Marketing, 51(2), 32–41.
8. Sharma, S. (2024). *Consumer Awareness and Social Media Promotions in Urban India*. Journal of Consumer Studies, 18(1), 77–89.
9. Sinha, R. (2024). *Health Consciousness and Organic Choices among Urban Youth*. Journal of Sustainable Consumption, 12(2), 101–115
10. Kumar, A., & Rozy, M. (2024). *Barriers to Social Media Adoption in Developing Regions*. International Journal of Business and Management, 19(3), 88–97.
11. Martínez-Acosta, R., et al. (2023). *Educational Institutions and Community Programs for Sustainable Consumption*. Journal of Environmental Education, 34(2), 56–70.
12. UNEP. (2023). *Policy Support for Sustainable Consumption Practices*. United Nations Environment Programme Report.
13. Tukker, A., et al. (2014). *Sustainable Consumption and Production: An Agenda for Action*. Journal of Cleaner Production, 63, 1–8.
14. Purushothaman, K. (2025). *Eco-Friendly Production Methods in the Food Industry*. International Journal of Sustainable Development, 22(1), 14–25.
15. Jackson, T. (2005). *Motivating Sustainable Consumption: A Review of Evidence on Consumer Behaviour*. Sustainable Development Research Network