

Role Of Social Media Marketing Influencers In Influencing Customer Intentions.

Dr. Disha Mathur^{1*}, Ms. Bhavika Paliwal²

^{1*} Associate Professor, Sir Padampat Singhanian University, Udaipur

² Research Scholar, Sir Padampat Singhanian University, Udaipur

How to cite this article: Disha Mathur, Bhavika Paliwal (2024). Role Of Social Media Marketing Influencers In Influencing Customer Intentions., Library Progress International, 44(3), 8160-8166

ABSTRACT

The aim of this study is to explore social media marketing influencers and their impact on consumer intentions (Entertainment, purchase, Information seeking). This study also analyses the mediating roles of social media presence and satisfaction. The participants in this study were experienced users of two social media platforms Facebook and Instagram in India. A self-administered questionnaire was used collect data from respondents. We used online influencer in inviting respondents to answer our questionnaire. This paper will take social media influencers activities as the main research object to explore the impact of use of social media short video marketing on consumers' brand attitude. Specifically, this paper divides social media marketing uses into five dimensions: Entertainment, purchase, satisfaction, Information seeking, social media presence. And measures the effects of these five variables in influencing consumers. Entertainment, purchase, satisfaction, Information seeking, social media presence are independent variable and consumer demographics as a dependent variable. SPSS was used to analyze the data collected from 593 questionnaires, and the following conclusions were drawn:

Keywords: Influencer marketing, consumer intentions, Social media marketing

INTRODUCTION

Influencers in general terms refers to anyone influencing decisions. Influencers can be an enterprise or a person whom people follow. In different categories, demographic profile and geographic region and culture. Taste and preference of public changes and so their influencer can be different. On a large scale influencers are celebrities, whom public follow and companies and brands advertise through them to sale their products. With the increase of use of social media, influencers from small regions are coming up and growing at a fast pace. Social media influencers are persons having a good number of followers. Now as these influencers are growing, we can see a trend of big companies approaching these influencers for marketing their products and services. And influencers work in collaboration with these business. But now the consumers are also becoming smarter and are understanding the concept of influencer marketing and are wisely using the social media. Now the task for companies to choose right influencer for a specific objective is becoming tough and businesses (local and brands) are facing problems such as defining objective, this includes what is the objective of influencer marketing. Is it giving information to customers (advertise), persuading them purchase (sales), social media presence (being active to know trends), after sales (feedback). In this paper, we are going to analyse the response of consumers to know how they see social media influencers so that it will be helpful for businesses to make target based objective. To begin examining this issue, this paper employs a review of the literature to categorise the findings of previous studies on social media influencers and consumer response. Allowing for the division of social media influencers marketing results into three categories: entertainment, information seeking, product purchase, social media presence and satisfaction. In order to confirm the impact of influencer marketing activities on consumers attitudes on social media, questionnaire surveys and mathematical statistical analysis were primarily used.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Given the increasing interest in virtual influencers, Suprawan & Pojanavatee (2022) look into the reasons behind social media users' interactions with these influencers. The research model was developed using the self-congruity theory as a basis. Data was gathered by sending questionnaires to social media users using judgmental sampling. After the questionnaire was distributed on social media, 230 responses were received. These were analysed using a covariance-based structural equation. When it came to influencer-brand fit, it was found that there was a weak direct effect on engagement but a little direct influence on mimicry desire. Engagement and the desire to imitate are directly and significantly impacted by value homophily. Additionally, value homophily was found to partially mediate the relationship

between virtual influencer, brand fit, and desire to mimic was fully mediated by brand fit and engagement. It was discovered that imitation desire did not significantly mediate the relationship between virtual influencer-brand fit and engagement. This study contributes to the field of influencer marketing by highlighting value homophily as the main factor explaining why consumers respond to a virtual influencer when used as a message source in marketing communication.

The study conducted by Irshad et al. (2020) revealed that customers' online purchasing intentions were positively influenced by compensation and social motives through both direct and indirect trust-mediated influences. However, trust acted as a complete mediating factor in the relationship between customers' intentions to make online purchases and their motivation for empowerment. Few studies have attempted to explain customers' trust in the context of social media marketing, based on the body of existing research.

Bala's (2014) paper investigates how social roles, which are more prone to dissolution when interpersonal communication occurs on public platforms, are being redefined by new media. Young people feel alienated in the real world among the hundreds of thousands of people they have made friends with on social media. The author comes to the conclusion that a new type of social order is emerging in the age of over communication, one that is strengthening mass and public communication while weakening interpersonal communication.

Using the theory of planned behaviour (henceforth referred to as TPB) (Ajzen, 1991) and social learning theory by Bandura and Walters (1963) as part of the qualitative research to identify key factors of influencer marketing that impact consumer behaviour, Chopra et.al. (2010) study sheds light on various aspects of influencer marketing that drive consumer behaviour. According to the study, peer influence had no effect on consumer behaviour, but attitudes towards influencers and perceived behaviour control that permits an increase in domain knowledge did. Perceived risk had no effect on behaviour, but three other constructs—personal relevance, inspiration, and trust—had a favourable effect. Customers considered product influencer fitment to be a crucial factor since they adhered to the particular influencer types for various product categories. Consumers are impacted at four different levels, depending on the posts shared by influencers: greater brand awareness, subject matter expertise, brand preference, and preference. The key to effective influencer marketing is finding the right kind of influencer who can curate stories, recommendations, and advice to engage the audience.

Liu et.al. (2019) study states that Brand attitudes are positively impacted by interesting content. Experience that is based in a scene positively affects brand attitude. Businesses that use short video marketing can give consumers a realistic scene that they can experience for themselves through intricately created life scenes and consumption scenes. Interaction with users that participate positively affects brand attitude. When businesses use short video marketing, they should encourage more users to take part in the production and imitation of short videos and encourage their frequent, friendly interaction with one another. The impact of short video marketing on brand attitude is partially mediated by brand perception. When businesses use short videos for marketing, they should fully take into account the visual and auditory perceptions of their target audience as well as the times and methods of brand exposure. They should also use engaging content and scene-based experiences to enhance the audience's perception of the brand and encourage a positive attitude towards it.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This section details research technique, methodology, design, instrument development, sampling strategy, and data collecting adopted in this paper, to give a transparent view.

Objectives

- To identify reasons of engagement of consumers on influencers marketing activities.
- To identify demographic segment largely influenced by influencer marketing activities.

Research design

First off, the Likert five-point rating scale—which includes Entertainment, purchase, satisfaction, Information seeking, social media presence. There are two steps in this section of the scale design: first, by conducting a thorough literature review and conducting interviews to obtain the scale questions. The multi-item questionnaire was further adjusted and improved, and a formal questionnaire will eventually be formed. The questionnaire is comprised of two parts: the first part contains the general demographic questions and second part includes likert scale questions on the 5 variables namely Entertainment, purchase, satisfaction, Information seeking and social media presence. Comparison of these 5 independent variables was done through One-way ANOVA by taking averages of respective variables with demographics. One sample t-test was used to test whether these variables actually has an effect on the population of interest, or whether two groups are different from one another. Other statistics like mean mode median gives more clarity about the responses of the target population.

ANALYSIS

Reasons of engagement of consumers on influencers marketing activities.

Consumers generally interact on the content of influencers on these 5 variables identified by us are Entertainment, purchase, satisfaction, Information seeking and social media presence. The results of the responses can be seen through the table: 1 Statistics

Table:1 Statistics

Statistics		AE	AIS	AP	AS	ASMP
N	Valid	593.00	593.00	593.00	593	593.00
	Missing	167.00	167.00	167.00	167	167.00
Mean		3.68	3.54	3.58	3.489	3.60
Median		3.83	3.86	3.83	3.800	3.83
Mode		3.83	3.86	3.50	4.0	3.50
Std. Deviation		0.78	0.82	0.81	0.8875	0.80
Variance		0.61	0.68	0.66	0.788	0.64
Range		3.33	3.14	3.33	3.4	3.33
Minimum		1.33	1.29	1.17	1.2	1.17
Maximum		4.67	4.43	4.50	4.6	4.50
Sum		2179.67	2097.00	2123.50	2068.8	2135.17

From the table we can see that the average of variable Entertainment have highest values ($M=3.68$, $SD=0.78$), followed by Average social media presence ($M=3.60$, $SD=0.80$), then average purchase ($M=3.58$, $SD=0.81$), then average information seeking ($M=3.54$, $SD=0.82$) and lastly average satisfaction ($M=3.489$, $S=0.8875$). so we can say that mostly consumers take marketing activities of influencers as an entertainment purpose.

Demographic segment largely influenced by influencer marketing activities.

For demographics we have taken Age, Gender, Working status and Monthly Income level of the respondents and these demographics will be compared with the variables identified by us Entertainment, purchase, satisfaction, Information seeking and social media presence through one-way ANOVA and finally t-test.

Table: 2.1 ONEWAY ANOVA Age, Gender, Working status and Monthly Income level BY Average entertainment.

ANOVA		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Age	Between Groups	54.251	16	3.391	2.725	0.000
	Within Groups	716.700	576	1.244		
	Total	770.951	592			
Gender	Between Groups	4.930	16	0.308	1.277	0.206
	Within Groups	139.020	576	0.241		
	Total	143.949	592			
Working status	Between Groups	8.719	16	0.545	0.961	0.499
	Within Groups	326.735	576	0.567		
	Total	335.454	592			
Monthly Income level	Between Groups	33.487	16	2.093	1.627	0.057
	Within Groups	740.945	576	1.286		
	Total	774.432	592			

From the table 2.1, we can see the values of p value for age, gender, working status and Monthly income level are 0.000, 0.206, 0.499 and 0.057 respectively. The values have p- values< 0.05, thus age is statistically significant and others are not statistically significant. Hence information seeking activity is influenced by Age factor only.

Table: 2.2 ONEWAY ANOVA Age, Gender, Working status and Monthly Income level BY Average Information seeking.

ANOVA		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Age	Between Groups	44.281	7	6.326	5.093	0.000
	Within Groups	726.671	585	1.242		
	Total	770.951	592			
Gender	Between Groups	2.724	7	0.389	1.612	0.129
	Within Groups	141.225	585	0.241		
	Total	143.949	592			
Working status	Between Groups	5.164	7	0.738	1.307	0.245
	Within Groups	330.290	585	0.565		
	Total	335.454	592			
Monthly Income level	Between Groups	39.753	7	5.679	4.522	0.000
	Within Groups	734.678	585	1.256		
	Total	774.432	592			

From the table 2.2, we can see the values of p value for age, gender, working status and Monthly income level are 0.000, 0.129, 0.245 and 0.000 respectively. The values of Age and Monthly income have p- values< 0.05, thus they are statistically significant and others are not statistically significant. Hence information seeking activity is influenced by Age factor and Monthly Income level.

Table: 2.3 ONEWAY ANOVA Age, Gender, Working status and Monthly Income level BY purchase.

ANOVA		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Age	Between Groups	86.331	7	12.333	10.538	0.000
	Within Groups	684.620	585	1.170		
	Total	770.951	592			
Gender	Between Groups	1.625	7	0.232	0.954	0.464
	Within Groups	142.325	585	0.243		
	Total	143.949	592			
Working status	Between Groups	3.550	7	0.507	0.894	0.511
	Within Groups	331.903	585	0.567		
	Total	335.454	592			
Monthly Income level	Between Groups	67.453	7	9.636	7.974	0.000
	Within Groups	706.979	585	1.209		
	Total	774.432	592			

From the table 2.3, we can see the values of p value for age, gender, working status and Monthly income level are 0.000, 0.464, 0.511 and 0.000 respectively. The values of Age and Monthly income have p- values< 0.05, thus they are statistically significant and others are not statistically significant. Hence satisfaction level of consumers after purchase is influenced by Age factor and Monthly Income level.

Table: 2.4 ONEWAY ANOVA Age, Gender, Working status and Monthly Income level BY Average satisfaction.

ANOVA						
		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Age	Between Groups	23.251	6	3.875	3.037	0.006
	Within Groups	747.700	586	1.276		
	Total	770.951	592			
Gender	Between Groups	1.607	6	0.268	1.103	0.359
	Within Groups	142.342	586	0.243		
	Total	143.949	592			
Working status	Between Groups	0.911	6	0.152	0.266	0.953
	Within Groups	334.543	586	0.571		
	Total	335.454	592			
Monthly Income level	Between Groups	41.743	6	6.957	5.564	0.000
	Within Groups	732.689	586	1.250		
	Total	774.432	592			

From the table 2.4, we can see the values of p value for age, gender, working status and Monthly income level are 0.006, 0.359, 0.953 and 0.000 respectively. The values of Age and Monthly income have p- values< 0.05, thus they are statistically significant and others are not statistically significant. Hence satisfaction is influenced by Age factor and Monthly Income level.

Table: 2.5 ONEWAY ANOVA Age, Gender, Working status and Monthly Income level BY Average Social media presence.

ANOVA						
		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Age	Between Groups	60.151	7	8.593	7.072	0.000
	Within Groups	710.800	585	1.215		
	Total	770.951	592			
Gender	Between Groups	1.218	7	0.174	0.713	0.661
	Within Groups	142.731	585	0.244		
	Total	143.949	592			
Working status	Between Groups	2.572	7	0.367	0.646	0.718
	Within Groups	332.882	585	0.569		
	Total	335.454	592			

Monthly Income level	Between Groups	40.997	7	5.857	4.671	0.001
	Within Groups	733.435	585	1.254		
	Total	774.432	592			

From the table 2.5, we can see the values of p value for age, gender, working status and Monthly income level are 0.000, 0.661, 0.718 and 0.001 respectively. The values of Age and Monthly income have p- values< 0.05, thus they are statistically significant and others are not statistically significant. Hence social media presence is influenced by Age factor and Monthly Income level.

Table:3 One Sample t-test

One-Sample Test						
Test Value = 3						
	t	Df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
					Lower	Upper
AE	21.047	592	0.000	0.68	0.61	0.74
AIS	15.874	592	0.000	0.54	0.47	0.60
AP	17.377	592	0.000	0.58	0.52	0.65
AS	13.410	592	0.000	0.49	0.42	0.56
ASMP	18.320	592	0.000	0.60	0.54	0.67

AE, AIS, AP, AS and ASMP in table 3 stands for average entertainment, average information seeking, average purchase, average satisfaction and average social media presence respectively. The results of one sample t-test shows that AE is statistically significant at 0.5 level of significance ($t=21.042$, $Df = 592$, $p<0.000$) from the [Test value =3] The [Mean difference = 0.68, 95% of CI (0.61-0.74)]. AIS is statistically significant at 0.5 level of significance ($t=15.874$, $Df = 592$, $p<0.000$) from the [Test value =3] and [Mean difference = 0.54, 95% of CI (0.47-0.60)]. Ap is statistically significant at 0.5 level of significance ($t=17.377$, $Df = 592$, $p<0.000$) from the [Test value =3] The [Mean difference = 0.58, 95% of CI (0.52-0.65)]. AS is statistically significant at 0.5 level of significance ($t=13.410$, $Df = 592$, $p<0.000$) from the [Test value =3] The [Mean difference = 0.49, 95% of CI (0.42-0.56)]. ASMP is statistically significant at 0.5 level of significance ($t=18.320$, $Df = 592$, $p<0.000$) from the [Test value =3] The [Mean difference = 0.60, 95% of CI (0.54-0.67)].

FINDINGS

Overall findings shows that out of the 5 variables, entertainment is the variable for which consumers are active and following influencers on the social media platforms, followed by social media presence then for purchase, then information seeking and lastly satisfaction (feedback). And the demographics characteristics who are positive towards influencers marketing are Age and Monthly income and working status and gender have no or least impact.

REFERENCES

- Suprawan, L., & Pojanavatee, S. (2022). What causes social media users to engage and mimic virtual influencers? The role of self-congruity. *Innovative Marketing*, 18(4), 148–160. [https://doi.org/10.21511/im.18\(4\).2022.13](https://doi.org/10.21511/im.18(4).2022.13)
- Bala (2014). SOCIAL MEDIA AND CHANGING COMMUNICATION PATTERNS. Global Media Journal-Indian Edition. https://www.caluniv.ac.in/global-mdia-journal/ARTICLE-JUNE-2014/A_3.pdf.
- Chopra et.al. (2010), Influencer Marketing: An Exploratory Study to Identify Antecedents of Consumer Behavior of Millennial. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/342181914_Influencer_Marketing_An_Exploratory_Study_to_Identify_Antecedents_of_Consumer_Behavior_of_Millennial.
- Liu et.al. (2019). The effect of influencer marketing on the buying behavior of young consumers. <https://liu.diva-portal.org/smash/get/diva2:1668422/FULLTEXT01.pdf>.

5. Irshad et al. (2020). Understanding consumers' trust in social media marketing environment. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/370769616_Understanding_consumers'_trust_in_social_media_marketing_environment.