Benefits of Higher Education on Social Media Marketing Activities Alike Different Marketing Promotional Tools on Purchase Intention among Consumers in Organized Apparel Sector

Sukanya Sharma[1], Saumya Singh[1*], Gairik Das[2]

[1]Department of Management Studies, Indian Institute of Technology (Indian School of Mines), Jharkhand, India
[2]Department of Retail Management, Calcutta University, Indian Institute of Social Welfare & Business Management, Kolkata, India

*Corresponding Author: Dr. Saumya Singh
PhD, Professor and Head of the Department, Department of Management Studies, Indian Institute of Technology (Indian School of Mines), Dhanbad – 826004, Jharkhand, India; Phone: 0326–2235497; Fax: 0326–2296631; email: saumya@iitism.ac.in

Abstract
Social media marketing activities (SMMA) are found in highly educated consumers regarding purchase intention (PI) of apparel like other marketing promotional tools (MPTs). This study investigates empirical research based on PI among consumers through seven MPTs and SMMA especially Facebook (FB) in the organized apparel sector of easter India. A total of 599 respondents are selected for this study. The application of different statistical methods shows better performance on the influence of a few MPTs as well as FB on PI for apparel. The results of MANOVA and post hoc test indicate that demographic variables viz. higher education as graduation and post-graduation are predicted in more beneficial on FB alike other MPTs viz. sales promotion, loyalty, advertisement, visual merchandizing, direct monetary incentive, trained sales force, store Point-of-Purchase, and packaging, respectively. In conclusion, eight MPTs can be substituted by SMMA, like FB, on the PI related to consumers of eastern India when buying apparel. Higher education in consumers is found more beneficial for online and offline marketing through product reviews and information, advertisements, auctions, discounts, easy payment, etc. in FB for apparel. Studying with other media for SMMA related to apparel marketing is suggested.

Keywords: Marketing communication tools; Social media marketing activities; Facebook marketing tool; Apparel merchandising; Purchase intention; Empirical research

Present-day organizations are extremely dynamic, competitive, and interactive. Business organizations are facing various challenges combined with the huge accessibility of product selection and the increasing of knowledgeable buyers. Consequently, retailers need to carefully formulate business strategies to engross their customers in all probable and possible touchpoints. According to Islam and Rahman (2016), attracting and engaging consumers is to build a strong customer relationship, which is considered tactical and authoritative to build a long-lasting and justifiable competitive advantage. Strong customer relationship management (CRM) and consumer involvement are the keys to success in the retail arena. Presently marketing practitioners are focusing more on the same (Rather and Sharma, 2017; Kujur and Singh, 2017; Kujur and Singh, 2018; Kujur and Singh, 2020), and Islam and Rahman (2016) observed positive influences on "customer satisfaction, customer loyalty, firm performance, firm reputation, and firm value". Notwithstanding wide research on the application of customer engagement, many areas remain unexplored.

According to many studies, demographic variables like age, gender, occupation, marital status, income, and qualification have a significant link with the purchaser's buying decision (Wan, Yuon, and Fang 2001; Dickson et al., 2004; Workman and Studak, 2006; Kumar and Sarangi, 2008; Chen et al., 2012; De and Singh, 2017). A study by Kamaladevi (2010) indicated the role of macro factors such as branding, pricing, promotional aspect, management of supply chain, location of shop, advertising, packaging, and labeling, service mixture, as well as ambiance in the retail environment, which may show the appearance of customer experiences and buying behavior. This finding emphasized that more customer satisfaction may lead to higher frequency of shopping, larger wallet sharing, and higher profitability. Moreover, it has been established that retailer organizations, especially in the apparel sector, are using various marketing communication tools such as sales promotion other than a monetary incentive, advertisement, loyalty, trained sales force, packaging, visual merchandising, direct monetary incentive, store point-of-purchase (POP) and SM to attract the consumers for making a purchase (Bhatti and Latif, 2013; Hussain and Ali, 2015; Pradhan, 2015; Satish Kumar, 2018). In SMMA, the consumers may influence online and off-line marketing more than traditional marketing by using other promotional tools for only offline marketing. From past studies, the traditional system of the above-mentioned marketing tools is well-known by many researchers (Ansari, 2013; Hussain and Ali, 2015; Pradhan, 2015; Lee and Chen-Yu, 2018; Satish Kumar, 2018).

In the digital era, the betterment of internet facilities, and product selling is continued with product information, advertisement, auctions, discounts, easy payment, etc. (Bala and Verma, 2018). Recently, in a revolutionized way, e-commerce can be done

through the internet, especially for marketing, and several organizations such as "google.com", "yahoo.com", "amazon.com", "alibaba.com", and "youtube.com", etc. are supporting the selling and buying the products (Bala and Verma, 2018). Moreover, Bala and Verma (2018) mentioned in their review work that businesses can benefit from "Digital Marketing" through several attributes such as optimization of a search engine, marketing of search engine, marketing of contents and its automation, marketing influencers, marketing of e-commerce, marketing campaign, and marketing through social media (SM). Moreover, the optimization of SM, direct marketing through e-mail, display of easy advertising, e-books, optical disks, games, etc. more potent online content in recent advanced technology (John, Sheeja, and Bhavana 2017; Yadav and Rahman, 2017). In another work, Kujur and Singh (2017) reported that YouTube is the most innovative social networking site (SNS) in which buyers can be allowed to post, view, comment, and link to videos on the site regarding brand activities. Recently, Kujur and Singh (2020) developed a theoretical model based on the consumer-brand relationship, which has a potential impact on visual communications among buyers through SNS. Prasad (2014) reported that apparel products are different from other products of fashion, branding, etc. These products have shorter life cycles and higher product turnover. In this context, the consumer's purchase intention shows a contrasting attitude toward apparel products in SM (Prasad, 2014; Kunwar, 2017; Sharma et al., 2021).

In some national and international studies, it was reported that digital marketing induces the intention to purchase products among consumers (Bauer et al., 2005; Kujur and Singh, 2017; Enginkayaa and Cinar, 2018; Jayasingh, 2019; Kujur and Singh, 2020). Few studies find the impact of digital marketing on the apparel sectors related to purchasing intention among consumers (Ahmad, Salman, and Ashiq 2015; Sarkar, 2019; Sharma et al., 2021).

In this context, our empirical research employs eight MPTs such as sales promotion, visual merchandising, advertising, packaging, direct monetary incentive, trained salesforce, store point-of-purchase (POP), and loyalty along with SMMA especially FB related to PI of consumers as per demographic profiles in the organized apparel sector.

Literature review
Marketing Communication and Social Media Tools in Purchase Intention
We characterize different questionnaires to know earlier studies on the marketing communication tools viz. sales promotion, visual merchandising, advertising, packaging, direct monetary incentive, trained salesforce, store point-of-purchase (POP), and loyalty along with SM, especially FB (Table 1 panel A).

Generally, SM can help companies retain relations with customers as customers frequently visit or discuss such brands that they have loyalty to or are already interested in on a recommendation by friends and family (Baird and Parasnis, 2011). Bashar, Ahmad, and Wasiq (2012) found that consumers are embracing SM like anything, and are obsessed with knowing more and more about products, and offers. Cultural aspects may be influenced by buyers' usage of SNS and have an extraordinary effect on online buying intentions (Pookulangaran, Hawley, and Xiao 2011). Interaction with the targeted brand in SM is seen contrastingly by shoppers relying upon the message they pass on (Shin, 2008). The apparent risk of buying and the measure of cash a purchaser is eager to pay for an item additionally decide the client to ponder the quality and the utility of the product (Ioanas, 2012). The use of SM has become immensely popular and the network and virtual communities have converted consumers, societies, and organizations with wider access to information, better SNS, and increased correspondence abilities (Kucuk and Krishnamurthy, 2007). "Blogs", "YouTube", "My Space", "Facebook", etc. are examples of SM that are popular among all types of buyers (Sin, Nor, and Al-Agaga 2012). Hanna, Rohm, and Crittenden (2011) reported that the exclusive features of SM related to popularity, which was found revolutionized through marketing strategies especially advertising and promotion of products.

Online gatherings have an observable impact on behavior and customer purchasing intention as per buying choice (Ioanas and Stoica, 2014). Kozinets et al. (2010) reported that SM websites provided a platform for people in which easy access to product information facilitated buying decisions (Kozinets et al., 2010). From earlier research, it was seen that online business or e-commerce should be possible through SM, and it empowers to arrive more purchasers. Because of the advantages of SM in associating organizations straightforwardly with end-buyers, in a short period and less expensive (Kaplan and Haenlein, 2010). Research carried out by Bashar, Ahmad, and Wasiq (2012) found that presently people are passionate about SM such as Facebook, YouTube, blogs, Twitter, etc. In the present scenario, the marketing communication tool especially purchasing through SM is showing more interest in purchasing products through the process of better reviewing, discounts, brands, visualizing of the products, etc. (Kujur and Singh, 2017; Kujur and Singh, 2018; Kujur and Singh, 2020). Recently, SM platforms such as Facebook, WhatsApp, Twitter, and Instagram (Hellberg, 2015) as well as e-commerce platforms viz. Amazon, Flipkart, etc. have attracted millions of consumers to purchase various products (Boyd and Ellison, 2007; Hellberg, 2015; Kati, 2018; Kujur and Singh, 2018; Satish Kumar, 2018; Kujur and Singh, 2020). However, one cannot deny the fact of physical touch, an experience that can be felt in offline mode with the help of a unique digital network to attract consumers for PI.

SMM tool is used by billions of people. In a report by Facebook (2019), it was obtained that people used Facebook of about 2.38 billion per month and everyday activities of about 1.56 billion, respectively. eMarketer (2018) has mentioned about worldwide communication through SM, the entire figure of SM users is projected to rise to 3.29 billion users in 2022, which is supposed to be 42.3% of the world's population. However, the importance of advertising on SM has been recently discovered (Gordon et al., 2019), and the way it communicates with other forms of media like television (Fossen and Schweidel, 2017; 2019) helps in the acceptance of product through the dispersal of info mechanisms (Hennig-Thurau et al., 2015). Old-style SM have amplified their platforms to deliver a wider collection of purposes and amenities (Cheng, 2017; Chowdry, 2018). Haenlin (2017) and Haenlein and Libai (2017) defined invisible customer relation management (CRM) as upcoming systems that will make customer commitment simple and reachable for customers. Kujur and Singh (2017) conducted an empirical study on the activity of bandings, marketing, etc. by using SNS. They also studied SEM and its impact on SM. Kujur and Singh

(2018) reported that YouTube is the most innovative SNS, where consumers are allowed to post, view, comment, and link to videos on the site regarding brand activities. They investigated that emotional appeals are being used in SNS like YouTube advertisements which promotion of their products through big brands of different sectors in an emerging market like India. Kujur and Singh (2020) proposed a theoretical model based on the consumer-brand relationship through visual communications of consumers on corporate SNS. According to them, SEM validated the effect of visuals concerning the content of information, entertainment, and remuneration for consumer engagement to determine the consumer-brand relationship (Reinartz, Nico, and Imschloss 2019).

Digital marketing communication tools are less expensive and help us to understand our clientele's opponents as well as market scenarios (Yamin, 2017). The online services in communication help us by facilitating our business to communicate with the target audience through automated pertinent real-time communications combined across desktop, mobile and digital and conventional marketing networks (Bhattacharjee, 2012; Enginkayaa and Cinar, 2014; Kamal, 2016; Kanan and Li, 2017; Idrysheva et al., 2019). The success of acquiring new customers through the new trend of digital marketing is more helpful for those who are successful in manipulating the leading incoming marketing networks to get perceptibility and chief clients/leads (Kamal, 2016). The major channels are SM and email marketing, all powered by content publicizing. While using these channels is viable, several free, and paid tools are accessible to advance, which is directing and improving the efficiency of online campaigns (Kamal, 2016; Zhang et al., 2017). The digital transformation of business has brought the use of robots and artificial intelligence even to stitch and cut cloth. AI will also contribute to forecast style and augment manufacturing (Ramya and Kartheeswaran, 2019). Retailers and various brands progressively position these digital tools, in an innovative world of individualization for consumers in fashion. SM platforms are immensely valued by fashionable and modish brands. Due to germinating online supporters, many hidden brands are highlighted and get recognition. Nifty stylish brands are modifying SM tactics fit for distinct platforms.

Companies of the present day are facing various challenges due to cut-throat competition. The main reason being, rapid technological advancement, the growing role of e-commerce, ever-changing fashion, and shorter lead time have posed many challenges for apparel retailers. The fashion industry is going through a seismic shift due to various reasons such as a shift in the global economy, competition from online and omnichannel, digitalization, decreasing foot traffic, etc.

Demographic profiles and purchase intentions

Table 1 (panel B) tabulates demographic variables viz. Age, Gender, Occupation, Income, and qualification have a significant link with the purchaser's buying decision. A study carried out by (De and Singh, 2017), showed that age is the most important demographic factor followed by Income thereafter occupation, qualification, and gender.

It has been observed that gender affects purchasing behavior and male and female consumers behave differently in their behaviour for deciding on purchasing apparel. Several demographic variables affect fashion awareness, including gender (Kwon, 1997). As mentioned, (Underhill, 1999) females are universally shopaholics, especially in the case of fashion and apparel. But recently due to an increase in the number of working women and less time for household activities their shopping behaviour has changed to a great extent. As per research conducted by Dickson et al. (2004) and Mitchell & Walsh (2004) shows that women are more fashion-conscious and perfectionist compared to men. But as mentioned by Gould & Stern, (1989) and Workman & Studak (2006), not many in numbers of men are fashion-conscious and are more innovators. Besides, women are more brand-conscious follow current fashion trends from various media sources, and usually do not care much for discounts (Low and Freeman, 2007). As said by Mitchell & Walsh, (2004) males and females have different tastes and means for obtaining products.

Age is one more demographic variable that implies fashion consciousness. As said by Wan, Yuon, and Fang (2001), the impact of fashion is more on Youngsters compared to older ones. They are always attracted to the latest fashion trends and popular brands and do not wait for discounts or monetary incentives all the time (Dickson et al., 2004). On the contrary, research carried out by Yoon and Cole (2008) indicated that older shoppers always prefer value for money reluctant to discover new information for products (Wells and Gubar, 1966). As mentioned by many reports (Szmigin & Carrigan 2001; Myers & Lumbers, 2008; Thompson & Thompson, 2009; United Nations Population Fund and Help Age International, 2012), there is a lot of discussion and research regarding the global aging population in media and academic world. As pointed out by many researchers (Myers & Lumbers, 2008; Thompson & Thompson, 2009), the marketing community is fascinated by the population who are under fifty.

Income is one of the major factors that affect consumer behavior in shopping (Zeithaml, 1985). High-income groups usually do not make a planned purchase but spend much more whenever they visit (Zeithaml, 1985). Consumers belonging to the High-income group show a higher level of fashion awareness (Wan, Yuon, and Fang 2001). On the contrary, shoppers belonging to the low-income group, tend to be economical Shoppers (Zeithaml, 1985). Earlier studies also propose that income has a positive impact on consumer innovativeness and innovation consciousness of the consumer (Blythe, 1999).

Past research suggested that there might be a positive correlation between education and fashion consciousness. It has been assessed from many reports that well-educated consumers appeared to be more fashion-conscious than less-educated consumers (Wan, Yuon, and Fang 2001). They are more inclined towards new and innovative fashion (Dash and Sarangi, 2008; Brokaw and Lakshman, 1995), concerned about quality (Walsh & Mitchell, 2005), and give more importance to comfort, fashion, shade, brand name, and content of a product (Dickson et al., 2004). Schaninger & Sciglimpaglia, (1981) said that educated customers gather various information before making the purchase decision and are more knowledgeable about fashion.

It is considered one of the vital demographic variables that influence consumer buying behavior. Married people respond in their own way to different brands. Various perceptions regarding the functional, aesthetic, and social value of a product vary

for married people of different age and social status. According to Chen et al. (2012), marital status along with other demographic variables play a key role in making a purchase decision.

Table 1. Summary of literature review related to factors and demographic profiles.

A. Literature on factors influenced PI		
Variables	Relevant Findings	References
SP other than Monetary Incentive	Gifts given during sales promotion attracts consumers.	Raghubir (2004) Belch and Belch (2009)
	Buy one get one free encourages to buy consumers.	Sinha and Smith (2000) Li, Sun, and Wang (2007) Malik (2014)
	Special offers during the end-of-season sale like 50% to 60% discount or buy 2 get two free are the best deal for consumers.	Karabag, Yavuz, and Berggren (2011)
	Various in-store activities during specific festivals allure consumers to buy children's garments.	Samad and Sabeerdeen (2016)
	In-store activities during Christmas attract to consumers buy winter garments.	Blattberg, and Briesch (2010) Malik (2014)
	Leaflets regarding sales promotion of a store attract consumers.	Samad and Sabeerdeen (2016)
Loyalty	Redemption of points earned through loyalty cards is a good reason to make a repeat purchase from that store.	Altstiel and Grow (2006)
	Gift coupons and discount coupons are a source of savings for consumers' next purchase.	Dowling and Uncles (1997)
	Loyalty card motivates consumers to buy from the same store.	Yi and Jeon (2003) Mimouni and Volle (2010)
	Discount vouchers attract consumers to buy apparels.	Jain and Singhal (2012)
Advertising	Communication-related to design and fitting of apparels on media attracts consumers to buy from this store.	Belch et al. (2001) Shimp (2000)
	Billboard advertisements attract consumers.	Katke (2007) Lichtenthal, Yadav, and Donthu (2006) Taylor and Franke (2003) Taylor et al. (2006)
	Television advertisement gives information about fashion and promotional offers.	Gerber, Terblanche-Smit, and Crommelin (2014)
	Consumers like an advertisement in fliers and leaflets on various offers regarding apparels.	Gijsbrechts, Campo, and Goossens (2003)
VM	Display in the mannequins gives consumers a feeling about how they look like in that dress.	Jain, Sharma, and Narwal (2012)
	Window display influences unplanned purchase.	Bhalla and Anurag (2010)
	The layout of the store makes the display apparels more attractive.	Storms (2006)
	Window display attracts consumers towards that store.	Dawes (2008)
Trained salesforce	The body language and smartness of the salesperson of a store attracts consumers to buy from that store.	Wong and Shoal (2003)
	Consumers take advice from salespersons for making a purchase decision.	Leong, Busch, and John (1989) Saxe and Weitz (1982) Boorom, Goolsby, and Rosemary (1998)
	Behaviour of the salesperson of a store attracts consumers.	Smith and Zook (2016)
Store POP	The lighting of the store attracts consumers.	Hussain and Ali (2015) Pradhan (2015)
	The shelf arrangement and assortment of the apparels attract consumers.	Ghosh (1990) Pradhan (2016)

	The music and fragrance of the store attracts consumers.	Morrison (2001)
Packaging	The design of the shopping bag of this store attracts consumers.	Nilson and Ostrom (2005) Borishade, Ogunnaike, and Dirisu (2015)
	Gift wrapping and a shopping bag of this store is very attractive for consumers.	Bhardwaj (2014)
Direct Monetary incentive	Cash discount during the end of season sale is beneficial for consumers.	Yin and Huang (2014)
	Price influences me while choosing a particular brand in apparels.	Lee and Chen-Yu (2018)
	A special gift on a particular bill amount is the main attraction for consumers to come to the store.	Gilbert and Jackaria, (2002) Banerjee (2009)
	Cash discount as a surprise gift on a special occasion like birthday, anniversary makes consumers a frequent visitor to the store.	Blattberg and Briesch (2010)
SM	Consumers follow advertisements on Facebook.	Rajapaksha and Thilina (2019)
	Consumers follow the advertisement for this store in social media.	Hanna, Rohm, and Crittenden (2011)
	SMS from apparel store influences consumers to buy.	Bamba and Barnes (2007)
	Internet advertisement regarding recent fashion trends attract consumers.	Kozinets (2002) Kucuk and Krishnamurthy (2007)

B. Literature on demographic profiles

Variables	Relevant Findings	References
Gender	Females are universally shopaholic especially in the case of fashion and apparel. Women are more fashion conscious and perfectionist compared to men. Women are more brand conscious and follow current fashion trends from various media sources and usually do not care much for discounts.	Underhill (1999) Dickson et al. (2004) Mitchell and Walsh (2004) Low and Freeman (2007)
Age	Impact of fashion is more on youngsters compared to older ones. Youngsters always attracts latest fashion trends and popular brands and do not wait for discounts or monetary incentives all the time. The marketing community is fascinated by the population who are under fifty.	Wan, Yuon, and Fang (2001) Dickson et al. (2004) Myers and Lumbers (2008) Thompson and Thompson, (2009)
MS	Marital status along with other demographic variables play a key role in making a purchase decision.	Chen et al. (2012)
Education	Well-educated consumers appeared to be more fashion-conscious than less-educated consumers.	Wan, Yuon, and Fang (2001) Prabowoa, Bramulyaa, and Yuniarty (2020)
F_Indepe	Consumers belonging to the High-income group show a higher level of fashion awareness.	Wan, Yuon, and Fang (2001)
Family_I	High-income groups usually do not make a planned purchase but spend much more whenever they visit.	Zeithaml (1985)

SP = sales promotion; VM = Visual merchandizing, POP = Point-of-purchase; SM = SocialMedia; MS = Marital status; F_Indene = Financial independence; Family_I = Family income

Hypothesis Development

H[1]: Hypotheses regarding promotional tools and demographic profiles that influence consumer purchase intention in organized apparel retail.

H[2]: The hypothesis regarding social media marketing and demographic profiles that influence consumer purchase intention in organized apparel retail.

Research Design
Selection of Samples

In the present study, the sample size was selected at 770 nos. A total of 385 participants were selected from Patna and Ranchi while another 385 nos. from Kolkata, which combined as 770 nos. However, out of those 171 responses were rejected because they were not properly filled up whereas 599 nos. filled up the questionnaire completely, recruited for the present study. The questionnaire with slight modifications for 4 statements was administered to the respondents. The study was done to develop a framework for finding effective promotional tools such as sales promotion, visual merchandising, advertising, packaging, direct monetary incentive, trained salesforce, store point-of-purchase (POP), and loyalty along with SMMA especially Facebook (FB), which are influencing consumer PI in the apparel retail sector. In this study, the target population was visited in shopping malls as it is easy to access and interact. The survey was carried out in the eastern part of India, covering three capital cities of India such as Kolkata, Ranchi, and Patna. The main reason behind the selection of the study area because the researcher is linked to all the cities, which made possible easy admittance to the data source.

Data Collection
Primary data was collected through the questionnaire survey method. The researcher visited various shopping malls at different hours of the day and approached the respondents with the questionnaire. The target respondents were those who were visiting the malls or leaving after shopping.

Study parameters
MPTs viz. sales promotion, visual merchandising, advertising, packaging, direct monetary incentive, trained salesforce, store point-to-purchase (POP), and loyalty along with SMMA especially Facebook (FB) related to PI of consumers as per demographic profiles in the organized apparel sector.

Statistical analysis
Advanced data analyses were carried out using statistical software (SPSS, version 21) on the primary data of the respondents. Statistical methods such as MANOVA, Post-hoc test, and logistic regression were performed as per the protocol of Hair et al. (2010).

To achieve the above research objectives, a conceptual framework was established with the help of a wide-ranging literature review. It was tested and validated the statistical methods, the research methodology was separated into two segments: (1) the data collection technique, and (2) the data analysis technique. The procedure for data collection consisted of identifying the subjects, eligibility criteria for selection of subjects, and sample size. It studied different promotional tools that may influence consumer purchase intention in organized apparel retail. It was also studied to know demographic profiles concerning social media and different marketing tools that may influence consumer purchase intention in organized apparel retail.

Empirical findings
Test of MANOVA
The "one-way multivariate analysis of variance (one-way MANOVA)" was determined about differences between "independent groups" and one or more continuous "dependent variables". In this study, MANOVA was carried out to check the influence of demographic variables on the 9 factors separately. This helps to test multiple dependent variables at the same time.

Table 2 (panel A) describes the factor as sales promotion (independent variable) related to more than one continuous dependent variable (demographic profiles). In the case of gender, the β-coefficient value was obtained .0864 and p-value .328, which is >.05, so the comparisons are non-significant while age showed the coefficient value of -.004 and p-value .956, which is also >.05, so it is also insignificant. The marital status was observed of a β-coefficient value of .0692 and a p-value of .505, which is also non-significant. For educational qualification, the β-coefficient value was obtained at .0768 and the p-value at .062, it is also non-significant. In the case of financial independence, the β-coefficient value was -.0609 and p-value .523, which is also non-significant. For family income, the β-coefficient value was .0388 and p-value .402, which is >.05, so it is also insignificant. Hence, we can say that the demographic variables do not have any impact on the factor like a sales promotion.
Table 2 (panel B) describes the factor as loyalty (independent variable) related to more than one continuous dependent variable (demographic profiles). In the case of gender, the β-coefficient was obtained at -.0689 and p-value of .434, which is >.05, so it is non-significant while age showed the β-coefficient value of -.1423 and p-value .053, which is also >.05, so is insignificant. The marital status was observed of a β-coefficient value of .1935 and a p-value of .062, which is also non-significant. For educational qualification, the β-coefficient value was observed at .0633 and the p-value at .122, it is also non-significant. In the case of financial independence, the β-coefficient value was obtained -.1183 and p-value .213, which is also non-significant. Whereas the family income showed the β-coefficient value (-.9182) is negative and the P-value .047, which is <.05 significant. So, we can say that the demographic variables viz. "gender, age, marital status, educational qualification, and financial independence" do not have any impact on the factor loyalty. But people with lower incomes have more disposition for this factor of loyalty.
Table 2 (panel C) describes the factor as an advertisement (independent variable) related to more than one continuous dependent variable (demographic profiles). In the case of gender, the β-coefficient value was observed at .1377 and p-value .12, which is >.05, so it is non-significant while age showed the β-coefficient value was -.0779 and p-value .291, which is also >.05, so is insignificant. The marital status was observed of a β-coefficient value of .0704 and a p-value of .499, which is also non-significant. For educational qualification, the β-coefficient value was .071, and the p-value was .085, it is also non-significant. In the case of financial independence, the β-coefficient value was .015, and the p-value .867, which is also non-

significant. For family income, the β-coefficient was found negative (-.031) and p-value .492, which is >.05, so it is insignificant. Hence, we can say that the demographic variables viz. "gender, age, marital status, educational qualification, and financial independence" do not have any impact on the factor advertisement.

Table 2 (panel D) describes the factor as visual merchandising (independent variable) related to more than one continuous dependent variables (demographic profiles). In the case of gender, the β-coefficient value was obtained -.0248, and p-value .776, which is >.05, so it is non-significant while age is showed the β-coefficient value (-.1449) negative and p-value .047, which is <.05, which is significant. The marital status was observed of β-coefficient value .1774 and p-value .084, which is also non-significant. For educational qualification, the β-coefficient value was also found negative (-.0935) and p-value .022, which is <.05, so it is significant. In the case of financial independence, the β-coefficient was -.0751, and the p-value was .426, which is also non-significant. For family income, the β-coefficient was showed negative (-.1176) and the p-value .011, which is <.05, so it is significant. Hence, we can say that the demographic variables viz. "gender, marital status, and financial independence" do not have any impact on the factor advertisement. But lower age groups, educated groups, and low-income groups of respondents have a higher inclination towards visual merchandising.

Table 2 (panel E) describes the factor as a direct monetary incentive (independent variable) related to more than one continuous dependent variable (demographic profiles). In the case of gender, the β-coefficient value was obtained at .0535, and the p-value .544, which is greater than .05, so it is non-significant while age showed the β-coefficient value of -.072 and p-value of .328, which is also >.05, so is insignificant. The marital status was observed with the β-coefficient value of .1136 and p-value .274, which is also non-significant. For educational qualification, the β-coefficient value was obtained at .0302, and p-value of .463, it is also non-significant. In the case of financial independence, the β-coefficient value was -.01386, and the p-value was .884, which is also non-significant. For family income, the β-coefficient was found negative (-.1166), and the p-value was .012, which is <.05, so it is significant. Hence, we can say that demographic variables like "gender, age, marital status, educational qualification, and financial independence" do not have any impact on the factors like direct monetary incentive but respondents with lower family income have more dispositions towards the factor as a direct monetary incentive.

Table 2 (panel F) describes the factor as a trained salesforce (independent variable) related to more than one continuous dependent variable (demographic profiles). In the case of gender, the β-coefficient value was obtained at .10954, and the p-value was .212, which is >.05, so it is non-significant. The age showed a β-coefficient value of -.0376 and a p-value of .607, which is non-significant. The marital status was observed with the β-coefficient value of .2014 and p-value of .051, which is also non-significant. For educational qualification, the β-coefficient value was .0761 and the p-value .062, it is also non-significant. In the case of financial independence, the β-coefficient value was .0920, and the p-value was .331, which is also non-significant. For family income, the β-coefficient was found negative (-.1518), and the p-value .001, which is <.05, so it is highly significant. Hence, we can say that the demographic variables like gender, educational qualification, marital status, and financial independence do not have any impact on the factor like trained sales force but respondents belonging to lower family income have more dispositions towards the factor as a trained salesforce.

Table 2 (panel G) describes the factor as store POP (independent variable) related to more than one continuous dependent variables (demographic profiles). In the case of gender, the β-coefficient value was .0683, and the p-value .430, which is >.05, so it is non-significant. The age was showed the β-coefficient value of -.1077 and p-value .136, which is non-significant. The marital status was observed of β-coefficient value .2995 and p-value .003, which is <.05, and significant. For educational qualification, the β-coefficient value was found negative (-.0718) and p-value .075, it is also non-significant. In the case of financial independence, the β-coefficient was also found negative (-.0138), and the p-value .883, which is also non-significant. For family income, the β-coefficient was also found negative (-.1637) and the p-value is .000, which is <.05 and it is highly significant. Hence, we can say that the demographic variables like gender, age, educational qualification, and financial independence do not have any impact on the factor like store POP but respondents belonging to married and lower family income have more dispositions towards the factor as store POP.

Table 2 (panel H) describes the factor as packaging (independent variable) related to more than one continuous dependent variables (demographic profiles). In the case of gender, the β-coefficient value was .1253, and the p-value is .145, which is >.05, so it is non-significant. The age was showed the β-coefficient value of -.0927 and p-value .196, which is also non-significant. The marital status was observed of β-coefficient value .05813 and p-value .565, which is also non-significant. For educational qualification, the β-coefficient value was obtained .0382 and p-value .338, it is also non-significant. In the case of financial independence, β-coefficient was found negative (-.4203) and p-value .000, which is <.05 and highly significant. For family income, the β-coefficient was obtained .1323 and p-value .003, and it is also highly significant. Hence, we can say that the demographic variables like gender, age, educational qualification, and marital status do not have any impact on the factor like the packaging but respondents who are financially independent more interested in this factor of packaging and lower family income have more dispositions towards the factor as packaging.

Table 2 (panel I) describes the factor as social media (independent variable) related to more than one continuous dependent variables (demographic profiles). In the case of gender, the β-coefficient value was obtained .0452, and the p-value .600, which is >.05, so it is non-significant while age was showed the β-coefficient value of -.2083 and p-value .004, which is <.05 and highly significant. The marital status was observed the β-coefficient value .231 and p-value .023, which is <.05, and significant. For educational qualification, the β-coefficient value was .0309 and p-value .440, it is also non-significant. In the case of financial independence, the β-coefficient value was .0161, and the p-value .862, which is also non-significant. For family income, the β-coefficient was found negative (-.2334), and p-value .000, which is <.05, so it is highly significant. Hence, we can say that the demographic variables like gender, educational qualification, and financial independence do not have any impact on the factor like social media but respondents belonging to lower age group, married people, and lower family income have more dispositions towards the factor as social media.

Table 2. MANOVA for MPTs and SM related to demographic profiles.

Covariate	β –coefficient	Beta	Std. Err.	t-value	Sig. of t	Lower-95%	Cl-upper
A. Sales promotion other than monetary incentive							
Gender	.0864	.0420	.0883	.9787	.328	-.087	.2598
Age	-.004	-.0028	.0736	-.0546	.956	-.149	.1405
MS	.0692	.0337	.1038	.6674	.505	-.135	.2732
Education	.0768	.08854	.0411	1.8699	.062	-.004	.1575
F_Indepe	-.0609	-.0304	.0953	-.6392	.523	-.248	.1263
Family_I	.0388	.0352	.0464	.8379	.402	-.052	.1300
B. Loyalty							
Gender	-.0689	-.0335	.0879	-.7831	.434	-.242	.1039
Age	-.1423	-.0990	.0734	-1.941	.053	-.286	.0016
MS	.1935	.0943	.1034	1.871	.062	-.010	.3967
Education	.0633	.073	.0409	1.547	.122	-.017	.1437
F_Indepe	-.1183	-.0592	.0949	-1.246	.213	-.305	.0681
Family_I	-.9182	-.0833	.0462	-1.9864	.047	-.183	-.001
C. Advertisement							
Gender	.1377	.067	.0884	1.5569	.120	-.036	.3115
Age	-.0779	-.0543	.0737	-1.056	.291	-.223	.0670
MS	.0704	.0343	.1040	.6769	.499	-.134	.2747
Education	.071	.0820	.0412	1.7274	.085	-.010	.1519
F_Indepe	.015	.0079	.0955	.167	.867	-.172	.2035
Family_I	-.031	-.029	.0465	-.688	.492	-.123	.0593
D. Visual merchandising							
Gender	-.0248	-.0121	.0873	-.2847	.776	-.196	.1470
Age	-.1449	-.101	.0728	-1.990	**.047**	-.288	-.0019
MS	.1774	.0864	.1027	1.728	.084	-.024	.3792
Education	-.0935	-.1078	.0406	-2.303	**.022**	-.173	-.0138
F_Indepe	-.0751	-.0376	.0943	-.7974	.426	-.260	.1100
Family_I	-.1176	-.1068	.0459	-2.564	**.011**	-.208	-.0275
E. Direct monetary incentives							
Gender	.0535	.026	.0883	.6066	.544	-.120	.227
Age	-.0721	-.0502	.0737	-.9793	.328	-.217	.0725
MS	.1136	.0553	.1039	1.0938	.274	-.090	.3176
Education	.0302	.0348	.041	.735	.463	-.050	.1109
F_Indepe	-.01386	-.0069	.0954	-.1453	.884	-.201	.1734
Family_I	-.1166	-.1059	.0464	-2.512	**.012**	-.208	-.0255
F. Trained salesforce							
Gender	.1095	.0532	.0876	1.25	.212	-.062	.2816
Age	-.0376	-.0262	.0731	-.5152	.607	-.181	.1058
MS	.2014	.0982	.103	1.9583	.051	-.001	.4041
Education	.0761	.0878	.0407	1.8694	.062	-.004	.1562
F_Indepe	.0920	.046	.0946	.9733	.331	-.094	.2779
Family_I	-.1518	-.1379	.0460	-3.2988	**.001**	-.242	-.0615
G. Store POP							
Gender	.0683	.03322	.0864	.7897	.430	-.101	.2381
Age	-.1077	-.075	.0721	-1.494	.136	-.249	.0339
MS	.2995	.1459	.1016	2.9454	**.003**	.100	.4992
Education	-.0718	-.0828	.0402	-1.7864	.075	-.151	.0071
F_Indepe	-.0138	-.0069	.0934	-.1478	.883	-.197	.1695
Family_I	-.1637	-.1487	.0454	-3.604	**.000**	-.253	-.0745
H. Packaging							
Gender	.1253	.0609	.0858	1.460	.145	-.0433	.2939
Age	-.0927	-.0646	.0716	-1.2956	.196	-.2333	.0478
MS	.05813	.02832	.1009	.5759	.565	-.141	.2564
Education	.0382	.04413	.0399	.9587	.338	-.0401	.1167
F_Indepe	-.4203	-.2103	.0927	-4.5351	**.000**	-.6023	-.2383
Family_I	.1323	.12022	.0451	2.9352	**.003**	.0438	.22098
I. Social media							
Gender	.0452	.022	.08613	.5253	.600	-.1239	.2143
Age	-.2083	-.1452	.07181	-2.9012	**.004**	-.3493	-.0673
MS	.231	.01125	.1012	2.2813	**.023**	.0321	.4299
Education	.0309	.0356	.04006	.7724	.440	-.0477	.1096
F_Indepe	.0161	.008	.09298	.1739	.862	-.1664	.1987
Family_I	-.2334	-.2119	.04525	-5.1593	**.000**	-0.3223	-0.1445

MS = Marital status; F_Indene = Financial independence; Family_I = Family income

Post-hoc Test

Table 3 (A-F) describes results of post-hoc test (Turkey HSD) in case of five MPTs and SM as FB related to education as demographic profile among respondents. The result of the post hoc test (Table 3 panel A) indicates that there is a significant

difference in the score of sales promotions other than monetary incentive with educational qualification between HS and PG or above (P<.05). There is also obtained significant change in the score of loyalty with educational qualification between S, HS, G, P and PG or above at a significant level of P<.05 and P<.01 (Table 3 panel B). There is also obtained a significant change in the score of visual merchandising (VM) with educational qualification, between HS (P<.05), G (P<.000) and PG and above among respondents (Table 3 panel C). There is a highly significant change in the score of store POP between the respondents whose qualification is HS (P<.001), P (P<.000) and PG and above (P<.000) (Table 3 panel D). There is also significant change in the score of packaging between respondents whose qualification is HS (P<.01) and those who are PG or above (Table 3 panel E). There is a significant difference in score of social media (SM) between the respondents who are G and PG and above (P<.01) (Table 3 panel F).

Table 3. Post hoc test between MPTs and educational qualifications.

		MD (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% CI LB	UB
A. Sales promotion versus educational qualification						
S	HS	.1394410	.20181665	.958	-.4135100	.692392
	G	-.0739510	.19239567	.995	-.6010897	.453188
	P	-.1219391	.21384806	.979	-.7078545	.463976
	PG or above	-.2020554	.20053681	.852	-.7514998	.347389
HS	S	-.1394410	.20181665	.958	-.6923920	.413510
	G	-.2133920	.10672995	.268	-.5058179	.079034
	P	-.2613801	.14179627	.350	-.6498831	.127123
	PG or above	-.3414964*	.12078991	**.039**	-.6724448	-.010548
G	S	.0739510	.19239567	.995	-.4531877	.601090
	HS	.2133920	.10672995	.268	-.0790340	.505818
	P	-.0479881	.12803246	.996	-.3987802	.302804
	PG or above	-.1281044	.10428966	.735	-.4138443	.157635
P	S	.1219391	.21384806	.979	-.4639763	.707854
	HS	.2613801	.14179627	.350	-.1271230	.649883
	G	.0479881	.12803246	.996	-.3028039	.398780
	PG or above	-.0801163	.13996869	.979	-.4636120	.303379
PG or above	S	.2020554	.20053681	.852	-.3473890	.751500
	HS	.3414964*	.12078991	**.039**	.0105480	.672445
	G	.1281044	.10428966	.735	-.1576355	.413844
	P	.0801163	.13996869	.979	-.3033794	.463612
B. Loyalty versus educational qualification						
S	HS	-.6019589*	.20616232	**.030**	-1.1668164	-.037101
	G	-.7144296*	.19653847	**.003**	-1.2529190	-.175940
	P	-.6133210*	.21845279	**.042**	-1.2118528	-.014789
	PG or above	-.6734939*	.20485492	**.010**	-1.2347693	-.112218
HS	S	.6019589*	.20616232	**.030**	.0371013	1.166816
	G	-.1124707	.10902814	.841	-.4111934	.186252
	P	-.0113622	.14484953	1.000	-.4082307	.385506
	PG or above	-.0715350	.12339085	.978	-.4096097	.266540
G	S	.7144296*	.19653847	**.003**	.1759401	1.252919
	HS	.1124707	.10902814	.841	-.1862520	.411193
	P	.1011085	.13078935	.938	-.2572370	.459454
	PG or above	.0409357	.10653530	.995	-.2509570	.332828
P	S	.6133210*	.21845279	**.042**	.0147892	1.211853
	HS	.0113622	.14484953	1.000	-.3855064	.408231
	G	-.1011085	.13078935	.938	-.4594541	.257237
	PG or above	-.0601729	.14298260	.993	-.4519263	.331581
PG or above	S	.6734939*	.20485492	**.010**	.1122185	1.234769
	HS	.0715350	.12339085	.978	-.2665396	.409610
	G	-.0409357	.10653530	.995	-.3328283	.250957
	P	.0601729	.14298260	.993	-.3315806	.451926
C. Visual merchandising versus educational qualification						
S	HS	-.1976119	.20052623	.862	-.7470273	.351803
	G	-.2861074	.19116548	.565	-.8098756	.237661
	P	.0002828	.21248070	1.000	-.5818862	.582452
	PG or above	.1790840	.19925457	.897	-.3668472	.725015
HS	S	.1976119	.20052623	.862	-.3518035	.747027
	G	-.0884955	.10604751	.920	-.3790517	.202061
	P	.1978947	.14088961	.625	-.1881242	.583914
	PG or above	.3766959*	.12001758	**.016**	.0478636	.705528

G	S	.2861074	.19116548	.565	-.2376607	.809876
	HS	.0884955	.10604751	.920	-.2020607	.379052
	P	.2863902	.12721382	.163	-.0621588	.634939
	PG or above	.4651914*	.10362283	**.000**	.1812786	.749104
P	S	-.0002828	.21248070	1.000	-.5824519	.581886
	HS	-.1978947	.14088961	.625	-.5839137	.188124
	G	-.2863902	.12721382	.163	-.6349393	.062159
	PG or above	.1788012	.13907372	.700	-.2022424	.559845
PG or above	S	-.1790840	.19925457	.897	-.7250152	.366847
	HS	-.3766959*	.12001758	**.016**	-.7055282	-.047864
	G	-.4651914*	.10362283	**.000**	-.7491043	-.181279
	P	-.1788012	.13907372	.700	-.5598448	.202242
D. Store POP versus educational qualification						
S	HS	-.1135203	.20035711	.980	-.6624723	.435432
	G	-.2017333	.19100425	.829	-.7250597	.321593
	P	-.3018225	.21230150	.614	-.8835005	.27986
	PG or above	.3456081	.19908652	.413	-.1998627	.891079
HS	S	.1135203	.20035711	.980	-.4354317	.662472
	G	-.0882130	.10595807	.920	-.3785242	.202098
	P	-.1883022	.14077079	.668	-.5739956	.197391
	PG or above	.4591283*	.11991636	**.001**	.1305733	.787683
G	S	.2017333	.19100425	.829	-.3215931	.725060
	HS	.0882130	.10595807	.920	-.2020981	.378524
	P	-.1000891	.12710653	.934	-.4483442	.248166
	PG or above	.5473414*	.10353543	**.000**	.2636680	.831015
P	S	.3018225	.21230150	.614	-.2798556	.883500
	HS	.1883022	.14077079	.668	-.1973912	.573996
	G	.1000891	.12710653	.934	-.2481660	.448344
	PG or above	.6474305*	.13895643	**.000**	.2667083	1.028153
PG or above	S	-.3456081	.19908652	.413	-.8910788	.199863
	HS	-.4591283*	.11991636	**.001**	-.7876833	-.130573
	G	-.5473414*	.10353543	**.000**	-.8310148	-.263668
	P	-.6474305*	.13895643	**.000**	-1.0281528	-.266708
E. Packaging versus educational qualification						
S	HS	.0340280	.20469050	1.000	-.5267969	.594853
	G	-.1393387	.19513535	.953	-.6739838	.395306
	P	-.2233692	.21689322	.841	-.8176280	.370890
	PG or above	-.3990173	.20339243	.287	-.9562857	.158251
HS	S	-.0340280	.20469050	1.000	-.5948529	.526797
	G	-.1733667	.10824977	.497	-.4699568	.123223
	P	-.2573972	.14381543	.381	-.6514325	.136638
	PG or above	-.4330453*	.12250994	**.004**	-.7687064	-.097384
G	S	.1393387	.19513535	.953	-.3953064	.673984
	HS	.1733667	.10824977	.497	-.1232233	.469957
	P	-.0840305	.12985563	.967	-.4398177	.271757
	PG or above	-.2596786	.10577473	.103	-.5494874	.030130
P	S	.2233692	.21689322	.841	-.3708896	.817628
	HS	.2573972	.14381543	.381	-.1366381	.651432
	G	.0840305	.12985563	.967	-.2717568	.439818
	PG or above	-.1756481	.14196182	.730	-.5646048	.213308
PG or above	S	.3990173	.20339243	.287	-.1582511	.956286
	HS	.4330453*	.12250994	**.004**	.0973843	.768706
	G	.2596786	.10577473	.103	-.0301302	.549487
	P	.1756481	.14196182	.730	-.2133085	.564605
F. Social Media versus educational qualification						
S	HS	-.2949559	.19985390	.579	-.8425291	.252617
	G	-.4267299	.19052453	.167	-.9487420	.095282
	P	-.3714157	.21176829	.402	-.9516329	.208801
	PG or above	-.0931953	.19858650	.990	-.6372961	.450905
HS	S	.2949559	.19985390	.579	-.2526174	.842529
	G	-.1317741	.10569195	.724	-.4213561	.157808
	P	-.0764599	.14041723	.983	-.4611845	.308265
	PG or above	.2017605	.11961518	.443	-.1259693	.529490

G	S	.4267299	.19052453	.167	-.0952821	.948742
	HS	.1317741	.10569195	.724	-.1578079	.421356
	P	.0553142	.12678729	.992	-.2920662	.402695
	PG or above	.3335346*	.10327540	**.010**	.0505737	.616495
P	S	.3714157	.21176829	.402	-.2088014	.951633
	HS	.0764599	.14041723	.983	-.3082648	.461184
	G	-.0553142	.12678729	.992	-.4026946	.292066
	PG or above	.2782204	.13860743	.264	-.1015456	.657986
PG or above	S	.0931953	.19858650	.990	-.4509054	.637296
	HS	-.2017605	.11961518	.443	-.5294903	.125969
	G	-.3335346*	.10327540	**.010**	-.6164955	-.050574
	P	-.2782204	.13860743	.264	-.6579864	.101546

MD = Mean difference; S = Secondary; HS = Higher secondary; G = Graduate; P = Professional; PG = Postgraduate; LB = Lower bound; UB = Upper bound *MD is significant

Table 4 describes the logistic regression is done to predict the propensity of attractiveness towards offers like price off, rebate, coupons, contest with the 9 factors. Table 4 describes the results of the logistic regression. Since the P-value of factor 1 (sales promotion) is significant (0.000) so, customers who give higher importance to the sales promotional factor will have a higher propensity to get attracted to offers like coupons, contests, rebates, and price of apparels.

Table 4. Logistic regression of studied factors

Variables in the Equation					
Factors	**Coefficients**	**P-Value**	**OR**	**95% CI for OR**	
				Lower	**Upper**
FAC1_Sales Promo.	.431	**.000**	1.539	1.250	1.895
FAC2_loyalty	.108	.337	1.114	.893	1.390
FAC3_Adv.	.317	**.003**	1.373	1.115	1.690
FAC4_VM	.062	.575	1.064	.856	1.323
FAC5_direct MI	.224	**.041**	1.251	1.009	1.551
FAC6_Trn S.Force	-.190	.108	.827	.656	1.043
FAC7_Store POP	.374	**.001**	1.453	1.162	1.818
FAC8_Packg.	.003	.981	1.003	0.796	1.263
FAC9_Soc. med	.241	**.026**	1.273	1.029	1.574
Constant	1.804	**.000**	6.077		

Promo. = Promotion; Adv. = Advertisement; VM = Visual merchandising; MI = Monetary incentive; TrnSforce = Trained sales force; Packg. = Packaging; Soc. med = Social media; OR = Odds ratio; CI = confidence interval

General Discussion
Summary
This study focuses on those consumers who wish to buy apparel from the organized retail sector. In this study, the target population was visited in shopping malls as it is easy to access and interact. The survey was carried out in the eastern part of India, covering three capital cities of India such as Kolkata, Ranchi, and Patna.
The analysis revealed that 56.1% of the respondents were in the age group of 18-25 followed by 26 to 35 years, who are more attracted towards the various promotional tools. Retailers' managers need to think and design some communication tools that meet the expectation for people belonging to the age group >35 years. Might be people are more focused on quality and brand identity more than offers. Respondents whose educational qualification is graduates are more influenced by promotional tools compared to postgraduates and professionals. A survey has been carried out to access the educational qualification of consumers and their likings. This can be used to design certain online and offline promotional offers for all. The study also revealed that unmarried people like more promotional offers compared to married. Most of the respondents whose income is in the slab of 10k to 30k are more allured towards the promotional tools. So, the higher income groups are not influenced by those. However, managers might design some other form of online or offline communication strategy that would be otherwise beneficial for the high-income group, like time-saving time in the buying process.

Theoretical implications
The demographic variables like gender, educational qualification, and financial independence do not have any impact on the SM especially FB but respondents belonging to lower age group, married people, and lower but reasonable family income have observed significant correlation towards the marketing of apparel through SM, which has conformity with other works (Jung, 2013; Ahmad, Salman, and Ashiq 2015; Tripathi, 2019; Mayrhofera et al., 2020). The study is also found the usage of SM particularly Facebook in the educated such as graduate and post-graduate participants to purchase apparel products and some similar observation was reported among college students (Prabowoa, Bramulyaa and Yuniarty 2020). The SM can help retailers in retaining relations with customers for frequent visits or discuss such brands that they have a loyalty to or are already interested in on a recommendation by friends and family (Baird and Parasnis, 2011; Duffett, 2015). The various SM sites like Facebook, Twitter, blogs, etc. have become an important platform for apparel retailers as they can display the merchandise designed for customers for viewing. Bashar, Ahmad, and Wasiq (2012) found that consumers are embracing SM like anything, and are obsessed to know more and more about products, and offers. In the present study, SM especially FB in the case of

marketing and buying the apparel, which is supported by earlier studies (Ahmad, Salman, and Ashiq 2015; Islam and Rahman, 2016; Kalu, 2019; Rajapaksha and Thilina, 2019). In a recent overview by Appel et al. (2020), it is understood that SM marketing research still has many novel avenues for academicians, managers, and practitioners. Interestingly, SMMA can help online and offline marketing among educated consumers while other MPTs can only achieve offline marketing. In this context, it is suggested more studies with other SM platforms need to highlight the rate of online and offline marketing.

Managerial implications

The present study offers various managerial suggestions. This research found that females are more influenced by promotional tools compared to males. Men's styles of clothes do not change frequently, so for this, they do not prefer long visits to the stores. The retailers might design some innovative marketing strategies that will offer some hedonic benefits and fun. The online advertisement and promotional tools may not have focused on the quality of the product. So, quality assessment, certification or opinion, and reviewers from respondents who use high-class brands might help the managers. Communication gaps and information irregularity often create hurdles in the business process. Winning customer confidence is the main crux to becoming successful in business. Certain policies that will lead to strategies need to be designed by the senior-level management. The present scenario of social media has some facets like – business models and know how's that best fits the present industries', and the way organizations are applying these for various purposes. Social media has a strong impact on the behavior of consumers and various promotional practices.

Limitations and Future Scope

No research is completely flawless but has certain limitations. This study also possesses some limitations as the study has been carried out considering only one aspect of SMM i.e., Facebook. But as we are living in the 21st century of the digital era the organizations of present days are innovative, and the work process has changed. Quick output is expected everywhere. On the other hand, several organizations are using "Twitter", "Instagram", "Blogs", "Wikis", etc. It is emphasized to cover some more dimensions of SMMA then it can understand how organizations are using SM under varied circumstances. Secondly, the sample size considered was only 385 in each study area, which brings some limitations. If the work with a large sample size like 800 or 1000 then it may get some wide conception regarding SM and other MPTs. The study encompassed of respondents from metro cities of India. But it can be extended to some smaller states that would help to get some more inputs about how people perceive SMMA. It is also under a new research goal that socioeconomic and demographic variables of participants may enhance the SMMA.

The present findings are reported for its first-time in these capital cities and studied only on FB as SM along with other MPTs. In future comparison studies, different SM sites like WhatsApp, Instagram, YouTube, etc. should be evaluated to know the impact of apparel purchase intention through digital marketing.

Conclusion

In the present study, the selection of marketing tools such as sales promotion other than monetary incentive, visual merchandising, advertising, packaging, direct monetary incentive, store POP, and social media about the Purchase Intention of consumers while buying apparel is found appropriate. From the result of the study, it is concluded that there is a suitable impact on SM especially Facebook usage in apparel marketing and buying. The demographical variables mainly age groups between 18-25 years, married participants, and family income of INR 10000 to 30000, respectively observed more active in SM marketing and purchasing the apparel products. It is also found that SM activity especially on Facebook is a suitable platform where people can easily visit, view the brands, and merchandise the products compared to other MPTs.

Declaration of Conflicting Interests

The authors declare no conflicts of interest concerning the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

References

1. Ahmad, Nawaz, Atif Salman, and Rubab Ashiq (2015), "The impact of social media on fashion industry: Empirical investigation from Karachiites," *Journal of Resources Development and Management*, 7, 1-7.
2. Altstiel, Tom, and Jean Grow (2006). "*Advertising Strategy: Creative Tactics from the Outside/In*," Thousand Oaks, California: Sage Publications Inc.
3. Ansari, Saukat (2013), "Apparel retailing: Challenges and prospects in India with special reference to Lucknow division," PhD Thesis. Department of Commerce, University of Lucknow.
4. Appel, Gil, Lauren Grewal, Rhonda Hadi, and Andrew T. Stephen (2020), "The future of social media in marketing," *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 48 (1), 79-95.
5. Baird, Carolyn H., and Gautam Parasnis (2011), "From social media to social customer relationship management," *Strategy & Leadership*, 39 (5), 30-37.
6. Bala, Madhu, and Deepak Verma (2018), "A critical review of digital marketing," *International Journal of Management, IT & Engineering*, 8 (10), 321-39.
7. Bamba, Fatim, and Stuart J. Barnes (2007), "SMS advertising, permission and the consumer: A study," *Business Process Management Journal*, 13, 815-29.
8. Banerjee, Subhojit (2009), "Effect of product category on promotional choice: comparative study of discounts and freebies," *Management Research News*, 32 (2), 120-31.
9. Bashar, Abu, Irshad Ahmad, and Mohammad Wasiq (2012), "Effectiveness of social media as a marketing tool: an empirical study," *International Journal of Marketing, Financial Services & Management Research*, 1 (11), 88-99.

10. Bauer, Hans H, Stuart J. Barnes, Tina Reichardt, and Marcus M. Neumann (2005), "Driving consumer acceptance of mobile marketing: A theoretical framework and empirical study," *Journal of Electronic Commerce Research,* 6 (3), 181-91.

11. Belch, George E., and Michael A. Belch (2009), *Advertising and Promotion: An Integrated Marketing Communications Perspective*, 8th ed. Avenue of the Americas, New York: McGraw-Hill.

12. Bhalla, Swati, and Anurag S. (2010), *Visual Merchandising*. New Delhi: Tata McGraw-Hill Education.

13. Bhardwaj, Teena, and N. Suresh (2014), "A study on convenience of shopping in apparel sector," *MSRUAS-Journal of Management and Commerce*, 1 (1), 23-27.

14. Bhattacherjee, Anol (2012), *Social Science Research: Principles, Methods, and Practices*. USF Tampa Bay Open Access Textbooks, Florida: Tampa.

15. Bhatti, Khurram L. and Seemab Latif (2013), "The impact of visual merchandising on consumer impulse buying behavior," *Eurasian Journal of Business and Management*, 2 (1), 24-35.

16. Blattberg, Robert C., and Richard A. Briesch (2010), "Sales Promotion," Forthcoming in Oxford handbook of pricing management. Doi: 10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199543175.013.0024

17. Blythe, J. (1999), "Innovativeness and newness in high tech consumer durables," *Journal of Product & Brand Management*, 8 (5), 415-29.

18. Boorom, Michael L., Jerry, R. Goolsby, and Ramsey Rosemary P. (1998), "Relational communication traits and their effect on adaptiveness and sales performance," *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 26 (1), 16-30.

19. Borishade, Taiye Tairat, Olaleke Oluseye Ogunnaike, and Joy Dirisu (2015), "Empirical study of packaging and its effect on consumer purchase decision in a food and beverages firm," *European Journal of Business and Social Sciences*, 3 (11), 44-53.

20. Boyd, Danah M., and Nicole B. Ellison (2007), "Social network sites: Definition, history, and scholarship," *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication*, 131, 210-30.

21. Brokaw, S. and C. Lakshman (1995), "Cross-cultural consumer research in India: A review and analysis", *Journal of International Consumer Marketing*, 7 (3), 53-80.

22. Chen, Ching-Yaw, Chia-Hui Chao, Yu-Je Lee, and TSAI Pei-chuan (2012), "Exploration of the differences in Taiwanese women's purchasing decisions toward luxury goods and general products," *African Journal of Business Management*, 6 (2), 548-61.

23. Cheng Evelyn (2017), "China is Living the Future of Mobile Pay Right Now," (accessed October 28, 2020) https://tinyurl.com/y8hm6vlo.

24. Chowdry Amit (2018), "Facebook Launches Ads in Marketplace," (accessed October 30, 2020), https://tinyurl.com/y8kf5g4t

25. Dawes C. (2008), "Visual Merchandiser," (accessed September 30, 2020), http://www.sunburysc.vic.edu .au/pdfs/newsletters/September2008.pdf

26. Dash, Prashanta Kumar, and Minaketan Sarangi (2008), "Sociocultural dimensions of consumer behavior on retail shopping: a special focus on textile consumption in Orissa," ICFAI *University Journal of Consumer Behavior*, 3 (4), 7-23.

27. De, Debdeep, and Ajay Singh (2017), "Consumer's perspective and retailer's consideration towards purchase of private label brands," *Procedia Computer Science*, 22, 587-94.

28. Dickson, Marsha A. Sharron J. Lennon, Catherine P. Montalto, Dong Shen, and Li Zhang (2004), "Chinese consumer market segments for foreign apparel products," *Journal of Consumer Marketing*, 21 (5), 301-17.

29. Dowling, Grahame R. and Mark Uncles (1997), "Do customer loyalty programs really work?" *Sloan Management Review*, 38 (4), 71-82.

30. Duffett, Rodney Graeme (2015), "Facebook advertising's influence on intention-to-purchase and purchase amongst Millennials," *Internet Research*, 25 (4), 498-526.

31. eMarketer (2018), "Social Network Users and Penetration in Worldwide," (accessed December 15, 2019), https://tinyurl.com/ycr2d3v9.

32. Enginkayaa, Ebru and Dilaysu Cinar (2014), "The impact of digital advertising on consumer purchase decisions," Conference Paper, 432-41.

33. Enginkayaa, Ebru and Dilaysu Cinar (2018), "The impact of digital advertising on consumer purchase decisions," 2nd İnternational Interdisciplinary Business-Economics Advancement Conference at İstanbul.

34. Facebook (2019), "Company Info," (accessed October 15, 2020), Available at: https://tinyurl.com/ n544jrt

35. Fossen, Beth L. and David A. Schweidel (2017), "Social TV: How social media activity interacts with TV advertising," *GfK Marketing Intelligence Review*, 9 (2), 31-35.

36. Fossen, Beth L. and David A. Schweidel (2019), "Measuring the impact of product placement with brand-related social media conversations and website traffic," *Marketing Science*, 38 (3), 481-99.

37. Gerber, Charlene, Marlize Terblanche-Smit, and Tracey Crommelin (2014), "Brand recognition in television advertising: The influence of brand presence and brand introduction," *Acta Commercii*, 14 (1), Art #182, 8 pages. Doi: 10.4102/ac.v14i1.182

38. Ghosh, Avijit (1990), *Retail management*, Chicago: Dryden press.

39. Gijsbrechts, Els, Katia Campo, and Tom Goossens (2003), "The impact of store flyers on store traffic and store sales: A geo-marketing approach," *Journal of Retailing*, 79, 1-16.

40. Gilbert, David, and N. Jackaria (2002), "The efficacy of sales promotions in UK supermarkets: A consumer view," *International Journal of Retail & Distribution Management*, 30 (6), 315-22.

41. Gordon, Brett R., Florian Zettelmeyer, Neha Bhargava, and Dan Chapsky (2019), "A comparison of approaches to advertising measurement: Evidence from big field experiments at Facebook," *Marketing Science*, 38 (2), 193-225.

42.   Gould, Stephan J., and Barbara B. Stern (1989), "Gender schema and fashion consciousness," *Psychology and Marketing*, 6 (2), 129-45.

43.   Haenlein, Machael, and Barak Libai (2017), "Seeding, referral, and recommendation: Creating profitable word-of-mouth programs," *California Management Review*, 59 (2), 68-91.

44.   Haenlin, Machael (2017), "How to date your clients in the 21st century: Challenges in managing customer relationships in today's world," *Business Horizons*, 60 (5), 577-86.

45.   Hair, Joseph, William Black, Barry Babin, and Rolph Anderson (2010), "*Multivariate Data Analysis: A Global Perspective*, 7th ed. Harlow: Pearson Education.

46.   Hanna, Richard, Andrew Rohm, and Victoria L. Crittenden (2011), "We're all connected: the power of the social media eco system," *Business Horizons*, 54 (3), 785-807.

47.   Hellberg, Maria (2015), "Visual brand communication on Instagram: A study on consumer engagement," Thesis, Department of Marketing, Hanken School of Economics, Helsinki.

48.   Hennig-Thurau, Thorsten, Caroline Wiertz, and Fabian Feldhaus (2015), "Does twitter matter? The impact of microblogging word of mouth on consumers' adoption of new movies", *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 43 (3), 375-94.

49.   Hussain, Riaz, and Mazhar Ali (2015), "Effect of store atmosphere on consumer purchase intention," *International Journal of Marketing Studies*, 7 (2), 35-43.

50.   Idrysheva, Zhazira, Nataliya Tovma, Kyz-Zhibek Abisheva, Meiramkul Murzagulova, and Nazym Mergenbay (2019), "Marketing communications in the digital age," E3S Web of Conferences 135, 04044.

51.   Ioanas, Elisabeta, and Ivona Stoica (2014), "Social media and its impact on consumers behavior," *International Journal of Economic Practices and Theories*, 4 (2), 295-303.

52.   Ioanas, Elisabeta (2012), "Price fairness perception on Asiatic markets," International Conference on Social Responsibility, Ethics and Sustainable Business – ICSR, 1, Bucharest.

53.   Islam, Jamid, and Zillur Rahman (2016), "Linking customer engagement to trust and word of mouth on facebook brand communities: An empirical study," *Journal of Internet Commerce*, 15, 40-58.

54.   Jain, Rohini, and S. Singhal (2012), "A conceptual model for exploring impact of loyalty programs on consumer purchase behavior: with special reference to Indian apparel retailers," *International Journal of Research in Management & Technology*, 2 (2), 164-73.

55.   Jain, Vinamra, Ashok Sharma, and Pradeep Narwal (2012), "Impact of visual merchandising on consumer behaviour towards women's apparel" *International Journal of Research in Marketing*, 2 (5), 106-117.

56.   Jayasingh, Sudarsan (2019), "Consumer brand engagement in social networking sites and its effect on brand loyalty," *Cogent Business & Management*, 6 (1), 1698793. Doi: 10.1080/23311975. 2019.1698793

57.   John, Franklin S., Sheeja, R. and Bhavana, P.B. (2017), "A study on effectiveness of internet advertisements on students buying behaviour in the Coimbatore district," *International Journal of Engineering & Scientific Research*, 5 (2), 23-39.

58.   Jung, Yeo Jin (2013), "Facebook marketing for fashion apparel brands: Effect of other consumer postings and type of brand comment on brand trust and purchase intention," M.Sc Thesis, University of North Texas, USA.

59.   Kalu, Felicia (2019), "The impact of social media influencer marketing on purchase intention from an Irish male millennial's perception: A case study of Irish fashion industry," M.Sc Thesis, National College of Ireland, Ireland.

60.   Kamal, Yusuf (2016), "Study of trend in digital marketing and evolution of digital marketing strategies," *International Journal of Engineering Science and Computing*, 6 (5), 5300-02.

61.   Kamaladevi, Baskaran (2010), "Customer experience management in retailing," *Business Intelligence Journal*, 3 (1), 37-54.

62.   Kanan, P.K. and Hongshuang Li (Alice) (2017), "Digital marketing: A framework, review and research agenda", *International Journal of Research in Marketing*, 34 (1), 22-45.

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

64.   Karabag, Solmaz Filiz, Mehmet Yavuz, and Christian Berggren (2011), "The impact of festivals on city promotion: A comparative study of Turkish and Swedish festivals," *Turizam: znanstveno-stručni časopis*, 59, 447-64.

65.   Kati, Chitrakorn (2018), "5 technologies transforming retail in 2018," Available at: https://www.businessoffashion.com/articles/fashion-tech/5-technologies-transformingretail.

66.   Katke, Kadambini (2007). "The Impact of television advertising on child health and family spending – A Case Study," International Marketing Conference on Marketing & Society, 8-10 April, IIMK, At Indian Institute of Kozhikode, India.

67.   Kozinets, Robert V. (2002), "The field behind the screen: Using netnography for marketing research in online communities," *Journal of Marketing Research*, 39, 61-72.

68.   Kozinets, Robert V., Kristine de Valck, Andrea Wojnicki, and Sarah J. S. Wilner (2010), "Networked narratives: Understanding word-of-mouth marketing in online communities," *Journal of Marketing*, 74 (2), 71-89.

69.   Kucuk, Umit S. and Sandeep Krishnamurthy (2007), "An analysis of consumer power on the internet," *Technovation*, 27 (1), 47-56.

70.   Kujur, Fedric, and Saumya Singh (2017), "Engaging customers through online participation in social networking sites," *Asia Pacific Management Review*, 22 (1), 16-24.

71.   Kujur, Fedric, and Saumya Singh (2018), "Emotions as predictor for consumer engagement in YouTube advertisement," *Journal of Advances in Management Research*, 15 (2), 184-97.

72.   Kujur, Fedric, and Saumya Singh (2020), "Visual communication and consumer-brand relationship on social networking sites - Uses & gratifications theory perspective," *Journal of Theoretical and Applied Electronic Commerce Research*, 15 (1), 2020. Doi: 10.4067/S0718-18762020000100104202

73.   Kunwar, Pooja (2017), "A study on consumer behavior towards organized apparel retail industry with reference to Gujarat," PhD Synopsis, Gujarat Technological University, Ahmedabad.

74.   Kwon, Yoon-Hee (1997), "Sex, sex-role, facial attractiveness, social self-esteem and interest in clothing," *Perceptual and Motor Skills*, 84 (3), 899-907.

75.   Lee, Jung Eun, and Jessie H. Chen-Yu (2018), "Effects of price discount on consumers' perceptions of savings, quality, and value for apparel products: mediating effect of price discount affect," *Fashion and Textiles*, 5, 13. Doi: https://doi.org/10.1186/s40691-018-0128-2

76.   Leong, Siew Meng, Paul S. Busch, and Deborah R. John (1989), "Knowledge bases and salesperson effectiveness: a script-theoretic analysis," *Journal of Marketing Research*, 26, 164-78.

77.   Li, Shu, Yan Sun, and Yong Wang (2007), "50% off or buy one get one free? Frame preference as a function of consumable nature in dairy products," *The Journal of Social Psychology*, 147 (4), 413-21.

78.   Lichtenthal, David J., Vivek Yadav, and Naveen Donthu (2006), "Outdoor advertising for business markets," *Industrial Marketing Management*, 35, 236-47.

79.   Low, Patrick, and Ina Freeman (2007), "Fashion marketing to women in Kazakhstan," *Journal of Fashion Marketing and Management*, 11 (1), 41-55.

80.   Malik, Garima (2014), "Comparative analysis of celebrity endorsements on rural and urban areas with reference to FMCG Sector," *Pacific Business Review International*, 7 (1), 105-14.

81.   Mayrhofera, Mira, Jörg Matthes, Sabine Einwiller, and Brigitte Naderer, (2020), "User generated content presenting brands on social media increases young adults' purchase intention," *International Journal of Advertising*, 39 (1), 166-86.

82.   Mimouni, Aida, and Pierre Volle (2010), "Perceived benefits of loyalty programs: Scale development and implications for relational strategies," *Journal of Business Research*, 63 (1), 32-37.

83.   Mitchell, Vincent-Wayne, and Gianfranco Walsh, (2004), "Gender differences in German consumer decision-making styles", *Journal of Consumer Behaviour*, 3 (4), 331-46.

84.   Morrison, Michael (2001), "*The power of music and its influence on international retail brands and shopper behaviour: A multi case study approach*," in *Bridging Marketing Theory and Practice*, Conference Proceedings, Sylvie Chetty and Brett Collins eds. Australian and New Zealand Marketing Academy, 1-1.

85.   Myers, Hayley, and Margaret Lumbers (2008), "Understanding older shoppers: a phenomenological investigation," *Journal of Consumer Marketing*, 25 (5), 294-301.

86.   Nilsson, Johan, and Tobias Ostrom (2005), "Packaging as a brand communication vehicle," Thesis of Lulea University of Technology.

87.   Pookulangara, Sanjukta, Jana Hawley, and Ge Xiao (2011), "Explaining multi-channel consumer's channel-migration intention using theory of reasoned action," *International Journal of Retail & Distribution Management*, 39 (3), 183-202.

88.   Prabowoa, Hartiwi, Ridho Bramulyaa and Yuniarty Yuniarty (2020), "Student purchase intention in higher education sector: The role of social network marketing and student engagement," *Management Science Letters*, 10, 103-10.

89.   Pradhan, Vidha (2015)," Factors affecting impulsive buying behavior among consumers in supermarket in Kathmandu Valley," MBA graduate research project report submitted to Pokhara University.

90.   Pradhan, Vidha (2016), "Study on impulsive buying behavior among consumers in supermarket in Kathmandu valley," *Journal of Business and Social Sciences Research*, 1 (2), 215-33.

91.   Prasad, G. Hari Shankar (2014), "Factors influencing buying behavior of a selected apparel retailer's customers," *Annual Research Journal of Symbiosis Centre for Management Studies*, 1, 41-55.

92.   Raghubir, Priya (2004), "Free gift with purchase: Promoting or discounting the brand?" *Journal of Consumer Psychology*, 14 (1&2), 181-85.

93.   Rajapaksha, L.B., & Thilina, D.K. (2019), "The influence of Facebook brand page on consumer purchase intention with reference to fashion retailing industry", *Sri Lanka Journal of Marketing*, 5 (1), 55-101.

94.   Ramya, Lakshmi Narayanan, and Kartheeswaran, K. (2019), "Future of digital marketing in 2020," Conference on Digital Marketing: Scope and opportunities, At Sathyamangalam.

95.   Rather, Raouf Ahmad, and Sharma Jyoti (2017), "Customer engagement for evaluating customer relationships in hotel industry," *European Journal of Tourism, Hospitality and Recreation*, 8 (1), 1-13.

96.   Reinartz, Werner, Wiegand Nico, and Monika Imschloss (2019), "The impact of digital transformation on the retailing value chain," *International Journal of Research in Marketing*, 36 (3), 350-66.

97.   Samad, K. Abdus, and Sabeerdeen M. (2016), "A study on effective brand promotional strategies influencing customers," *International Journal of Management*, 7 (2), 52-65.

98.   Sarkar, Amit (2019), "The impact of social media marketing on customers preferences in fashion industry," MBA Thesis, Department of Management studies, Tamil Nadu: Sri Venkateshwara College of Engineering and Technology.

99.   Satish Kumar, R. (2018), Emerging trends in textile industry," *Current Trends in Fashion Technology & Textile Engineering*, 4 (2), 0023-0024.

100. Saxe, Robert, and Barton A. Weitz (1982), "The soco scale: a measure of the customer orientation of salespeople," *Journal of Marketing Research*, 19 (3), 343-51.

101. Schaninger, Charles M., and Donald Sciglimpaglia (1981), "The influence of cognitive personality traits and demographics on consumer information acquisition," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 8, 208-16.

102. Sharma, Sukanya, Saumya Singh, Fedric Kujur, and Gairik Das (2021), "Social media activities and its influence on customer-brand relationship: An empirical study of apparel retailers' activity in India," *Journal of Theoretical and Applied Electronic Commerce Research*, 16, 602-17.

103. Shimp, Terence A. (2000), *Advertising Promotion*, Supplemental aspects of integrated marketing communications, 5th ed. San Diego, CA: Harcourt College Publishers.

104. Sin, See Siew, Khalil Md. Nor, and Ameen M. Al-Agaga (2012), "Factors affecting Malaysian young consumers' online purchase intention in social media websites," *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 40, 326-33.

105. Sinha, Indrajit, and Michael F. Smith (2000), "Consumers' perceptions of promotional framing of price," *Psychology and Marketing*, 17 (3), 257-75.

106. Smith, PR. and Ze Zook (2016), *Marketing Communications – Offline & Online Integration engagement & analytics*, 6th ed. Kogan Page.

107. Szmigin, Isabelle, and Marylyn Carrigan (2001), "Time, consumption, and the older consumer: An interpretive study of the cognitively young," *Psychology & Marketing*, 18, 1091-1116.

108. Taylor, Charles R., and George R. Franke (2003), "Business perceptions of the role of billboards in the U.S. economy," *Journal of Advertising Research*, 43 (02), 150-61.

109. Taylor, Charles R., George R. Franke, and Hae-Kyong Bang (2006), "Use and effectiveness of billboards: Perspectives from selective-perception theory and retail-gravity models," *Journal of Advertising*, 35 (4), 21-34.

110. Thompson, Nicholas J., and Keith E. Thompson (2009), "Can marketing practice keep up with Europe's ageing population?" *European Journal of Marketing*, 43 (11-12), 1281-88.

111. Tripathi, Smriti (2019), "Impact of social media on generation Y for buying fashion apparel," *Journal of Content, Community & Communication*, 9 (5), 105-13.

112. Underhill, Paco (1999), *Why We Buy: The Science of Shopping*. New York: Simon & Schuster Pbks. Available at: http://doi.wiley.com/10.1002/mar.1004

113. United Nations Population Fund and Help Age International (2012), Ageing in the Twenty-First Century," (accessed October 19, 2020), https://www.unfpa.org/publications/ageing-twenty-first-century.

114. Walsh, Gianfranco, and Vincent-Wayne Mitchell (2005), "Consumer vulnerable to perceived product similarity problems: Scale development and identification," *Journal of Macromarketing*, 25 (2), 140-52.

115. Wan, Fang, Seounmi Yuon, and Tammy Fang (2001), "Passionate surfers in image-driven consumer culture: fashion-conscious, appearance-savvy people and their way of life," *Advances in Consumer Research*, 28 (1), 266-74.

116. Wells, William D., and George Gubar (1966), "Life cycle concept in marketing research," *Journal of Marketing Research*, 3, 355-63.

117. Wong, Amy, and Amrik Sohal (2003), "Service quality and customer loyalty: perspectives on two levels of retail relationship," *Journal of Service Marketing*, 17 (5), 495-513.

118. Workman, Jane E., and Cathryn M. Studak (2006), "Fashion consumers and fashion problem recognition style," *International Journal of Consumer Studies*, 30 (1), 75-84.

119. Yadav, Mayank, and Zillur Rahman (2017), "Measuring consumer perception of social media marketing activities in e-commerce industry: Scale development and validation," *Telematics and Informatics*, 34 (7), 1294-1307.

120. Yamin, Ahmad Bin (2017), "Impact of Digital marketing as a tool of marketing communication: a behavioral perspective on consumers of Bangladesh," *American Journal of Trade and Policy*, 4 (3), 117-122.

121. Yi, Youjae, and Hoseong Jeon (2003), "Effects of loyalty programs on value perception, program loyalty, and brand loyalty," *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 31 (3), 229-40.

122. Yin, Xu, and Jin-Song Huang (2014), "Effects of price discounts and bonus packs on online impulse buying," *Social Behavior & Personality: An International Journal*, 42 (8), 1293-1302.

123. Yoon, Carolyn, and Catherine A. Cole (2008), *Aging and Consumer Behavior*. New York: Springer.

124. Zeithaml, Valarie A. (1985), "The new demographics and market fragmentation," *Journal of Marketing*, 49 (3), 64-75.

125. Zhang, Yuchi, Michael Trusov, M., Andrew T. Stephen, and Zainab Jamal (2017), "Online shopping and social media: Friends or foes?" *Journal of Marketing*, 81 (6), 24-41.