



Review Article

Vol.12, Issue.4: 2025 (Oct-Dec)



INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF BUSINESS, MANAGEMENT AND ALLIED SCIENCES (IJBMAS)

A Peer-Reviewed and Refereed Journal

Social Media Marketing Strategies and Their Impact on University Student Consumer Behaviour

YL Mungshing¹, Dr. Ch. Ibohal Meitei², Chingripem KAS³

¹ Research Scholar, Manipur Institute of Management Studies, Manipur University

Email: ylmungshing@gmail.com

² Professor, Manipur Institute of Management Studies, Manipur University

Email: ibmeitei@gmail.com

³ Research Scholar, Commerce Department, Manipur University

Email: wellykharei@gmail.com

DOI: [10.33329/ijbmas.12.4.1](https://doi.org/10.33329/ijbmas.12.4.1)



ABSTRACT

This study investigates the influence of social media marketing on university students' purchasing behaviours, with a focus on gender differences. Social media platforms such as Facebook, Instagram, and Twitter have transformed how consumers discover, evaluate, and purchase products, significantly affecting marketing strategies. The research explores current social media marketing trends and their reception among students, using a combination of descriptive and exploratory methodologies. Data were gathered through a survey of 400 students from university students of Manipur, analysed using SPSS, with tools such as descriptive statistics and Chi-square tests. The findings reveal insights into the relationship between monthly expenditure on social media marketing and gender, contributing to the broader understanding of how social media impacts consumer behaviour among university students.

Keywords: Social Media, Social Media Marketing, Marketing Strategies, Consumer Behaviour.

Introduction

In the current corporate climate, social media marketing is a new marketing technique that is getting momentum quickly. The use of social media channels to spread information, concepts, and

practises to advance social as well as commercial goals can be summed up in one sentence (Lazer & Kelly's 1973). Among the widely used social networking platforms are Facebook, Instagram, WhatsApp, Google+, Twitter, Myspace, LinkedIn, and Wikipedia. (Xiang & Gretzel, 2010, as mentioned in Nadaraja & Yazdanifard, 2013). In this study, social media encompasses online platforms created for sharing information and facilitating communication, aimed at maintaining personal connections between individuals. (Chaudary & Anupriya, 2017).

The current generation relies on social networking sites to stay informed about events, achievements, and new academic programs at universities, thereby boosting the institutions' reputations. (Taylor, 2017). According to Sternthal and Craig (1982), Consumer buying behaviour is the process that highlights key aspects of how individuals make purchasing decisions and consume products. No business can operate successfully without customers (Jacinto et al., 2021). Although social media marketing platforms offer various tools for exploring, searching for, and verifying product details, it is clear that social media marketing has become a potent instrument for shaping customer purchasing behaviour (Gupta & Chopra, 2020).

Literature Review

Social media marketing refers to a broad concept that encompasses all marketing strategies and theories focused on the significance and utilization of social networking and other social media platforms (Zarella, 2010). Social media marketing has transformed consumer habits by offering new methods for searching, evaluating, selecting, and purchasing products and services (Albors, Ramos, & Hervás, 2008). These changes impact how marketers conduct their operations and shape their strategies and tactics, introducing new challenges and difficult decisions for them to navigate (Thomas, 2007). A significant portion of research focuses on the consumer perspective, particularly regarding increased consumption (Alhabash et al. 2015; Hoffman et al. 2014; Hong 2012) and the impact of social media marketing on consumer behavior (Bilgihan et al. 2014; Chang et al. 2015; Lorenzo-Romero et al. 2012; Ozguven & Mucan 2013; Schulze et al. 2014; La Torre, Miccoli, & Ricciardi 2014; Workman & Gupta 2013).

The studies by Vijay and Balaji (2009) and Neti (2011) confirmed that online shopping is the most favored method of shopping in India, and online retailers have strategies to shift Indian consumers away from cash-on-delivery. Additionally, Ahamad and Zafar (2013) focused their research on consumer behavior. Singh (2016) found a positive correlation between social media marketing and consumer behavior in a sample collected from Punjab. Tanha (2018) observed that social media has created numerous opportunities for businesses and individuals, significantly enhancing customer engagement.

Social media enhances a university's image by showcasing posts about events, achievements, and new programs (Singh, 2019). While social media is widely used and influenced by marketing efforts, there is still limited research on the impact of social media marketing among university students.

Objectives of the Study

1. To study the social media marketing trends and its influence among students.
2. To examine students' preferences for different promotional channels on social media and their networking behaviour.
3. To explore the impact of social media marketing on the buying behaviour of different genders.

Hypothesis of the Study

Ho1 The level of monthly expenditure on social media marketing does not differ significantly across gender.

Research Methodology

The study employed both descriptive and exploratory methods, as it was data-driven, with conclusions drawn from the collected data. A simple random sampling technique was used to select the sample from the university. Both primary and secondary data sources were utilized, with 400 questionnaires distributed among students from university students. Secondary data were gathered from books, journals, magazines, and papers available in university libraries and other sources. The study population included students enrolled in various department of University. Of the participants, 208 were male and 192 were female, with 292 unmarried and only 8 married individuals. The collected data were coded and analysed using SPSS version 26.0. Relevant statistical tools, including descriptive statistics and Chi-square tests, were applied for analysis. Descriptive statistics (mean, frequency, percentage, and standard deviation) provided insights into the sample data, while Chi-square tests were conducted to determine whether monthly online shopping expenditure varied independently between genders.

Results

Table 1: Summary of Demographic Profiles

Variables	Group	Frequency	Percent (%)
Gender	Male	208	52
	Female	192	48
Age	18-22	24	6
	23-27	368	92
	28-32	8	2
Marital Status	Married	8	2
	Unmarried	392	98
Educational Status	Undergraduate	48	12
	Graduate	104	26
	Postgraduate	248	62

Table 1 indicates that 52% of the respondents are male, while the remaining 48% are female. Regarding age, the majority of respondents (92%) fall within the 23-27 years age group; 6% are between 18-22 years old, and the remaining 2% are in the 28-32 years age range. Concerning marital status, the table shows that 98% of the respondents are unmarried. Finally, in terms of educational qualifications, 62% of respondents are postgraduates, 26% are graduates, and 12% are undergraduates.

Table 2: Summary of Income and Expenditure of Respondents

Variables	Group	Frequency	Percent (%)
Annual Household Income	Below 50,000	16	4
	50,000 – 100,000	272	68
	100,000 – 150,000	96	24
	150,000 – 200,000	16	4
Monthly Expenditure	Below 5,000	128	32
	5,000 – 10,000	176	44
	10,000 – 15,000	80	20
	Above 15,000	16	4

Source: Primary data

The table outlines the respondents' annual household income and their monthly expenditure on social media and online shopping. It shows that 4% of respondents have an annual household income below Rs. 50,000; 68% fall within the Rs. 50,000 – 100,000 range; 24% earn between Rs. 100,000 – 150,000; and 4% have an income between Rs. 150,000 – 200,000.

Regarding monthly expenditure on social media and online shopping, 32% of respondents spend less than Rs. 5,000; 44% spend between Rs. 5,000 – 10,000; 20% spend between Rs. 10,000– 15,000; and 4% spend more than Rs. 15,000.

Table 3: Summary of Social Media Related Profile of the Respondents

Variables	Group	Frequency	Percent
Internet and social media usage	–	400	100
	Social networking	160	40
Purpose of social media usage	Email	56	14
	Shopping	64	16
	Entertainment	96	24
	Others	24	6
Generally purchased items from internet	Mobile, Computers, Accessories	72	18
	Electrical Items	32	8
	Dress and Footwear	192	48
	Books	88	22
	Others	16	4
Reason for purchase on the internet	Discount offer	56	14
	Convenience	128	32

Mode of Payment	Wide range	88	22
	No waiting lines	56	14
	Others	72	18
	Debit Card	88	22
	Net Banking	32	8
	Cash on Delivery	280	70

Source: Primary data

The table indicates that all 400 respondents (100%) use the internet and social media. Among them, 40% use these platforms for social networking; 16% for shopping; 24% for entertainment; 14% for email; and 6% for other purposes. Additionally, the data shows that 48% of respondents purchase clothing and footwear online; 22% buy books; 18% buy mobile phones, computers, and accessories; 8% purchase electrical items; and the remaining 8% buy other products. When it comes to reasons for buying products online, 32% do so for convenience; 22% for a wider range of products; 28% for discounts; and 18% for other reasons. Regarding payment methods, 70% of respondents prefer cash on delivery, 22% use debit cards, and 8% use net banking.

Table 4: Descriptive Statistics of Online Shopping Website

Refined Table: Shopping Website Preferences

Shopping Website	Mean	SD	To No Extent at All	To No Extent	To Some Extent	To Moderate Extent	To a Good Extent	To a Great Extent	To a Very Great Extent
AMAZON	3.70	2.09	64 (16%)	88 (22%)	56 (14%)	40 (12%)	56 (14%)	16 (4%)	72 (18%)
FLIPKART	3.42	1.71	48 (12%)	96 (24%)	88 (22%)	56 (14%)	48 (12%)	48 (12%)	16 (4%)
SNAPDEAL	3.80	1.84	40 (10%)	72 (18%)	80 (20%)	72 (18%)	56 (14%)	32 (8%)	48 (12%)
MYNTRA	3.90	2.06	72 (18%)	48 (12%)	56 (14%)	64 (16%)	48 (12%)	56 (14%)	56 (14%)
JABONG	3.56	1.75	56 (14%)	48 (12%)	50 (10%)	64 (16%)	48 (12%)	32 (8%)	32 (8%)
INSTAGRAM	3.34	1.82	80 (20%)	80 (20%)	56 (14%)	72 (18%)	48 (12%)	48 (12%)	16 (4%)
FACEBOOK	3.68	1.84	56 (14%)	80 (20%)	48 (12%)	72 (18%)	64 (16%)	56 (14%)	24 (6%)

Source: Primary data

From the above table showing the mean rank of shopping sites, it can be concluded that the most preferred online shopping site is Myntra (Mean =3.9) followed by Snapdeal (Mean=3.8), Amazon (Mean=3.7), Facebook (Mean=3.68), Jabong (Mean=3.56), Flipkart (Mean= 3.42) and Instagram(Mean =3.34).

Table 5: Descriptive Statistics of Preferential Channels of Promotion

Variables	Mean	SD	To No Extent	To Some Extent	To Moderate Extent	To Good Extent	Great Extent	To a Very Great Extent
FACEBOOK	3.58	1.59	56 (14%)	48 (12%)	80 (20%)	96 (24%)	64 (16%)	56 (14%)
INSTAGRAM	3.88	1.61	48 (8%)	56 (14%)	88 (22%)	64 (16%)	72 (18%)	88 (22%)
WHATSAPP	3.48	1.80	64 (16%)	88 (22%)	64 (16%)	48 (12%)	48 (12%)	88 (22%)
GOOGLE+	3.46	1.90	104 (26%)	48 (12%)	40 (10%)	48 (12%)	88 (22%)	72 (18%)
TWITTER	2.84	1.50	88 (22%)	104 (26%)	80 (20%)	64 (16%)	40 (10%)	24 (6%)
LINKEDIN	3.04	1.73	96 (24%)	96 (24%)	48 (12%)	72 (18%)	32 (8%)	56 (14%)

Source: *Primary data*

From the above table, the mean rank shows that the most preferred online social site is Instagram ((Mean=3.88) followed by Facebook (Mean=3.58), WhatsApp (Mean=3.48), Google+ (Mean= 3.46), LinkedIn (Mean= 3.04) and Twitter (Mean 2.84).

Table 6: Descriptive Statistics of Products Which Needs Advertisement

Products	Mean	SD	To No Extent	To Some Extent	To Moderate Extent	To a Good Extent	Great Extent	To a Very Great Extent
Food/Beverages	3.02	1.44	80 (20%)	64 (16%)	96 (24%)	120 (30%)	8 (2%)	32 (16%)
Clothes	3.36	1.61	56 (14%)	88 (22%)	72 (18%)	72 (18%)	64 (16%)	48 (12%)
Jewelry	2.84	1.47	88 (22%)	96 (24%)	80 (20%)	96 (24%)	8 (2%)	32 (8%)
Cosmetics	2.72	1.59	120 (30%)	96 (24%)	48 (12%)	72 (18%)	40 (10%)	24 (6%)
Accessories	3.42	1.73	72 (18%)	64 (16%)	72 (18%)	88 (22%)	24 (6%)	80 (20%)
Household Items	2.86	1.69	120 (30%)	72 (18%)	80 (20%)	32 (8%)	64 (16%)	32 (8%)

Source: *Primary data*

From table 6, we can conclude that Accessories need more advertisement (Mean= 3.42) followed by Clothes (Mean=3.36), Food and Beverages (Mean= 3.02), Household Items (Mean= 2.86), Jewelry (Mean= 2.84) and Cosmetics (Mean=2.72).

Table 7: Descriptive Statistics of Student's Usage of Social Media Marketing

Refined Table: Social Media Usage Behaviour

Variables	Mean	SD	To an extent	To some extent	To moderate extent	To great extent
I read blogs on the internet every day	2.70	1.07	48 (12%)	160 (40%)	56 (14%)	136 (34%)

I use social media to view online advertisements	2.36	1.15	120 (30%)	112 (28%)	72 (18%)	96 (24%)
I share the links of my favorite brands with friends and relatives using social networking sites	2.66	1.11	80 (20%)	96 (24%)	104 (26%)	120 (30%)
I look for advertisements of different product categories before buying products on social networking sites	2.72	1.10	80 (20%)	72 (18%)	128 (32%)	120 (30%)
Total	10.44	3.13	—	—	—	—

Source: Primary data

From the above table, we can conclude that most of the respondents look advertisement of the different products category before buying the products in social networking sites before buying (Mean = 2.72).

Table 8. Descriptive Statistics of Students Viewing Social Media Advertising

Variables	Mean	SD	1. To no extent	2. To some extent	3. To moderate extent	4. To great extent
Watch all the ads	2.16	1.01	112 (28%)	152 (38%)	80 (20%)	64 (16%)
Watch most of the ads	2.04	1.08	168 (42%)	144 (36%)	104 (26%)	88 (22%)
Watch only few ads	2.78	1.26	72 (18%)	48 (12%)	64 (16%)	96 (24%)
Skip the channel / close advertisement window	2.94	1.25	40 (10%)	48 (12%)	128 (32%)	112 (24%)
Divert attention	3.06	1.28	8 (2%)	8 (2%)	24 (6%)	40 (10%)
Total	12.98	3.85	—	—	—	—

Source: Primary data

From the above table, we can conclude that most of the respondents divert attention when advertisement appear on Television/ social media (mean = 3.06) and few of the respondents watch most of the advertisement (mean = 2.04).

Table 9: Chi-square of Monthly Expenditure on Social Media Marketing between Gender

Monthly Allowance Levels	Male	Female	Total (n = 400)	Chi-square	df	Sig.
Below 5000	88 (68.75%)	40 (31.25%)	128 (32.0%)	1.145	3	0.766
5000 – 10000	88 (50.0%)	88 (50.0%)	176 (44.0%)			
10000 – 15000	48 (60.0%)	32 (40.0%)	80 (20.0%)			
Above 15000	8 (50.0%)	8 (50.0%)	16 (4.0%)			
TOTAL	232 (58.0%)	168 (42.0%)	400 (100%)			

Source: Primary Data.

Chi-square (χ^2) tests was conducted to investigate whether monthly expenditure on online shopping are independent of Gender. The Chi-square (χ^2) result, as shown in Table 9 ($\chi^2 = 1.145$, $df = 5$, $p = 0.766$), did not have significant differences at 5% level of significance. This means that the null hypothesis of no significant difference in the monthly expenditure on online shopping across gender was fail to reject.

Discussion

The study set out to examine emerging trends in social media marketing and their influence on university students, with a particular emphasis on understanding how these trends affect purchasing behaviour across different genders. The research revealed that almost all students, regardless of their educational background or qualifications, had access to the internet and actively engaged with social media platforms. This widespread access underscores the pervasive role of social media in the daily lives of students, making it a critical area of study for understanding consumer behaviour within this demographic. The analysis highlighted that social media and the internet exert a differentiated impact on the buying and usage behaviours of male and female students. While both genders use social media extensively, the ways in which they interact with content, perceive advertisements, and make purchasing decisions can vary. This differentiation in behaviour suggests that marketers need to consider gender-specific strategies when targeting university students to maximize the effectiveness of their campaigns.

The study also provided a detailed demographic profile of the respondents, revealing that the majority of participants were between the ages of 23 and 27. The gender distribution was nearly balanced, with 52% male and 48% female respondents. Notably, more than 62% of the students were pursuing postgraduate studies, and the vast majority were unmarried. This demographic context is important as it reflects a group of young adults who are likely to be in a transitional phase of life, making decisions that could have long-term implications for their consumer habits. Furthermore, the research found that students exhibited a generally equal preference for various online platforms, indicating that no single social media site dominated their attention. However, the students' response to social media advertisements suggested that these ads were effective in capturing their interest, albeit temporarily. This implies that while social media ads can draw attention, sustaining that attention and converting it into purchasing decisions may require more targeted and engaging content.

The study also investigated the relationship between monthly expenditure on social media marketing and gender, concluding that there was no significant difference in spending habits between male and female students. This finding challenges the assumption that gender plays a major role in determining spending behaviour in the context of social media marketing, suggesting that other factors, such as individual preferences, the type of products being marketed, or the nature of the social media content, might be more influential. This study provides valuable insights into how social media marketing trends are influencing university students, revealing nuanced differences in behaviour across genders, but also highlighting commonalities in how this demographic interacts with social media. These findings can help marketers tailor their strategies more effectively to engage this key audience.

Conclusion

Social media has become deeply integrated into daily life, particularly for university students who rely on these platforms to connect, share ideas, and collaborate. Beyond personal interaction, social media also serves as a significant channel for marketing, influencing how students perceive brands and make purchasing decisions. The study reveals that social media marketing has a noticeable impact on

the buying behaviour of university students, but interestingly, this impact does not differ significantly between male and female students. This suggests that social media's role in shaping consumer behaviour is consistent across genders, challenging the notion that marketing strategies should be heavily gender-specific for this demographic. The uniformity in how both male and female students respond to social media marketing underscores the platform's broad appeal and effectiveness. It indicates that while students use social media for diverse purposes – ranging from social interaction to academic collaboration – their purchasing behaviours tend to align when influenced by online marketing.

This finding highlights the importance of focusing on the quality, relevance, and engagement level of marketing content, rather than solely tailoring strategies based on gender differences. Overall, the study emphasizes social media's powerful role as a tool for both communication and consumer influence among university students, impacting their daily activities and spending habits in a consistent manner.

References

- Albors, J., Ramos, J. C., & Hervás, J. L. (2008). New learning network paradigms: Communities of objectives, crowdsourcing, wikis and open source. *International Journal of Information Management*, 28(3), 194–202. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijinfomgt.2007.09.006>
- Alhabash, S., McAlister, A. R., Quilliam, E. T., Richards, J. I., & Lou, C. (2015). Alcohol's getting a bit more social: When alcohol marketing messages on Facebook increase young adults' intentions to imbibe. *Mass Communication and Society*, 18(3), 350–375. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15205436.2014.945651>
- Bilgihan, A., Peng, C., & Kandampully, J. (2014). Generation Y's dining information seeking and sharing behavior on social networking sites. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 26(3), 349–366. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJCHM-11-2012-0220>
- Chaudary, P., & Anupriya, S. (2017). Role of social media in marketing & business growth. *International Journal of Scientific & Engineering Research*, 8(10), 162–167. <http://www.ijser.org/researchpaper/Role-of-Social-Media-in-Marketing-and-Business-Growth.pdf>
- Chang, Y., Yu, H., & Lu, H. (2015). Persuasive messages, popularity cohesion, and message diffusion in social media marketing. *Journal of Business Research*, 68(4), 777–782. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2014.11.027>
- Gupta, S., & Chopra, C. (2020). Impact of social media on consumer behaviour. *International Journal of Creative Research Thoughts*, 8(6), 1943–1961. <https://doi.org/10.13140/RG.2.2.26927.15527>
- Hoffman, E. W., Pinkleton, B. E., Weintraub, A. E., & Reyes-Velazquez, W. (2014). Exploring college students' use of general and alcohol-related social media and their associations with alcohol-related behaviours. *Journal of American College Health*, 62(5), 328–335. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07448481.2014.902837>
- Hong, S. (2012). Online news on Twitter: Newspapers' social media adoption and their online readership. *Information Economics and Policy*, 24(1), 69–74. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.infoecopol.2012.01.004>

- Jacinto, J. X. N., Pintado, J. S., Ibanez, L. J. M., Dagahoy, R. G., & Buladaco, M. V. M. (2021). Social media marketing towards consumer buying behaviour: A case in Panabo City. *International Journal of Research and Innovation in Social Science*, 5(2), 22–30. <https://doi.org/10.47772/IJRISS.2021.5202>
- La Torre, G., Miccoli, S., & Ricciardi, W. (2014). The Italian alliance for vaccination strategies: Facebook as a learning tool for preventive medicine and public health. *Human Vaccines & Immunotherapeutics*, 10(10), 1–5. <https://doi.org/10.4161/21645515.2014.970497>
- Lazer, W., & Kelley, E. J. (Eds.). (1973). *Social marketing: Perspectives and viewpoints*. Richard D. Irwin Inc.
- Lorenzo-Romero, C., Alarcon-Del-Amo, M.-D.-C., & Constantinides, E. (2012). Segmentation of users of social networking websites. *Social Behavior and Personality*, 40(3), 401–414. <https://doi.org/10.2224/sbp.2012.40.3.401>
- Nadaraja, R., & Yazdanifard, R. (2013). Social media marketing: Advantages and disadvantages. ResearchGate. <http://www.researchgate.net/publication/256296291>
- Ozguven, N., & Mucan, B. (2013). The relationship between personality traits and social media use. *Social Behavior and Personality: An International Journal*, 41(3). <https://doi.org/10.2224/sbp.2013.41.3.517>
- Schulze, C., Scholer, L., & Skiera, B. (2014). Not all fun and games: Viral marketing for utilitarian products. *Journal of Marketing*, 78(1), 1–19. <https://doi.org/10.1509/jm.11.0528>
- Singh, R. (2016). A study of customer behaviour towards social media marketing. *International Journal of Advance Research and Innovative Ideas*, 2(4), 262–267. http://ijariie.com/AdminUploadPdf/A_STUDY_OF_CUSTOMER%E2%80%99S_BEHAVIOR_TOWARDS_SOCIAL_MEDIA_MARKETING_ijariie2849.pdf
- Singh, R. (2019). *Impact of social media marketing on an Indian student's decision of studying abroad* (Master's thesis, ESC Rennes School of Business). GRIN. <https://www.grin.com/document/909784>
- Sternthal, B., & Craig, C. S. (1982). *Consumer behaviour: An information processing approach*. Prentice Hall.
- Tanha, M. A. (2018). An introduction to brand building via social media. *International Journal of Management Research & Review*, 8(6), 1–12. <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/334706484>
- Taylor, I. (2019). Why social media should be a key ingredient in your marketing mix. *Small Business Trends*. <https://smallbiztrends.com/2008/05/social-media-key-to-marketing-mix.html>
- Thomas, A. R. (2007). The end of mass marketing: Or, why all successful marketing is now direct marketing. *Direct Marketing: An International Journal*, 1(1), 6–16. <https://doi.org/10.1108/17505930710734107>
- Vijay, S. T., & Balaji, M. S. (2009). Online shopping in India: Findings from a consumer research. *Marketing Mastermind*. https://www.iupindia.in/509/MM_Online_Shopping_12.html
- Workman, A. D., & Gupta, S. C. (2013). A plastic surgeon's guide to applying smartphone technology in patient care. *Aesthetic Surgery Journal*, 33(2), 275–280. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1090820X12472338>
- Zarella, D. (2010). *The social media marketing book*. O'Reilly Media.