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**ABSTRACT:**

 The role of YouTube influencers in shaping consumer behavior has gained significant prominence, especially in urban markets like Tiruchirappalli. This study explores the impact of YouTube influencers on the purchase decisions of Trichy consumers, focusing on trust, relatability, and niche-specific content. Influencers leverage authenticity and localized approaches to connect with their audiences, making their recommendations highly persuasive. With a growing preference for personalized reviews and relatable storytelling, consumers are increasingly influenced by product endorsements from YouTubers across categories such as technology, lifestyle, beauty, and fitness. The study highlights the importance of emotional engagement, targeted reach, and regional relevance in driving purchase decisions, reflecting the evolving dynamics of influencer marketing in the digital age.

**INTRODUCTION:**

Influencers have respect, power, relationships, information, and professional status with their followers. The development of social media has created Influencer Marketing, over the years it has witnessed web-based media replacing traditional media. Furthermore, consumers trust influencers more than brands as consumers can communicate with them directly, describing their own experience with a product. As much research shows that customers buy certain products as purely and simply as they are reviewed on the blog before. Collaboration with Influencers can result in gaining new customers and sharing information about the product and awareness about the product can be built. The aim of Influencers Marketing is to engage with real people whose messages are delivered to the customers. Marketers should engage influencers in campaigns if they are seen as credible sources of information, the factors through which influencers can be chosen by number of followers, and the number of posts and videos are shared daily, however, marketers should consider that online influence is about quantity not about the quality of the content Brands today are putting immense cash into Influencer Marketing. Purchase Behavior helps to meet the needs and wants of individuals, groups, or organizations pick, purchase, and organize ideas, products, and activities. As per the 2023 ComScore reports, YouTube helps to reach the “right customers” drive attention with the “right message” at the “right time” and connect with customers across regions, demographics, formats, and screens.

In the contemporary digital landscape, where social media platforms reign supreme, YouTube stands out as a powerhouse for influencer marketing. With its vast audience and diverse content creators, YouTube has become a hub for influencers to connect with followers and sway their purchase decisions. The rise of YouTube influencers as key opinion leaders has transformed the traditional marketing landscape, presenting brands with novel opportunities to engage with consumers authentically. Through vlogs, tutorials, reviews, and lifestyle content, influencers seamlessly integrate branded products into their narratives, fostering a sense of trust and credibility that resonates with viewers.

Central to the influence wielded by YouTube influencers is their ability to cultivate communities of like-minded individuals who share common interests and aspirations. These communities serve as fertile ground for brands seeking to connect with target audiences on a deeper level. By leveraging the intimate relationship between influencers and their followers, brands can tap into the inherent trust and authenticity that underpins influencer marketing, driving consumer engagement and purchase intent.

Moreover, the landscape of YouTube influencer marketing is constantly evolving, shaped by shifting consumer preferences, technological advancements, and emerging trends. As such, it is essential for marketers to stay abreast of the latest developments and best practices in influencer marketing to maximize their impact and ROI.

This research aims to delve deep into this phenomenon, exploring the mechanisms through which YouTube influencers shape consumer preferences, attitudes, and ultimately, purchase behaviors. In this research, the gap is to establish that YouTube Influencers play a major role in the purchase decision of customers when it comes to Tiruchirapalli.

**REVIEW OF LITERATURE:**

**1.** **E. A. Aventajado, “The Influence of YouTube on Young Consumers’ Purchase Behavior”, IJMDES, vol. 2, no. 1, pp. 31–38, Jan. 2023.** This study explores YouTube's impact on young consumers' buying habits, highlighting the role of YouTubers' personalities in product endorsements. It finds that credibility, expertise, and entertainment value influence decisions, alongside product reviews, video metrics, and brand popularity. YouTubers' personalities strongly shape consumer perceptions.

**2.** **Nugraha, F. (2023). Exploring “The Influence of YouTube Videos on Purchase Intentions among Millennial Consumers in Tasikmalaya City”. International Journal of Multidisciplinary Approach Research and Science, 1(02), 147–168.** This study examined the impact of YouTube User Generated Content (UGC) on Millennial purchasing behavior in Tasikmalaya. It identified key factors and revealed that video quality, duration, and presentation delivery greatly influence Millennial purchase decisions, positively shaping their buying intentions.

**3.** **Nadia Annisa ROSARA, Amia LUTHFIA, exploring “The factors Influencing Consumer’s Purchase Intention on Beauty Products in YouTube” Journal of Distribution Science 18-6 (2020) 37-46.** This study explores the impact of social media influencers (SMI), electronic word of mouth (EWOM), and perceived quality (PQ) on beauty product purchase intention (PI) on YouTube in Indonesia. SMI and PQ significantly affect PI, while EWOM has a greater influence elsewhere. Leveraging SMI and PQ effectively boosts consumer engagement and purchase intentions on YouTube.

**4.** **Monge-Benito, S., Elorriaga-Illera, A., & Olabarri-Fernández, E. (2020). “YouTube celebrity endorsement: audience evaluation of source attributes and response to sponsored content”.** This article examines followers' responses to maternity and childcare product endorsements by Spanish influencer "Verdeliss". Surveying 949 followers, it highlights her likeability and expertise as purchase drivers, despite moderate direct influence. It offers tips for influencers to improve endorsements and suggests brand tactics for selecting ideal influencers.

**5.** **Min Xiao (2023) “Engaging in Dialogues: The Impact of Comment Valence and Influencer-Viewer Interaction on the Effectiveness of YouTube Influencer Marketing”, Journal of Interactive Advertising, 23:2, 166-186.** This research explores the impact of negative comments on YouTube influencer marketing, finding that active influencer engagement can mitigate their influence. Valuable insights are provided for managing negativity in this context.

**6.** **Maria Rybaczewska, Betty Jebet Chesire, Leigh Sparks.** This paper explores the impact of YouTube vloggers on consumer purchasing behavior, focusing on brand awareness and decision-making. It emphasizes the trustworthiness of vlogger content and analyses the dynamics between vloggers and their audience, identifying key factors that shape this relationship.

**7.** **Marcia filipa martins botelho, “Impact of influencers in the consumer’s purchase intention: The cosmetic industry” (28 November 2019).** This study explores how social media influencers affect the purchase intention of cosmetic products. It finds that characteristics like trustworthiness and likability of influencers don’t significantly impact purchase decisions.

**8.** **Dhiyaa Nathifa Aziza, Rifelly dewi astuti, " Evaluating the effect of YouTube advertising towards young customers’ Purchase intention.” (2018).** This study found that entertainment and informativeness positively influenced advertising value on YouTube, suggesting that customers enjoyed it and found ads useful.

**9.** **Tsung-hsien kuo& Han –Kuang Tien, “Impact of relationship quality between social media influencers and their followers on brand purchase intention.” (2021).** This study aims to uncover the relationship quality between social media influencers and their followers and its impact on brand purchase intention. The results reveal that a strong relationship between influencers and followers facilitates trust transfer, positively influencing brand attitudes.

**10.** **Maria Francisca Lies Ambarwati, Herlina Damaryanti, Harjanto Prabowo, Muhammad Hamsal, “The impact of a digital influencer to the purchase decision” (2019).** The purpose of this study is to investigate the impact of a beauty vlogger on the purchase intention of the viewers in the YouTube channel. The result of this study shows that the contribution of the digital influencer to the decision of purchasing cosmetic products is 87.6%.

**STATEMENT OF PROBLEM:**

In recent years, YouTube influencers have emerged as powerful entities in shaping consumer behavior and purchase decisions across various industries. However, the extent and mechanisms of their influence remain poorly understood. This study aims to address this gap by examining the impact of YouTube influencers on Trichy consumers purchase decisions.

**OBJECTIVES:**

* To examine the extent to which YouTube influencers marketing impacts buying behavior.
* To compare the effectiveness of various types of YouTube influencers on purchase decisions.
* To identify the factors that contribute to a YouTube influencer and their content effectiveness in driving purchase decisions.

**HYPOTHESIS:**

YouTube influencers have a significant impact on purchase decisions among consumers in Trichy, with factors such as trust, engagement, and content relevance playing a crucial role in shaping consumer behavior.

**H0**: Youtube influencers does not have significant impact on purchase decisions.

Any observed influence of YouTube influencers on consumer purchase decisions in Trichy is either negligible or occurs due to chance rather than a direct causal relationship. If this hypothesis is true, it suggests that factors like product quality, price, brand reputation, personal preferences, or word-of-mouth recommendations play a more dominant role in influencing consumer purchases, rather than YouTube influencer promotions.

 **H1:** Consumers in Trichy are more likely to purchase a product if it is endorsed by a YouTube influencer they trust.

This hypothesis suggests that YouTube influencers positively impact the purchase decisions of consumers in Trichy, provided that the consumers trust the influencer. Trust plays a crucial role in this relationship, meaning that people are more inclined to buy a product if they perceive the influencer as credible, knowledgeable, and authentic.

**H2:** YouTube influencers have a significant impact on purchase decisions among consumers in Trichy.

This hypothesis suggests that YouTube influencers play a crucial role in shaping consumer purchasing behavior in Trichy. It implies that when influencers promote, review, or endorse a product, it significantly influences consumers' buying decisions. This impact could be due to various factors such as trust, perceived authenticity, product demonstrations, or emotional connections with the influencer.

**SCOPE OF THE STUDY:**

This study examines the influence of YouTube influencers on consumer purchase decisions in Trichy, Tamil Nadu, with a focus on the factors that drive consumer trust, engagement, and buying behavior. The research is confined to Trichy (Tiruchirappalli), Tamil Nadu, a rapidly developing city with a growing digital consumer base. It aims to understand how local consumers interact with YouTube influencer content and how it affects their purchase decisions.

**RESEARCH METHODOLOGY:**

The study was conducted by using primary data with a sample of 70 respondents selected at random in Tiruchirappalli using an online data collection form with 20 questions. The data was analyzed using tables, One sample T-Test and pie charts. Secondary data was also collected from books, magazines and websites for the study.

DATA ANALYSIS METHOD:

**Descriptive Statistics:**

 Percentage and frequency distributions to analyze consumer preferences.

Visualization tools: Charts, graphs and table to present findings.

Inferential Statistics: One sample T-Test to measure the impact of influencer trust and engagement levels on purchase intent.

**LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY:**

There are certain limitations, which are common to all research studies.

The limitations of this study are given below:

* The respondents of the study have been selected only from the city of Trichy and in a particular domain.
* The study was undertaken at a particular point of time when the respondents had a set of beliefs, preferences and attitudes which are not static variables.
* The number of respondents was restricted to 70 due to the time factor.

**ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATIONS:**

Based on the responses from 70 respondents, here is the analysis and interpretations of the impact of YouTube influencers on purchase decision:

TABLE NO:1

AGEOF THE RESPONDENTS

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **S.NO** | **AGE IN YEARS** | **FREQUENCY** | **% OF RESPONDENTS** |
| 1 | 18-25 | 63 | 90 |
| 2 | 36-45 | 3 | 4.3 |
| 3 | 26-35 | 2 | 2.9 |
| 4 | 46-55 | 1 | 1.4 |
| 5 | More than 55 | 1 | 1.4 |
|  | **TOTAL** | **70** | **100** |

From the above table, it is inferred that 90 percent of the respondents belong to the age group of 18-25 years, 4.3 percent belongs to 36-45 years, 2.9 percent belongs to 26-35 years, 1.4 percent belongs to 46-55 years and more than 55 years each.
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**TABLE NO 2:**

**GENDER OF RESPONDENTS**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **S.NO** | **GENDER** | **FREQUENCY** | **% OF RESPONDENTS** |
| 1. | Female | 62 | 88.6% |
|  2. | Male | 8 | 11.4% |
|  | **TOTAL** | **70** | **100%** |

**TABLE NO: 3**

**OCCUPATION OF THE RESPONDENTS**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **S.NO** | **OCCUPATION** | **FREQUENCY** | **% OF RESPONDENTS** |
| 1 | STUDENT | 59 | 84.3 |
| 2 | EMPLOYEE | 6 | 8.6 |
| 3 | OTHERS | 4 | 5.7 |
| 4 | BUSINESSMAN | 1 | 1.4 |
|  | **TOTAL** | **70** | **100** |

From the above table, it is inferred that 84.3% of the respondents are students, 8.6% are employees, , 1.4% are businessmen and 5.7% of the respondents belong to some other category not specified.

**TABLE NO: 4**

**SOURCE OF AWARENESS ON TRENDING PRODUCTS**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **S.NO** | **MEDIUM** | **FREQUENCY** | **% OF RESPONDENTS** |
| 1 | YOUTUBE | 34 | 48.6 |
| 2 | OTHER SOCIAL MEDIA PLATFORMS | 26 | 37.1 |
| 3 | TELEVISION | 9 | 12.9 |
| 4 | OTHER PROMOTIONAL ADVERTISEMENTS | 1 | 1.4 |
|  | **TOTAL** | **70** | **100** |

From the above table, it is inferred that 48.6% of the respondent get information from Youtube, 37.1% from other social media platforms,12.9% respondents from television, and 1.4% get information from other promotional advertisements**.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **One sample test** | Test Value = 70 |
| t | df | Sig. (2-tailed) | Mean Difference | 95% Confidence Interval of the Difference |
| Lower | Upper |
| SOURCE OF AWARENESS ON TRENDING PRODUCTS | -6.929 | 3 | .006 | -52.50000 | -76.6146 | -28.3854 |

INTERPRETATION: since the p-value (0.006) is less than 0.05 , so reject the null hypothesis and the difference is statistically significant at the 5%.

**TABLE NO : 5**

**AVAILABILITY OF YOUTUBE ACCOUNT**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **S.NO** | **YOUTUBE ACCOUNT** | **FREQUENCY** | **% OF RESPONDENTS** |  |  |
| 1 | YES | 56 | 80 |  |
| 2 | NO | 14 | 20 |
| **TOTAL** | **70** | **100** |

From the table, it is inferred that 56 percent of respondents are having the YouTube account and 14 percent of respondents are not having the YouTube accounts

|  |
| --- |
| **One-Sample Test** |
|  | Test Value = 70 |
| t | df | Sig. (2-tailed) | Mean Difference | 95% Confidence Interval of the Difference |
| Lower | Upper |
| **AVAILABILITY OF YOUTUBE ACCOUNT**  | -1.667 | 1 | .344 | -35.00000 | -301.8303 | 231.8303 |

INTERPRETATION: since the p-value (0.344) is greater than 0.05 , so accept the null hypothesis and the difference is not statistically significant at the 5%.
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**TABLE NO : 6**

**FREQUENCY OF WATCHING YOUTUBE VIDEOS**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **S.NO** |  **FREQUENCY** | **FREQUENCY** | **% OF RESPONDENTS** |  |  |
| 1 | DAILY | 55 | 78.57 |  |
| 2 | ONCE A WEEKLY | 11 | 15.71 |
| 3 | RARLY | 4 | 5.71 |
| **TOTAL** | **70** | **100** |

From the above table, it is inferred that 55 percent of respondents are watching youtube videos daily , 11 percent of respondents are watching it once a week and 4 percent of respondents are watching it rarely

|  |
| --- |
| **One-Sample Test** |
|  | Test Value = 70 |
| t | df | Sig. (2-tailed) | Mean Difference | 95% Confidence Interval of the Difference |
| Lower | Upper |
| **FREQUENCY OF WATCHING YOUTUBE VIDEOS** | -6.347 | 3 | .008 | -52.50000 | -78.8234 | -26.1766 |

INTERPRETATION: since the p-value (0.008) is less than 0.05 , so reject the null hypothesis and the difference is statistically significant at the 5%.

**TABLE NO :7**

**ACTUAL TIME SPENT IN A DAY BY THE RESPONDENTS ON YOUTUBE**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **S.NO** | **TIME SPENT ON YOUTUBE** | **FREQUENCY** | **% OF RESPONDENTS** |  |  |
| 1 | LESS THAN 1 HOUR | 39 | 55.71 |  |
| 2 | 1-2HOUR | 22 | 31.42 |
| 3 | 2-3HOUR | 5 | 7.14 |
| 4 | 3HOURS OR MORE | 4 | 5.17 |
| **TOTAL** | **70** | **100** |

From the above table , it is inferred that 39 percent of respondents are watching youtube for less than 1 hour in a day ,22 percent of respondents are watching it for 1-2 hours , 5 percent of respondents are watching for 2-3 hours and 4 percent of respondents are watching it for 3 hours or more in a day.

|  |
| --- |
| **One-Sample Test** |
|  | Test Value = 70 |
| t | df | Sig. (2-tailed) | Mean Difference | 95% Confidence Interval of the Difference |
| Lower | Upper |
| **ACTUAL TIME SPENT IN A DAY BY THE RESPONDENTS ON YOUTUBE** | -10.215 | 3 | .002 | -52.50000 | -68.8569 | -36.1431 |

INTERPRETATION: since the p-value (0.002) is less than 0.05 , so reject the null hypothesis and the difference is statistically significant at the 5%.
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**TABLE NO: 8**

**REASONS FOR TRUSTING THE YOUTUBE INFLUENCERS**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **S.NO** | **FACTORS FOR GAINING TRUST** | **FREQUENCY** | **% OF RESPONDENTS** |
| 1 | BEING KNOWLEDGEABLE ABOUT THE PRODUCTS | 29 | 41.4 |
| 2 | OTHERS | 19 | 27.2 |
| 3 | BEING HONEST ABOUT THEIR EXPERIENCE | 18 | 25.7 |
| 4 | BEING GENUINE | 4 | 5.7 |
|  | **Total** | **70** | **100** |

From the above table, it is inferred that 41.4% respondents trust youtubers for being knowledgeable about the products, 25.7% respondents trust them for being honest about their experience, 5.7% respondents trust them for being genuine and 27.2% respondents trust them for other reasons not specified.

|  |
| --- |
| **One-Sample Test** |
|  | Test Value = 70 |
| t | df | Sig. (2-tailed) | Mean Difference | 95% Confidence Interval of the Difference |
| Lower | Upper |
| **REASONS FOR TRUSTING THE YOUTUBE INFLUENCERS** | -8.434 | 3 | .003 | -52.50000 | -72.3106 | -32.6894 |

INTERPRETATION: since the p-value (0.003) is less than 0.05 , so reject the null hypothesis and the difference is statistically significant at the 5%.

**TABLE NO: 9**

**TYPE OF INFLUENCERS THE PEOPLE SUBSCRIBED THE MOST**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **S.NO** | **NO.OF.SUBSCRIPTION** | **FREQUENCY** | **% OF RESPONDENTS** |
| 1 | MEGA INFLUENCERS (ABOVE 1MILLION FOLLOWERS) | 29 | 41.4 |
| 2 | MACRO INFLUENCERS (1 LAKH-1 MILLION FOLLOWERS) | 26 | 37.1 |
| 3 | MICRO INFLUENCERS (1000-1LAKH FOLLOWERS) | 13 | 18.6 |
| 4 | NANO INFLUENCERS (LESS THAN 1000 FOLLOWERS) | 2 | 2.9 |
|  | **Total** | **70** | **100** |

From the above table, it is inferred that 41.4% of the respondents subscribed Mega influencers, 37.1% respondents subscribed Macro influencers, 18.6% respondents subscribed Micro influencers, and 2.9% respondents subscribed Nano influencers.

|  |
| --- |
| **One-Sample Test** |
|  | Test Value = 70 |
| t | df | Sig. (2-tailed) | Mean Difference | 95% Confidence Interval of the Difference |
| Lower | Upper |
| **TYPE OF INFLUENCERS THE PEOPLE SUBSCRIBED THE MOST** | -7.031 | 3 | .006 | -52.50000 | -76.2620 | -28.7380 |

INTERPRETATION: since the p-value (0.006) is less than 0.05 , so reject the null hypothesis and the difference is statistically significant at the 5%.

**TABLE NO :10**

**FACTORS INFLUENCING THE IMPULSIVE BUYING BEHAVIOUR TOWARDS A PRODUCT RECOMMENDED BY YOU TUBERS**.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **S. No** | **Factors** | **FREQUENCY** |  **% of respondents** |
| 1. | Product quality | 39 | 55.7 |
| 2. | Creative content | 16 | 22.9 |
| 3. | Brand reputation | 9 | 12.9 |
| 4. | Influencers reputation | 6 | 8.6 |
|  | **TOTAL** | **70** | **100%** |

From this table, it is inferred that 55.7% of the respondents are influenced by the product quality, 22.9% by the to creative content, 12.9% by the brand reputation, and 8.6% by the influencers’ reputation**.**

|  |
| --- |
| **One-Sample Test** |
|  | Test Value = 70 |
| t | df | Sig. (2-tailed) | Mean Difference | 95% Confidence Interval of the Difference |
| Lower | Upper |
| **FACTORS INFLUENCING THE IMPULSIVE BUYING BEHAVIOUR TOWARDS A PRODUCT RECOMMENDED BY YOU TUBERS** | -14.913 | 4 | .000 | -56.00000 | -66.4255 | -45.5745 |

INTERPRETATION: since the p-value (0.000) is less than 0.05 , so reject the null hypothesis and the difference is statistically significant at the 5%.

**TABLE NO : 11**

**Key factor drawing attention towards you tubers.**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **S.No** | **Factors that draws your attention** | **Frequency** | **% of respondents** |
| 1. | Product satisfaction | 24 | 34.3% |
| 2. | Video quality | 20 | 28.6% |
| 3. | Influencers reputation | 14 | 20% |
| 4. | Accessibility | 9 | 12.9% |
| 5. | Seller reputation | 3 | 4.2% |

From this table, it is inferred that 34.3% of respondents are drawn towards a youtube influencer due to the satisfaction from the product recommended by the influencers, 28.6% due to video quality, 20% due to influencers reputation, 12.9% due to accessibility, and 4.2% are drawn due to seller reputation**.**

|  |
| --- |
| **One-Sample Test** |
|  | Test Value = 70 |
| t | df | Sig. (2-tailed) | Mean Difference | 95% Confidence Interval of the Difference |
| Lower | Upper |
| **KEY FACTOR DRAWING ATTENTION TOWARDS YOUTUBERS** | -5.736 | 4 | .005 | -56.00000 | -83.1041 | -28.8959 |

INTERPRETATION: since the p-value (0.005) is less than 0.05 , so reject the null hypothesis and the difference is statistically significant at the 5%.

**TABLE NO 12**

**MAIN USAGE OF YOUTUBE**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  **S.No** | **Reasons people use YouTube personally** | **Frequency** | **% of respondents** |
| 1. | To see what’s trending | 53 | 75.7 |
| 2. | Seeing what’s going on in everyone’s life | 6 | 8.6 |
| 3. | To share the content | 4 | 5.7 |
| 4. | To know the political situation in country | 4 | 5.7 |
|  5. | To promote and run business | 3 | 4.3 |

From this table, it is inferred that 75.7% of the respondents use YouTube for seeing what’s trending, 8.6% use it to see what’s going on in everyone’s life, 5.7% use it to share the content, 5.7% use it to know the political situation of the country, and 4.3% of them use it to promote and run business.

|  |
| --- |
| **One-Sample Test** |
|  | Test Value = 70 |
| t | df | Sig. (2-tailed) | Mean Difference | 95% Confidence Interval of the Difference |
| Lower | Upper |
| **MAIN USAGE OF YOUTUBE**  | -24.981 | 3 | .000 | -52.50000 | -59.1882 | -45.8118 |

INTERPRETATION: since the p-value (0.000) is less than 0.05 , so reject the null hypothesis and the difference is statistically significant at the 5%.

**TABLE NO 13**

**THE FACTORS CONSIDERED WHILE DECIDING TO PURCHASE BASED ON YOUTUBE INFLUNCERS SUGGESTIONS .**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **S.N** | **FACTORS TO BE CONSIDERED** | **FREQUENCY** | **% OF RESPONDENTS** |  |  |
| 1 | QUALITY OF ENGAGEMENT | 22 | 31.43 |  |
| 2 | NUMBER OF SUBSCRIBES | 20 | 28.57 |
| 3 | OTHERS | 15 | 21.43 |
| 4 | REACH TO AUDIENCE | 13 | 18.57 |
| TOTAL | 70 | 100 |

From the table, it can be inferred that while deciding to purchase a product based on YouTube influencers’ suggestions, 22 percent of respondents consider quality engagement, 20 percent of respondents consider number of subscribers , 15 percent of respondents consider other features , and 13 percent of respondents consider their reach to audience

|  |
| --- |
| **One-Sample Test** |
|  | Test Value = 70 |
| t | df | Sig. (2-tailed) | Mean Difference | 95% Confidence Interval of the Difference |
| Lower | Upper |
| **THE FACTORS CONSIDERED WHILE DECIDING TO PURCHASE BASED ON YOUTUBE INFLUNCERS SUGGESTIONS** | -5.736 | 4 | .005 | -56.00000 | -83.1041 | -28.8959 |

INTERPRETATION: since the p-value (0.005) is less than 0.05 , so reject the null hypothesis and the difference is statistically significant at the 5%.

**TABLE NO: 14**

**THE TYPE OF PRODUCTS PURCHASED BASED ON YOUTUBE INFLUENCER’S SUGGESTION.**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **S.NO** | **PRODUCT PURCHASED** | **FREQUENCY** | **% OF RESPONDENTS** |
| 1 | FREQUENTLY USED PRODUCTS | 20 | 28.6 |
| 2 | LOW VALUED | 18 | 25.7 |
| 3 | RARELY USED | 18 | 25.7 |
| 4 | HIGH VALUED | 14 | 20 |
|  | Total  | 70 | 100 |

From the above table, it is inferred that, on the basis of youtube influencers suggestion 28.6% respondent purchases frequently used products, 25.7% respondent purchases low valued products, 25.7% respondent purchases rarely used products, and 20% respondent purchases high valued products**.**

|  |
| --- |
| **One-Sample Test** |
|  | Test Value = 70 |
| t | df | Sig. (2-tailed) | Mean Difference | 95% Confidence Interval of the Difference |
| Lower | Upper |
| **THE TYPE OF PRODUCTS PURCHASED BASED ON YOUTUBE INFLUENCER’S SUGGESTION** | -24.981 | 3 | .000 | -52.50000 | -59.1882 | -45.8118 |

INTERPRETATION: since the p-value (0.000) is less than 0.05 , so reject the null hypothesis and the difference is statistically significant at the 5%.

**TABLE NO : 15**

**REASONS FOR BUYING THE PRODUCT REFERRED BY YOUTUBE INFLUENCERS**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **S.NO** | **BASIS** | **FREQUENCY** | **% OF RESPONDENTS** |
| 1. | You actually need it  | 28 | 40% |
| 2. | Affordable price | 20 | 28.6% |
| 3. | Trendy | 15 | 21.4% |
| 4. | You like it  | 5 | 7.1% |
| 5. | Celebrity endorsed one  | 2 | 2.9% |
|  | TOTAL | 70 | 100% |

From the above table it is inferred that 28(40%) respondents buy products which are preferred by youtubers when they actually need it ,20(28.6%) respondents buy for its affordable price , 15(21.4%)respondents buy because it is trendy , 5(7.1%) respondents buy when they like it and 2(2.9%) respondents buy it due to celebrity endorsement**.**

|  |
| --- |
| **One-Sample Test** |
|   | Test Value = 70 |
| t | df | Sig. (2-tailed) | Mean Difference | 95% Confidence Interval of the Difference |
| Lower | Upper |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **REASONS FOR BUYING THE PRODUCT REFERRED BY YOUTUBE INFLUENCERS** |  -41.723 | 3 | .000 | -52.50000 | -56.5045 | -48.4955 |

INTERPRETATION: since the p-value (0.000) is less than 0.05 , so reject the null hypothesis and the difference is statistically significant at the 5%.

**TABLE NO : 16**

**STATE OF MIND AFTER PURCHASING ON THE REFERNCE OF YOUTUBERS**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| S.NO | STATE OF MIND | FREQUENCY | % OF RESONDENTS |
| 1. | Meets the expectation | 47 | 67.1% |
| 2. | More than the expectation | 12 | 17.1% |
| 3. | Less than the expectation | 11 | 15.7% |
|  | TOTAL | 70 | 100% |

From the above table it is inferred that after purchasing based on youtubers recommendation , for 47(67.1%) respondents it meets the expectation , 12(17.1%) respondents gained more than the expectation , and 11(15.7%) respondents experienced less than the expectation.

|  |
| --- |
| **One-Sample Test** |
|  | Test Value = 70 |
| t | df | Sig. (2-tailed) | Mean Difference | 95% Confidence Interval of the Difference |
| Lower | Upper |
| **STATE OF MIND AFTER PURCHASING ON THE REFERNCE OF YOUTUBERS** | -11.702 | 4 | .000 | -56.00000 | -69.2864 | -42.7136 |

INTERPRETATION: since the p-value (0.000) is less than 0.05 , so reject the null hypothesis and the difference is statistically significant at the 5%.

**TABLE NO : 17**

**TYPES OF CONTENT PREFERRED PRIMARILY TO TAKE FIRM PURCHASE DECISIONS IN YOUTUBE PLATFORM**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **S.NO** | **TYPE OF CONTENT** | **FREQUENCY** | **% OF RESPONDENTS**  |
| 1. | Reviews/comments | 41 | 58.6% |
| 2. | Vlogs | 15 | 21.4% |
| 3. | Tutorials | 6 | 8.6% |
| 4. | Endorsements | 5 | 7.1% |
| 5. | Others | 3 | 4.3% |
|  | TOTAL | 70 | 100% |

From the above table it is inferred that before making firm purchase decision reviews/comments are preferred by 41(58.6%) respondents, vlogs are preferred by 15(21.4%) respondents tutorials are preferred by 6(8.6%) respondents, endorsements are preferred by 5(7.1%) respondents and other than these forms are preferred by 3(4.3%) respondents.

|  |
| --- |
| **One-Sample Test** |
|  | Test Value = 70 |
| t | df | Sig. (2-tailed) | Mean Difference | 95% Confidence Interval of the Difference |
| Lower | Upper |
| **TYPES OF CONTENT PREFERRED PRIMARILY TO TAKE FIRM PURCHASE DECISIONS IN YOUTUBE PLATFORM**  | -3.942 | 2 | .059 | -46.66667 | -97.5965 | 4.2632 |

INTERPRETATION: since the p-value (0.059) is greater than 0.05 , so accept the null hypothesis and the difference is not statistically significant at the 5%.

**TABLE .NO: 18**

**THE ROLE PLAYED BY YOUTUBE INFLUENCERS ON CONSUMER BUYING PROCESS**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **S.NO** | **ROLE PLAYED BY YOUTUBE INFLUENCERS** | **FREQUENCY** | **% OF RESPONDENTS** |
| 1. | For searching market information | 26 | 37.1 |
| 2. | Helping you out in choosing the best alternatives | 21 | 30 |
| 3. | making you aware of post purchase effects | 11 | 15.7 |
| 4. | In recognize your problem/need | 7 | 10 |
| 5. | being an opinion leader in purchase decision | 5 | 7.1 |
|  | Total | 70 | 100 |

From the above table, it is inferred that, for 37.1% respondents YouTube acts as the searching platform to gain market information, for 30% of respondents it helps them in choosing the best alternative by evaluation, for 15.7% respondents YouTube acts as awareness platform about post purchase effect, 10% respondents use it for recognizing their need/problems, and 7.1% respondents take them as an opinion leader while taking their decision.

|  |
| --- |
| **One-Sample Test** |
|  |  | Test Value = 70/ |
|  |  t | df | Sig. (2-tailed) | Mean Difference | 95% Confidence Interval of the Difference |
|  | Lower | Upper |
|  | **THE ROLE PLAYED BY YOUTUBE INFLUENCERS ON CONSUMER BUYING PROCESS** |  -7.935 | 4 | .001 | -56.00000 | -75.5931 | -36.4069 |

INTERPRETATION: since the p-value (0.001) is less than 0.05 , so reject the null hypothesis and the difference is statistically significant at the 5%.

**TABLE .NO:19**

**TYPES OF PROMOTIONAL TOOLS ENDORSED BY YOUTUBERS INORDER TO INDUCE THE CONSUMERS**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **S.NO.** | **PROMOTIONAL TOOLS USED BY YOUTUBE INFLUENCERS** | **FREQUENCY** | **% OF RESPONDENTS** |
| 1. | Promotional code | 27 | 38.57 |
| 2. | Affiliate link | 14 | 20 |
| 3. | Free product launch event tickets | 12 | 17.14 |
| 4. | Other tools | 12 | 17.14 |
| 5. | Participated in giveaway and contest | 5 | 7.14 |
|  | Total | 70 | 100 |

From the above table, it is inferred that 38.57% of respondents used the promotional code of the YouTube influencers, 20% of them used the affiliate link attached by the influencers, 17.14% of respondents used the free product launch and event ticket, 17.14% used none of the tools of the influencers, and 7.14% of respondents participated in giveaway and contest.

|  |
| --- |
| **One-Sample Test** |
|  |
|  | Test Value = 70 |
| t | df | Sig. (2-tailed) | Mean Difference | 95% Confidence Interval of the Difference |
| Lower | Upper |
| **TYPES OF PROMOTIONAL TOOLS ENDORSED BY YOUTUBERS INORDER TO INDUCE THE CONSUMERS**  | -13.745 | 4 | .000 | -56.00000 | -67.3121 | -44.6879 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

INTERPRETATION: since the p-value (0.000) is less than 0.05 , so reject the null hypothesis and the difference is statistically significant at the 5%.

**TABLE .NO:20**

**THE PERCEPTION OF THE RESPONDENTS ABOUT THE YOUTUBE INFLUENCERS**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **S.NO.** | **PERCEPTIONS ABOUT YOUTUBERS** | **NO. OF RESPONDENTS** | **% OF RESPONDENTS** |
| 1. | Explorer of new product | 27 | 38.6 |
| 2. | Real- life testimony | 14 | 20 |
| 3. | Thought leaders [ market expert] | 13 | 18.6 |
| 4. | As a friend who shares same mentality | 12 | 17.1 |
| 5. | Deceptive persons (lying about the facts) | 4 | 5.7 |
| 6. | Ambiguous endorser (unclear disclosure) | NIL | NIL |
|  | Total | 70 | 100 |

From the table, it is inferred that 38.6% of respondents take youtubers as the explorer of new products, 20% of respondents see them as real-life testimony, 18.6% respondents consider them as thought leaders or market experts,17.1% respondents perceive them as their friend i.e. parasocial interaction, 5.7% of respondents consider them as deceptive person and none of them take them as ambiguous endorser.

|  |
| --- |
| **One-Sample Test** |
|  | Test Value = 70 |
|  t | df | Sig. (2-tailed) | Mean Difference | 95% Confidence Interval of the Difference |
| Lower | Upper |
| **THE PERCEPTION OF THE RESPONDENTS ABOUT THE YOUTUBE INFLUENCERS** |  -15.3 | 4 | .000 | -56.00000 | -66.2766 | -45.7234 |

INTERPRETATION: since the p-value (0.000) is less than 0.05 , so reject the null hypothesis and the difference is statistically significant at the 5%.

**CONCLUSION:**

It can be concluded that the majority of YouTube users in the surveyed demographic in Tiruchirappalli are young (18-25 years old), female, and students. The findings of one sample T-Test indicates to accept the alternate hypothesis ie)YouTube influencers have a significant influence on younger, digitally engaged audiences, particularly among female students. These influencers are valued for their ability to furnish valuable product insights, with a strong prominence placed on authenticity and relatability. While mega influencers capture the attention, it's the macro influencers who are trusted more due to their perceived authenticity. In spite of users spending relatively little time on the platform daily, they actively engage with influencer content, showing its significance in their lives.

YouTube influencers are perceived as more than just entertainers; they're explorers of new products, trendsetters, and trusted advisors in the intricate landscape of consumer decision-making.

A future study could investigate how emerging trends like Virutual Reality, Augmented Reality, and interactive content impact YouTube influencer marketing. It could also compare YouTube influencers with those on Instagram and TikTok, analyzing their influence on purchase decisions in Trichy. Such research would inform businesses on enhancing influencer strategies for local consumer engagement.

Overall, the survey findings underscore the multifaceted impact of YouTube influencers on consumer behavior in Tiruchirappalli. From informing purchase decisions to shaping broader trends, influencers hold significant influence in the digital landscape. As consumer preferences and behaviors continue to evolve, understanding and leveraging the power of influencer marketing will remain vital for brands seeking to connect with their intended audiences effectively.
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