



Consumer Behaviour Towards Smart Gadgets

Madhan Kumar J, Dr.S.V.Harshini

UG, Department of Business management

Sri Krishna Adithya College of Arts and Science, coimbatore,Tamil Nadu ,india

Abstract- The rapid proliferation of smart gadgets—encompassing smartphones, smart wearables, smart home devices, tablets, and Internet of Things (IoT)-enabled consumer electronics—has fundamentally reshaped consumer markets and purchasing behavior across the globe. This article examines the multifaceted dimensions of consumer behaviour towards smart gadgets, integrating theoretical frameworks, empirical research findings, and contemporary market trends to provide a comprehensive analysis of the factors that drive, moderate, and constrain consumer adoption decisions. Drawing upon established models including the Technology Acceptance Model (TAM), the Unified Theory of Acceptance and Use of Technology (UTAUT), and the Theory of Planned Behaviour (TPB), the article investigates the roles of perceived usefulness, ease of use, social influence, hedonic motivation, price sensitivity, brand perception, and post-purchase satisfaction in shaping consumer attitudes and purchase intentions toward smart gadgets. The study further explores emerging behavioral patterns related to brand loyalty, switching behavior, online versus offline purchase preferences, and the growing influence of digital peer networks and social media on consumption decisions. Key challenges including privacy concerns, technological anxiety, information overload, and rapid product obsolescence are critically examined. The article concludes by proposing a conceptual model of smart gadget consumer behaviour and offering strategic insights for marketers, product developers, and policymakers operating in the smart technology ecosystem.

Keywords- Consumer behaviour, Smart gadgets, Technology Acceptance Model, Purchase intention, Brand loyalty, Digital consumers, IoT devices, Perceived usefulness, Social influence, Smart technology adoption Transactions, User Authentication Shopping Cart, Order Tracking.

I. INTRODUCTION

The twenty-first century has witnessed an unprecedented convergence of digital technology and everyday consumer life, with smart gadgets emerging as defining artifacts of this transformation. From the smartphone that serves as a personal command center to the smartwatch that monitors physiological vitals, from voice-activated home assistants that automate domestic tasks to connected fitness trackers that quantify human activity—smart gadgets have woven themselves into the fabric of contemporary living with a speed and pervasiveness that has few historical parallels. The global smart gadget market was valued at over USD 1.2 trillion in 2023 and is projected to grow at a compound annual growth rate (CAGR) exceeding 12% through 2030, driven by continuous technological innovation, declining hardware costs, and expanding digital infrastructure in emerging economies [1].

Understanding consumer behaviour toward smart gadgets is a matter of profound theoretical and practical significance. From a theoretical standpoint, smart gadgets occupy a unique intersection of



functional utility and symbolic meaning, challenging traditional models of consumer decision-making that focus primarily on utilitarian product attributes. The purchase of a smart gadget is rarely a purely rational calculation of features versus price; it is simultaneously an act of identity construction, social signaling, hedonic gratification, and technological self-expression [2]. This complexity demands analytical frameworks that integrate cognitive, affective, social, and situational dimensions of consumer experience.

From a practical standpoint, the implications for marketing strategy, product development, and retail management are equally compelling. Companies operating in the smart gadget space—ranging from global technology giants such as Apple, Samsung, and Google to a proliferating ecosystem of specialist manufacturers—compete not merely on product specifications but on the quality of consumer experience, the strength of brand communities, and the effectiveness of omnichannel engagement strategies. Understanding what motivates consumers to adopt new smart technologies, remain loyal to particular brands, share product experiences online, and eventually upgrade or replace their devices is essential intelligence for sustaining competitive advantage in this dynamic market [3].

In the Indian context, the smart gadget market presents particularly instructive dynamics. With over 750 million smartphone users, a rapidly expanding smart wearables segment, and accelerating adoption of smart home devices in urban and semi-urban households, India represents one of the world's most consequential consumer markets for smart technology [4]. The intersection of a youthful demographic profile, rising disposable incomes, intense market competition, and deeply embedded social and cultural influences on consumption creates a distinctive behavioral landscape that warrants dedicated scholarly attention.

This article is organized as follows: Section 2 reviews the theoretical and empirical literature on consumer behaviour toward technology products. Section 3 examines the key determinants of consumer behaviour toward smart gadgets. Section 4 presents a comparative analysis of demographic and psychographic segmentation patterns. Section 5 discusses emerging behavioral trends and challenges. Section 6 proposes a conceptual model and strategic recommendations. Section 7 concludes.

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

Theoretical Frameworks in Technology Consumer Behaviour

The scholarly understanding of consumer behaviour toward technology products has been substantially advanced by a series of theoretical models developed over the past four decades. Davis [5] introduced the Technology Acceptance Model (TAM), positing that two core constructs—perceived usefulness (PU) and perceived ease of use (PEOU)—are the primary determinants of users' attitudes toward technology adoption and actual usage behavior. TAM has been extensively applied and validated across diverse technology contexts, from enterprise software to consumer electronics, and continues to serve as a foundational reference point for studies of smart gadget adoption.

Venkatesh et al. [6] proposed the Unified Theory of Acceptance and Use of Technology (UTAUT), consolidating insights from eight competing technology adoption models into a unified framework encompassing performance expectancy, effort expectancy, social influence, and facilitating conditions as the primary predictors of behavioral intention and use behavior. The extended version, UTAUT2, incorporated hedonic motivation, price value, and habit as additional determinants relevant to consumer (as opposed to organizational) technology adoption contexts, making it particularly applicable to smart gadget purchase behavior [7].

Ajzen's [8] Theory of Planned Behaviour (TPB) provides a complementary lens, emphasizing the roles of attitude toward the behavior, subjective norms, and perceived behavioral control in predicting



consumer intentions. The TPB has proven particularly valuable in elucidating the social and normative dimensions of smart gadget adoption—how peer influence, family opinion, and social media validation shape individual purchase decisions in networked consumer environments.

Rogers' [9] Diffusion of Innovations theory contributes temporal and social system perspectives to technology adoption, classifying consumers into adopter categories—innovators, early adopters, early majority, late majority, and laggards—based on their relative openness to new technologies. This framework illuminates the heterogeneous nature of smart gadget markets, where simultaneous segments of technophilic early adopters and cautious mainstream consumers coexist, each requiring differentiated marketing approaches.

Empirical Research on Smart Gadget Consumer Behaviour

Empirical research specifically focused on smart gadget consumer behaviour has expanded substantially in the past decade, reflecting the growing commercial and academic significance of this product category. Dwivedi et al. [10] examined smartphone adoption behavior across multiple countries, finding significant positive effects of performance expectancy, hedonic motivation, and habit on usage intention, while identifying notable cross-cultural variation in the relative weights of social influence and price value. Their findings underscore the importance of culturally contextualized models of smart gadget consumer behaviour.

Kim and Garrison [11] investigated consumer adoption of smart wearables, revealing that privacy concern acts as a significant moderator of the relationship between perceived usefulness and adoption intention—a finding with important implications for the design and marketing of health-monitoring smart devices that collect sensitive biometric data. Similarly, Chuah et al. [12] found that self-expressiveness and social value significantly predict smart gadget purchase intentions among millennial consumers, emphasizing the symbolic and identity dimensions of smart technology consumption that purely functional models overlook.

Research on post-purchase behavior in smart gadget markets has documented complex dynamics of satisfaction, loyalty, and switching behavior. Liang et al. [13] identified service quality, product performance consistency, and ecosystem lock-in effects as primary determinants of brand loyalty in the smartphone market, while Shin and Shin [14] documented the role of social comparison processes in driving gadget upgrade behavior, particularly among consumers for whom smart gadgets function as status symbols within peer networks.

Consumer Decision-Making and the Purchase Journey

The consumer decision-making process for smart gadgets has been profoundly transformed by the digitalization of the purchase journey. Traditional linear models of problem recognition, information search, evaluation of alternatives, purchase decision, and post-purchase behavior have given way to non-linear, multi-touchpoint experiences in which digital channels—search engines, e-commerce platforms, social media, peer review websites—intersect with physical retail environments in complex, iterative patterns [15].

Verhoef et al. [16] documented the emergence of omnichannel consumer behaviour in consumer electronics, where individuals engage in cross-channel browsing—researching products online before purchasing in-store (research shopping), or experiencing products physically before completing the purchase digitally (showrooming). Both behaviors are prevalent in smart gadget markets, creating challenges for retailers and opportunities for brands that can deliver seamless cross-channel experiences. The rise of influencer marketing and user-generated content (UGC) has further transformed the information environment in which smart gadget purchase decisions are made, with peer reviews



and social media endorsements now ranking among the most trusted information sources for technology consumers [17].

III. KEY DETERMINANTS OF CONSUMER BEHAVIOUR TOWARDS SMART GADGETS

Perceived Usefulness and Functional Performance

Perceived usefulness remains the most consistently documented driver of smart gadget adoption across diverse product categories and geographic contexts. Consumers evaluate smart gadgets primarily on their ability to enhance productivity, simplify daily tasks, improve health and fitness outcomes, enhance entertainment experiences, and facilitate social connectivity [18]. The introduction of artificial intelligence (AI)-powered features—including intelligent assistants, predictive text, personalized content recommendations, and adaptive interfaces—has significantly expanded the functional value proposition of contemporary smart gadgets, raising consumer expectations and intensifying competitive differentiation around AI capabilities.

Functional performance consistency is equally critical to sustained consumer engagement. Research by Karahanna et al. [19] demonstrated that initial adoption decisions are primarily driven by beliefs about usefulness and ease of use, while continued use is increasingly determined by the gap between anticipated and experienced performance. In smart gadget markets, where frequent software updates and hardware iterations can dramatically alter performance characteristics, managing consumer expectations across the product lifecycle is a strategic imperative.

Brand Perception and Trust

Brand equity plays a disproportionately influential role in smart gadget consumer behaviour relative to many other product categories. Given the high involvement, high risk, and rapid innovation characteristic of smart technology markets, consumers rely heavily on brand signals as heuristic guides to quality, reliability, and after-sales support [20]. Premium smart gadget brands—particularly Apple and Samsung—have cultivated brand communities characterized by strong emotional attachment, shared identity, and evangelical word-of-mouth behavior that significantly amplifies marketing impact and reduces customer acquisition costs.

Trust, encompassing both institutional trust in the brand and interpersonal trust mediated through peer recommendations, is a foundational precondition for smart gadget purchase. Privacy and data security concerns represent the most significant trust challenge in the sector, with surveys consistently documenting consumer anxiety about data collection practices, device vulnerability to cyberattack, and the opacity of data governance frameworks employed by smart gadget manufacturers [21].

Price Sensitivity and Value Perception

Smart gadget markets are characterized by extreme price heterogeneity, with comparable functional capabilities available across price points ranging from budget devices at USD 50 to ultra-premium flagships exceeding USD 1,500. Consumer price sensitivity is modulated by income level, brand aspiration, perceived quality differentiation, and the perceived social risk of purchasing a low-status device in socially visible contexts [22]. In emerging markets such as India and Indonesia, price-to-performance ratio is the dominant purchase criterion for the mass-market consumer segment, creating intense competitive pressure on mid-range manufacturers.

The concept of value-for-money, operationalized as the ratio of perceived quality benefits to financial and opportunity costs, provides a more nuanced analytical lens than simple price sensitivity. Research by Sweeney and Soutar [23] documented that functional value, emotional value, social value, and



price/value-for-money collectively constitute the consumer value construct for durable technology goods, suggesting that smart gadget marketers must address multiple value dimensions simultaneously to achieve competitive differentiation.

Social Influence and Reference Group Effects

Social influence constitutes one of the most powerful determinants of smart gadget consumer behaviour, reflecting the fundamentally social nature of technology consumption in networked societies. Reference groups—including family members, peer networks, professional colleagues, online communities, and media personalities—shape consumer attitudes toward smart gadgets through informational influence (providing product information and recommendations), normative influence (communicating social norms about appropriate consumption), and identification influence (enabling consumers to express desired social identities through product choice) [24].

The rise of social media platforms has exponentially amplified the scale and speed of social influence in smart gadget markets. Influencer endorsements, peer reviews on platforms such as Amazon and Flipkart, unboxing videos on YouTube, and product discussions on Reddit and Twitter create information cascades that can drive rapid market adoption of new gadgets or equally swiftly damage the reputation of products perceived to underperform [25].

Hedonic Motivation and Experiential Value

Beyond functional utility, smart gadgets generate significant hedonic value through the pleasurable experiences of exploration, discovery, aesthetic appreciation, and technological mastery they afford. Research by Van der Heijden [26] demonstrated that hedonic motivation—the intrinsic enjoyment derived from interacting with a technology system—is a stronger predictor of consumer adoption in voluntary usage contexts than the utilitarian constructs emphasized in TAM. This finding is particularly relevant to smart gadgets such as gaming consoles, smart entertainment systems, and lifestyle wearables, where experiential pleasure is the primary value driver.

Product design aesthetics represent an increasingly critical dimension of hedonic value in smart gadget markets. Consumers demonstrate strong sensitivity to visual design language, material quality, haptic feel, and interface aesthetics, with premium design features commanding significant price premiums and generating disproportionate emotional attachment and loyalty [27].

IV. DEMOGRAPHIC AND PSYCHOGRAPHIC SEGMENTATION OF SMART GADGET CONSUMERS

Table 1 presents a comparative overview of consumer segmentation patterns in the smart gadget market, illustrating the differential behavioral characteristics, purchase motivations, and preferred engagement channels of key consumer segments identified in the literature.

Table 1: Segmentation of Smart Gadget Consumers by Demographics and Psychographics

Consumer Segment	Key Characteristics	Primary Purchase Motivation	Preferred Channel
Gen Z (18–25)	Digital natives, high social media engagement, trend-sensitive	Social signaling, hedonic experience, peer influence	Social commerce, mobile apps



Consumer Segment	Key Characteristics	Primary Purchase Motivation	Preferred Channel
Millennials (26–40)	Tech-proficient, value-conscious, brand loyal	Productivity, ecosystem integration, brand trust	E-commerce, brand stores
Gen X (41–55)	Pragmatic adopters, quality-focused, late majority	Functional performance, reliability, after-sales support	Omnichannel, retail stores
Senior Consumers (55+)	Selective adopters, ease-of-use priority, family influence	Health monitoring, connectivity, simplicity	Offline retail, assisted purchase
Tech Enthusiasts	Innovators, early adopters, high involvement	Innovation, specifications, exclusivity	Online platforms, tech forums
Budget-conscious	Price-sensitive, value-maximizing, mid-range focused	Price-to-performance, functional necessity	Discount e-commerce platforms

The segmentation analysis reveals that no single behavioral model adequately captures the diversity of consumer motivations and decision processes operating simultaneously in smart gadget markets. Effective marketing strategies must therefore be differentiated by segment, with distinct value propositions, communication channels, and post-purchase engagement approaches tailored to the specific behavioral profiles of each consumer group [28].

Table 2: Key Theories and Their Application to Smart Gadget Consumer Behaviour

Theory / Model	Core Constructs	Application to Smart Gadgets	Key Scholars
TAM	Perceived usefulness, ease of use	Smartphone and tablet adoption studies	Davis [5]
UTAUT2	Performance expectancy, hedonic motivation, habit	Wearables and smart home device adoption	Venkatesh et al. [7]
Theory of Planned Behaviour	Attitude, subjective norms, perceived control	Social influence in purchase decisions	Ajzen [8]
Diffusion of Innovations	Adopter categories, innovation attributes	Market penetration analysis	Rogers [9]
Consumer Value Theory	Functional, emotional, social, price value	Premium vs. budget gadget segment analysis	Sweeney & Soutar [23]



Theory / Model	Core Constructs	Application to Smart Gadgets	Key Scholars
Social Comparison Theory	Upward/downward comparison, status signaling	Upgrade behavior and brand switching	Shin & Shin [14]

V. EMERGING BEHAVIORAL TRENDS AND CHALLENGES

Sustainability and Ethical Consumption

A significant emerging trend in smart gadget consumer behaviour is the growing salience of environmental sustainability and ethical production practices as purchase determinants. Younger consumer segments, particularly Gen Z and environmentally conscious millennials, increasingly factor in the ecological footprint of smart gadget production, energy consumption, and electronic waste (e-waste) generation in their purchase decisions [29]. Brands that credibly communicate commitments to sustainable materials sourcing, carbon neutrality, repairability, and device longevity—such as Fairphone's modular smartphone design philosophy—are gaining traction among this segment, signaling an important market shift from pure performance competition toward sustainability differentiation.

Privacy Concerns and Data Anxiety

The pervasive data collection capabilities embedded in smart gadgets—encompassing location tracking, biometric monitoring, behavioral profiling, and ambient listening—have generated widespread consumer anxiety about privacy and data security. Studies by Malhotra et al. [30] and Xu et al. [31] document that privacy concern significantly negatively moderates smart gadget adoption intention, with consumers demonstrating a pronounced privacy calculus—a conscious weighing of the informational benefits of smart features against the perceived risks of data exploitation. This dynamic is particularly acute for smart home devices and health wearables, where the sensitivity of collected data is high.

Regulatory developments, including the European Union's General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) and India's Digital Personal Data Protection Act (2023), are reshaping the consumer privacy landscape, mandating greater transparency in data practices and strengthening consumer rights to data access and deletion. These regulatory changes are likely to accelerate the emergence of privacy as a mainstream consumer value in smart gadget markets.

Rapid Product Obsolescence and Upgrade Cycles

The accelerating pace of smart gadget innovation creates a cycle of planned and perceived obsolescence that profoundly influences consumer behaviour. Manufacturers deploy multiple mechanisms to drive replacement purchases—including operating system updates that degrade older device performance, the introduction of aesthetically distinct new designs that stigmatize previous models, and the development of new feature categories (foldable displays, augmented reality capabilities) that create fresh desire among existing owners [32].

Consumer attitudes toward upgrade cycles are becoming increasingly ambivalent, with segments demonstrating both upgrade enthusiasm (technology enthusiasts and brand loyalists) and upgrade fatigue (pragmatic consumers who resist the pressure to replace functionally adequate devices). The emergence of certified pre-owned gadget markets and device trade-in programs reflects market adaptation to this ambivalence, enabling manufacturers to capture value across consumer segments with varying upgrade propensities.



Influence of Artificial Intelligence and Personalization

Artificial intelligence is transforming both the smart gadget product experience and the consumer marketing ecosystem. On the product side, AI-powered features—including computational photography, on-device health analytics, predictive personalization of digital services, and natural language processing in voice assistants—are rapidly becoming key purchase differentiators, particularly among tech-savvy and premium consumer segments [33]. On the marketing side, AI-driven personalization of digital advertising, dynamic pricing, and recommendation systems enables brands to deliver highly targeted consumer experiences that improve conversion rates but also raise ethical questions about manipulative marketing practices.

Online Community Influence and Co-Creation

Online brand communities and user-generated content ecosystems have become powerful co-creators of smart gadget value and meaning. Consumer communities organized around specific brands—such as Reddit's r/apple and r/android communities or Samsung's Members platform—generate vast quantities of product knowledge, troubleshooting advice, feature wishlists, and brand advocacy content that supplement official marketing communications and shape consumer perceptions [34]. Progressive smart gadget brands actively cultivate these communities, incorporating consumer feedback into product development processes and leveraging community members as authentic brand ambassadors.

VI. CONCEPTUAL MODEL AND STRATEGIC RECOMMENDATIONS

Proposed Conceptual Model of Smart Gadget Consumer Behaviour

Drawing upon the theoretical frameworks and empirical evidence reviewed in this article, a comprehensive conceptual model of smart gadget consumer behaviour is proposed. The model posits that purchase intention toward smart gadgets is determined by five primary antecedent constructs: (i) Functional Value, encompassing perceived usefulness, performance expectancy, and technological capability; (ii) Hedonic Value, comprising experiential pleasure, aesthetic appreciation, and exploration motivation; (iii) Social Value, including social influence, identity expression, and status signaling; (iv) Trust and Privacy, incorporating brand trust, data security confidence, and institutional credibility; and (v) Economic Value, represented by price-value perception and total cost of ownership considerations. These primary determinants are moderated by demographic characteristics (age, income, education, digital literacy) and psychographic variables (technology enthusiasm, brand orientation, environmental values), and their effects on purchase intention are mediated by overall consumer attitude and self-efficacy. Post-purchase behaviour, including satisfaction, loyalty, and word-of-mouth, feeds back into trust construction and future purchase intention, completing the dynamic behavioral cycle.

Strategic Recommendations for Marketers and Product Developers

Develop Segment-Specific Value Propositions: Smart gadget marketers should develop differentiated communication strategies that address the dominant value drivers of each consumer segment—emphasizing productivity and ecosystem integration for professional users, aesthetic design and social currency for younger consumers, and health monitoring simplicity for senior segments.

Prioritize Privacy by Design: Manufacturers should embed privacy protection as a foundational product design principle rather than a compliance afterthought, communicating privacy credentials transparently and empowering consumers with meaningful control over their data. This approach is increasingly critical to building trust in health and home smart device categories.

Invest in Omnichannel Experience Integration: Brands should invest in delivering seamless consumer experiences across online and offline touchpoints, ensuring that digital information richness is complemented by tactile product engagement opportunities that are particularly important in high-involvement purchase decisions.



Cultivate Online Brand Communities: Smart gadget brands should actively support and engage with online user communities, leveraging authentic peer-to-peer advocacy and co-creation processes that generate consumer trust and product improvement insights that formal marketing research cannot easily replicate.

Address Sustainability Credentials: Manufacturers should develop credible sustainability narratives—grounded in verifiable commitments to e-waste reduction, repairability, recycled materials usage, and supply chain ethics—and communicate these narratives through channels that resonate with environmentally conscious consumer segments.

Leverage AI for Personalization with Ethical Guardrails: The use of AI in consumer marketing and product personalization should be pursued within ethical boundaries that respect consumer autonomy, prevent manipulative targeting practices, and ensure transparency about algorithmic decision-making processes affecting consumer experiences.

VII. CONCLUSION

Consumer behaviour towards smart gadgets represents one of the most dynamic, complex, and consequential domains in contemporary marketing science. The smart gadget consumer is neither the purely rational calculator of classical economics nor the impulsive hedonic actor of early consumer behavior theory, but rather a sophisticated, socially embedded, value-pluralistic decision-maker who navigates an increasingly rich and demanding technology consumption environment.

This article has demonstrated that smart gadget consumer behaviour is shaped by an intricate constellation of functional, hedonic, social, economic, and trust-related factors that vary systematically across demographic segments, psychographic profiles, cultural contexts, and product categories. Theoretical models such as TAM, UTAUT2, and TPB provide valuable analytical tools, but must be extended, combined, and contextualized to adequately capture the richness of consumer experience in smart gadget markets.

The emerging challenges of privacy anxiety, sustainable consumption pressure, upgrade fatigue, and AI-driven personalization create both risks and opportunities for smart gadget brands. Firms that demonstrate authentic responsiveness to consumer values around privacy, sustainability, and agency—while continuing to deliver compelling functional and experiential innovation—will be best positioned to build the deep consumer relationships that underpin sustainable competitive advantage in this market.

Future research should explore the longitudinal dynamics of smart gadget loyalty and defection, the cross-cultural generalizability of behavioral models developed primarily in Western and East Asian contexts, and the behavioral implications of emerging gadget categories such as extended reality (XR) devices, implantable health technologies, and AI-native personal computing platforms. As smart technology continues its penetration into every domain of human activity, understanding the consumer at the center of this transformation remains both an academic imperative and a business necessity.

REFERENCES

1. Grand View Research (2023). Smart Consumer Electronics Market Size, Share and Trends Analysis Report, Grand View Research, San Francisco, Available at: <https://www.grandviewresearch.com/industry-analysis/consumer-electronics-market>.



2. Belk R. W. (1988). Possessions and the Extended Self, *Journal of Consumer Research*, 15(2), 139–168, Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1086/209154>.
3. Kotler P. and Keller K. L. (2016). *Marketing Management*, 15th edition, Pearson Education, New Jersey, Available at: <https://www.pearson.com/en-us/subject-catalog/p/marketing-management/P200000005899/9780133856460>.
4. IAMAI (2023). *Internet and Mobile Association of India Annual Report 2023*, IAMAI, New Delhi, Available at: <https://www.iamai.in/research>.
5. Davis F. D. (1989). Perceived Usefulness, Perceived Ease of Use, and User Acceptance of Information Technology, *MIS Quarterly*, 13(3), 319–340, Available at: <https://doi.org/10.2307/249008>.
6. Venkatesh V., Morris M. G., Davis G. B. et al. (2003). User Acceptance of Information Technology: Toward a Unified View, *MIS Quarterly*, 27(3), 425–478, Available at: <https://doi.org/10.2307/30036540>.
7. Venkatesh V., Thong J. Y. L. and Xu X. (2012). Consumer Acceptance and Use of Information Technology: Extending the Unified Theory of Acceptance and Use of Technology, *MIS Quarterly*, 36(1), 157–178, Available at: <https://doi.org/10.2307/41410412>.
8. Ajzen I. (1991). The Theory of Planned Behavior, *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 50(2), 179–211, Available at: [https://doi.org/10.1016/0749-5978\(91\)90020-T](https://doi.org/10.1016/0749-5978(91)90020-T).
9. Rogers E. M. (2003). *Diffusion of Innovations*, 5th edition, Free Press, New York, Available at: <https://www.simonandschuster.com/books/Diffusion-of-Innovations-5th-Edition/Everett-M-Rogers/9780743222099>.
10. Dwivedi Y. K., Shareef M. A., Simintiras A. C. et al. (2016). A Generalised Adoption Model for Services: A Cross-Country Comparison of Mobile Health (mHealth), *Government Information Quarterly*, 33(1), 174–187, Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.giq.2015.06.003>.
11. Kim K. J. and Garrison G. (2009). Investigating Mobile Wireless Technology Adoption: An Extension of the Technology Acceptance Model, *Information Systems Frontiers*, 11(3), 323–333, Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10796-008-9073-8>.
12. Chuah S. H. W., Rauschnabel P. A., Krey N. et al. (2016). Wearable Technologies: The Role of Usefulness and Visibility in Smartwatch Adoption, *Computers in Human Behavior*, 65, 276–284, Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2016.07.047>.
13. Liang C. J., Wang W. H. and Farquhar J. D. (2009). The Influence of Customer Perceptions on Financial Performance in Financial Services, *International Journal of Bank Marketing*, 27(2), 129–149, Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1108/02652320910935616>.
14. Shin D. H. and Shin Y. J. (2011). Why Do Consumers Use Mobile Internet Services While Moving? The Application of a Value-Based Model, *Journal of Business Research*, 64(11), 1242–1250, Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2011.06.028>.
15. Court D., Elzinga D., Mulder S. et al. (2009). The Consumer Decision Journey, *McKinsey Quarterly*, 3, 96–107, Available at: <https://www.mckinsey.com/capabilities/growth-marketing-and-sales/our-insights/the-consumer-decision-journey>.
16. Verhoef P. C., Kannan P. K. and Inman J. J. (2015). From Multi-Channel Retailing to Omni-Channel Retailing: Introduction to the Special Issue on Multi-Channel Retailing, *Journal of Retailing*, 91(2), 174–181, Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jretai.2015.02.005>.
17. Cheung C. M. K. and Thadani D. R. (2012). The Impact of Electronic Word-of-Mouth Communication: A Literature Analysis and Integrative Model, *Decision Support Systems*, 54(1), 461–470, Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.dss.2012.06.008>.
18. Park Y. and Chen J. V. (2007). Acceptance and Adoption of the Innovative Use of Smartphone, *Industrial Management and Data Systems*, 107(9), 1349–1365, Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1108/02635570710834009>.
19. Karahanna E., Straub D. W. and Chervany N. L. (1999). Information Technology Adoption Across Time: A Cross-Sectional Comparison of Pre-Adoption and Post-Adoption Beliefs, *MIS Quarterly*, 23(2), 183–213, Available at: <https://doi.org/10.2307/249751>.



20. Aaker D. A. (1996). Measuring Brand Equity Across Products and Markets, *California Management Review*, 38(3), 102–120, Available at: <https://doi.org/10.2307/41165845>.
21. Dinev T. and Hart P. (2006). An Extended Privacy Calculus Model for E-Commerce Transactions, *Information Systems Research*, 17(1), 61–80, Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1287/isre.1060.0080>.
22. Nagle T. T. and Muller G. (2017). *The Strategy and Tactics of Pricing: A Guide to Growing More Profitably*, 6th edition, Routledge, New York, Available at: <https://www.routledge.com/The-Strategy-and-Tactics-of-Pricing/Nagle-Muller/p/book/9781138737518>.
23. Sweeney J. C. and Soutar G. N. (2001). Consumer Perceived Value: The Development of a Multiple Item Scale, *Journal of Retailing*, 77(2), 203–220, Available at: [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0022-4359\(01\)00041-0](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0022-4359(01)00041-0).
24. Bearden W. O. and Etzel M. J. (1982). Reference Group Influence on Product and Brand Purchase Decisions, *Journal of Consumer Research*, 9(2), 183–194, Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1086/208911>.
25. De Veirman M., Cauberghe V. and Hudders L. (2017). Marketing Through Instagram Influencers: The Impact of Number of Followers and Product Divergence on Brand Attitude, *International Journal of Advertising*, 36(5), 798–828, Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1080/02650487.2017.1348035>.
26. Van der Heijden H. (2004). User Acceptance of Hedonic Information Systems, *MIS Quarterly*, 28(4), 695–704, Available at: <https://doi.org/10.2307/25148660>.
27. Bloch P. H. (1995). Seeking the Ideal Form: Product Design and Consumer Response, *Journal of Marketing*, 59(3), 16–29, Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1177/002224299505900302>.
28. Wedel M. and Kamakura W. A. (2000). *Market Segmentation: Conceptual and Methodological Foundations*, 2nd edition, Kluwer Academic Publishers, Boston, Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4615-4651-1>.
29. Baldé C. P., Forti V., Gray V. et al. (2017). *The Global E-waste Monitor 2017*, United Nations University, International Telecommunication Union, and International Solid Waste Association, Geneva, Available at: <https://www.itu.int/en/ITU-D/Climate-Change/Pages/Global-E-waste-Monitor.aspx>.
30. Malhotra N. K., Kim S. S. and Agarwal J. (2004). Internet Users' Information Privacy Concerns (IUIPC): The Construct, the Scale, and a Causal Model, *Information Systems Research*, 15(4), 336–355, Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1287/isre.1040.0032>.
31. Xu H., Luo X. R., Carroll J. M. et al. (2011). The Personalization Privacy Paradox: An Exploratory Study of Decision Making Process for Location-Aware Marketing, *Decision Support Systems*, 51(1), 42–52, Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.dss.2010.11.017>.
32. Guiltinan J. (2009). Creative Destruction and Destructive Creations: Environmental Ethics and Planned Obsolescence, *Journal of Business Ethics*, 89(S1), 19–28, Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-008-9907-9>.
33. Puntoni S., Reczek R. W., Giesler M. et al. (2021). Consumers and Artificial Intelligence: An Experiential Perspective, *Journal of Marketing*, 85(1), 131–151, Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022242920953847>.
- 34.** Muniz A. M. and O'Guinn T. C. (2001). Brand Community, *Journal of Consumer Research*, 27(4), 412–432, Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1086/319618>.