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ABSTRACT

This research aims to investigate the relationship between of Brand Innovativeness on Electronic Word of Mouth, this relationship in the field of application which is smart watches customers in Dakahliya.

The Research adopted the philosophy of positivism, the deductive approach, and the method of quantitative analysis as the research methodology. The instrument utilized for data collection was the questionnaire. Consequently, 384 usable questionnaires were collected electronically through social media channels from customers of Smart Watches in Dakahliya. In addition, using Warp PLS 8, path analysis was employed to explore the relationships among the research variables.

The findings reveal that Brand Innovativeness is significantly positive affect Electronic Word of Mouth. Also, research results show that Demographics differences have Partial significant differences in respondents’ opinions of Smart Watches customers regarding research variables (Brand Innovativeness and Electronic Word of Mouth).

In addition, this research also has significant practical implications and guidelines for Smart Watch Companies, and theoretical implications for researchers who are interested in research variables.

Keywords: Smart Watches Customers, Brand Innovativeness, Electronic Word of Mouth.
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Introduction

The terms “innovation” and “innovativeness” significantly differ, although their uses have frequently interchanged in the literature of business and hospitality. Generally, innovation focuses on the outcomes of new elements or a new combination of traditional elements in a firm’s activities, while innovativeness refers to a firm’s capability to be amenable to new ideas, services, and promotions. Innovation as an outcome of a firm’s endeavor to pursue new ideas is a necessity for its survival and competitiveness, since the dynamic marketplace constantly winnows organizations that lack the capability to explore new markets and opportunities. In contemporary research, innovativeness has had greater adoption in marketing and management literature in comparison to innovation (Kim et al., 2018).

Notably, in the marketing literature, previous research has emphasized the contribution of brand innovativeness to brand perceptions in the minds of customers (Boisvert & Ashill, 2011; Hubert et al., 2017; Jin et al., 2016; Konuk, 2019). Particularly, since customers lack full access to information about a brand, they become more cynical and hesitant in the online platforms given the presence of perceived risk (Küster, 2006; Mahrous & Hassan, 2017). Accordingly, they frequently rely on extrinsic information to evaluate the brand (Tran & Chang, 2022).

Recently, the term “brand innovativeness” has gained more attention from researchers (e.g., Kim et al., 2021; Nysveen et al., 2018). In the context of branding, Ouellet (2006, p.312) proposes that the notion of brand innovativeness reflects a perception of customers about a brand’s proclivity for “new ideas, novelty, experimentation, and creative processes.”

Today’s word of mouth communication through electronic media is important and gets attention because this positive information can increase consumer intention to buy the product and have an impact on sales turnover. Marketing communication through online media is known as e-WOM. A positive E-WOM can also indicate that the company’s marketing performance is improving (Suartina et al., 2022). E-WOM is a place for consumers to provide comments about the brand of a product or the brand of a place to shop. Comments from consumers are usually information for potential consumers before making a buying decision. If comments from previous consumers are positive, this is certainly good information influencing the choice of future consumers (Mainolfi & Vergura, 2021). Therefore, every business always tries to create conditions so that its customers are willing to give good and positive reviews about their products or place of business so that they also have a positive impact on other target markets (Langga et al., 2021).

Research Purpose

This study proposes a novel relationship between brand innovativeness and electronic word of mouth in our research model, which therefore expand the literature in the field of smart watches users. In other words, to the best of the researcher knowledge no research has studied all of these variables simultaneously with these dimensions or on this sector.

Literature Review

Brand Innovativeness

Many variables influence how individuals react to innovation, individual innovativeness, which can be regarded as the most important one, has been a part of innovation distribution studies for a
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long time (Agarwal & Prasad, 1998). The concept of innovativeness can be defined as differences among individuals that characterize how individuals react to new things. As an individual characteristic, individual innovativeness can be related to taking risks, being open new experiences or age (Goldsmith & Foxall, 2003). Individual innovativeness is a factor that determines whether one individual accepts innovation before others (Agarwal & Prasad, 1998). In this line, innovativeness can be defined as one individual’s or other organizations’ level of accepting a new idea relatively earlier than other members of the society (Rogers, 1983; Daft & Marcic, 2011). Individuals react differently to a new idea, application or product due to their characteristics of individual innovativeness. Rogers (1983) categorizes individuals or other unit of adoption into five groups according to their level of innovativeness as follows: (1) innovators, (2) early adopters, (3) early majority, (4) late majority, and (5) laggards (Rogers, 1983).

Appreciation of strategic innovativeness has been crucial in today’s fast-changing business environments. A business’ capability for innovativeness is the foundation for gaining competitive advantage in the marketplace. Previous studies of innovativeness have predominantly investigated high-technology and manufacturing industries rather than service industries, despite the acknowledged significance of innovativeness in all types of industries. However, a simple transposition of the well-established notion of innovativeness from manufacturing to services is improper (Kim et al., 2018).

Innovativeness that consumers perceive from a new product/service is very important for the success of the product/service because it has a significant impact on the adoption behavior for new technologies. That is, if consumers perceive high levels of innovativeness from a new technology, they are more likely to use the new technology. From a consumer standpoint, perceived innovativeness is considered a corporate effort to meet the needs of consumers to crave something new. In particular, perceived innovativeness has a profound effect on the profitability of a company, so companies are necessary to understand how consumers perceive innovativeness from their products (Kim et al., 2019).

There are many scholars who have offered a variety of definitions of this concept. Innovativeness in business is defined as “the successful implementation of creative ideas within an organization” (Amabile et al., 1996, p. 1155). Also, brand innovativeness is defined as “the extent to which consumers perceive brands as being able to provide new and useful solutions to their needs” (Eisingerich and Rubera, 2010, p. 66). Kim et al. (2018) describes innovativeness as: business’ broad activities that show capability and willingness to consider and institute “unique” and “meaningfully different” ideas, services, and promotions from customers’ perspectives when selected from alternative activities.

**Brand Innovativeness Dimensions**

Innovativeness from customers’ perspective represents a client’s subjective perception of a business’ capability to provide novel and creative performance (Kunz et al., 2011). In the past two decades, an investigation of conceptualization and measurement of a firm’s or a brand’s innovativeness usually focused only on a single perspective (e.g., product, service, technology or experience). However, Kunz et al. (2011) argued for a holistic approach of assessing the practices for pursuing newness and novelty.
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The researcher will adopt the most used dimensions and the more closely related to the concept of brand innovativeness, which are represented in 4 dimensions: product innovativeness, Technology-based service innovativeness, Experiential innovativeness, Promotional innovativeness (Kim et al., 2018), and this is the following definition of each of these dimensions.

1) **Product innovativeness**

Product innovativeness is identified as customers’ perceptions of newness and uniqueness of a product (Ali et al., 1995). This notion allows assessment of differentiation between a new offering and previous ones (Garcia & Calantone, 2002) and if any, which the new offering gains customers’ perceptions of value, utility, and meaning (Rubera et al., 2011). Particularly, customer-perceived innovativeness at the product level has typically focused on technology, demonstrated by a product’s features and functionality (Hubert et al., 2017; Lee et al., 2003). The hospitality industry has ample options for adding innovativeness for products since customized and personalized offerings to customers have emerged as a major practice toward innovation.

2) **Technology-based service innovativeness**

Service innovativeness is defined as “an idea for performance enhancement that customers perceive as offering a new benefit of sufficient appeal that dramatically influences their behavior, as well as the behavior of competing companies” (Berry et al., 2006, p. 56). Driven by service-dominant logic (Vargo and Lusch, 2004), Innovativeness perception literature during 2012 describes the intangible offerings of a firm to customers through novel service performance or delivery processes, which are essential tactics to create business opportunities (Berry et al., 2006; Kim and Mauborgne, 1999; Kleijnen et al., 2005; Meuter et al., 2005).

Experiential innovativeness is described as a firm’s practice for creating a personalized and lifestyle-based experience for individual customers with a novel approach (Prahalad and Ramaswamy, 2003). Differing from technology-based service innovativeness, experiential innovativeness focuses on engaging an environment and circumstances (Sashi, 2012; Sipe, 2016).
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3) Promotional innovativeness

Promotion is observed as an important form of marketing communications allowing a firm to present brand, product, or service messages to targeted customers (Grewal et al., 2011). Promotional innovativeness is a firm’s capability to offer multiple opportunities to effectively target customers. Creative promotional activities include many new practices, such as use of mobile, digital, and social media to convey information (Doherty and Ellis-Chadwick, 2010; Shankar et al., 2010), regarding a new product mix, discounts, or new designs for gifts (Lin et al., 2013).

Electronic word of mouth (eWOM)

According to Bulut and Karabulut (2018), online shopping is riskier than offline shopping, so customers will look for product information or media that consumers will use where customers can obtain information through electronic word of mouth (EWoM) media. According to Jalilvand and Samiei (2012), EWoM is a positive or negative customer statement about a product or brand available on the internet network.

E-WOM is all non-formal communication intended for consumers through internet media related to product usage or specifications, both in the form of goods and services and sellers (Litvin, Goldsmith, and Pan 2008).

EWoM, according to Mansourimoayyed et al. (2020), refers to customer expressions about a particular product or service carried out via the internet network. EWoM provided by customers can impact customer trust in products or services that lead to a purchase (Wang et al., 2018).

There are many scholars have offered a variety of definitions of this concept. Xun & Reynolds (2010) is describing it as a fast and effective way to share information. Also, Bronner and de Hoog (2011) indicated that ewom is consumers engagement with products and services via the internet. While (Ahmad et al., 2019) explained ewom as the online communities for sharing consumers their positive or negative experiences toward products and services. Also, Gunawan et al., (2020) defined ewom as communication about a specific product through various social media channels.
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*The Dimensions of Electronic word of mouth (eWOM)*

1) **Quality**

Bhattacherjee A. (2006), defined the e-WOM as the convincing power of comments rooted in an informational message. The information quality that is available online in the goal of it is related to the objective, the percentage of understanding and accuracy, and the level of significance which gives most users the ability to build their plans based on the information usefulness (Delone H. and McLean R., 2003; Lizbeth L., 2016). The importance of e-WOM quality appears in the quality of user’s reviews, most users study the measures of how the reviews quality is logical, can be trusted, and real (Park et al., 2009).

2) **Quantity**

Lizbeth L., (2016), described e-WOM quantity as the total number of reviewers and comments which posted online. The amount of information customers received effect on customers’ decisions to purchase products and services (Lee et al., 2008). The importance of e-WOM quantity is considered evidence for representing product's performance within the market (Chevalier A. and Mayzlin D., 2006; Chinho L. et al., 2013).

3) **Trust**

The concept of e-WOM trust is one of the most important and critical online variables which refers to defining and verifying online users identity, digital products, and the protection of users (Brengman M. and Karimov P., 2012). Customers perceive interpersonal communication about products and services as more dependable sources of information than marketer-generated content (Mangold G. and Faulds J., 2009). Trust is considered as a strength point to online shopping as it has a great impact on improve consumers behaviors and purchase intentions towards buying products (Alhidari & Almeshal, 2017).
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Brand Innovativeness and Electronic word of mouth (eWOM)

The findings showed that positive relationships exist between innovativeness and opinion leadership (Flynn et al., 1996; Sun et al., 2006). Goldsmith and Desborde (1991) identified a significant correlation between innovativeness and the scale of opinion leadership. Rogers (1995) also documented a positive relationship between innovativeness and information seeking. Studies have indicated the degree of innovativeness of members is positively related to their engagement in eWOM on social networks sites (Wang et al., 2016). A study found that online product reviews are increasingly being sought by consumers at pre-purchase information search (Adjei, Noble, & Noble, 2010). Technological innovativeness and gadget lovers are predictors of technological opinion leadership (Thakur et al., 2016).

The results of (Cuong et al., 2022) indicate that brand innovativeness has a positive relationship with PWOM, mediated by perceived brand expertise.

This finding corroborates prior research that suggests that individuals who are susceptible to new ideas are heavy users of interpersonal communication, which is the immediate intrinsic motivation to engage in WOM activity (Bayus et al., 1984). One major reason is that engaging in eWOM on social networking sites may give members unexpected positive feedback from others on innovative tasks they are undertaking, thereby further increasing their intrinsic motivation to complete those tasks. Consumer’s innovativeness is related positively with opinion leadership. (Shoham & Ruvio, 2008).

Research Gap

According to the researcher readings, the researcher concludes the following which formulates the research gap in the current study:

To the best of the researcher knowledge, prior studies have examined brand innovativeness and electronic word of mouth in different contexts. However, some studies have investigated brand innovativeness in some fields like food delivery service (Kim et al., 2018) and mobile phone category (Shams, 2015). Moreover, (Lee et al., 2022) examined electronic word of mouth in the field of famous restaurant.
The relationship between Brand Innovativeness and Electronic Word of Mouth

Furthermore, the relation between brand innovativeness and electronic word of mouth in the field of hospitality, tourism business also on social network users (Kim et al., 2019; Lee et al., 2022; Kim et al., 2018). Since the smartphone market is maturing, information technology merchants are attempting to generate new interest in cell phones, and to a large extent, their concentration is directed toward wearable devices (Jung et al., 2016). In 2014, 3.6 million smartwatches were sold, and this volume is projected to reach 101 million in 2020 (Omdia, 2015). The sales volume and the tremendous amounts of applications offered for smartwatches are facts that mirror the increased interest in this innovation (Curry, 2015). Hence, smartwatches are acknowledged as the next big thing that will have a remarkable influence on our everyday lives (Cecchinato et al., 2015).

Also (Sabbir et al., 2020) Explored Factors Affecting Consumers’ Intention to Use Smartwatch, (Suryanto, 2023) examines soccer players' behavior's impact on using smartwatches as a training monitoring tool.

But smart watches have not been adequately addressed in the literature. So, with the increasing use of smartwatches in various fields, smartwatches have become an important area to be researched, both by academics and by industry. The industry needs input from the use of smartwatches to further refine it, both in terms of features and from hardware constraints. Several previous studies have confirmed that the development of smartwatch trends is related to technical matters and humans (Wu et al., 2016). So, in this study the researcher will discuss the relationship between brand innovativeness and electronic word of mouth in the smart watches context.

Research Questions

RQ1: What is the nature of the correlation relationship between the dimensions of the research variables (Brand Innovativeness and Electronic Word of Mouth)?

RQ2: Is there an effect of brand innovativeness on electronic word of mouth among smart watches customers?

RQ3: What is the nature of the difference in the perceptions of smart watches customers about the Research Variables (Brand innovativeness and electronic word of mouth) according to their different demographic variables (gender, monthly income level, education level)?
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Research Objectives

O1: Investigating the nature of the correlation relationship between the dimensions of the research variables (Brand Innovativeness and Electronic Word of Mouth).

O2: Measuring the effect of brand innovativeness on electronic word of mouth among smart watches customers.

O3: Determining the nature of the difference in the perceptions of smart watches customers about the ResearchVariables (Brand innovativeness and electronic word of mouth) according to their different demographic variables (gender, monthly income level, education level).

Research hypotheses

H 1: There is a significant correlation between the dimensions of the research variables (Brand innovativeness and electronic word of mouth).

H 2: Brand innovativeness significantly affects electronic word of mouth among smart watches customers, this hypothesis is divided into the following sub-hypotheses:

H2a: Brand innovativeness significantly affects eWOM Quality among smart watches customers.

H2b: Brand innovativeness significantly affects Ewom Quantity among smart watches customers.

H2c: Brand innovativeness significantly affects Ewom trust among smart watches customers.

H 3: There is a significant difference in the perceptions of smart watches customers about the Research Variables (Brand innovativeness and electronic word of mouth) according to their different demographic variables (gender, monthly income level, education level).
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**Conceptual Framework for the relationships between research Variables**

Based on the Literature, and the research hypotheses, *Figure 1* shows the Conceptual Framework for the Relationships between Research Variables.

*Figure 1* Conceptual Framework for the Relationships between Research. Source: By researcher depending on Literature and Research hypotheses.
Research Methods

There were two popular techniques (or methodology) in the social sciences in the twentieth century: quantitative research and qualitative research. The quantitative research approach is based on the collection of quantitative data through methods such as experiments, quasi-experiments, surveys, and longitudinal studies, whereas the qualitative research approach is based on the collection of qualitative data through methods such as narrative research, phenomenological research, ethnography, and case studies (Shan, 2022). The researcher will depend on quantitative research methods to collect data from the targeted sample. The quantitative approaches entail developing hypotheses to guide statistical testing, employing instruments to appropriately measure the research variables, collecting data, and then statistically analyzing the data to test the hypotheses (Nardi, 2018).

Research Design

There are three categories of research based on their purpose: descriptive, exploratory, and explanatory (Saunders et al., 2009). The current research is explanatory in nature, as it seeks to explain the causal link between the research variables.

Data Collection

Research data was collected during the period from May 2023 to June 2023.

Using Google Form, researcher designed an electronic version of the questionnaire which was published to smart watches users through social media channels like Facebook Pages, Facebook Groups, and WhatsApp Groups interested in smart watches brands in Egypt. Total responds were (409), while accepted responds were (384). Researcher exported the collected data from Google Form to Google Sheet then to Excel Sheet in which items were codded and formatted to be ready for WarpPLS. Research used WarpPLS 8.0 to analyze research data which is a development of the PLS analysis.

Types of Data

Researchers used the Two types of data, which are primary and secondary. The primary data was collected via questionnaire which were designed on google form and shared on social media. Secondary data was the reports, literature, and data about the field available on the internet.

Data Collection Techniques

The questionnaire is a form or instrument that includes a series of questions and secure responses that respondents (from a certain demographic) fill out to provide the researchers with the information needed for the research (Taherdoost, 2021). Considering the primary data, a questionnaire survey was chosen as the data gathering strategy in the current research.
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Time Horizon of Collected Data

The time horizons of the acquired data are examined after choosing the research strategy and data gathering methodologies. Research can be classified as cross-sectional or longitudinal based on the horizons of the data gathered. In cross-sectional research, data is gathered for a given phenomenon at a single moment, referred to as a "snapshot," whereas in longitudinal studies, data is collected for a specific phenomenon over a period, referred to as a "dairy." (Saunders et al., 2009). The current research used a cross-sectional design.

Questionnaire Design

Current research used a closed ended questions structured questionnaire, in which respondents are instructed to select only one answer from a set of choices.

The questionnaire consisted of cover, letter, research concepts, and Two main parts. Part One consisted of two sections, while part Two contained the demographics. Part one, and up to two sections were the items measuring the research variables which were Likert Five Scale sentences. They were closed ended answers in which respondent could choose from the answers “Strongly Disagree,” “Disagree,” “Un-decided,” “Agree,” or “Strongly Agree.” (1) point was given to the answer “Strongly Disagree,” (2) points to “Disagree”, (3) points to “Un-decided”, (4) points to “Agree”, and (5) points to “Strongly Agree”. Part two consisted of (3) demographic closed ended questions which were Gender, Monthly Income level, Education Level.

Measures

All constructs were measured with a 5-point Likert type scale (5 = strongly agree, 4 = agree, 3 = neutral, 2 = disagree, 1 = strongly disagree).

Brand Innovativeness

Brand Innovativeness was measured by 17 item-scale developed by (kim et al., 2018). 5 items to measure Product innovativeness, 4 items to measure Technology-Related Service Innovativeness, 4 items for Experiential Innovativeness and finally 4 items for Promotional Innovativeness.

Electronic Word of Mouth

Electronic Word of Mouth was measured by 10 item-scale developed by (Ahmad et al., 2019). 3 items to measure eWOM Quality, 3 items to measure eWOM Quantity, and finally 4 items for trust.

Population and Sampling

The population of the current research are customers of smart watches in Dakahlia. There are (25) brands in Egypt, the biggest working companies of them are (4) which are: Apple,
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Hawaii, Samsung, Xiaomi. According to Saunders et al. (2009), a sample size of 384 is required if the margin of error is 5%, which is the proportion utilized in social research, the confidence level is 95%, and the size of the society is over 1,000,000.

Sampling Unit

The sampling unit in the current research is the customers of smart watches in Dakahlia.

Sample Size

The sample size required to be large enough to generalize the findings to a population. According to Saunders et al. (2009), a sample size of 384 is required if the margin of error is 5%, which is the proportion utilized in social research, the confidence level is 95%, and the size of the society of 1,000,000.

Sampling Technique

The research depended on Random Sampling technique. Using Google Form, the researcher created an electronic version of the questionnaire, which was sent to smart watches customers in Dakahlia using social media channels such as Facebook Pages, Facebook Groups, and WhatsApp Groups. There were (409) total responses, while acceptable responses were (384).

Validity

One of the most significant qualities of a good research instrument is its validity. According to Bell et al. (2017), validity relates to how well an instrument measures what it is supposed to measure. More specifically, validity reveals the amount to which a certain variable is assessed correctly. Face validity, content validity, construct validity, and criterion-related validity are the four basic categories of validity (Saunders et al., 2009). The researchers mentioned face validity, content validity, and construct validity.

Face Validity

The present research instrument, the questionnaire, was translated into Arabic by the researchers and forwarded to specialists for grammar, appropriateness, equivalence, and consistency checks.
Content Validity

To ensure content authenticity, the original questionnaire was distributed to five professors from Egyptian Universities who specialize in business administration and marketing. Most of the comments suggested that the items directly fit their constructions, with slight rephrasing of certain things that were ambiguous to make the questionnaire more understandable to the target respondents, all of which played a significant effect in the final questionnaire design.

Translation of Questionnaire

The first questionnaire form was offered in English. It was then translated into Arabic to ensure that the questions were accurately comprehended and answered. Once again, the Arabic copy has been translated back into English to be contrasted with the main form in accordance with the validity processes of back translation methodologies approved by Saunders et al. (2009). Finally, the researcher analyzed the two original questionnaires to arrive at a final and more appropriate one.

Construct Validity

Construct validity may be divided into two types: convergent validity and discriminant validity.

Table 1: Correlations among l.vs. with sq. rts. of AVEs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>B_innov</th>
<th>EWOM(QL)</th>
<th>EWOM(QN)</th>
<th>EWOM(T)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B_innov</td>
<td>0.656</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EWOM(QL)</td>
<td>0.321</td>
<td>0.881</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EWOM(QN)</td>
<td>0.444</td>
<td>0.599</td>
<td>0.857</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EWOM(T)</td>
<td>0.577</td>
<td>0.406</td>
<td>0.606</td>
<td>0.808</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Square roots of average variances extracted (AVEs) shown on diagonal.

Source: Prepared by the researchers according to statistical analysis.

---

1 Prof. Dr. Talaat Asaad, Mansoura University.
Prof. Dr. Abel-Aziz Hassan, Mansoura University.
Prof. Dr. Wefqy Al-Emam, Mansoura University.
Dr. Hesham Yasin, Mansoura University.
Dr. Mohammed Hani, Mansoura University.
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Convergent validity reveals how closely the construct's components are connected. Average variance extracted (AVE) is used to determine convergent validity, according to Hair et al. (2010). The AVE indicates the total amount of variance in the pieces that make up a construct. On the other hand, discriminant validity translates how different one construct is from other related constructs (Tarling, 2008). Fornell and Larcker (1981) define discriminant validity as the square root of the AVE that must surpass the association between constructs.

As shown in table 1, all these construct’s AVEs are greater than 0.5. Therefore, the results indicate that there is convergent validity for all the latent used in this research.

Table 2: Combined loadings and cross-loadings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>B_innov</th>
<th>EWOM_QL</th>
<th>EWOM_QN</th>
<th>EWOM_T</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>P value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B_innov 01</td>
<td>(0.560)</td>
<td>0.700</td>
<td>-0.030</td>
<td>-0.108</td>
<td>0.048</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B_innov 02</td>
<td>(0.545)</td>
<td>0.240</td>
<td>0.570</td>
<td>-0.325</td>
<td>0.047</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B_innov 03</td>
<td>(0.667)</td>
<td>0.790</td>
<td>0.006</td>
<td>-0.080</td>
<td>0.051</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B_innov 04</td>
<td>(0.767)</td>
<td>0.266</td>
<td>0.013</td>
<td>-0.096</td>
<td>0.048</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B_innov 05</td>
<td>(0.536)</td>
<td>-0.361</td>
<td>0.537</td>
<td>0.062</td>
<td>0.049</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B_innov 06</td>
<td>(0.569)</td>
<td>-0.554</td>
<td>0.590</td>
<td>0.071</td>
<td>0.047</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B_innov 07</td>
<td>(0.573)</td>
<td>-0.168</td>
<td>0.252</td>
<td>0.262</td>
<td>0.047</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B_innov 08</td>
<td>(0.763)</td>
<td>0.222</td>
<td>-0.086</td>
<td>-0.025</td>
<td>0.046</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B_innov 09</td>
<td>(0.549)</td>
<td>-0.607</td>
<td>0.722</td>
<td>-0.144</td>
<td>0.049</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B_innov 10</td>
<td>(0.657)</td>
<td>-0.189</td>
<td>-0.164</td>
<td>-0.220</td>
<td>0.047</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B_innov 11</td>
<td>(0.743)</td>
<td>0.117</td>
<td>-0.185</td>
<td>0.136</td>
<td>0.046</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B_innov 12</td>
<td>(0.706)</td>
<td>-0.143</td>
<td>-0.439</td>
<td>0.061</td>
<td>0.046</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B_innov 13</td>
<td>(0.804)</td>
<td>-0.010</td>
<td>-0.475</td>
<td>-0.004</td>
<td>0.046</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B_innov 14</td>
<td>(0.574)</td>
<td>0.338</td>
<td>0.078</td>
<td>-0.149</td>
<td>0.047</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B_innov 15</td>
<td>(0.581)</td>
<td>-0.414</td>
<td>0.379</td>
<td>0.196</td>
<td>0.047</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B_innov 16</td>
<td>(0.699)</td>
<td>-0.167</td>
<td>-0.434</td>
<td>0.275</td>
<td>0.046</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B_innov 17</td>
<td>(0.751)</td>
<td>0.484</td>
<td>-0.267</td>
<td>-0.168</td>
<td>0.048</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EWOM_QL 01</td>
<td>0.123</td>
<td>(0.865)</td>
<td>0.043</td>
<td>-0.085</td>
<td>0.045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EWOM_QL 02</td>
<td>-0.175</td>
<td>(0.951)</td>
<td>0.085</td>
<td>0.075</td>
<td>0.045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EWOM_QL 03</td>
<td>0.073</td>
<td>(0.821)</td>
<td>-0.144</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>0.046</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EWOM_QN 01</td>
<td>0.029</td>
<td>0.300</td>
<td>(0.829)</td>
<td>-0.169</td>
<td>0.045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EWOM_QN 02</td>
<td>-0.079</td>
<td>-0.312</td>
<td>(0.872)</td>
<td>0.169</td>
<td>0.045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EWOM_QN 03</td>
<td>0.052</td>
<td>0.027</td>
<td>(0.869)</td>
<td>-0.008</td>
<td>0.045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EWOM_T 01</td>
<td>0.252</td>
<td>0.287</td>
<td>-0.204</td>
<td>(0.572)</td>
<td>0.049</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EWOM_T 02</td>
<td>-0.153</td>
<td>0.166</td>
<td>-0.113</td>
<td>(0.747)</td>
<td>0.046</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EWOM_T 03</td>
<td>0.027</td>
<td>-0.206</td>
<td>0.160</td>
<td>(0.935)</td>
<td>0.045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EWOM_T 04</td>
<td>-0.038</td>
<td>-0.010</td>
<td>-0.010</td>
<td>(0.922)</td>
<td>0.045</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: Loadings are unrotated and cross-loadings are oblique-rotated. SEs and P values are for loadings. P values < 0.05 are desirable for reflective indicators. Scores for each item <0.30 are desirable for sample 384 (Hair, 2009).
Source: Prepared by the researcher according to statistical analysis
Reliability

To perform internal consistency reliability, the researcher relies on Cronbach's alpha coefficient (α) and Composite Reliability (CR). Cronbach's alpha and CR should be larger than or equal to 0.7 (Hair et al., 2010).

Table 3: Composite reliability coefficients & Cronbach’s alpha coefficients (α)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Composite reliability coefficients</th>
<th>B_innov</th>
<th>EWOM(QL)</th>
<th>EWOM(QN)</th>
<th>EWOM(T)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.926</td>
<td>0.912</td>
<td>0.893</td>
<td>0.879</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cronbach's alpha coefficients</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B_innov</td>
<td>0.858</td>
<td>0.853</td>
<td>0.819</td>
<td>0.722</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Prepared by the researcher according to statistical analysis

As shown in table 3, Cronbach's alpha and CR are larger than 0.7 which indicates high internal consistency reliability.

Sample Description

Accepted responses to the questionnaire were (384), described as follows:

Number of Male to Female

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>21.35%</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>78.65%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Source: Prepared by the researchers according to statistical analysis

As shown in Table 4, the number of Male was (82) Responses, while the number of Female was (302).

Monthly Income Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Monthly Income Level</th>
<th>&lt;5000</th>
<th>From 5000 to &lt;10000</th>
<th>From 10000 to &lt;15000</th>
<th>≥15000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>135</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35.16%</td>
<td>39.58%</td>
<td>7.29%</td>
<td>17.97%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Prepared by the researchers according to statistical analysis
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As shown in Table 5, most respondents’ income was from 5,000 to less than 10,000 Egyptian pounds was (152), while the respondents with income from 10,000 to less than 15,000 Egyptian pounds was (28) Responses.

**Education Level**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education Level</th>
<th>Less than undergraduate</th>
<th>27</th>
<th>7.03%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>75.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Post Graduate Studies</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>17.97%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source: Prepared by the researchers according to statistical analysis**

As shown in Table 6 most respondents Education Level Undergraduate was (288) Responses, while the respondents with Less than undergraduate (27) Responses.

**Descriptive Statistics**

According to Byrne (2010), data analysis is a necessary step before testing the measurement model, particularly when utilizing structural equation modelling.

**Table 7: Descriptive Statistics for Each Item**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Skewness</th>
<th>Kurtosis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>B_innov 01</td>
<td>4.0078</td>
<td>.99473</td>
<td>-1.072</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>B_innov 02</td>
<td>3.5391</td>
<td>.93860</td>
<td>-.733</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>B_innov 03</td>
<td>4.1120</td>
<td>.85225</td>
<td>-1.539</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>B_innov 04</td>
<td>4.2188</td>
<td>.67716</td>
<td>-.298</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>B_innov 05</td>
<td>4.5078</td>
<td>.67784</td>
<td>-1.040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>B_innov 06</td>
<td>3.6536</td>
<td>.99992</td>
<td>-.712</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>B_innov 07</td>
<td>4.3594</td>
<td>.76203</td>
<td>-1.172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>B_innov 08</td>
<td>4.0755</td>
<td>.88917</td>
<td>-.776</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>B_innov 09</td>
<td>4.3255</td>
<td>.84629</td>
<td>-1.378</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>B_innov 10</td>
<td>3.6328</td>
<td>.76685</td>
<td>-.244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>B_innov 11</td>
<td>3.9661</td>
<td>.82797</td>
<td>-.325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>B_innov 12</td>
<td>3.6120</td>
<td>.93828</td>
<td>-.184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>B_innov 13</td>
<td>3.8490</td>
<td>.83532</td>
<td>-.466</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>B_innov 14</td>
<td>3.2109</td>
<td>1.32452</td>
<td>-.210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>B_innov 15</td>
<td>4.1172</td>
<td>.96914</td>
<td>-1.379</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>B_innov 16</td>
<td>3.4193</td>
<td>1.21081</td>
<td>-.129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>B_innov 17</td>
<td>3.6016</td>
<td>1.20491</td>
<td>-.924</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Electronic Word of Mouth</th>
<th>EWOM Quality</th>
<th>EWOM Quality_01</th>
<th>.81476</th>
<th>-1.596</th>
<th>4.477</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EWOM Quality_02</td>
<td>3.9740</td>
<td>.81715</td>
<td>-1.453</td>
<td>3.874</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EWOM Quality_03</td>
<td>3.6146</td>
<td>1.01034</td>
<td>-0.590</td>
<td>0.067</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EWOM Quantity</td>
<td>EWOM Quantity_01</td>
<td>3.9062</td>
<td>.96766</td>
<td>-0.941</td>
<td>0.949</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EWOM Quantity_02</td>
<td>3.7969</td>
<td>.89699</td>
<td>-1.029</td>
<td>1.570</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EWOM Quantity_03</td>
<td>3.7188</td>
<td>1.02147</td>
<td>-0.774</td>
<td>0.144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust</td>
<td>EWOM T_01</td>
<td>3.4583</td>
<td>1.05629</td>
<td>-0.464</td>
<td>0.144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EWOM T_02</td>
<td>3.9036</td>
<td>1.04399</td>
<td>-0.913</td>
<td>0.364</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EWOM T_03</td>
<td>3.9714</td>
<td>.77609</td>
<td>-0.388</td>
<td>-0.261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EWOM T_04</td>
<td>4.0417</td>
<td>.73220</td>
<td>-0.065</td>
<td>-1.128</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Prepared by the researcher according to statistical analysis

As shown in Table 7, before commencing the statistical investigation, the researchers took certain measures to confirm that the necessary circumstances for the statistical procedures were in place.

**Structural Equation Modeling**

According to Ong et al. (2017), structural equation modelling (SEM) is a statistical tool that uses a confirmatory approach incorporating hypothesis testing to investigate a structural theory based on specific facts. SEM also denotes causal techniques that provide explanations for a wide range of variables. Such variables can be observed as either latent or manifest. The observed variable is measured directly, but the latent variable is assessed indirectly using two or more observed variables.

Furthermore, SEM investigates the links between one or more independent and dependent variables by measuring the fitness level of hypothetical constructions using data acquired. SEM is becoming more popular in the realms of psychology and social sciences, where
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it is recognized as a fundamental tool. The current research utilized partial least squares (PLS) analysis, precisely Warp PLS version 8.0.

**Assessing the Structural Model and Hypotheses Testing**

**Model Fit Indices**

A structural model is frequently employed to address the causal links between the study's components. The structural model is also utilized to analyses the study's theoretical model (Ong et al., 2017). Three additional metrics were used to quantify the overall fit of the model fit indices: Average Path Coefficient (APC), Average R-squared (ARS), and Average full collinearity VIF. According to Kock (2015), APC and ARS are significant if the P-value is less than 0.05, but Average full collinearity VIF must be less than 5.

**Table 8: Model Fit Indices**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fit Measures</th>
<th>Actual Values</th>
<th>P Values</th>
<th>Accepted Fit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>APC</td>
<td>0.479</td>
<td>P&lt;0.001</td>
<td>P &lt; 0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARS</td>
<td>0.238</td>
<td>P&lt;0.001</td>
<td>P &lt; 0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFVIF</td>
<td>1.811</td>
<td></td>
<td>acceptable if &lt;= 5 ideally &lt;= 3.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Prepared by the researcher according to statistical analysis*

**Testing Hypothesizes**

**Table 9: Correlations Matrix**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>PI</th>
<th>TI</th>
<th>EI</th>
<th>ProI</th>
<th>Qual</th>
<th>Quan</th>
<th>Tr</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PI</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.344**</td>
<td>.181**</td>
<td>.564**</td>
<td>.664**</td>
<td>.651**</td>
<td>.454**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TI</td>
<td>.344**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.525**</td>
<td>.572**</td>
<td>.226**</td>
<td>.493**</td>
<td>.539**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EI</td>
<td>.181**</td>
<td>.525**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.750**</td>
<td>.078</td>
<td>.121</td>
<td>.443**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ProI</td>
<td>.564**</td>
<td>.572**</td>
<td>.750**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.337**</td>
<td>.402**</td>
<td>.598**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qual</td>
<td>.664**</td>
<td>.226**</td>
<td>.078</td>
<td>.337**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.603**</td>
<td>.447**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quan</td>
<td>.651**</td>
<td>.493**</td>
<td>.121</td>
<td>.402**</td>
<td>.603**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.584**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tr</td>
<td>.454**</td>
<td>.539**</td>
<td>.443**</td>
<td>.598**</td>
<td>.447**</td>
<td>.584**</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).**

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).**

*Source: Prepared by the researcher according to statistical analysis.

*PI= product innovativeness, TI= Technology-based service innovativeness, EI= Experiential innovativeness, ProI= Promotional innovativeness, Qual= eWOM Quality, Quan=, eWOM Quantity, Tr= trust.*
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As the correlation matrix shows there is a positive relationship between Brand Innovativeness dimensions which are (product innovativeness, Technology-based service innovativeness, Experiential innovativeness, Promotional innovativeness) and Electronic Word of Mouth dimensions which are (eWOM Quality, eWOM Quantity and trust).

Based on the statistical analysis, Brand Innovativeness significant positive effect of Brand Innovativeness on Electronic Word of Mouth among smart watches customers at P Value P<0.001. Table 8 shows the statistical analysis of the relationships between research variables.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 10 Total Effects &amp; P Values</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Variable/Dimension</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H&lt;sub&gt;2a&lt;/sub&gt;: Brand innovativeness significantly affects eWOM Quality among smart watches customers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H&lt;sub&gt;2b&lt;/sub&gt;: Brand innovativeness significantly affects Ewom Quantity among smart watches customers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H&lt;sub&gt;2c&lt;/sub&gt;: Brand innovativeness significantly affects Ewom trust among smart watches customers.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: By Researchers based on WarpPLS V 8.0 Statistical analysis.
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Fig. (2) The relationship between brand innovativeness and electronic word of mouth.

Source: By Researchers based on WarpPLS V 8.0 Statistical analysis.

Determining the nature of the difference in the perceptions of smart watches customers about the Research Variables (Brand innovativeness and electronic word of mouth) according to their different demographic variables (gender, monthly income level, education level).

H3: There is a significant difference in the perceptions of smart watches customers about the Research Variables (Brand innovativeness and electronic word of mouth) according to their different demographic variables (gender, monthly income level, education level).

H3 a: There is a significant difference in the perceptions of smart watches customers about the Research Variables (Brand innovativeness and electronic word of mouth) according to their (gender)
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The significant difference in the perceptions of smart watches customers about the Research Variables according to their (gender) The analysis for this hypothesis showed several results, as shown in Table (11)

Table 11: The significant difference in the perceptions of smart watches customers about the Research Variables according to their (gender)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Variables</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>Sign.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brand innovativeness</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>4.0416</td>
<td>.63246</td>
<td>3.085</td>
<td>.002*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>3.8416</td>
<td>.48642</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>electronic word of mouth</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>3.8472</td>
<td>.82925</td>
<td>.055</td>
<td>.956</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>3.8429</td>
<td>.56167</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** Moral at a level 0.01 & * Moral at a level 0.05

Source: Prepared by the researcher based on the results of statistical analysis

There is a significant difference in the perceptions of smart watches customers about (Brand innovativeness) according to their (gender). But There is unsignificant difference in the perceptions of smart watches customers about (electronic word of mouth) according to their (gender).

So, we accept the first sub-hypothesis partially from the third hypothesis.

H3 b: There is a significant difference in the perceptions of smart watches customers about the Research Variables (Brand innovativeness and electronic word of mouth) according to their (monthly income level).

The significant difference in the perceptions of smart watches customers about the Research Variables (Brand innovativeness and electronic word of mouth) according to their (monthly income level) The analysis for this hypothesis showed several results, as shown in Table (12)
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Table 12: The significant difference in the perceptions of smart watches customers about the Research Variables) according to their (monthly income level)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Variables</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sign.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Brand innovativeness</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;5000</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>4.0065</td>
<td>.51218</td>
<td>5.106</td>
<td>.002*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From 5000 to &lt;10000</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>3.8239</td>
<td>.48720</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From 10000 to &lt;15000</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>3.6500</td>
<td>.21640</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>≥15000</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>3.8732</td>
<td>.66228</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>384</td>
<td>3.8843</td>
<td>.52658</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Electronic word of mouth</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9.374</td>
<td>.000**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;5000</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>3.6786</td>
<td>.69894</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From 5000 to &lt;10000</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>3.8569</td>
<td>.50182</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From 10000 to &lt;15000</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>3.8056</td>
<td>.16973</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>≥15000</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>4.1538</td>
<td>.72774</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>384</td>
<td>3.8438</td>
<td>.62719</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Moral at a level 0.01 & * Moral at a level 0.05**

Source: Prepared by the researcher based on the results of statistical analysis

There is a significant difference in the perceptions of smart watches customers about (Brand innovativeness and electronic word of mouth) according to their (monthly income level).

So, we accept the second sub-hypothesis from the third hypothesis completely.

H3 c: There is a significant difference in the perceptions of smart watches customers about the Research Variables (Brand innovativeness and electronic word of mouth) according to their (education level).

The significant difference in the perceptions of smart watches customers about the Research Variables) according to their (education level) The analysis for this hypothesis showed several results, as shown in Table (13)
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Table 13: The significant difference in the perceptions of smart watches customers about the Research Variables) according to their (education level)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Variables</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sign.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brand innovativeness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than undergraduate</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>3.4847</td>
<td>.24822</td>
<td>.04777</td>
<td>8.698</td>
<td>.000**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>3.9153</td>
<td>.52766</td>
<td>.03109</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post Graduate Studies</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>3.9112</td>
<td>.54303</td>
<td>.06537</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>384</td>
<td>3.8843</td>
<td>.52658</td>
<td>.02687</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>electronic word of mouth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than undergraduate</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>3.1718</td>
<td>.90520</td>
<td>.17421</td>
<td>19.50</td>
<td>.000**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>3.8704</td>
<td>.58745</td>
<td>.03462</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post Graduate Studies</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>3.9960</td>
<td>.48990</td>
<td>.05898</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>384</td>
<td>3.8438</td>
<td>.62719</td>
<td>.03201</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** Moral at a level 0.01 & * Moral at a level 0.05

Source: Prepared by the researcher based on the results of statistical analysis

There is a significant difference in the perceptions of smart watches customers about (Brand innovativeness and electronic word of mouth) according to their (education level).

So, we accept the third sub-hypothesis of the third hypothesis completely.

Theoretical Implications

The current research contributes to the body of knowledge of the existing literature of Brand Innovativeness and Electronic Word of Mouth. In addition, the research aimed to fill the knowledge gap focusing on the effect of Brand innovativeness on electronic word of mouth. Therefore, researchers summarize the theoretical implications as follows:

1. The current Research contributes to a broader and more comprehensive understanding of Brand Innovativeness and knowing the extent of its effect on Electronic Word of Mouth.
2. The current research gives deeper analysis for the effect of Demographics’ differences on the differences of respondents’ opinions about research variables.
Practical Implications
The current research was prepared based on reviewing previous studies and noticing a lack of studies that focused on the link between Brand Innovativeness and Electronic Word of Mouth. Therefore, the study directed towards examining the relationship between Brand Innovativeness and Electronic Word of Mouth. Based on the literature review, these relationships were not analyzed in the same depth before, in addition to that the application field still needs more investigation. The results of the current study provide some practical contributions as follows:
1. CEOs of companies rather than Apple (Samsung, Huawei, Xiaomi) should do more in brand innovativeness within their smart watches to attract a larger layer of users.
2. Top Managers should priorities user experience in their website design to deliver an enjoyable and satisfying website shopping experience.

Recommendations
In the light of the practical implications, the researchers provide some important recommendations for marketers of smartwatches companies:
1. It can be argued that smartwatch developers should invest enough to add smarter and personal health monitoring features in a smartwatch. For example: monitor the health of newborn babies, developing applications that track older people, or keep health records for several days.
2. Also, marketers should especially take enough care of the design of the smartwatch. As smartwatches are somewhat perceived as fashion goods, so a smartwatch with eye-catching interface, a chic look, or in sum, an aesthetically pleasing design might ensure prompt acceptance.
3. Companies could also offer customized designs targeting different demographic segments of users. 4. More attention should be given to communication strategies to generate a more positive attitude towards the use of smartwatches.

Conclusion
This study represents a comprehensive assessment of the relationship between Brand Innovativeness and Electronic Word of Mouth. Data was collected from 384 smart watches customers. The proposed model and hypotheses were analyzed using the structural equation modelling employing the PLS-SEM.

The results indicated that Brand Innovativeness is significantly positive affect Electronic Word of Mouth. Moreover, the results indicate a Partial difference in the perceptions of smart watches customers about the research variables according to their different demographic variables.
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Research Limitations

This research has some limitations which researcher summarize it as follows:

People: This research results are limited to Customers of smart watches in Dakahlia.
Place: This research results are limited to the most used smart watches Companies in Egypt.

Time: This research results are limited to the cross-sectional period in when the questionnaire was shared to customers of smart watches Companies in Dakahlia during the period from May 2023 to June 2023.

Future Research Directions

Researchers give Future Research Directions based on what they studied in the current research as follows:

1. Future studies can also examine the relationship between brand innovativeness and customer behavior.
2. Also Future studies can investigate the effect of electronic word of mouth on customer loyalty, brand image, and competitive advantage.
3. Moreover, Future studies can use another demographic variables.
4. A study on comparison of different samples would also be fascinated for future directions.
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