International Journal of Enhanced Research in Management & Computer Applications,
ISSN: 2319-7471, Volume 15 Issue 8, August 2026

A Study of Customer Preferences, Perceived Value and Purchase Decisions of Health Oriented Luxury Sleeping Products by Gen-Z

Shreyas Goyal[1], Dr. T P Singh[2]

[1]Class: S7E School: Modern School Barakhamba Road, City: Delhi
[2]Research Mentor: Editor-in-Chief, Applied Researches, Noida

ABSTRACT

The rise of the "sleep economy" reflects sleep's shift from a biological need to a central wellness and lifestyle marker. This 65.8 billion USD market is driven in part by Gen Z (born c. 1995–2009). Gen Z treats wellness as identity and social currency, prioritizing quality and aligning spending with personal values; they are markedly more likely to increase wellness expenditures and redirect luxury budgets toward health. Mattresses, despite being used for nearly a third of life, remain underappreciated despite their important role in spinal support, recovery, temperature regulation, sleep consolidation, cognitive performance, and immune function. In India, Gen Z displays a duality: outward-focused status aspirations alongside growing attention to invisible wellness drivers like sleep. This study analyses the gap by empirically examining the antecedents of mattress purchase decisions among Indian Gen Z, aiming to extend consumer behavior and perceived value theory within the sleep-wellness product category. The study, with the help of primary data from 101 Indian respondents, conducted exploratory factor analysis which revealed four distinct mattress buyer segments: social/brand-engaged, health-investment oriented, tech/influencer oriented, and delay/celebrity-driven. The study concludes that the Social/brand-engaged consumers rely on networks and brand reputation, favouring word-of-mouth and brand-building. Whereas, health-investors treat mattresses as medical-grade investments, seeking clinical validation and expert endorsements. On the other hand, tech-oriented buyers value smart features, app connectivity, and influencer recommendations. Overall, the market is segmented rather than uniform, with age—especially Gen Z—strongly influencing technology adoption and preference for clinical evidence versus celebrity influence.

Keywords: Sleep economy, Gen Z consumers, Mattress purchase behaviour, Exploratory factor analysis (EFA), Health Investment Orientation

INTRODUCTION

In the contemporary consumer landscape, sleep has transcended its biological imperative to become a critical dimension of holistic health and wellness, giving rise to what scholars and industry analysts now term the "sleep economy." The global sleep market was valued at USD 65.8 billion in 2025 and is projected to grow to USD 80 billion by 2034. Generation Z or Gen-Z (born approximately 1995–2009), unlike previous generations, approaches wellness not as a supplementary lifestyle choice but as a primary identity marker and social currency. McKinsey's research characterises Gen Z as "maximalist optimisers" who invest heavily in discretionary wellness products, valuing quality above cost and demonstrating loyalty to brands that align with their personal values. Notably, Gen Z consumers are 84% more likely than other demographic cohorts to increase their wellness spending, with 64% indicating that such expenditure will draw directly from their broader luxury budget.

A mattress is an often-overlooked but essential everyday product. On average, individuals spend seven to eight hours each night on a mattress—nearly one third of their lives—relying on it to support spinal alignment, facilitate physical recovery, regulate body temperature, and enable restorative sleep. Despite its profound influence on well-being, the mattress seldom receives acknowledgement. It frequently goes unmentioned, uncredited, and uncelebrated, yet it plays a decisive role in preventing morning back pain, consolidating sleep cycles, enhancing concentration and long-term memory, promoting muscular recovery after exercise, and supporting immune function. In short, the mattress materially contributes to the quality and efficiency of sleep, even though its contribution is rarely recognized.

In today's world, more specifically when we look at the Indian Gen Z, there are two sides- the world of visible aspirations, brand, status symbols, luxury products and on the other side, there is a growing awareness, particularly among health-conscious young people, that the invisible parts of life (your sleep, your recovery) are the things that actually determine how far you will get.

India is at a turning point in consumer consciousness. The COVID-19 pandemic permanently shifted the way people looked at health, recovery, or physical well-being. Before the pandemic, a luxury mattress was just a functional upgrade. People only made the switch when their old mattress wore out or there was serious back pain, enough for the doctor telling you to change your mattress. After the pandemic, people's perspectives changed. They started treating sleep not just as a passive activity but as a performance-enhancing behavior. A mattress is now considered a new framework for who you are, not just furniture. It is the starting point of every productive day.

The present study aims to fill this critical gap by empirically investigating the antecedents of purchase decisions for health-oriented sleeping products- mainly mattresses among Gen Z consumers, thereby contributing both to the theoretical frameworks of consumer behaviour and perceived value theory in the sleep wellness segment.

LITERATURE REVIEW

The Digital Discovery Tension: Social Trust vs. Clinical E-Commerce Today, young people find almost everything through influencers. Nair and Seshanna (2024) conducted a primary data survey to understand how Gen Z discovers brands. Their methodology involved tracking the social media habits of urban youth. They found that about 44% of Gen Z consumers in Delhi will buy something just because an influencer told them to. The findings proved that young buyers want to see someone they relate to actually using the product before they trust it. If there is no human connection, the product gets ignored.

But there is a big difference between which platform they discover the product and where they actually put their money. They might see a cool aesthetic on Instagram, but they always switch over to Amazon or Flipkart to actually purchase it. Fortune Business Insights (2026) published a market analysis report looking at global sales data. Their summary showed that e-commerce platforms now take about 42% of the sleep and ergonomic market share. Dataintelo (2026) used a similar methodology of tracking online sales and found the exact same trend. This implies that people need to see the background details. They go to e-commerce sites to read the reviews, compare the specs, and check the prices before they pay.

Influencers might grab their attention, but the technical reviews sell them on the reality. TechSci Research (2026) did a financial summary of the Global Ergonomic Chair Market and found the global market hit USD 11.36 Billion. Their findings show that to succeed, a brand has to bridge that gap between looking good on social media and having real, solid data to back it up.

The Brand Paradox and Split-Brain Budgeting: There is a lot of debate about whether brand names even matter for things you keep in your bedroom. Kuncoro and Kusumawati (2021) did a quantitative study asking people what they look for in a mattress. The findings were clear: comfort is the only thing that matters, and the brand is unimportant. They concluded that people do not buy a mattress for the logo.

But Lea Nitsche (2025) and Austin Zuo (2020) did their own qualitative studies on young people and found the exact opposite. Their summary stated that Gen Z cares deeply about the brand when setting up their personal space. Their findings showed that young people want their bedroom to feel premium, even if nobody else sees it.

The real answer comes down to a concept called "split-brain budgeting." Visa (2025) researched consumer credit card data. Their methodology was tracking where young people actually spend their money versus where they save it. They found that 89% of Gen Z will save as much money as possible on basic, everyday stuff just so they can spend real money on one premium item that matters to them. So, they might buy the cheapest bed sheets, but they will drop serious cash on a good mattress brand. When something supports the health side of a human, the brand suddenly holds a lot of value. They treat it as a health investment.

Sleep Products as Health Technology: People simply do not look at beds the same way anymore. Kunuratna et al. (2024) surveyed people with sleep problems. The summary of their paper showed that younger buyers treat memory foam and latex as health technology. The findings proved that if someone has back pain or a bad sleep cycle, upgrading their mattress is basically a medical decision. It is not just furniture anymore.

This is especially true in India. Industry Research Biz (2026) tracked the sales of office and bedroom furniture. They found the Indian ergonomic market is growing 11% every year. India has 5.4 million IT and BPO workers who sit at desks all day, which leads to major neck and back pain. Buying a good mattress or an ergonomic chair is treated as physical rehabilitation. They are starting to realize that this is the starting point for their productivity and their career.

Aesthetics and the Sustainability Contradiction: Even though health is the main concern, looking good is still a factor. McKinsey (2025) ran a massive global survey on wellness. The findings noted that having a good-looking personal space is a top-three wellness goal for Gen Z. Coherent Market Insights (2026) also researched this and found that the bedroom is a major place for self-expression. People want products that fix their posture but also look appealing aesthetically.

On the other hand, when it comes to being eco-friendly, there is a big gap between what people say and what they do. Coherent Market Insights (2026) stated that 73% of Gen Z will pay more for sustainable materials. However, GWI (2025) looked at actual checkout data and found that when it is time to actually pay, the price usually wins. The findings showed that while people like the idea of sustainability, they do not want to sacrifice their budget for it.

RESEARCH GAP AND CONTEXT

Existing research and the demographic covered therein, point to the need for research, especially in the post-COVID era in India when health concerns are increasing. This gap is especially relevant for Generation Z in urban India, whose purchasing decisions are influenced by both wellness concerns and social identity. Therefore, this research is uniquely placed in this direction.

Existing studies look at health benefits and social status separately and does not examine what happens when a product is great for your health, but no one else can see it. They do not address what happens when a young Indian consumer has to choose between a visible status symbol and an invisible health product. This study uses primary data from youth in Delhi to understand what they actually prefer when making a choice in the context of their everyday lives.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The goal of this research paper was to understand how Indian consumers think, feel, and behave when considering buying a sleep product, more specifically a mattress. Some brands are focused on marketing without understanding the consumer's motivation while making a purchase decision. This study tries to fill that gap by asking potential consumers targeted questions and interpreting the results for a comparative analysis to get better insight into consumers' behaviour. This research follows a quantitative cross-sectional design in which the data was collected numerically and people had closed-ended answers. This was collected at one point in time, not tracked over months or years. A structured Google Form was used in which 101 responders answered several questions in the exact same format to keep it fair and constant while comparing the solutions.

The responders used an MCQ-based format where they chose from preset options, mostly on a scale of 1 to 5 (1 being the lowest/least degree and 5 being the highest/most degree). The study focused on 9 questions for this analysis: Q5 (willingness to pay premium for health-certified mattress), Q6 (importance of investing in quality sleep products), Q7 (delay in purchasing sleep product despite need), Q8 (clinically certified vs celebrity-endorsed mattress), Q9 (seek recommendations before purchase), Q10 (recommend brand to family and friends), Q12 (importance of brand recognition), Q13 (susceptibility to social media influencer, 1–5) and Q15 (willingness to pay for tech-advanced mattress).

These questions were not selected randomly. Each represents a different possible outcome or reason for buying a sleep product:

- Health conscious
- Brand oriented
- Social influence
- Brand loyalty
- Technical preference

Together they gave a full picture of consumers’ attitude.
Two statistical tests were used. These were Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA) and the Chi-Square Test of Independence. These tests conduct different jobs and address different aspects.

Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA): EFA helps transform several related questions about willingness to pay premiums, trust in clinical certifications, brand loyalty, and influencer impact into a few clear factors that reveal the hidden patterns in how Gen Z evaluates health-oriented luxury sleeping products. Before running the EFA test, the Two separate analyses are conducted.

The first one is the KMO test which helps in correlating the responses with each other to justify the statistical data. The second check is Bartlett's test of sphericity, which confirms the correlation between variables that are not nil. In other words, these questions are interrelated with each other.

The Chi-square test of independence works completely differently. It analyses the age group and whether age factor makes a difference in this study. If it does, the difference is called statistically significant. The threshold used is P > 0.05, which means there is less than a 5% chance that the difference happened by random luck.

Together EFA tells what consumer types exist and Chi-squared tells whether age group is one of the factors that separates these types.

RESULTS AND ANALYSIS

Age Group Distribution of Respondents

Age Group	Number of Respondents	Percentage (%)
Below 25 years (Gen Z)	55	54.5
26–35 years (Younger Millennials)	5	5.0
36–45 years (Older Millennials)	32	31.7
46–55 years	7	6.9
Above 55 years	2	2.0

More than half our respondents — 54.5% — fall in the Gen Z age group of below 25 years, which is primarily who we're targeting with sleep-wellness products. The second biggest section is older millennials at 31.7%. Since Gen Z dominates the sample, most of our findings and conclusions are going to reflect how this generation thinks, spends, and makes decisions around sleep-wellness products.

Annual Family Income of Respondents

Annual Family Income	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Up to ₹10,00,000	5	5.0%
₹10,00,000 – ₹20,00,000	13	12.9%
₹20,00,000 – ₹50,00,000	17	16.8%
₹50,00,000 – ₹1 crore	16	15.8%
Above ₹1 crore	50	49.5%

Almost half our respondents — 49.5% — come from families earning above ₹1 crore a year. That's a very affluent section of society. Since the focus of this study is the willingness to pay for quality sleep products rather than ability to pay, this works in our favour. These are people who can comfortably afford to spend on a good mattress or pillow, so their preferences are genuinely useful for brands positioning themselves in the premium segment.

Gender Distribution of Respondents

Gender	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Male	**52**	**51.5%**
Female	**46**	**45.5%**
Non-binary / Other	**3**	**3.0%**

The gender split is pretty balanced — 51.5% male and 45.5% female, with a small 3% identifying as non-binary or other. This means the data isn't heavily skewed towards one gender. Whatever patterns we find around spending, brand preference, or sleep priorities can be seen as fairly representative of the broader urban consumer base.

City Tier – distribution of respondents by city tier of residence

City Tier	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Tier 1 (Metro cities: Delhi, Mumbai, Bangalore, etc.)	95	94.1%
Tier 2 (Pune, Jaipur, Lucknow, etc.)	1	1.0%
Tier 3 (Smaller cities and towns)	2	2.0%
Rural areas	3	3.0%

94.1% of the respondents are from Tier-1 metro cities, which makes this almost entirely an urban dataset. That's expected given how the survey was distributed, but it's important to note because metro consumers behave very differently — they're more exposed to large retail outlets, e-commerce, premium brands, and online research before buying. So our findings are most relevant for businesses targeting metro markets, which is where premium sleep products are primarily sold anyway.

Family Structure – distribution of respondents by household type

Family Structure	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Joint family (3+ generations)	57	56.4%
Nuclear family with 1-2 children	40	39.6%
Living with spouse/partner (no children)	3	3.0%
Living alone	1	1.0%

Over 96% of respondents live in either a joint or nuclear family setup, which is very typical of urban Indian households. This matters because buying a mattress or pillow isn't usually a solo decision — it often involves family input, shared budgets, and sometimes even elders making the final call. This context helps explain why certain responses around spending and priorities might be more conservative or family-driven.

Education Level of respondents

Education level	Number of respondents	Percentage of respondents
Up to Graduate	68	67.3%
Postgraduate	23	22.8%
Professional degree	9	8.9%
Doctorate	1	1.0%

Distribution of respondents by education Approximately 67.3% of our participants are graduates, reflecting the significant Gen Z representation in our sample. The remaining half consists of graduates and professionals, creating a highly informed respondent base. This educational background is crucial because these individuals are more likely to scrutinize health certifications and technical specs, ensuring our data reflects how critical thinkers evaluate the starting point of their sleep quality.

Price Range (Mattress) – Distribution of respondents by mattress spending range

Price Range (Mattress)	Respondents	Percentage (%)
Below ₹10,000	6	5.9%
₹10,000 – ₹20,000	14	13.9%
₹20,000 – ₹40,000	36	35.6%
₹40,000 – ₹60,000	19	18.8%
Above ₹60,000	26	25.7%

Most respondents are comfortable spending in the mid-to-premium range on a mattress. Around 35.6% lie in the ₹20,000–₹40,000 band, while another 44.5% are willing to go beyond ₹40,000. This shows a clear willingness to invest in better sleep products, which supports positioning your offering as a premium or health-focused mattress rather than a purely budget option, especially when targeting affluent urban consumers.

Fashion Spending Range – Distribution of respondents by annual fashion spend

Fashion Spending Range	Respondents	Percentage (%)
I rarely buy such items	4	4.0%
Below ₹20,000	9	8.9%
₹20,000 – ₹50,000	15	14.9%
₹50,000 – ₹1,00,000	22	21.8%
Above ₹1,00,000	51	50.5%

Half the sample spends above ₹1,00,000 per year on visible fashion categories such as bags, shoes, watches, and accessories. This confirms that these respondents are high-spending, appearance-conscious consumers. It sets up an important contrast in the research: it allows us to examine whether people who freely spend on visible status items show the same willingness to invest in less visible, health-driven products like mattresses and pillows.

Choice – Ergonomic chair versus trendy recliner trade-off

Choice	Respondents	Percentage (%)
Definitely the ergonomic chair	30	29.7%
Probably the ergonomic chair	27	26.7%
Difficult to choose	16	15.8%
Probably the trendy recliner	22	21.8%
Definitely the trendy recliner	6	5.9%

When given a fixed budget and a clear trade-off, 56.4% of respondents choose or lean towards the ergonomic chair that supports posture and long-term health. Only 27.7% favour the trendy recliner that looks better in social media posts. This suggests that for comfort and seating products, a majority in your sample still prioritises functional health benefits over pure aesthetics, which strongly supports a clinically-designed sleep-product positioning.

Willingness to Pay 50 to 70 percent premium for a certified mattress

Willingness to Pay Premium	Respondents	Percentage (%)
Definitely not	4	4.0%
Probably not	11	10.9%
Maybe	42	41.6%
Probably yes	25	24.8%
Definitely yes	19	18.8%

Only a small minority (14.9%) clearly reject paying a 50–70% premium for a mattress with certified health benefits. In contrast, 43.6% are positively inclined ("probably" or "definitely" yes), and another 41.6% are undecided. This means that almost half the respondents are already open to spending on a health premium, and a large "maybe" segment could be converted with strong evidence, certifications, and clear communication around long-term benefits.

Importance Level – Importance of investing in quality sleep products

Importance Level	Respondents	Percentage (%)
Not important	7	6.9%
Somewhat important	9	8.9%
Moderately important	30	29.7%
Important	37	36.6%
Extremely important	18	17.8%

A clear majority of respondents (54.4%) see investing in quality sleep products as "Important" or "Extremely important," and another 29.7% rate it as "Moderately important." Only about 15.8% treat it as a low priority. This shows that, at a mindset level, respondents already believe that sleep is worth spending on, which is a strong foundation for premium or wellness-oriented product strategies.

Choice – Clinically certified versus celebrity endorsed mattress

Choice	Respondents	Percentage (%)
Definitely Option A (Certified, no brand)	60	59.4%
Probably Option A	17	16.8%
Difficult to choose	11	10.9%
Probably Option B (Celebrity-endorsed)	11	10.9%
Definitely Option B	2	2.0%

An overwhelming 76.2% of respondents lean towards the clinically tested, doctor-certified mattress with no branding, while only 12.9% prefer the celebrity-endorsed, heavily advertised alternative at the same price. This is one of our strongest findings. It clearly indicates that, in this category, credibility and health assurance matter more than celebrity endorsement or advertising glamour for this sample.

Purchase Channel through which respondents buy sleep products

Purchase Channel	Respondents	Percentage (%)
From retail store, after trial	60	59.4%
From e-commerce website after browsing	16	15.8%
As per family or friends' suggestion	15	14.9%
From social media platform, via influencer recommendation	6	5.9%
Spontaneous buying without any research or recommendation	4	4.0%

Almost 60% of respondents prefer buying sleep products from a retail store after physically trying them, even though they are metro-based and comfortable with online shopping. E-commerce is the second-most common route at 15.8%, followed closely by family or friend-led purchases. This shows that touch-and-feel and trusted advice still dominate acquisition behaviour, which is crucial when planning distribution.

KMO and Bartlett's test: reading the data fitness report.
Statistical Analysis
The data has been checked for suitability for further research/statistically fit for factor analysis. The KMO value came out to be 0.516, which is acceptable for academic standards. A value above 0.5 is considered the minimum or mediocre standard. Values between 0.5 and 0.6 are acceptable. A KMO of 0.516 means that the data is barely acceptable. The questions are related to each other but not very significantly. Thus, this is not perfectly stable but enough to conduct further research.

KMO and Bartlett's Test		
Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy.		.516
Bartlett's Test of Sphericity	Approx. Chi-Square	114.186
	df	36
	Sig.	.000

Barlett's test of sphericity came out highly significant, with the chi-square value of 114.186. The degrees of freedom are 36 and p is more than 0.001. This tells us the nine items are independent of each other and have meaningful correlations. The questions are related to each other and real patterns in the data are worth exploring.

Total Variance Explained									
	Initial Eigenvalues			Extraction Sums of Squared Loadings			Rotation Sums of Squared Loadings		
	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %
1	1.967	21.858	21.858	1.967	21.858	21.858	1.706	18.958	18.958
2	1.479	16.434	38.293	1.479	16.434	38.293	1.521	16.901	35.859
3	1.434	15.933	54.226	1.434	15.933	54.226	1.383	15.361	51.220
4	1.055	11.724	65.949	1.055	11.724	65.949	1.326	14.729	65.949
5	.874	9.717	75.666						
6	.709	7.882	83.548						
7	.613	6.814	90.362						
8	.511	5.679	96.041						
9	.356	3.959	100.000						
Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.									

The total variance table shows the output of principal component analysis and confirms that four factors are retained. The first four components have the eigenvalues 1.967, 1.479, 1.434, and 1.055, all above the Kaiser criterion of 1.0. The fifth component has an eigenvalue of 0.874, which falls below the standard value and thus is void.

The four retained factors have a total variance of 65.949% in this data. Thus, roughly two-thirds of the variation among the 101 respondents' themes in the nine questions is accounted for. The remaining 34% is individual variation that cannot be grouped. This can be caused by misunderstood questions or factors that were simply not captured by this particular set of questions.

After Varymax rotation the variance is redistributed more evenly across the four factors. Instead of the first factor dominating with 21.8%, the related solution spreads the explanation more fairly. Factor 1 explains 18.96%, Factor 2 explains 16.90%, Factor 3 explains 15.36%, and Factor 4 explains 14.73%.

The cumulative total remains exactly 65.949%. The rotation does not add or remove any information; it only recognizes that each factor becomes more interpretable.

ROTATED COMPONENT MATRIX

Rotated Component Matrix					
Questionnaire Items		**Factor Loading**			
		1	**2**	**3**	**4**
Q5	Pay premium for health-certified mattress		**.869**		
Q6	Importance of investing in quality sleep products		**.834**		
Q7	Delay in purchase despite need				**.814**
Q8	Clinically vs celebrity mattress				**-.673**
Q9	Seek recommendations before purchase	**.727**			
Q10	Recommend brand to family and friends	**.771**			
Q12	Importance of brand recognition	**.693**			
Q13	Susceptibility to social media influencer			**.594**	
Q15	Willingness to pay for tech-advanced mattress			**.739**	
Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis. Rotation Method: Varimax with Kaiser Normalization.					

The rotated component matrix is the heart of analysis and the most important output of EFA. It shows exactly which questions are grouped together and how strongly they are loaded into each factor. This tells us what each factor means and why it makes sense.

Factor 1 – Social and Brand Engagement Factor (Q9, Q10, Q12)
Factor 1 has strong positive loadings for Q9 (seek recommendations before purchase, 0.727), Q10 (recommend brand to family and friends, 0.771) and Q12 (importance of brand recognition, 0.693). All these questions are about social behavior: asking others, telling others, or caring about the brand name that consumers associate with the brand. Consumers who score high are plugged into the social network. Before buying they ask around, after buying they talk about it, and while choosing they prefer the brand that is known and respected. It explains about 19% of the total variance, making it a strong single factor in this study

Factor 2 – Health Investment Orientation Factor (Q5, Q6)
Factor 2 is defined by Q5 (willingness to pay premium for health-certified mattress, loading 0.869) and Q6 (importance of investing in quality sleep products, loading 0.834). These two questions are both about treating sleep as a health issue that deserves serious financial investment. Consumers who have scored high are not just buying a mattress for sleeping but are actually investing in their health. This factor has high loadings above 0.8, making it very clean and well defined, with only two variables. This is the health investment orientation factor, and it accounts for 17% of the total variance

Factor 3 – Tech-Advanced Willingness and Influencer Factor (Q13, Q15)
Factor 3 shows notable loadings for Q13 (susceptibility to social media influencer, 0.594) and Q15 (willingness to pay for tech-advanced mattress, 0.739). The respondents who have scored high on this factor are tech-forward, digitally influenced, and open to making smart purchases with features like temperature control or sleep tracking. They are likely to take influencers' recommendations seriously. This factor makes sense especially for Gen Z in India, who discover products through Instagram or YouTube advertisements, and were the early adopters. This is the tech influencer orientation factor, explaining about 50% of the variance

Factor 4 – Delay vs Clinical vs Celebrity Factor (Q7, Q8)
Factor 4 is characterised by a high positive loading for Q7 (delay in purchase despite need, 0.814) and a strong negative loading for Q8 (clinically certified vs celebrity endorsed mattress, −0.673). These consumers are relatively more comfortable with celebrity-endorsed options and tend to delay purchases even though they acknowledge a need for a new mattress.. This is a weaker or more mixed factor because it captures the real pattern of human behavior

CHI-SQUARE RESULTS

The g-squared analysis deepens this picture by showing that age is not a neutrally valuable variable in the sleep product purchasing decision. Gen Z and older consumers are remarkably similar:

- Both groups delivered purchases at roughly the same rate.
- Both value brand recognition to the same degree.
- Both are willing to pay a premium for certified products.

In other dimensions, the generational divide is sharp and significant. Gen Z is more willing to pay for high-tech advanced mattresses. This is not a marginal difference; it is one of the most clear and more reliable results in the entire study. It confirms that the market for smart products is significant for the youth and that older consumers are largely satisfied with traditional product features.

The second clearly significant finding is a preference for clinical certification over celebrity endorsement. This shows an equally clear divide in the opposite direction. Older consumers strongly prefer the same type of product while Gen Z is more split. This aligns with the broader behavioral literature on generational trust. The older generation tends to trust more clinically tested, scientifically proven, or a doctor's recommendation by a doctor while other younger generations tend to trust personalities, peer reviews.

The borderline findings are also worth noting carefully. The marginal significance of social media influence (Gen Z more susceptible, p trend = 0.013) and the quality investment pattern (older respondents value it more, p trend = 0.006) are not strong enough to claim with full confidence, but they point in consistent directions that are likely to become clearer with a larger sample.

Question 15 ($p < 0.001$) gave the strongest result. Gen Z respondents are dramatically more willing to pay extra for a tech-advanced mattress compared to older respondents. This implies that if a brand launches a smart mattress, their core target is clearly Gen Z.

Question 8 ($p = 0.035$) was also clearly significant. Older respondents show a stronger preference for clinically certified matters, whereas Gen Z is evenly split between clinically certified and celebrity endorsed sleep products. This is consistent with broader research showing that older consumers tend to rely more on evidence and credentials while younger consumers are more influenced by images or idols.

Questions 6, 9, and 13 showed broader line or marginal significant factors. The main chi-square was not significant at 0.05 ($p = 0.094$) but the linear test was very significant, showing that as age increases the importance given to sleeve investment also increases. For question 9 (seeking recommendation), the broader line result ($p = 0.051$) suggests that older groups depend more on trusted advice from people they know. For question 13 (social media influence), the trend test ($p = 0.013$) confirmed that Gen Z is more influenced by influencers in marketing.

Questions 5, 7, 10, and 12 showed no significant effect of age on whether consumers delay purchasing, recommend brands to others, pay for health-certified products, or value brand recommendation. These behaviors are more broadly similar across different age groups showing that these attributes towards sleep are universal regardless of generation.

	Meaning (short)	Age group higher on strong responses	Chi-square (p-value)	Interpretation of age effect
Q5	Pay premium for health-certified mattress	Gen Z (slightly)	p = 0.245 (NS)	No significant age effect on health-premium willingness
Q6	Importance of investing in quality sleep products	Others	p = 0.094 (trend p = 0.006)	Older respondents value sleep investment more; age shows upward trend
Q7	Delay in purchase despite need	Similar	p = 0.947 (NS)	No age effect on delay behaviour
Q8	Clinically vs celebrity mattress	Others	p = 0.035 (Sig.)	Older respondents clearly prefer clinically tested mattress
Q9	Seek recommendations before purchase	Others	p = 0.051 (LR p = 0.044)	Weak but real pattern: older groups depend more on advice
Q10	Recommend brand to family and friends	Slightly Others	p = 0.133 (NS)	Age does not clearly affect brand recommendation behaviour

Q12	Importance of brand recognition	Similar	$p = 0.271$ (NS)	Brand importance broadly similar across age groups
Q13	Susceptibility to social media influencer	Gen Z	$p = 0.056$ (trend $p = 0.013$)	Younger respondents more influenced by social media
Q15	Willingness to pay for tech-advanced mattress	Gen Z	$p < 0.001$ (Sig.)	Strong age effect: Gen Z much more willing to pay for tech mattress

LIMITATIONS

Even though this research provides detailed and valuable insights into the consumer preferences and perceived value & purchase decision towards health-oriented sleep products, it cannot be generalized to a large & diversified population demographics like India. Some of the major limitations of this study include:

First, the dynamic nature of Gen-Z consumer preferences in a globally integrated market of luxury sleeping products. Although researchers tried all possible measures to keep the accuracy and timelessness of these findings.

Second, this study adopted convenient sampling with small sample size in comparison to the large population size of Gen-Z consumers in India. This may result in biases and asymmetry of data distribution.

Furthermore, a researcher's own biasness can also be considered as one of the limiting factors for research result generalizability. Thus, acknowledging these limitations are essential to contextualize the conclusions drawn on consumer preferences toward health-oriented luxury sleep products

CONCLUSION

This study set out to understand what drives Indian consumers especially in terms of their attitudes, beliefs, and behaviours when it comes to sleep products. Using data from 101 respondents and two well-established statistical methods, the research has produced findings that are both practically useful for marketers and academically meaningful as a baseline study in this category.

The first findings come from the EFA analysis, which revealed that consumer attitudes towards sleep products are not scattered randomly but are from 9 independent dimensions. They organized themselves into four coherent underlined themes or factors that emerged directly from the data itself. This makes this method particularly valuable because it helps us interpret what consumers are actually thinking rather than what the researcher assumed they would think.

The first factor, social and brand engagement, is the strongest; nearly 19% of the total variance. It captures the type of consumer who is embedded in social networks and brand ecosystems. This type of consumer asks for advice before buying, shares its experience after buying, and places high importance on whether a brand is well known or has market dominance. This factor is actionable. Investing in brand building, word-of-mouth campaigns, referral programs, and earned media will resonate strongly with this consumer segment. Social proof is not just nice to have for this group; it is their primary decision-making mechanism.

The second factor, Health Investment Orientation, reveals a segment that reads, "The purchase of a mattress is, the same way they treat a visit to a doctor, as a responsible investment in their own health." These respondents pay extra attention to good sleep patterns and are willing to pay for certification or specialization in mattress quality assurance. For marketing this means that health claims, clinically tested credentials, and doctor endorsements have high demand in this group. They do not need to convince the consumer that sleep matters. What they need is confidence that a specific product delivers on its health promise, which can be clinically proven or is scientifically backed.

The third factor, tech and influencer orientation, is particularly interesting in the context of modern India. These consumers are digitally active, open to innovation, and influenced by online personalities. They would pay for a smart mattress with smart features like temperature regulation, sleep tracking, and app connectivity, and they also need social media influence, with endorsements by influencers or celebrities, as a source of information or recommendation. This is not a huge group but it is growing as Gen Zs are a major contributor. Brands that want to be seen as innovative and forward-thinking should invest in influencer partnerships and technologically distinctive product features to capture the segment.

The fourth factor is Delay and Celebrity Tendency. The consumer is not actively seeking out clinical validation. Image and aspiration play a bigger role rather than evidence and certification. This is actually the segment most vulnerable to flash sales, limited time offers, and aspirational advertisements featuring celebrities.

Both the EFA and the G-Square results tell us a coherent story about the Indian sleep products consumer. There is no single type of buyer. The market is generally segmented and has meaningful differences in attitudes toward health investment, social engagement, and technical and technology enthusiasm. The most important factor is the age differentiator, particularly when it comes to technology and the relative weight given to clinical evidence vs celebrity association.

REFERENCES

1. Coherent Market Insights (2026) *Why Millennials and Gen Z are driving new home décor trends*. Available at: https://www.coherentmarketinsights.com/blog/consumer-goods/how-millennials-and-gen-z-are-driving-home-decor-trends-3139 (Accessed: 9 August 2026).
2. Dataintelo (2026) *Ergonomic products market research report 2034*. Available at: https://dataintelo.com/report/global-ergonomic-products-market (Accessed: 9 August 2026).
3. Fortune Business Insights (2026) *Ergonomic chair market size, share & industry analysis, 2034*. Available at: https://www.fortunebusinessinsights.com/ergonomic-chair-market-112042 (Accessed: 9 August 2026).
4. GWI (2025) *Gen Z spending habits: The trends marketers need to know in 2025*. Available at: https://www.gwi.com/reports/gen-z (Accessed: 9 August 2026).
5. Industry Research Biz (2026) *Ergonomic furniture market size, trends, and share, growth, report 2035*. Available at: https://www.industryresearch.biz/market-reports/ergonomic-furniture-market-113114 (Accessed: 9 August 2026).
6. Kuncoro, H.A.D.P. and Kusumawati, N. (2021) ‘A study of customer preference, customer perceived value, sales promotion, and social media marketing towards purchase decision of sleeping product in Generation Z’, *Advanced International Journal of Business, Entrepreneurship and SMEs*, 3(9), pp. 265–276. doi: 10.35631/AIJBES.39018. Available at: https://gaexcellence.com/aijbes/article/view/218 (Accessed: 9 August 2026).
7. Kunuratna, S., Boonyagul, S., Thongpance, N., Mekkaew, C., Chotikunnan, P. and Wongkamhang, A. (2024) ‘Innovative health mattress acceptance: Using technology acceptance model’, *Pakistan Journal of Life and Social Sciences*, 22(1), pp. 6302–6325. Available at: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/382716197_Innovative_Health_Mattress_Acceptance_Using_Technology_Acceptance_Model (Accessed: 9 August 2026).
8. McKinsey & Company (2025) *The future of wellness trends survey 2025*. Available at: https://www.mckinsey.com/industries/consumer-packaged-goods/our-insights/future-of-wellness-trends (Accessed: 9 August 2026).
9. Nair, P. and Seshanna, S. (2024) ‘Understanding the buying behavior of Generation Z consumers in India: The parasocial mediating role of influencers on consumption tendency’, *SSRN Electronic Journal*. doi: 10.2139/ssrn.4861287. Available at: https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=4861287 (Accessed: 9 August 2026).
10. Nitsche, L. (2025) *The Gen Z’s perception of luxury brands as status symbols: A qualitative study*. Master’s thesis. Umeå University. Available at: http://www.diva-portal.org/smash/record.jsf?pid=diva2:1975216 (Accessed: 23 Jun 2025).
11. TechSci Research (2026) *Global ergonomic chair market size and outlook 2031*. Available at: https://www.techsciresearch.com/report/ergonomic-chair-market/19647.html (Accessed: 9 August 2026).
12. Visa Business and Economic Insights (2025) *Unlocking Gen Z’s mindset and consumer potential*. Available at: https://usa.visa.com/partner-with-us/visa-consulting-analytics/economic-insights/searching-for-the-consumer-of-tomorrow-the-gen-z-opportunity.html (Accessed: 9 August 2026).
13. Zuo, A. (2024) ‘Research on excessive consumption of luxury goods by the “Generation Z” — Based on behavioral economics’, *Finance & Economics*, 1(4), pp. 1–5. doi: 10.61173/hfvffk80. Available at: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/377164195_Research_on_excessive_consumption_of_luxury_goods_by_the_Generation_Z (Accessed: 9 August 2026).