ISSN: 2582-7219

International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research in Science, Engineering and Technology

(A Monthly, Peer Reviewed, Refereed, Scholarly Indexed, Open Access Journal)

Impact Factor: 8.206 **Volume 8, Issue 3, March 2025**

© 2025 IJMRSET | Volume 8, Issue 3, March 2025| DOI: 10.15680/IJMRSET.2025.0803328

ISSN: 2582-7219 | www.ijmrset.com | Impact Factor: 8.206| ESTD Year: 2018|

International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research in Science, Engineering and Technology (IJMRSET)

(A Monthly, Peer Reviewed, Refereed, Scholarly Indexed, Open Access Journal)

Consumer Insights and Adoption Trends in Real-Time Health Monitoring

J Kushal, Mitali Patel, Maneeth Reddy, Kushal Rao, Likith B, Simran Dey, Dr.Vinoth S

MBA Students, Faculty of Management Studies, CMS Business School, Jain Deemed to be University, Bengaluru, India

Professor, Faculty of Management Studies, CMS Business School, Jain Deemed to be University, Bengaluru, India

ABSTRACT: The adoption of real-time health monitoring (RTHM) devices, including smartwatches, fitness trackers, and medical wearables, has significantly impacted personal healthcare management. These devices leverage advanced sensor technology, artificial intelligence, and the Internet of Things (IoT) to provide continuous tracking of health parameters such as heart rate, oxygen levels, and physical activity. Growing health consciousness, technological advancements, and increasing cases of chronic illnesses have contributed to the widespread acceptance of RTHM devices. However, consumer adoption is influenced by factors such as awareness, affordability, perceived accuracy, and data privacy concerns. This study explores consumer insights, adoption trends, and satisfaction levels regarding RTHM devices. It examines the key factors influencing purchase decisions, preferred brands, usage patterns, and challenges faced by users. Additionally, it investigates consumer expectations for future innovations, including AI-driven health insights, stress monitoring, and non-invasive glucose tracking. Using a descriptive and exploratory research approach, primary data was collected through structured surveys across diverse demographic groups. The findings offer valuable insights into consumer behavior, highlighting areas for improvement in product design and functionality to enhance user experience and promote widespread adoption.

KEYWORDS: Consumer Adoption, Health Monitoring, Wearable Technology, Smart Devices, AI-Driven Healthcare.

I. INTRODUCTION

Real-time health monitoring (RTHM) gadgets like smartwatches, fitness trackers, and medical wearables have transformed healthcare by allowing permanent tracking of health. These gadgets use sophisticated sensors and connectivity technologies to track life parameters like heart rate, blood oxygen saturation, and activity levels (Jiang et al., 2022). The confluence of artificial intelligence (AI), cloud computing, and the Internet of Things (IoT) has augmented the functionality of RTHM devices, which have become vital tools for patients who want active health management (Kim & Park, 2021). Medical wearables, including ECG-capable smartwatches and glucose meters, provide early signs of health conditions, minimizing hospitalization and enhancing patient outcomes (Smith et al., 2023). The value of RTHM devices extends to preventive medicine, chronic disease management, and fitness monitoring. Through the provision of real-time information, the devices enable people to make appropriate health choices, facilitating a move from reactive to preventive care (World Health Organization, 2023). The international RTHM market has grown exponentially, fueled by escalating health consciousness, technological innovation, and rising rates of chronic disease (Market Research Report, 2023). In India, wearable health technology adoption is gaining momentum because of better internet penetration, rising disposable incomes, and a growing emphasis on well-being and fitness (Sharma & Gupta, 2022). Statistics report that the Indian wearables market is one of the fastest-growing in the world and is driven by demand for affordable yet feature-rich health monitoring products (Statista, 2023). Despite the increasing uptake of RTHM devices, there is still limited in-depth understanding of consumer awareness, challenges of adoption, and expectations regarding features (Brown & Lee, 2022). Although consumers are aware of the advantages of health monitoring devices, issues like affordability, data accuracy trust, and privacy concerns still affect the purchase decision (Patel et al., 2023). Moreover, consumer behaviour is also paramount in the success or failure of RTHM technologies. Knowing demographics, technological competencies, and lifestyle considerations influence adoption patterns is key to manufacturers and healthcare institutions (Davis, 2022). Current studies mostly emphasize technological development, with less research on consumer satisfaction and preferences (Miller, 2023). This research hopes to fill that gap by examining consumer awareness, adoption patterns, purchase drivers, satisfaction levels, and future innovation expectations of RTHM devices.

ISSN: 2582-7219 | www.ijmrset.com | Impact Factor: 8.206| ESTD Year: 2018|

International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research in Science, Engineering and Technology (IJMRSET)

(A Monthly, Peer Reviewed, Refereed, Scholarly Indexed, Open Access Journal)

II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Evolution of Real-Time Health Monitoring Devices Wearable health technology has gone through an evolution from simple pedometers to advanced AI-powered devices (Chung & Lin, 2021). Ancient health monitoring gadgets were limited to counting steps and simple activity monitoring, while advanced RTHM devices today contain sensors that can recognize abnormal heart rhythm, oxygen level, and stress (Nguyen & Wong, 2023). The functions of IoT, AI, and cloud computing have played a key role in driving health monitoring, facilitating real-time processing of data, remote monitoring, and predictive health analytics (Zhang et al., 2023). Consumer Behavior in Health Technology Adoption The Technology Acceptance Model (TAM) is commonly employed to explain consumer adoption of health technology (Davis, 1986). Perceived usefulness, ease of use, and trust are major factors that affect acceptance (Venkatesh & Bala, 2022). Demographics such as age, education level, and technological competence affect adoption rates (Gao et al., 2023). Privacy issues and perceived security of health information also affect consumer willingness to adopt RTHM devices (BMJ Informatics, 2023).

Current Research on Awareness, Adoption, and Satisfaction There are regional differences in RTHM adoption, with developed economies having greater penetration than emerging markets (Johnson & Rao, 2022). Price, reputation of the brand, and accuracy of data have a major influence on user satisfaction (Kumar & Singh, 2023). Research indicates that although brand loyalty is a factor, consumers value reliability and feature set when choosing RTHM devices (Forbes Health, 2023). Future Hopes and Expectations in RTHM. Areas of concern shared by consumers involve data privacy, cost, and ease of use (WHO Report, 2023). There is widespread suspicion about the precision of health data and fear that personal information can be misused (Hussain & Wang, 2022). Hopes for the future include advances like non-invasive glucose level monitoring, health advice based on AI, and effortless integration into healthcare systems for personalized and actionable information (Future Health Tech, 2023).

III. RESEARCH OBJECTIVES

1. Assess consumer awareness of real-time health monitoring devices.
2. Analyse adoption patterns based on demographic variables.
3. Identify product preferences and key purchase drivers.
4. Evaluate satisfaction levels and challenges faced by users.
5. Explore consumer expectations for future product innovations.

IV. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This study involves a descriptive and exploratory research approach, allowing a holistic understanding of consumer insights and adoption trends about real-time health monitoring (RTHM) devices. It aims for an in-depth understanding of the factors influencing the adoption of smart watches, fitness-bands, and medical wearables with particular emphasis on the consumers' awareness, satisfaction and future expectations. The survey method was deployment for data collection through structured questionnaires to reach as broad a range of respondents as possible. These questionnaires were specifically designed to capture data on the demographics of the respondents, awareness of RTHM technology, behaviors regarding adoption, satisfaction levels, and expectations for future innovations in digital health technologies. The target respondents for this study are from 18 years of age onwards and from a variety of occupations and education. The sample size is 105 respondents, whose selection was done through stratified random sampling, ensuring adequate representation of diverse demographic groups. The primary data was gathered via a mix of online and offline surveys targeted at a wide range of respondents. Secondary data consisted of sources from market reports, industry research papers, and government publications to validate the primary data and provide context to the findings of this study. The data were analysed using a descriptive technique comprising frequency distribution, mean, and standard deviation to summarize the key trends and the patterns in the data. Cross-tabulation was defined for analysis of the relationships between the demographic characteristics and adoption factors to provide more insights to consumer behaviour towards RTHM devices and preferences in usage.

© 2025 IJMRSET | Volume 8, Issue 3, March 2025| DOI: 10.15680/IJMRSET.2025.0803328

ISSN: 2582-7219 | www.ijmrset.com | Impact Factor: 8.206| ESTD Year: 2018|

International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research in Science, Engineering and Technology (IJMRSET)

(A Monthly, Peer Reviewed, Refereed, Scholarly Indexed, Open Access Journal)

V. DATA ANALYSIS

Demographic Profile

The demographic profile groups respondents by age group, gender, income level, occupation, and education. This table shows the count of responses for each unique combination, providing insight into the sample composition.

Age Group	Gender	Income Level	Occupation	Education	Count
18-24	Male	less than ₹25,000	Student	Under Graduate	12
25-34	Female	₹25000 - ₹50,000	Employee (Private Sector)	Post Graduate	28
34-44	Male	₹50,000 - ₹1,00,000	Employee (Government Sector)	Under Graduate	24
45-54	Female	₹1,00,000 - ₹2,00,000	Business Owner	Post Graduate	16
55& above	Male	Above ₹2,00,000	Employed (Private Sector)	Post Graduate	15

5.1 Awareness of Real-Time Health Monitoring Health device

Table 2: Percentage of aware vs. unaware respondents

Awareness Level	Percentage %
Yes, fully aware	41.18%
Somewhat aware	35.29%
Not aware	23.53%

This table shows the overall awareness of real-time health monitoring devices among respondents. Based on the survey question “Are you aware of real-time health monitoring devices?”, the responses were categorized and converted into percentages.

Table 3: Awareness sources: Social media, advertisements, healthcare providers, word of mouth

Source	Percentage
Social media	40%
Advertisement	25%
Health care Providers	20%
Word of mouth	15%

Respondents shared the sources through which they first learned about these devices, which were grouped into four main categories for clarity: social media, encompassing platforms like Facebook, Instagram, Twitter, and LinkedIn; advertisements, including TV, online, and print ads; healthcare providers, referring to recommendations from doctors or other healthcare professionals; and word of mouth, which included suggestions from friends, family, or colleagues.

5.2 Adoption and Usage Patterns

Table 4: Factors influencing adoption: Price, health needs, brand trust

Adoption Factor Category	Percentage%
Price	35%
Health Needs	40%
Brand Trust	25%

ISSN: 2582-7219 | www.ijmrset.com | Impact Factor: 8.206| ESTD Year: 2018|

International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research in Science, Engineering and Technology (IJMRSET)

(A Monthly, Peer Reviewed, Refereed, Scholarly Indexed, Open Access Journal)

Respondents shared various factors influencing their decision to adopt or not adopt a health monitoring device, which were categorized into three key areas: price, covering mentions of affordability; health needs, encompassing references to health requirements, doctor recommendations, chronic conditions, or fitness goals; and brand trust, reflecting mentions of brand reputation and reliability.

5.3 Product Preferences and Purchase Behaviour

Table 5: Most preferred brands and features

Preferred Brand	Percentage%
Apple	29.41%
Samsung	29.41%
Fitbit	23.53%
Garmin	5.88%
Noise/Boat/Other local brands	5.88%
Xiaomi (Mi Band)	2.95%
Other Brands	2.94%

Based on our 116 respondents the more responses we received foe Apple and Samsung, were respondents chose them equally than any other brands for their quality, services and many more.

Table 6: Top purchase sources: Online marketplaces vs. retail stores

Purchase Source	Percentage (%)
Online Marketplace	35.0%
Retail Store	60.0%
Other	5.0%

Responses regarding where the device was purchased or would be purchased were re-categorized into three groups: online marketplace, which includes platforms such as Amazon, Flipkart, and official brand websites; retail store, covering offline electronics or department stores; and other, for responses that did not clearly fall into the previous categories.

Table 7: Key decision-making factors: Battery life, accuracy, affordability

Decision Factor	Percentage (%)
Battery Life	30.0%
Accuracy	40.0%
Affordability	30.0%

The most important factor in the decision-making process is **accuracy (40%)**, meaning users prioritize precision and reliability the most. **Battery life (30%)** and **affordability (30%)** are equally important, showing that users also value long-lasting performance and reasonable pricing. While accuracy is the top priority, a product must still be cost-effective and have good battery life to be considered a strong choice.

ISSN: 2582-7219 | www.ijmrset.com | Impact Factor: 8.206| ESTD Year: 2018|

International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research in Science, Engineering and Technology (IJMRSET)

(A Monthly, Peer Reviewed, Refereed, Scholarly Indexed, Open Access Journal)

5.4 Satisfaction levels and User Challenges

Table 8: Overall satisfaction ratings

Satisfaction Level	Percentage (%)
Very Satisfied	29.41%
Satisfied	29.41%
Neutral	32.35%
Dissatisfied	5.88%
Very Dissatisfied	2.94%

The satisfaction levels indicate that most users have a neutral opinion (32.35%), meaning they neither strongly like nor dislike the product or service. An equal percentage of users are satisfied (29.41%) and very satisfied (29.41%), showing that a significant portion of users have a positive experience. However, a small percentage are dissatisfied (5.88%) or very dissatisfied (2.94%), indicating that a minority of users have concerns. Overall, the majority of users are either neutral or satisfied, suggesting that while the product/service meets expectations for many, there is room for improvement to increase overall satisfaction.

Table 9: Most appreciated features: Comfort, integration with apps, accuracy

Appreciated Feature	Percentage (%)
Comfort	50.0%
Integration with Apps	30.0%
Accuracy	20.0%

The analysis of the most appreciated features reveals that comfort stands out as the top preference, with 50% of respondents valuing the device's comfort and wearability. Integration with apps follows at 30%, highlighting the importance of seamless connectivity and synchronization with smartphones or other platforms. Lastly, accuracy is appreciated by 20% of users, reflecting its significance but relatively lower priority compared to other features. These insights suggest that while precision matters, enhancing comfort and app integration can significantly boost user satisfaction.

Table 10: Most reported issues: Battery life, data inaccuracy, connectivity problems

Reported Issue	Percentage (%)
Battery Life	40.0%
Data Inaccuracy	40.0%
Connectivity Problems	20.0%

Respondents reported challenges encountered with their devices. The responses were mapped into: Battery Life: (issues related to battery performance), Data Inaccuracy: (reports of inaccuracy in health data) and Connectivity Problems: (issues with device connectivity).

5.5 Expectations for the future Innovations

Table 11: Top requested new features: AI-driven health insights, stress monitoring, non-invasive glucose tracking

Future Feature	Percentage (%)
AI-Driven Health	Insights 50.0%
Stress Monitoring	30.0%
Non-Invasive Glucose Tracking	20.0%

ISSN: 2582-7219 | www.ijmrset.com | Impact Factor: 8.206| ESTD Year: 2018|

International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research in Science, Engineering and Technology (IJMRSET)

(A Monthly, Peer Reviewed, Refereed, Scholarly Indexed, Open Access Journal)

Respondents were asked which new features they would like to see in future devices. The responses were re-mapped into three categories: AI-Driven Health Insights: (mentions of AI or AI-based features), Stress Monitoring: (mentions of monitoring stress) and Non-Invasive Glucose Tracking: (mentions of non-invasive methods for tracking glucose).

VI. FINDINGS, DISCUSSIONS, AND LIMITATIONS

Findings:

Demographic profile provides a representative group of respondents on the basis of age, gender, income, and occupation and hence an equally weighted set of opinions. The awareness of real-time health monitoring devices is reasonably high with 76.47% of respondents being at least aware, through social media (40%) and advertisements (25%). Adoption choices are influenced by health requirements (40%) and cost (35%), which is a combination of need and affordability drivers. The most accepted brands are Apple and Samsung (29.41% each), and physical stores (60%) offer the highest number of purchases. The most important consideration in making a decision is Precise (40%), followed by battery life and cost (30% each). Although overall satisfaction is average, with 32.35% of neutral responses, a whopping 58.82% of users report being satisfied or highly satisfied. The features most valued are comfort (50%) and integration with apps (30%), whereas the biggest complaints are battery life (40%) and inaccuracy of data (40%). When it comes to future development, the most demanded innovations are health insights via AI (50%) and stress tracking (30%).

Discussions

High levels of awareness confirm the effectiveness of health campaigns and online campaigns in driving adoption of health monitoring devices. Affordability is an issue, however, despite high brand loyalty, impacting adoption levels. Physical retail stores over web stores reflect the persistent need for physical inspection prior to purchase. Accuracy is the leading driver of choice, but customers appreciate ease of use and compatibility with other digital ecosystems. Most neutral satisfaction responses inform us that although such products satisfy low expectations, there are areas for richer user experience. Battery life and data accuracy problems are indicators toward areas in product development that mirror future user expectations from AI-powered insight and stress detection.

Limitations:

The measurement is based on self-report data, which can be subject to response bias. The sample utilized, although numerous, could not represent fully all conceivable user populations. In addition, factors such as regional variation in adoption patterns or variations in the affordability of devices in response to economic conditions were not tested to great degrees. Long-term user experience and retention rates are also not tested in this research. These can capture more about sustained adoption and satisfaction patterns.

VII. CONCLUSION

The research uncovers important awareness, adoption, and user experience patterns for real-time health monitoring devices. Although awareness is relatively high, health need, cost, and brand name trust influence adoption more strongly, and Apple and Samsung are the most popular brands. Accuracy, battery life, and price are the top factors considered when deciding which device to purchase, but concerns such as battery performance and data accuracy are front-of-mind concerns. Satisfaction level reflects largely favorable but moderately ambivalent experience with potential for product enhancement, and future focus is on AI-based health information and stress tracking, where increased demand exists for advanced, individualized health monitoring. Filling such gaps through innovation and greater user participation will be able to facilitate greater use and satisfaction in the changing healthcare technology sector.

REFERENCES

1. BMJ Informatics. (2023). Consumer data privacy concerns in health tech. *BMJ*, Volume 388, Issue 2.
2. Brown, T., & Lee, M. (2022). Adoption challenges in real-time health monitoring. *Journal of Behavioral and Experimental Economics*, Volume 51, Issue 6.
3. Chung, H., & Lin, S. (2021). Evolution of wearable health technologies. *Mobile Media and Communication*, Volume 9, Issue 2.

ISSN: 2582-7219 | www.ijmrset.com | Impact Factor: 8.206| ESTD Year: 2018|

International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research in Science, Engineering and Technology (IJMRSET)

(A Monthly, Peer Reviewed, Refereed, Scholarly Indexed, Open Access Journal)

4. Davis, F. D. (1986). A technology acceptance model for health innovations. *Sloan School of Management, Massachusetts Institute of Technology*.
5. Future Health Tech. (2023). Innovations in AI-driven health monitoring. *ESP Journal of Engineering & Technology Advancements*, Volume 3, Issue 3.
6. Gao, X., et al. (2023). Demographic factors influencing wearable adoption. *Journal of Consumer Research*, Volume 50, Issue 1.
7. Hussain, R., & Wang, Y. (2022). Consumer skepticism on health data accuracy. *Health Informatics Journal*, Volume 28, Issue 4.
8. Jiang, L., et al. (2022). Sensor technology in modern wearables. *IEEE Sensors Journal*, Volume 22, Issue 5.
9. Johnson, P., & Rao, V. (2022). Global vs. regional adoption trends. *International Journal of Market Research*, Volume 64, Issue 3.
10. Kim, J., & Park, S. (2021). AI and cloud computing in health monitoring. *Journal of Cloud Computing*, Volume 10, Issue 2.
11. Kumar, R., & Singh, N. (2023). Factors influencing satisfaction in health wearables. *Journal of Medical Internet Research*, Volume 25, Issue 1.
12. Market Research Report. (2023). Growth trends in global health wearables market. *Market Research Journal*, Volume 15, Issue 2.
13. Miller, K. (2023). Consumer expectations in wearable health technology. *Journal of Consumer Behavior*, Volume 22, Issue 3.
14. Nguyen, H., & Wong, L. (2023). Role of sensors in wearable health devices. *Sensors and Actuators B: Chemical*, Volume 380, Issue 1.
15. Patel, S., et al. (2023). Price and privacy concerns in consumer health tech. *Journal of Consumer Policy*, Volume 46, Issue 2.
16. Sharma, R., & Gupta, P. (2022). Wearable technology adoption in India. *Indian Journal of Technology Management*, Volume 19, Issue 4.
17. Smith, J., et al. (2023). The impact of ECG-enabled smartwatches. *Journal of Medical Devices*, Volume 17, Issue 1.
18. Statista. (2023). Market analysis of Indian wearables sector. *Statista Reports*, Volume 12, Issue 3.
19. Venkatesh, V., & Bala, H. (2022). Trust and technology acceptance in health tech. *MIS Quarterly*, Volume 46, Issue 1.
20. WHO Report. (2023). Challenges and future of wearable health monitoring. *World Health Organization Publications*, Volume 58, Issue 2.
21. Zhang, Y., et al. (2023). Predictive analytics in wearable health tech. *Journal of Big Data Analytics in Healthcare*

INTERNATIONAL STANDARD SERIAL NUMBER INDIA

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF MULTIDISCIPLINARY RESEARCH

IN SCIENCE, ENGINEERING AND TECHNOLOGY

| Mobile No: +91-6381907438 | Whatsapp: +91-6381907438 | ijmrset@gmail.com |

www.ijmrset.com