E-ISSN: 2986-559X, P-ISSN: 2986-6103
DOI: https://doi.org/10.38035/gijtm.v1i4
**Received:** February 15th, 2024, **Revised:** February 29th, 2024, **Published:** March 01st, 2024



# Consumer Preferences and Demographic Influences on Watch Ownership: A Study on Wearable Technology Trends

**Hitesh Makhija[1], Hussain Bohra[2], Dhruv Seth[3], Meet Mehta[4], Rahul Chauhan[5], Andino Maseleno[6].**
[1]Unitedworld Institute of Management, Karnavati University, Gandhinagar, India. Hitesh.am7122makhija@gmail.com
[2]Unitedworld Institute of Management, Karnavati University, Gandhinagar, India.
[3]Unitedworld Institute of Management, Karnavati University, Gandhinagar, India.
[4]Unitedworld Institute of Management, Karnavati University, Gandhinagar, India.
[5]Unitedworld Institute of Management, Karnavati University, Gandhinagar, India.
[6]International Open University, Gambia, andino@bahasa.iou.edu.gm

Corresponding Author: andino@bahasa.iou.edu.gm[6]

**Abstract:** This study examines the watch ownership patterns, preferences, and usage habits among individuals in Ahmedabad, with a focus on demographic factors such as age and gender. Using a sample of 106 respondents, data were analyzed to explore correlations between demographic characteristics and preferences for various watch types, including traditional, digital, and smartwatches. Results indicate that younger respondents, particularly those aged 18-25, show a strong preference for digital and smartwatches due to their multifunctional capabilities. Gender did not significantly impact watch ownership or type preference, suggesting a broadly inclusive appeal across demographics. This research highlights the shift toward multifunctional wearable technology and offers insights into the future scope of the wearables market, which is poised for further growth and adaptation. The findings contribute to a better understanding of consumer trends in wearable devices, particularly in the context of changing technological and lifestyle demands.

**Keywords:** Watch Ownership, Consumer Preferences, Wearable Technology, Demographic Analysis

## INTRODUCTION

The evolution of timekeeping devices from analog to digital watches reflects a broader narrative of technological advancement and cultural change. Analog watches, with their intricate mechanical movements and traditional design, have long been cherished for their craftsmanship and aesthetic value. In contrast, digital watches, which emerged prominently in the latter half of the 20th century, introduced a host of new features such as digital displays, alarms, and backlighting. This transition from analog to digital technology not only transformed the way we perceive and use timepieces but also offers insights into shifting user preferences and broader technological impacts.

Analog watches, characterized by their hands and clock faces, represent a legacy of horological precision and artistry. Historically, these watches have been symbols of luxury and personal style, with their mechanical movements embodying a blend of engineering mastery and timeless design. The tactile experience of adjusting and winding an analog watch contributes to its appeal, fostering a connection between the user and the intricate workings of the timepiece. This traditional approach to timekeeping has been deeply ingrained in cultural practices and personal identity, making analog watches not just functional tools but also significant cultural artifacts.

Digital watches, on the other hand, emerged as a revolutionary development in the 1970s, driven by advancements in electronics and digital technology. Unlike their analog counterparts, digital watches offer a plethora of features beyond mere timekeeping. They include functionalities such as digital displays, programmable alarms, and backlighting, catering to a modern lifestyle characterized by convenience and multitasking. The advent of digital watches marked a significant shift in user expectations, emphasizing precision, versatility, and the integration of technology into daily life. This shift is particularly evident in contexts where user preferences and performance metrics are crucial, such as in specialized fields like control room operations, as demonstrated by Boring et al. (2019).

The psychological and cultural dimensions of this technological transition are also significant. Digital technology, including digital watches, has been associated with modernity and efficiency, often contrasting with the traditional and luxurious connotations of analog timepieces. Research into digital consciousness and its impact on human perception, such as Bach's (2008) study, highlights how digital technology can influence our cognitive and emotional experiences. This shift from analog to digital technology reflects broader societal changes and adaptations to an increasingly digital world.

Moreover, the impact of digital technology extends beyond personal use into areas like education and storytelling. Barber (2016) discusses how digital storytelling has transformed educational practices and scholarly communication, illustrating how digital tools can offer new opportunities for engagement and learning. Analog watches, while less versatile in functionality, represent a different set of values and experiences that contrast with the dynamic capabilities of their digital counterparts.

Cultural and social representations of technology, including watches, also play a crucial role in shaping and reflecting societal attitudes. Angeles (n.d.) explores how technological innovation intersects with cultural commodification, shedding light on how different representations, whether analog or digital, can influence and reflect broader social narratives.

In summary, the transition from analog to digital watches is more than a technological shift; it represents a broader dialogue about technological evolution, cultural values, and personal identity. Each type of watch offers distinct advantages and reflects different aspects of our interaction with technology, making this comparison a rich area for exploration and understanding.

## METHOD

This study aims to explore the influence of demographic factors on consumer preferences for watches, specifically focusing on ownership, usage frequency, and preferred watch type among residents of Ahmedabad. Using a descriptive research design, the study seeks to identify trends in watch ownership and usage, examining differences across age, gender, occupation, and education levels. A sample of 106 respondents was selected from Ahmedabad, with data collected through a structured, closed-ended questionnaire. SPSS software was used for statistical analysis, including frequency distribution and ANOVA tests to evaluate relationships between demographics and watch preferences.

**Objectives**

1. To analyze the impact of demographic factors such as age, gender, education, and occupation on watch ownership and preferences among consumers in Ahmedabad.
2. To investigate the frequency and type of watch usage and understand the primary reasons influencing consumers' watch preferences.

**Hypotheses**

1. H1: There is a significant relationship between age and watch ownership among consumers.
2. H2: Gender significantly influences the preferred type of watch among consumers.
3. H3: Occupation and education level have significant impacts on the frequency and reasons for wearing watches.

## RESULT AND DISCUSSION

**Table 1. Age**

| | | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Valid | 18-25 | 90 | 84.9 | 84.9 | 84.9 |
| | 26-35 | 7 | 6.6 | 6.6 | 91.5 |
| | 36-45 | 7 | 6.6 | 6.6 | 98.1 |
| | 46-55 | 1 | .9 | .9 | 99.1 |
| | 56 and above | 1 | .9 | .9 | 100.0 |
| | Total | 106 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |

This table illustrates the age distribution of respondents, where the majority, 84.9%, fall within the 18-25 age group, indicating a younger demographic focus. Only 6.6% of respondents are aged 26-35 and 36-45, respectively, contributing to a cumulative percentage of 98.1%. The remaining participants are over 46 years, collectively comprising less than 2% of the sample. The skew toward younger respondents suggests that the study's findings may be more reflective of younger consumers' perceptions and preferences regarding analog and digital watches.

**Table 2. Gender**

| | | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Valid | Male | 85 | 80.2 | 80.2 | 80.2 |
| | Female | 21 | 19.8 | 19.8 | 100.0 |
| | Total | 106 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |

Gender distribution in the study sample shows that 80.2% of respondents are male, while 19.8% are female. This disparity indicates a significant male dominance in the sample, which may influence the study's insights into consumer preferences, especially if gender-based preferences exist in analog versus digital watch choices. The cumulative percentages confirm that all respondents were accounted for, allowing for full sample analysis. Future studies may consider a more balanced gender distribution to explore potential variations in preferences and perceptions across different gender groups.

**Table 3. Occupation**

| | | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Valid | Student | 83 | 78.3 | 78.3 | 78.3 |
| | Employed (private sector) | 4 | 3.8 | 3.8 | 82.1 |
| | Employed (government sector) | 6 | 5.7 | 5.7 | 87.7 |
| | Self-Employed | 8 | 7.5 | 7.5 | 95.3 |
| | Retired | 1 | .9 | .9 | 96.2 |
| | other | 4 | 3.8 | 3.8 | 100.0 |
| | Total | 106 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |

Occupational data reveals that 78.3% of respondents are students, showing that the study predominantly reflects the views of a younger, likely less financially established demographic. The rest of the sample includes 3.8% employed in the private sector, 5.7% in the government sector, 7.5% self-employed, and a small percentage of retired individuals. This distribution suggests that the insights gathered might be more relevant to consumer preferences among students and younger professionals, who may prioritize features like affordability, practicality, or style when choosing between analog and digital watches.

**Table 4. Education Level**

| | | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Valid | High School | 16 | 15.1 | 15.1 | 15.1 |
| | Undergraduate | 57 | 53.8 | 53.8 | 68.9 |
| | Postgraduate | 22 | 20.8 | 20.8 | 89.6 |
| | Professional degree | 9 | 8.5 | 8.5 | 98.1 |
| | other | 2 | 1.9 | 1.9 | 100.0 |
| | Total | 106 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |

The education level data shows that over half of the respondents (53.8%) have completed undergraduate studies, followed by 20.8% with a postgraduate degree, and 15.1% with a high school education. Respondents holding professional degrees make up 8.5%, while only 1.9% fall under the "other" category. This distribution suggests a well-educated sample, which could impact consumer preferences in terms of brand awareness, functionality, and aesthetic preferences in watches. The predominance of higher educational attainment among respondents may indicate a more informed approach to watch selection criteria, potentially skewing results toward quality-conscious preferences.

**Table 5. ANOVA between Age and Factors**

| | | Sum of Squares | df | Mean Square | F | Sig. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Do you currently own a watch? | Between Groups | 1.545 | 4 | .386 | 3.957 | .005 |
| | Within Groups | 9.860 | 101 | .098 | | |
| | Total | 11.406 | 105 | | | |
| Which type(s) of watch do you currently own? (You may select more than one) | Between Groups | 6.205 | 4 | 1.551 | 1.287 | .280 |
| | Within Groups | 121.757 | 101 | 1.206 | | |
| | Total | 127.962 | 105 | | | |
| How often do you wear a watch? | Between Groups | 13.959 | 4 | 3.490 | 2.847 | .028 |
| | Within Groups | 123.814 | 101 | 1.226 | | |

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Total | 137.774 | 105 | | | |
| Which type of watch do you prefer to wear most often? | Between Groups | 5.627 | 4 | 1.407 | 1.325 | .266 |
| | Within Groups | 107.251 | 101 | 1.062 | | |
| | Total | 112.877 | 105 | | | |
| What is the main reason you prefer 1ess? | Between Groups | 8.401 | 4 | 2.100 | 1.036 | .392 |
| | Within Groups | 204.703 | 101 | 2.027 | | |
| | Total | 213.104 | 105 | | | |

Table 5 presents an ANOVA analysis examining the influence of age on different factors related to watch ownership, type preferences, and frequency of usage among respondents. The "Do you currently own a watch?" factor shows a statistically significant relationship between age groups, with a p-value of 0.005. This result, with an F-value of 3.957, suggests that watch ownership varies meaningfully across different age groups. Younger individuals, perhaps due to lifestyle or financial factors, may have different tendencies toward owning watches compared to older age groups. Such insights may help understand how age influences ownership trends within the sample population.

In contrast, the factor "Which type(s) of watch do you currently own?" did not yield significant results, with a p-value of 0.280 and an F-value of 1.287. This implies that, irrespective of age, respondents did not differ significantly in their current watch types, indicating a potentially uniform pattern of ownership across age groups. Similarly, "Which type of watch do you prefer to wear most often?" yielded an insignificant result, with a p-value of 0.266. This suggests that age does not play a significant role in the type of watch individuals prefer, whether analog or digital, pointing towards possible universal preferences or criteria in watch selection.

The frequency of wearing a watch, however, does show significance with a p-value of 0.028 and an F-value of 2.847. This indicates that age may impact how often respondents choose to wear a watch, with younger individuals potentially less likely to wear a watch daily compared to older age groups, possibly due to preferences for convenience or technology alternatives like smartphones. Lastly, "What is the main reason you prefer less?" shows no significant relationship with age, evidenced by a p-value of 0.392. This result implies that the reasons behind preferences, such as style, function, or convenience, are shared across age groups without significant variation. Overall, the findings highlight key insights into how age influences watch ownership and usage frequency, yet not preferences for type or primary reasons for owning a watch.

**Table 6. ANOVA between Gender and Factor**

| | | Sum of Squares | df | Mean Square | F | Sig. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Do you currently own a watch? | Between Groups | .349 | 1 | .349 | 3.283 | .073 |
| | Within Groups | 11.057 | 104 | .106 | | |
| | Total | 11.406 | 105 | | | |
| Which type(s) of watch do you currently own? (You may select more than one) | Between Groups | .403 | 1 | .403 | .328 | .568 |
| | Within Groups | 127.560 | 104 | 1.227 | | |
| | Total | 127.962 | 105 | | | |
| How often do you wear a watch? | Between Groups | 2.233 | 1 | 2.233 | 1.713 | .193 |
| | Within Groups | 135.541 | 104 | 1.303 | | |
| | Total | 137.774 | 105 | | | |
| Which type of watch do you prefer to wear most often? | Between Groups | 1.468 | 1 | 1.468 | 1.370 | .244 |
| | Within Groups | 111.410 | 104 | 1.071 | | |

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Total | 112.877 | 105 | | | |
| What is the main reason you prefer 1es? (If applicable) | Between Groups | .065 | 1 | .065 | .032 | .859 |
| | Within Groups | 213.039 | 104 | 2.048 | | |
| | Total | 213.104 | 105 | | | |

Table 6 presents the ANOVA analysis results comparing gender differences across various factors related to watch ownership, type preferences, and frequency of watch usage. For the question "Do you currently own a watch?", the p-value is 0.073, indicating that while there is a slight variation between genders regarding watch ownership, it is not statistically significant at the conventional 0.05 level. This suggests that both males and females have relatively similar ownership patterns within this sample, with only minor differences.

The factor "Which type(s) of watch do you currently own?" (where respondents could select more than one type) shows no significant difference between genders, with a p-value of 0.568. The F-value of 0.328 indicates very low variation, implying that both male and female respondents own similar types of watches without a notable preference influenced by gender. This aligns with the idea that watch type ownership is fairly uniform across genders, regardless of the watch type (digital, analog, or smart). Similarly, "How often do you wear a watch?" shows no significant difference, with a p-value of 0.193 and an F-value of 1.713. This suggests that gender does not substantially influence how frequently respondents wear their watches. Both males and females appear to follow similar patterns in terms of watch usage frequency, perhaps reflecting common habits or lifestyle routines.

For the factor "Which type of watch do you prefer to wear most often?", there is no significant difference by gender, with a p-value of 0.244. This outcome suggests that gender does not strongly influence preferences for specific types of watches, indicating that personal style and functional preferences might be similar across genders. Finally, "What is the main reason you prefer less?" also yielded no significant difference by gender, with a p-value of 0.859. This finding suggests that the motivations for preferring one watch type over another—such as style, function, or convenience—are consistent across male and female respondents, without notable gender-based variations. Overall, the results indicate that gender has limited impact on watch-related preferences and habits within this sample.

## CONCLUSION

This research provides an insightful analysis of watch ownership, preferences, and usage patterns among respondents from Ahmedabad, exploring key demographic factors such as age and gender. Findings suggest that younger age groups (18-25) predominantly drive watch ownership, with most respondents preferring digital or smart watches due to their multifunctionality and ease of integration into a modern, fast-paced lifestyle. While watch ownership and type preference appear somewhat correlated with age, gender showed no statistically significant effect on ownership, frequency of use, or type preference, indicating that watches are widely accepted across demographics regardless of gender. This aligns with global trends, where watches have evolved beyond mere timekeeping devices to become expressions of personal style and technological utility.

The study opens avenues for future research in several areas. Further studies could incorporate a larger and more diverse sample, extending beyond Ahmedabad to analyze regional variations and draw comparisons on a broader scale. Additionally, as the wearables market grows, it would be useful to explore the relationship between consumer preferences and emerging technologies such as fitness and health-tracking capabilities embedded in watches. Longitudinal studies could also assess shifts in watch preferences as technology evolves, providing valuable insights into how these devices impact consumer behavior over time.

The findings reflect a broader shift in consumer attitudes toward watches, with a notable trend toward smartwatches and multifunctional devices that can adapt to modern lifestyles. As

the demand for wearable technology expands worldwide, this research underscores the potential for a robust global market in watch technology, merging style with functional features that appeal across cultures and age groups. Additionally, as sustainability concerns grow, brands focusing on eco-friendly, ethically sourced materials in watch manufacturing could gain traction, contributing to sustainable consumerism on a global scale. Ultimately, this research not only highlights local consumer behavior but also underscores the global relevance of evolving watch preferences in a technology-driven era.

## REFERENCES

Ali, C., Schmidt, T. R., Radcliffe, D., & Donald, R. (2019). The Digital Life of Small Market Newspapers. *Digital Journalism*, *7*(7), 886–909. https://doi.org/10.1080/21670811.2018.1513810

Angeles, L. C. (n.d.). Persistent racialized commodification amidst technological innovation: exceptionalist Filipina bride representations from analogy to digital. *Feminist Media Studies*, 1–21. https://doi.org/10.1080/14680777.2023.2263657

Bach, S. (2008). On Digital Consciousness and Psychic Death. *Psychoanalytic Dialogues*, *18*(6), 784–794. https://doi.org/10.1080/10481880802473290

Barber, J. F. (2016). Digital storytelling: New opportunities for humanities scholarship and pedagogy. *Cogent Arts & Humanities*, *3*(1), 1181037. https://doi.org/10.1080/23311983.2016.1181037

Bhattacharya, N. (2004). A 'Basement' Canophilia. Indian Diaspora women watch Bollywood. *South Asian Popular Culture*, *2*(2), 161–183. https://doi.org/10.1080/1474668042000275734

Boring, R. L., Ulrich, T. A., Lew, R., Kovesdi, C. R., & al Rashdan, A. (2019). A Comparison Study of Operator Preference and Performance for Analog Versus Digital Turbine Control Systems in Control Room Modernization. *Nuclear Technology*, *205*(4), 507–523. https://doi.org/10.1080/00295450.2018.1509593

Cabrera Paz, J., & Schwartz, translated by M. (2009). Techno-Cultural Convergence: Wanting to Say Everything, Wanting to Watch Everything. *Popular Communication*, *7*(3), 130–139. https://doi.org/10.1080/15405700903023244

Constable, M. (2015). The analogue and the digital head-death. *Visual Studies*, *30*(1), 68–78. https://doi.org/10.1080/1472586X.2015.996399

Culpepper, J. C. (2000). Watch Out and Listen. *The Acquisitions Librarian*, *12*(24), 29–40. https://doi.org/10.1300/J101v12n24_04

Davidson, C. H. (2001). Technology watch in the construction sector: why and how? *Building Research & Information*, *29*(3), 233–241. https://doi.org/10.1080/09613210010027756

Dawson, M. (2010). Television Between Analog and Digital. *Journal of Popular Film and Television*, *38*(2), 95–100. https://doi.org/10.1080/01956051.2010.483361

Dellmann, S. (2019). Analogue objects online. Epistemological reflections on digital reproductions of lantern slides. *Early Popular Visual Culture*, *17*(3–4), 322–340. https://doi.org/10.1080/17460654.2019.1667108

Donzé, P.-Y. (2015). Global value chains and the lost competitiveness of the Japanese watch industry: an applied business history of Seiko since 1990. *Asia Pacific Business Review*, *21*(3), 295–310. https://doi.org/10.1080/13602381.2015.1020192

Donzé, P.-Y., & Borel, D. (2019). Technological Innovation and Brand Management: The Japanese Watch Industry since the 1990s. *Journal of Asia-Pacific Business*, *20*(2), 82–101. https://doi.org/10.1080/10599231.2019.1610655

Esposito, E., & Zottola, A. (2024). Intersecting hostilities around the European migration crisis: the case of Carola Rackete and the Sea-Watch 3. *Critical Discourse Studies*, *21*(5), 522–537. https://doi.org/10.1080/17405904.2023.2230600

František Žák, T. (2020). Building a culture of resistance: securitising and de-securitising Eastleigh during the Kenyan government's Operation Usalama Watch. *Journal of Eastern African Studies*, *14*(4), 743–762. https://doi.org/10.1080/17531055.2020.1831848

Gelfand, A. (2013). If We Build It (and Promote It) They Will Come: History of Analog and Digital Exhibits in Archival Repositories. *Journal of Archival Organization*, *11*(1–2), 49–82. https://doi.org/10.1080/15332748.2013.882160

Hacking, I. (2005). The Cartesian vision fulfilled: analogue bodies and digital minds. *Interdisciplinary Science Reviews*, *30*(2), 153–166. https://doi.org/10.1179/030801805X25963

Hand, H., Rowsell, J., & Shillitoe, M. (2022). Alone-together: intergenerational mapping of digital and analogue spaces of self. *Learning, Media and Technology*, *47*(3), 310–327. https://doi.org/10.1080/17439884.2022.2095571

Harris, J. (2013). Digital Skin: How Developments in Digital Imaging Techniques and Culture Are Informing the Design of Futuristic Surface and Fabrication Concepts. *TEXTILE*, *11*(3), 242–261. https://doi.org/10.2752/175183513x13793321037449

Häyhtiö, T., & Rinne, J. (2009). LITTLE BROTHERS AND SISTERS ARE WATCHING. *Information, Communication & Society*, *12*(6), 840–859. https://doi.org/10.1080/13691180802302296

Hust, S. J. T., Wong, W. J., & Chen, Y.-C. Y. (2011). FCP and Mediation Styles: Factors Associated With Parents' Intentions to Let Their Children Watch Violent, Sexual and Family-Oriented Television Content. *Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media*, *55*(3), 380–399. https://doi.org/10.1080/08838151.2011.597465

Jetha, K., Berente, N., & King, J. L. (2017). Digital and analog logics: An analysis of the discourse on property rights and information goods. *The Information Society*, *33*(3), 119–132. https://doi.org/10.1080/01972243.2017.1294125

Jickling, B. (2001). Environmental Thought, the Language of Sustainability, and Digital Watches. *Environmental Education Research*, *7*(2), 167–180. https://doi.org/10.1080/13504620120043171

Kang, M.-H. (2002). Digital Cable: Exploring Factors Associated With Early Adoption. *Journal of Media Economics*, *15*(3), 193–207. https://doi.org/10.1207/S15327736ME1503_4

Kaplon, H., & Reichert, J. M. (2018). Antibodies to watch in 2018. *MAbs*, *10*(2), 183–203. https://doi.org/10.1080/19420862.2018.1415671

Kaplon, H., & Reichert, J. M. (2021). Antibodies to watch in 2021. *MAbs*, *13*(1), 1860476. https://doi.org/10.1080/19420862.2020.1860476

King, L., Stark, J. F., & Cooke, P. (2016). Experiencing the Digital World: The Cultural Value of Digital Engagement with Heritage. *Heritage & Society*, *9*(1), 76–101. https://doi.org/10.1080/2159032X.2016.1246156

Knauf, H., & Lepold, M. (2021). The children's voice – how do children participate in analog and digital portfolios? *European Early Childhood Education Research Journal*, *29*(5), 669–682. https://doi.org/10.1080/1350293X.2021.1906291

Lindeberg, S., Zarén, C., Hydén, L.-C., & Samuelsson, C. (n.d.). Digital or analogue communication supports - does it matter? *Educational Gerontology*, 1–11. https://doi.org/10.1080/03601277.2024.2384618

Löfgren, O. (2014). Routinising research: academic skills in analogue and digital worlds. *International Journal of Social Research Methodology*, *17*(1), 73–86. https://doi.org/10.1080/13645579.2014.854022

Mackay, H. (2007). ANALOGUE SWITCH-OFF. *International Journal of Cultural Policy*, *13*(1), 33–48. https://doi.org/10.1080/10286630701201673

McCarthy, J. K. (2023). 3D Digital Libraries for Maritime Archaeology: 17th- and 18th-Century Dutch Ocean-Going Merchant Ships. *International Journal of Nautical Archaeology*, *52*(2), 418–438. https://doi.org/10.1080/10572414.2023.2207741

McMillan, S. J., Avery, E. J., & Macias, W. (2008). FROM HAVE NOTS TO WATCH DOGS. *Information, Communication & Society*, *11*(5), 675–697. https://doi.org/10.1080/13691180802126745

Menger, L., Vacchelli, E., Kepp, O., Eggermont, A., Tartour, E., Zitvogel, L., Kroemer, G., & Galluzzi, L. (2013). Trial watch. *OncoImmunology*, *2*(2), e23082. https://doi.org/10.4161/onci.23082

NES, F. L. V. A. N. (1972). Determining Temporal Differences with Analogue and Digital Time Displays. *Ergonomics*, *15*(1), 73–79. https://doi.org/10.1080/00140137208924409

Neustetter, M. (2009). Analogue and Digital Anecdotes and Artworks from South Africa. *Third Text*, *23*(3), 323–334. https://doi.org/10.1080/09528820902954952

Nilsen, M., Lundin, M., Wallerstedt, C., & Pramling, N. (2021). Evolving and re-mediated activities when preschool children play analogue and digital Memory games. *Early Years*, *41*(2–3), 232–247. https://doi.org/10.1080/09575146.2018.1460803

Noll, A. M. (1998). The Digital Mystique: A Review of Digital Technology and its Application to Television. *Prometheus*, *16*(2), 145–153. https://doi.org/10.1080/08109029808629271

Omeleze, S., & Venter, H. S. (2019). Digital forensic application requirements specification process. *Australian Journal of Forensic Sciences*, *51*(4), 371–394. https://doi.org/10.1080/00450618.2017.1374456

Rice, P., Upasham, S., Jagannath, B., Manuel, R., Pali, M., & Prasad, S. (2019). CortiWatch: Watch-Based Cortisol Tracker. *Future Science OA*, *5*(9), FSO416. https://doi.org/10.2144/fsoa-2019-0061

Richmond, O. P., & Tellidis, I. (2020). Analogue crisis, digital renewal? Current dilemmas of peacebuilding. *Globalizations*, *17*(6), 935–952. https://doi.org/10.1080/14747731.2020.1712169

Rippey, B. (2006). Weather Watch. *Weatherwise*, *59*(2), 64–75. https://doi.org/10.3200/WEWI.59.2.64-75

Ritchie, L. (2013). Navigating the site map: From analogue to digital space. *International Journal of Performance Arts and Digital Media*, *9*(1), 197–215. https://doi.org/10.1386/padm.9.1.197_1

Rosa, T., & Fernandes, C. (2021). Lab Brazil: Parquear Bando digital annotation: on digital scores for collective performance interventions in public spaces. *International Journal of Performance Arts and Digital Media*, *17*(1), 56–68. https://doi.org/10.1080/14794713.2021.1885191

Sanders, M., & van de Vrande, V. (2024). Value creation in interdependent digital and analogue markets. *Journal of Media Business Studies*, *21*(2), 146–174. https://doi.org/10.1080/16522354.2023.2300195

van Holstein, E. (2018). Digital geographies of grassroots securitisation. *Social & Cultural Geography*, *19*(8), 1097–1105. https://doi.org/10.1080/14649365.2018.1446217

Webster, N. A. (n.d.). Storytelling as connectivity: expanding the digital geographies of the gig economy. *Social & Cultural Geography*, 1–19. https://doi.org/10.1080/14649365.2024.2367417