

## *Chapter V*

# *The Hedonic Factors that Triggers Men on Impulsive Buying Behavior and Impulsive Buying Decision*

---

## **CHAPTER V**

# **HEDONIC FACTORS THAT TRIGGERS MEN ON IMPULSIVE BUYING BEHAVIOR AND IMPULSIVE BUYING DECISION**

### **5.1 INTRODUCTION**

Customers prefer branded raiment as the brand has become a status symbol and it gives great importance in their life style. The brand also add values to the customer by supplying meaning as well as communicates competence standard and image to the customer as it is an non- verbal form of communication and so the marketers using brands as an competitive advantage on other competitors which plays an important role for the success of the company.

Fashion basically represents a customer outlook that has a positive influence on their life style and status. Brand popularity, design, price, range, attractiveness etc, are also the hedonic factors that influence customer preference. There are numerous fashion designers and famous brands and they have expanded to world level which has given more improvement to Indian fashion industry. The impulsive purchase decision is also influenced by hedonic factors of brand.

### **5.2 MOST PREFERRED BRAND**

Respondent's taste and preference are changing according to their Psychological, Social, Cultural and Demographic variables. So the respondents were asked to rank the type of brand mostly preferred while making impulsive buying. The most preferred type of raiment was given a rank of 1 and the least preferred brand was given a rank of 5. Mean rating were found out for each type of brand which are given in the table 5.2.1

**Table: 5.2.1 Mean Rank - Most Preferred Brand**

<b>Brand Name</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>Rank</b>
Allen solly	4.90	1
Arrow	7.65	8
Parx	8.77	12
John player	8.33	10
Raymond	5.33	2
Black berry	8.73	11
Louis philippe	5.93	3
Peter England	6.14	4
Van heusen	6.35	5
Park avenue	7.49	6
Classic polo	7.59	7
Indian terrain	8.22	9
Basics	9.27	13
Sero	10.33	14

*(Source: Computed)*

It is clear from the table that Allen Solly has a lowest mean rank (4.90) which means, it is the brand mostly preferred by the respondents. Followed by Raymond (5.33), Louis Philippe (5.93), Peter England (6.14), Van Heusen (6.35), Park Avenue (7.49), Classic Polo (7.59), Arrow (7.65), Indian Terrain (8.22), John Player (8.33), Black Berry (8.73), Park (8.77), Basics (9.27) and the least rank is for Sero (10.33).

**Table 5.2.1 (a) Kendall's Coefficient of Concordance for type of brand preferred**

<b>Kendall's W</b>	<b>.143</b>
--------------------	-------------

Kendall's coefficient of concordance ( $w$ ) is applied to find the extent of similarity among the respondents in their order of assigning the ranks. Kendall's  $w$  varies between 0 and 1 higher the value of  $w$ , more will be the similarity among the respondents in the ranking order. The Kendall's  $w$  found for the 14 items mentioned in the table 5.2.1(a) is 0.143 which shows that there is less similarity among the respondents in the order of brands mostly preferred.

### 5.3 FASHION ACCESSORIES INFLUENCED TO BUY-MULTIPLE ACCESSORIES

Multiple brand influences customers to buy fashion accessories while making impulsive buying. The table 5.3 describes how fashion accessories are influencing customers to purchase.

**Table 5.3 – Fashion Accessories**

<b>Fashion Accessories</b>	<b>No. of respondents</b>	<b>Percent</b>
Tie	20	5.0
<b>Footwear</b>	<b>148</b>	<b>37.1</b>
Wallets	118	29.6
Jewellery ( cufflink tie pin)	20	5.0
Belts	38	9.5
Socks	46	11.5
Handkerchief	30	7.5
None of the above	94	23.6
<b>Total</b>	<b>400</b>	<b>100</b>

*(Source: Primary Data)*

The above table shows that among the several fashion accessories which are influencing the customers to purchase are footwear has received the maximum respondents rate at 37.1 per cent, followed by wallets with a respondents rate of 29.6 per cent, tie and jewelry each has received the lowest respondents rate at 5 per cent as the fashion

accessories influencing to go for brand raiment. Hence, most of the respondents have purchased footwear accessories.

#### 5.4 DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS - IMPULSIVE BUYING BEHAVIOUR

Descriptive analysis is applied to analyze the factors that influence customers to make impulsive buying. For this analysis about 14 factors are considered. The statements for the impulsive buying behaviour, factors were constructed on at 5 point Scale. The respondents were asked to rate their impulsive buying behavior to purchase their raiment from least preferred to mostly preferred, the ratings were ascertained as 1 for least preferred, 2 for less preferred, 3 for neutral, 4 for most preferred and 5 for mostly preferred. Mean ratings were found out for each brand which are given below.

**Table : 5.4 – Descriptive Statistics- Impulsive Buying Behaviour**

<b>Buying Behavior</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>Minimum</b>	<b>Maximum</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>S.D</b>
Brand name	400	2.00	5.00	4.3825	.76985
Raiment varieties	400	2.00	5.00	3.9900	.76901
Quality	400	3.00	5.00	4.4050	.78263
Price	400	1.00	5.00	4.0925	1.00072
Style and fit	400	1.00	5.00	4.0400	1.10292
Comfort to wear	400	2.00	5.00	4.1875	.88561
Self-image and status symbol	400	1.00	5.00	3.9000	.92852
Availability of raiment	400	2.00	5.00	3.8675	.87284
Range of colours and design	400	1.00	5.00	3.7600	1.15574
Frequent advertisement	400	1.00	5.00	3.0775	1.25516
Attractiveness of advertisement	400	1.00	5.00	3.0225	1.26728
Uniqueness	400	1.00	5.00	3.7300	1.04874
Easy to wash and handle	400	1.00	5.00	3.4800	1.20965
Endorsemen of Celebrity	400	1.00	5.00	2.7675	1.35389

(Source: Computed)

The mean ratings have shown that the respondents have highly preferred with the statement “Quality” (4.40). The next strongly preferred statement is “Brand name” (4.38) the next highest mean rating is (4.18) for the statement “comfort to wear”, (4.09) for “Price” the mean rating is (4.04) for “style and fit”, “raiment varieties’ with the mean rating (3.99), “self-image and status symbol” with the mean rating (3.90), “availability of raiment” with the mean rating (3.86) “range of colours and design” with the mean rating (3.76), “Uniqueness” with the mean rating (3.73), “Easy to wash and handle” with the mean rating (3.48), “frequent advertisement” with the mean rating (3.07), “attractiveness of advertisement” (3.02) followed with the lowest mean rating of (2.76) for “endorsement of celebrity”. Hence most of the respondents have agreed that quality is considered as the statement most preferred.

## **5.5 FACTOR ANALYSIS FOR IMPULSIVE BUYING BEHAVIOUR**

The factor analysis has been applied to summarize the information contained in a number of original variables into a smaller set of new composite dimensions (Factors) with minimum loss of information. (i.e.) The factor analysis identifies and defines the underlying dimensions in the original variables.

The factor analysis technique has been applied to identify the underlying dimensions in the set of statements relating to the impulsive buying behavior.

### **Factor analysis has been performed in four steps:**

1. First, the correlation matrix for all the variables is computed. Variables that do not appear to be related to other variables can be identified from the matrix and the correctness of the factor model can also be calculated.
2. Factor extraction has been the second step. Number of factors necessary to represent the data and the method of calculating them has been determined. Also, how well the chosen model fits the data has been ascertained.
3. The factors chosen have been transformed to make them more interpretable through a process of rotation.
4. Scores for each factor has been computed for each case. These scores have been used for further analysis.

The impulsive buying behaviour has a set of 14 statements (items) which are factor analyzed and the 5 point rating scale has been used to find the underlying factors.

### Step 1

Correlation matrix (Appendix I) for the variables, item1 to item 14, has been analyzed initially for possible inclusion in Factor Analysis.

**Table 5.5.1 - Correlations**

	<b>Brand value</b>	<b>Brand identity</b>	<b>Brand Advertisement</b>	<b>Brand image</b>
<b>Brand value</b>	1	.216**	-.046	.226**
<b>Brand identity</b>		1	.346**	.454**
<b>Brand Advertisement</b>			1	.408**
<b>Brand image</b>				1

(\*\* Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level)

Since one of the goals of the factor analysis is to obtain 'factors' that can be explained by the correlations, the variables must be related to each other for the factor model to be appropriate. A closer examination of the correlation matrix has revealed that the variable, usually a correlation value of 0.3 (absolute value) has been taken as sufficient to explain the relation between variables. All the variables from 1 to 14 have been retained for further analysis.

**Table 5.5.2 – KMO and Bartlett’s Test for impulsive buying behavior**

<b>KMO and Bartlett's Test</b>		
Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy.		.712
Bartlett's Test of Sphericity	Approx. Chi-Square	1827.156
	Df	91
	Sig.	.000

(\*\*-significant at 1 % level (p<0.01))

Bartlett's test of sphericity has been used to test whether the correlation matrix has been an identity matrix. i.e., all the diagonal terms in the matrix have been 1 and the off-diagonal terms in the matrix has been 0. In short, it has been used to test whether the correlations between all the variables has been 0. The test value (1827.156) and the associated significance level ( $P < .01$ ) given in the table has enunciated that the correlation matrix has not been an identity matrix, i.e., there exist correlations between the variables. Hence, the factor analysis has been valid and consistent.

Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) test has been used to measure the sampling adequacy. This test has been based on the correlations and partial correlations of the variables. If the test value, or KMO measure has been closer to 1, then it has been considered appropriate to employ factor analysis whereas, if the KMO has been closer to 0, then it has been considered to be inappropriate to use factor analysis for the variables. It has been noted that the value of test statistic has been 0.712 which means the factor analysis for the variables has been found to be more appropriate.

## **Step 2**

Principal Components Analysis (PCA) has been used to extract the factors. It is a method used to transform a set of correlated variables into a set of uncorrelated variables (here factors) so that the factors are unrelated and the variables selected for each factor have been related. Next PCA has been used to extract the number of factors required to represent the data. In order to determine the number of factors to be extracted, it has been noted that with more number of consecutive factors extracted, there exists less variability. Extraction of factors has been stopped while there has been very little 'random' variability identified.

In the correlation matrix, the analysis has been started from where the variances of all variables have been equal to 1. Therefore, the total variance in that matrix has been equal to the number of variables. There have been 14 variables (items), each with a variance of 1, and then the total variability that can potentially be extracted has been equal to 14 times 1. The variances accounted for by successive factors have been summarized in the following table.

**Table 5.5.3 - Total variance explained for impulsive buying behaviour**

Component	Initial Eigenvalues			Rotation Sums of Squared Loadings(extracted)		
	variance	% of Variance	Cumulative %	variance	% of Variance	Cumulative %
1	3.761	26.863	26.863	2.546	18.185	18.185
2	2.561	18.295	45.158	2.432	17.372	35.557
3	1.358	9.700	54.859	2.083	14.875	50.432
4	1.021	7.292	62.150	1.641	11.718	62.150
5	.923	6.590	68.740			
6	.778	5.555	74.295			
7	.678	4.845	79.140			
8	.605	4.318	83.459			
9	.568	4.059	87.517			
10	.510	3.641	91.159			
11	.395	2.823	93.982			
12	.332	2.372	96.354			
13	.282	2.013	98.367			
14	.229	1.633	100.000			

In the column titled ‘% of variance’ under *Initial Eigen Values* in the table, the variance on the new factors that have been successively extracted and these values have been expressed as a percent of the total variance. It has been noticed that factor 1 account for 27 per cent of the total variance, factor 2 about 18 per cent, factor 3 about 10 per cent and so on. As expected, the sum of the Eigen values has been equal to the number of variables. The third column has the cumulative variance extracted. The variances extracted by the factors have been called the *Eigen values*.

The factors with Eigen values greater than 1 have been retained for analysis. Four factors have been retained for the study. The total variance explained (62.150 per cent) by the four factor model in the original set of variables has been given in the last column of the table.

**Table 5.5.4 - Component matrix for impulsive buying behavior**

Statements	Component			
	1	2	3	4
Raiment varieties	.698	-.153	.041	-.361
Easy to wash and handle	.672	.108	.197	.192
Uniqueness	.616	.100	-.433	.067
Availability of raiment	.612	.014	-.261	.091
Comfort to wear	.598	.017	-.517	-.140
Range of colours and design	.588	.226	-.249	.485
Selfimage and status symbol	.565	.129	-.058	-.469
Price	.494	-.677	.255	.109
Frequent advertisement	.265	.671	.059	.235
Attractiveness of advertisement	.242	.661	.330	.210
Quality	.418	-.641	.242	.078
Style and fit	.473	-.603	.283	.185
Attractiveness of Celebrity	.299	.388	.573	.007
Brand name	.430	.421	.292	-.463

*Extraction method: principal component analysis. Four components have extracted*

The Component Matrix or Factor Matrix where PCA extracted four factors has been depicted in the table 6.6. These coefficients have been used to express a standardized variable in the terms of the factors called factor loadings, since they have indicated the quantum of weight assigned to each factor. Factors with large coefficients (in absolute value) for a variable have been closely related to that variable. For example, Factor 1 has the factor with largest loading (0.698) for the item, “**raiment varieties**”. These have been the correlations between the factors and the variables, Hence the correlation between the first statement in the component matrix and Factor 1 has been 0.698. Thus the factor matrix in the table has been obtained with the initially obtained estimates of factors.

### Step 3

Although the factor matrix (Table titled **Component Matrix**) has been obtained in the extraction phase has indicated the relationship between the factors and an

individual variables, it has been usually, difficult to identify meaningful factors based on this matrix. The rotation phase of the factor analysis has been attempted to transfer initial matrix into one that has been easier to interpret. It has been called the rotation of the factor matrix. Varimax Rotation has been employed to minimize the number of variables that have high loadings on a factor and has enhanced the interpretability of the factors.

The Rotated Factor Matrix using varimax rotation (Table titled Rotated Component Matrix) has been given in Table 6.7 where each factor has identified itself with a few set of variables. The variables which have been identified with each of the factors have been sorted in the decreasing order and have been highlighted against each column and row.

**Table 5.5.5 - Rotated factor Matrix for impulsive buying behavior**

Factors	Component			
	1	2	3	4
Price	.867	.110	-.092	.077
Style and fit	.830	.109	-.008	.014
Quality	.793	.063	-.111	.072
Uniqueness	.046	.736	.030	.194
Range of colours and design	.103	.732	.355	-.148
Comfort to wear	.021	.708	-.150	.347
Availability of raiment	.187	.614	.083	.179
Attractiveness of advertisement	-.188	.085	.777	.048
Attractiveness of Celebrity	.105	-.132	.693	.243
Frequent advertisement	-.296	.290	.638	.009
Easy to wash and handle	.365	.389	.471	.180
Brand name	-.073	.009	.430	.687
Selfimage and status symbol	.054	.296	.073	.680
Raiment varieties	.391	.317	.028	.623

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

Rotation Method: Varimax with Kaiser Normalization. Rotation converged in 8 iterations.

#### Step 4

Normally, from the factor results arrived, factor score coefficients can be calculated for all variables (since each factor is a linear combination of all variables) which have been used to calculate the factor scores for each statement separately. Since PCA has been used in extraction of initial factors and other methods have also resulted in estimating the same factor score coefficients. However, for the study, original values of the variables have been retained for further analysis.

**Table 5.5.6 - Table factors identified against the statements relating to impulsive buying behavior**

<b>Statements</b>	<b>Factors identified</b>
Price and offers	<b>Brand value</b>
Style and fit	
Quality	
Uniqueness	<b>Brand identity</b>
Range of colours and design	
Comfort to wear	
Availability of raiment	
Attractiveness of advertisement	<b>Brand advertisement</b>
Attractiveness of Celebrity	
Frequent advertisement	
Easy to wash and handle	
Brand name	<b>Brand image</b>
Selfimage and status symbol	
Raiment varieties	

It is found from the table that 14 variables have been reduced to four factor models and each factor has been identified with the corresponding variables viz., brand value, brand identity, brand advertisement.

Factors score were found out for each factor by adding the rating given by the respondents which are coming under each factor. These factor scores show the level of agreement while making impulsive buying. Respondents with higher score have higher level of agreement on each factor. These factor score were future analyzed by comparing among the groups of selected demographic variables and selected impulsive buying behaviour variables.

### 5.6 DEMOGRAPHIC VARIABLES VS BRAND VALUE

ANOVA/ t-Test has been used to test whether the scores obtained for ‘brand value’ has differed significantly among the respondents classified based on ‘demographic variables’ with the following null hypothesis.

H<sub>0</sub>: The brand value score do not differ significantly among the group of demographic variables namely age, education, occupation, marital status, family monthly income, location of residency, frequency of purchase, time of purchase and place of purchase.

The null hypothesis has been tested for each of the selected demographic variables separately and the results are exhibited in the following table.

**Table 5.6 – Demographic variables Vs Brand Value**

Demographic variables		Brand value			T value	F-value	Table value	Sig
		Mean	S.D	No.				
Age	Below 20 years	12.05	3.66	22	-	3.415	3.367	**
	21 – 30years	12.81	2.30	216				
	31 – 40 years	12.80	1.87	76				
	41 - 50 years	11.60	3.01	45				
	50 years and above	11.90	2.79	41				
	<b>Total</b>	12.54	2.49	400				

Demographic variables		Brand value			T value	F-value	Table value	Sig
		Mean	S.D	No.				
<b>Education qualification</b>	No formal education	12.45	2.51	186	-	9.277	3.367	**
	School level	10.93	2.67	45				
	Graduate	15.00	.00	12				
	Post Graduate	12.91	2.45	89				
	Professional	12.93	1.95	68				
	<b>Total</b>	12.54	2.49	400				
<b>Occupation</b>	Students	12.00	2.46	35		2.558	2.237	*
	Govt employee	12.17	2.12	24				
	Private employee	12.26	2.81	179				
	Businessman	13.07	2.42	88				
	Professionalist	13.38	1.74	37				
	Others	12.51	1.37	37				
	<b>Total</b>	12.54	2.49	400				
<b>Marital status</b>	Married	12.66	2.12	222	1.118	-	1.966	NS
	Unmarried	12.38	2.89	178				
	<b>Total</b>	12.54	2.49	400				
<b>Family monthly income</b>	Below Rs.25000	12.16	3.02	86	-	7.495	3.831	**
	25000 – 50000	13.30	1.51	136				
	50000 – 75000	11.86	2.38	88				
	Above 75000	12.40	2.94	90				
	<b>Total</b>	12.54	2.49	400				
<b>Location of residency</b>	Urban	13.02	2.20	131	-	18.348	4.659	**
	Semi-urban	11.49	2.91	129				
	Rural	13.05	2.00	140				
	<b>Total</b>	12.54	2.49	400				
<b>Frequency of purchase</b>	Once a month	12.46	3.64	67	-	6.018	3.831	**
	Once in every 3 months	12.62	1.80	78				
	Once in every 6 months	12.05	2.42	165				
	Once in an year	13.41	1.79	90				
	<b>Total</b>	12.54	2.49	400				

Demographic variables		Brand value			T value	F-value	Table value	Sig
		Mean	S.D	No.				
Time of purchase	Festival	13.49	1.76	108	-	12.714	3.367	**
	Discount	11.48	2.40	90				
	Function	11.93	2.51	86				
	Regular	13.19	2.46	93				
	Others	11.83	3.45	23				
	<b>Total</b>	12.54	2.49	400				
Place of purchase	Showroom	11.96	2.93	159	-	5.483	3.367	**
	Factory outlet	11.82	2.02	28				
	Shopping malls	13.07	1.83	147				
	Wholesale shop	13.26	2.35	39				
	Retail shop	12.70	2.63	27				
	<b>Total</b>	12.54	2.49	400				

(Source: Computed NS- Not Significant \*- Significant at 5% level \*\*- Significant at 1 % level)

### Age

The table 5.6 shows that the mean score is found to be high (12.81) in the age group of 21-30 years. The respondent in the age group of 31 – 40 years has the next highest mean score of 12.80 and the respondent in the age group of below 20 years has the mean score of 12.05. The respondents belong to the age group of above 50 years has scored the mean score of 11.90. The respondents belong to the age group of 41 - 50 years have the lowest mean score of (11.60). Hence, the null hypothesis has been rejected at 1 percent. The calculated F-ratio value is 3.415 shows that the brand value has a significant difference with respect to age group of 21 – 30 years.

### Education qualification

In the Educational Qualification of the respondents, the highest mean score is found among the graduates (15.00) followed by professionals respondents with the mean score of 12.93. Post graduate respondents have the mean score of 12.91 and no formal education have the mean score of 12.45. Lowest mean score has been found among the

school level respondents with the mean score of 10.93 indicating the low level of knowledge about brand value. The calculated F- ratio value (3.367) discloses that there is no significant difference with brand value. Hence, the null hypothesis has been accepted with respect to Educational Qualification.

### **Occupation**

Among Occupational Status, professionals have the highest mean score (13.38), followed by businessman respondents have the mean score of 13.07, other occupation respondents have the mean score of 12.51, private employee respondents have the mean score of 12.26, government employee respondents have the mean score of 12.17. Students respondents have the least mean score of (12.00). The F- ratio value shows that there is a significant difference in the brand value. Due to different occupational status the satisfaction level of respondents also differ. Thus, with the calculated F- value is 2.558, so the null hypothesis has been rejected at 5 per cent level of significance with respect to occupation of the respondents.

### **Marital status**

Married respondents (12.66) are more agreeable towards brand value than unmarried respondents with the mean score of (12.38). Since the calculated t value (1.118) is lesser than the table value it is inferred that brand value score do not differ significantly between marital status. Hence the null hypothesis has been accepted.

### **Family monthly income**

The respondents with a family monthly income of between Rs.25,000 – Rs.50,000 have a high mean score of 13.30 and a mean score of 12.40 has been found among the respondents whose family monthly income is above Rs.75,000. The respondents with a family monthly income of between Rs.50,000 – Rs.75,000 have a mean score of 11.86. The lowest mean score is (12.16) with the family monthly income of respondents is below Rs.25,000. The calculated F- value (7.495) shows that there is a significant difference between brand value and family monthly income. Hence, the null hypothesis has been rejected.

### **Location of residency**

The rural respondents have the highest mean score of 13.05, the urban respondent has the mean score of 13.02 and the respondents located in semi-urban have the lowest mean score of 11.49. Since the calculated F value (18.348) is greater than the table value it is inferred that brand value score differ significantly with location of residency. Hence the null hypothesis has been rejected.

### **Frequency of purchase**

Respondents who make their frequency of purchase for once in a year has the highest brand value mean score of 13.41 and followed by respondents who make their purchase for once in every 3 month has the mean score of 12.62, respondents who make their purchase at once a month (12.46), respondents who make frequency of purchase for once in every 6 months is low with the mean score of 12.05. Hence the calculated f-value (6.018) is greater than table value the null hypothesis has been rejected at 1 per cent level of significance with respect to frequency of purchase.

### **Time of purchase**

Respondents make purchase for festival has the highest mean score of 13.49 followed by respondents makes their purchase at regular purchase with the mean value of 13.19, time of function (11.93) and other time of purchase (11.83). The respondents who make purchase during discounts have the lowest mean score of 11.48. Hence the null hypothesis has been rejected at 1 per cent level of significance with respect to frequency of purchase.

### **Place of purchase**

Respondents make their purchases at wholesale shop has the highest brand value mean score of 13.26, followed by mean score of 13.07 respondents make their purchases in shopping malls, mean score of 12.70 respondents make their purchases in retail shop and (11.96) respondents make their purchases in showroom. The respondents make their purchases at factory outlet has the lowest mean score of 11.82. The calculated F value is 5.483 greater than table value. Hence there is no significant difference between brand value and place of purchase the null hypothesis has been rejected.

## 5.7 DEMOGRAPHIC VARIABLES Vs BRAND IDENTITY

ANOVA/ t-Test has been applied to test whether the scores obtained for ‘brand identity’ has differed significantly among the respondents classified based on ‘demographic variables’ with the following null hypothesis.

H<sub>0</sub>: The brand identity score do not differ significantly among the group of demographic variables namely age, education, occupation, marital status, family monthly income, location of residency, frequency of purchase, time of purchase and place of purchase.

The null hypothesis has been tested for each of the selected demographic variables separately and the results are exhibited in the following table.

**Table no 5.7 - Demographic variables Vs Brand Identity**

Demographic variables		brand identity			T value	F-value	Table value	Sig
		Mean	S.D	No.				
<b>Age</b>	Below 20 yrs	15.68	3.11	22	-	2.060	2.395	NS
	21 – 30yrs	15.45	3.00	216				
	31 – 40 yrs	16.03	2.76	76				
	41 - 50 yrs	14.62	2.70	45				
	51 yrs and above	16.07	2.75	41				
	<b>Total</b>	15.55	2.92	400				
<b>Education qualification</b>	No formal education	16.12	2.40	68	-	6.743	3.367	**
	School level	15.89	2.81	45				
	Graduate	15.61	2.88	186				
	Post Graduate	14.45	3.21	89				
	Professional	18.17	1.40	12				
	<b>Total</b>	15.55	2.92	400				

Demographic variables		brand identity			T value	F-value	Table value	Sig
		Mean	S.D	No.				
<b>Occupation</b>	Students	15.88	2.63	88		3.677	3.064	**
	Govt employee	15.96	3.01	24				
	Private employee	15.69	2.94	179				
	Businessman	16.29	2.95	35				
	Professionalist	14.49	3.13	37				
	Others	14.14	2.64	37				
	<b>Total</b>	15.55	2.92	400				
<b>Marital status</b>	Married	15.55	2.87	222	.00001	-	1.966	NS
	Unmarried	15.54	3.00	178				
	Total	15.55	2.92	400				
<b>Family monthly income</b>	Below Rs.25000	15.43	3.09	86	-	10.745	3.831	**
	25000 – 50000	15.29	3.05	136				
	50000 – 75000	14.64	2.48	88				
	Above 75000	16.93	2.48	90				
	<b>Total</b>	15.55	2.92	400				
<b>Location of residency</b>	Urban	15.95	2.96	131	-	2.138	3.018	NS
	Semi-urban	15.21	2.95	129				
	Rural	15.48	2.83	140				
	<b>Total</b>	15.55	2.92	400				

Demographic variables		brand identity			T value	F-value	Table value	Sig
		Mean	S.D	No.				
<b>Frequency of purchase</b>	Once a month	15.10	3.28	67	-	2.421	3.018	NS
	Once in every 3 months	15.58	2.69	78				
	Once in every 6 months	15.34	2.87	165				
	Once in an year	16.22	2.85	90				
	<b>Total</b>	15.55	2.92	400				
<b>Time of purchase</b>	Festival	15.99	2.60	108	-	9.191	3.367	**
	Discount	14.37	2.46	90				
	Function	15.47	2.84	86				
	Regular	16.58	3.11	93				
	Others	14.17	3.59	23				
	<b>Total</b>	15.55	2.92	400				
<b>Place of purchase</b>	Showroom	15.77	2.78	159	-	6.918	3.367	**
	Factory outlet	15.36	3.48	28				
	Shopping malls	14.88	2.89	147				
	Wholesale shop	17.49	1.94	39				
	Retail shop	15.22	3.20	27				
	<b>Total</b>	15.55	2.92	400				

(Source: Computed NS- Not Significant \*- Significant at 5% level \*\*- Significant at 1 % level)

## **Age**

The table shows that the mean score is found to be high (16.07) in the age group of above 50 years. The respondents in the age group of 31 – 40 years have the next highest mean score of 16.03 and the respondents in the age group of below 20 years have the mean score of 15.68. The respondents in the age group of 21 -30 years has scored the mean score of 15.45. The respondents in the age group of 41 - 50 years have the lowest mean score of 14.62. The calculated F value (2.060) is lesser than the table value. Hence there is no significance difference between age and brand identity. Hence the null hypothesis has been accepted at 1 percent significance level.

## **Education qualification**

In the Educational Qualification of the respondents, the highest mean score is found among the professionals (18.17) followed by no formal education respondents with the mean score of 16.12, school level respondents have the mean score of 15.89 and graduate respondents have the mean score of 15.61. Lowest mean score has been found among the post graduate respondents with the mean score of 10.93 indicating the low level of knowledge about brand identity. The calculated F value (6.743) is greater than the table value. Hence there is a significant difference between education qualification and brand identity. Hence the null hypothesis has been rejected at 1 percent significance level.

## **Occupation**

Among Occupational Status, businessman have the highest mean score (16.29) indicating that they have the highest satisfaction about the brand identity, followed by government employee respondents with the mean score of 15.96, private employee respondents with the mean score of 15.69, student respondents have the mean score of 15.88, professional respondents have the mean score of 14.49 whereas, others occupational respondents have the least score of (14.14)The calculated F value (3.677) is greater than the table value. Hence there is a significant difference between occupation and brand identity. Hence the null hypothesis has been rejected at 1 percent significance level.

### **Marital status**

Married respondents (15.55) are more agreeable towards brand identity than unmarried respondents with the mean score of 15.54. The calculated t value is .0001 is lesser than the table value. Hence there is no significance difference between marital status and brand identity. Hence the null hypothesis has been accepted.

### **Family monthly income**

The respondents with a family monthly income of above Rs.75,000 have a high mean score of 16.93 and a mean score of 15.43 has been found among the respondents whose family monthly income is below Rs.25000. The respondents with a family monthly income between Rs.25,000 – Rs.50,000 have a mean score of 15.29. The lowest mean score is (14.64) with the family monthly income of Rs.50,000 – Rs.75,000. The calculated F value (10.745) is greater than the table value. Hence there is a significant difference between family monthly income and brand identity. Hence the null hypothesis has been rejected at 1 percent significance level.

### **Location of residency**

The urban respondents have the highest mean score of 15.95 followed by rural respondents (15.48) and the semi - urban respondent has the lowest mean score of 15.21. The calculated F value (2.138) is lesser than the table value. Hence there is a significant difference between location of residency and brand identity. Hence the null hypothesis has been accepted.

### **Frequency of purchase**

Respondents who make their frequency of purchase for once in a year has the highest mean score of 16.22 and followed by respondents who make their purchase for once in every 3 month has the mean score of 15.58, respondents who make their purchase for once in every 6 month 15.34, respondents who make frequency of purchase for once a months is low with the mean score of 15.10. The calculated F value (2.421) is lesser than the table value. Hence there is a significant difference between frequency of purchase and brand identity. Hence the null hypothesis has been accepted.

### **Time of purchase**

Respondents who make purchase regularly has the highest mean score of 16.58 followed by festival purchase (15.99). Respondents purchases during function time are with the mean score of (15.47) and respondents purchase during time of discount is 14.37. The respondents who make purchases during other times have the lowest mean score of 14.17. The calculated F value (9.191) is greater than the table value. Hence there is a significant difference between time of purchase and brand identity. Hence the null hypothesis has been rejected.

### **Place of purchase**

Respondents who purchases at wholesale shop has the highest mean score of 17.49 followed by respondents purchasing in showroom with the mean score of 15.77, respondents purchasing in factory outlet with the mean score of 15.36. Respondents purchasing in retail shop with the mean score of 15.22. The respondents purchasing at shopping malls has the lowest mean score of 14.88. The calculated F value (6.918) is greater than the table value. Hence there is a significant difference between place of purchase and brand identity. Hence the null hypothesis has been rejected at 1 percent significance level.

## **5.8 DEMOGRAPHIC VARIABLES Vs BRAND ADVERTISEMENT**

ANOVA/ t-Test has been used to test whether the scores obtained for 'brand advertisement' has differed significantly among the respondents classified based on 'demographic variables' with the following null hypothesis.

H<sub>0</sub>: The brand advertisement score do not differ significantly among the group of demographic variables namely age, education, occupation, marital status, family monthly income, location of residency, frequency of purchase, time of purchase and place of purchase.

The null hypothesis has been tested for each of the selected demographic variables separately and the results are exhibited in the following table.

**Table 5.8 – Demographic variables Vs Brand Advertisement**

Demographic variables		Brand advertisement			T value	F-value	Table value	Sig
		Mean	S.D	No.				
<b>Age</b>	Below 20 years	13.50	3.26	22		4.479	3.367	**
	21 – 30years	12.20	3.66	216				
	31 – 40 years	13.49	4.03	76				
	41 - 50 years	11.20	1.60	45				
	51 years and above	11.63	2.52	41				
	<b>Total</b>	12.35	3.50	400				
<b>Education qualification</b>	No formal education	12.50	4.98	12	-	.797	2.395	Ns
	School level	12.73	2.53	45				
	Graduate	12.15	3.52	186				
	Post Graduate	12.12	3.79	89				
	Professional	12.90	3.34	68				
	<b>Total</b>	12.35	3.50	400				
<b>Occupation</b>	Students	13.42	3.34	24	-	4.335	3.064	**
	Govt employee	13.43	3.38	35				
	Private employee	12.46	3.62	179				
	Businessman	12.57	3.84	88				
	Professionalist	11.68	2.19	37				
	Others	10.24	2.36	37				
	<b>Total</b>	12.35	3.50	400				
<b>Marital status</b>	Married	11.88	3.31	222	3.021	-	2.588	**
	Unmarried	12.93	3.66	178				
	Total	12.35	3.50	400				
<b>Family monthly income</b>	Below Rs.25000	11.62	3.17	86	-	6.334	3.831	**
	25000 – 50000	12.28	3.68	136				
	50000 – 75000	11.83	2.90	88				
	Above 75000	13.66	3.75	90				
	<b>Total</b>	12.35	3.50	400				

Demographic variables		Brand advertisement			T value	F-value	Table value	Sig
		Mean	S.D	No.				
Location of residency	Urban	13.18	3.58	131	-	19.353	4.659	**
	Semi-urban	13.04	3.16	129				
	Rural	10.93	3.31	140				
	<b>Total</b>	12.35	3.50	400				
Frequency of purchase	Once a month	12.67	4.24	67	-	.508	2.627	Ns
	Once in every 3 months	12.32	3.61	78				
	Once in every 6 months	12.42	3.18	165				
	Once in an year	12.00	3.41	90				
	<b>Total</b>	12.35	3.50	400				
Time of purchase	Festival	11.73	2.90	108	-	9.572	3.367	**
	Discount	12.10	2.60	90				
	Function	11.63	3.06	86				
	Regular	14.20	4.61	93				
	Others	11.39	3.12	23				
	<b>Total</b>	12.35	3.50	400				
Place of purchase	Showroom	12.47	3.60	159	-	.809	2.395	Ns
	Factory outlet	13.29	2.66	28				
	Shopping malls	12.20	3.33	147				
	Wholesale shop	11.87	4.49	39				
	Retail shop	12.15	2.98	27				
	<b>Total</b>	12.35	3.50	400				

(Source: Computed NS- Not Significant \*- Significant at 5% level \*\*- Significant at 1 % level)

## **Age**

The table shows that the respondents mean score is 13.50 belong the age group of below 20 years. The respondent in the age group of 31 – 40 years has the next highest mean score of 13.49 and the respondent in the age group of below 21 - 30 years has the mean score of 12.20. Age group of above 41 - 50 years has scored the mean score of 11.63. The respondents are the age group of above 50 years has the lowest mean score of 11.20. The calculated F value (4.479) is greater than the table value. Hence there is a significant difference between age and brand advertisement. Hence the null hypothesis has been rejected at 1 percent significance level.

## **Education qualification**

In the Educational Qualification of the respondents, the highest mean score is found among the graduates (15.00) followed by professionals respondents are with the mean score of 12.90. School level respondents are with the mean score of 12.73 and no formal education respondents are with the mean score of 12.50. Lowest mean score has been found among the post graduate (12.12) indicating the low level of knowledge about brand advertisement. The F- ratio value (.797) discloses that there is no significant difference between education and brand advertisement. Hence, the null hypothesis has been accepted with respect to Educational Qualification.

## **Occupation**

Among Occupational Status, government employee have the highest mean score (13.43) indicating that they have the highest satisfaction about the brand advertisement, followed by student (13.43), businessman (12.57), private employee (12.46), professionals (11.68) whereas; other occupation respondents have the least mean score of (10.24). The calculated F- value (4.335) is greater than table value. Hence there is a significant difference in the brand advertisement and occupation. The null hypothesis has been rejected at 5 per cent level of significant with respect to occupation of the respondents.

### **Marital status**

Unmarried respondents are with the mean score of 12.93 towards brand advertisement than married respondents with the mean score of 11.88. The calculated t value is 3.021 is greater than the table value. Hence there is a significance difference between marital status and brand advertisement. Hence the null hypothesis has been rejected at 1 percent significance level.

### **Family monthly income**

The respondents with a family monthly income of above Rs.75,000 have a high mean score of 13.66 and a mean score of 12.28 has been found among the respondents whose family monthly income is Rs.25,000 – Rs.50,000. The respondents with a family monthly income between Rs.50,000 – Rs.75,000 have a mean score of 12.88. The lowest mean score is (11.62) with the family monthly income of respondents is below Rs.25,000. The calculated F value (6.334) is greater than the table value. Hence there is a significant difference between family monthly income and brand advertisement Hence the null hypothesis has been rejected at 1 percent significance level.

### **Location of residency**

The urban area respondents have the highest mean score of 13.18 and the semi - urban respondent has the mean score of 13.04. The calculated F value (19.353) is greater than the table value. Hence there is a significant difference between location of residency and brand advertisement Hence the null hypothesis has been rejected at 1 percent significance level.

### **Frequency of purchase**

Respondents who make their frequency of purchase for once a month has the highest mean score of 12.67 and respondents followed by respondents who make their purchase for once in every 6 month has the mean score of 12.42, respondents who purchase for once in every 3 month 12.32 who make frequency of purchase for once an year is low with the mean score of (12.00). The calculated F value (.508) is lesser than the table value. Hence there is no significant difference between frequency of purchase and brand advertisement Hence the null hypothesis has been accepted.

### **Time of purchase**

Respondents who makes purchase regularly has the highest mean score of 14.20 followed by respondents who make purchase during discount (12.10), respondent's time of purchase during festival (11.73) and respondent's time of purchase during function (11.63). The respondents who make purchase during other time have the lowest mean score of (11.39). The calculated F value (9.572) is greater than the table value. Hence there is a significant difference between time of purchase and brand advertisement Hence the null hypothesis has been rejected at 1 percent significance level.

### **Place of purchase**

Respondents make their purchases at factory outlet has the highest mean score of 13.29) followed by (12.47) respondents make their purchases in showroom, (12.20) respondents make their purchases in shopping malls and (12.15) respondents make their purchases in retail shop. The respondents make their purchases at wholesale shop has the lowest mean score of (11.87). The calculated F value (.809) is lesser than the table value. Hence there is no significant difference between place of purchase and brand advertisement Hence the null hypothesis has been rejected at 1 percent significance level.

## **5.9 DEMOGRAPHIC VARIABLES Vs BRAND IMAGE**

ANOVA/ t-Test has been used to test whether the scores obtained for 'brand image' has differed significantly among the respondents classified based on 'demographic variables' with the following null hypothesis.

H<sub>0</sub>: The brand image mean score do not differ significantly among the group of demographic variables namely age, education, occupation, marital status, family monthly income, location of residency, frequency of purchase, time of purchase and place of purchase.

The null hypothesis has been tested for each of the selected demographic variables separately and the results are exhibited in the following table.

**Table 5.9 - Demographic variables Vs Brand Image**

Demographic variables		brand image			T value	F-value	Table value	Sig
		Mean	S.D	No				
<b>Age</b>	Below 20 years	13.27	.70	22	-	2.529	2.395	*
	21 – 30years	12.18	1.70	216				
	31 – 40 years	12.42	2.10	76				
	41 - 50 years	11.87	2.20	45				
	51 years and above	12.41	1.94	41				
	<b>Total</b>	12.27	1.85	400				
<b>Education qualification</b>	No formal education	12.05	1.87	186	-	5.240	3.367	**
	School level	11.67	1.82	45				
	Graduate	13.50	.52	12				
	Post Graduate	12.45	1.80	89				
	Professional	12.84	1.78	68				
	<b>Total</b>	12.27	1.85	400				
<b>Occupation</b>	Students	13.00	1.24	35		2.491	3.064	*
	Govt employee	11.50	1.91	24				
	Private employee	12.18	1.74	179				
	Businessman	12.48	2.09	88				
	Professionalist	12.35	2.25	37				
	Others	11.97	1.50	37				
	<b>Total</b>	12.27	1.85	400				
<b>Marital status</b>	Married	12.06	2.01	222	2.552	-	1.966	*
	Unmarried	12.53	1.58	178				
	<b>Total</b>	12.27	1.85	400				
<b>Family monthly income</b>	Below Rs.25000	12.23	1.28	86	-	14.838	3.831	**
	25000 – 50000	12.07	1.71	136				
	50000 – 75000	11.59	2.04	88				
	Above 75000	13.28	1.92	90				
	<b>Total</b>	12.27	1.85	400				

Demographic variables		brand image			T value	F-value	Table value	Sig
		Mean	S.D	No				
Location of residency	Urban	13.07	1.82	131	-	20.009	4.659	**
	Semi-urban	11.82	1.70	129				
	Rural	11.94	1.77	140				
	<b>Total</b>	12.27	1.85	400				
Frequency of purchase	Once a month	12.88	1.61	67	-	11.811	3.831	**
	Once in every 3 months	12.97	1.63	78				
	Once in every 6 months	11.73	1.78	165				
	Once in an year	12.20	2.00	90				
	<b>Total</b>	12.27	1.85	400				
Time of purchase	Festival	12.37	1.71	108	-	34.057	3.367	**
	Discount	11.86	1.67	90				
	Function	10.95	1.64	86				
	Regular	13.65	1.49	93				
	Others	12.83	.89	23				
	<b>Total</b>	12.27	1.85	400				
Place of purchase	Showroom	12.55	1.95	159	-	5.890	3.367	**
	Factory outlet	11.11	1.64	28				
	Shopping malls	11.99	1.69	147				
	Wholesale shop	12.85	1.94	39				
	Retail shop	12.52	1.40	27				
	<b>Total</b>	12.27	1.85	400				

(Source: Computed NS- Not Significant \*- Significant at 5% level \*\*- Significant at 1 % level)

### Age

The above table 5.9 shows that the mean score is found to be high (13.27) in the age group of below 20 years. The respondent in the age group of 31 – 40 years has the next highest mean score of 12.42 and the respondent in the age group of above 50 years

has the mean score of 12.41. Age group of above 21 - 30 years has scored the mean score of 12.18. The respondents are the age group of 41 - 50 years has the lowest mean score of 11.87. The calculated F value (2.529) is greater than the table value. Hence there is a significant difference between age and brand image. Hence the null hypothesis has been rejected at 1 percent significance level.

### **Education qualification**

In the Educational Qualification of the respondents, the highest mean score is found among the graduates (13.50) followed by professionals respondents have the mean score of 12.84, post graduate respondents have the mean score of 12.45 and no formal education respondents have the mean score of 12.05. Lowest mean score has been found among the school level respondents have the mean score of 11.67 indicating the low level of knowledge about brand image. The calculated F value (5.240) is greater than the table value. Hence there is a significant difference between education qualification and brand image. Hence the null hypothesis has been rejected at 1 percent significance level.

### **Occupation**

Among Occupational Status, students have the highest mean score (13.00) indicating that they have the highest satisfaction about the brand image, followed by businessman respondents are with the mean score of 12.48, professional respondents are with the mean score of 12.35, private employee respondents are with the mean score of 12.18, other employee respondents are with the mean score of 11.97 whereas; government employee have the least score of 11.50. The calculated F value (2.491) is greater than the table value. Hence there is a significant difference between occupation and brand image. Hence the null hypothesis has been rejected at 1 percent significance level.

### **Marital status**

Unmarried respondents are with the mean score of 12.53 are more agreeable towards brand image than married respondents with the mean score of 12.06. The calculated t value (2.552) is greater than the table value. Hence there is a significant

difference between marital status and brand image. Hence the null hypothesis has been rejected at 1 percent significance level.

### **Family monthly income**

The respondents with a family monthly income of above Rs.75,000 have a high mean score of 13.28 and a mean score of 12.23 has been found among the respondents whose family monthly income is below Rs.75,000. The respondents with a family monthly income between Rs.25,000 – Rs.50,000 have a mean score 12.07. The lowest mean score is 11.59 with the family monthly income of respondents is Rs.50,000 – Rs.75,000. The calculated F value (14.838) is greater than the table value. Hence there is a significant difference between family monthly income and brand image. Hence the null hypothesis has been rejected at 1 percent significance level.

### **Location of residency**

The urban area respondents have the highest mean score of 13.07 and the rural respondent has the mean score of 11.94. The respondents located in semi-urban have the lowest mean score of 11.82. The calculated F value (20.009) is greater than the table value. Hence there is a significant difference between location of residency and brand image. Hence the null hypothesis has been rejected at 1 percent significance level.

### **Frequency of purchase**

Respondents make their frequency of purchase for once in every 3 month has the highest mean score of (12.97) and followed by respondents make their purchase for once a month have the mean score of (12.88), respondents make their purchase for once in a year (12.20) who make frequency of purchase for once in every 6 months is low with the mean score of (11.73). The respondents who make frequency of purchase for once in every 3 month are more agreeable towards brand image than respondents who make purchase for once in every 6 months. The calculated F value (11.811) is greater than the table value. Hence there is a significant difference between frequency of purchase and brand image. Hence the null hypothesis has been rejected at 1 percent significance level.

### **Time of purchase**

Respondents who make purchase regularly has the highest mean score of 13.65 followed by discount (12.86), respondents who purchase during other time are with the mean score of 12.83, respondents make purchase during festival are with the mean score of 12.37 and respondents other time of purchase during discount are with the mean score of 11.86. The respondents who make purchase during function have the lowest mean score of 10.95. The calculated F value (34.057) is greater than the table value. Hence there is a significant difference between time of purchase and brand image. Hence the null hypothesis has been rejected at 1 percent significance level.

### **Place of purchase**

Respondents who make their purchases at wholesale shop has the highest mean score of 12.85, followed by mean score of 12.55 respondents make their purchases in showroom, the mean score of 12.52 respondents make their purchases in retail shop and mean score of 11.99 respondents make their purchases in shopping malls. The respondents make their purchases at factory outlet has the lowest mean score of 11.11. The calculated F value (5.890) is greater than the table value. Hence there is a significant difference between place of purchase and brand image. Hence the null hypothesis has been rejected at 1 percent significance level.

## **5.10 DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS - FACTORS INFLUENCING PURCHASE DECISION**

Descriptive analysis is applied to analyze the factors influence purchase decision of the customers. The respondents were asked to rate the factors influenced to make their purchase decision from least preferred to mostly preferred. The rating were ascertained as 1 for least preferred, 2 for less preferred, 3 for neutral, 4 for most preferred and 5 for mostly preferred. Mean rating were found out for each factors are given below.

**Table: 5.10 – Descriptive statistics - Factors Influencing Purchase Decision**

<b>Purchase decision</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>Minimum</b>	<b>Maximum</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>S.D</b>
Confusion due to too many brands	400	1.00	5.00	3.7500	1.15579
Worthiness for money value	400	1.00	5.00	4.0075	.89131
Amount of money spend on purchase	400	1.00	5.00	3.9650	1.01802
Purchase through single payment/credit purchase	400	1.00	5.00	4.1000	.99119
Raiment is evaluated with proportionate price	400	1.00	5.00	3.7625	1.04346
Offers and discounts	400	1.00	5.00	4.0100	1.03323
Gift vouchers	400	1.00	5.00	3.5600	1.10201
Fashion /design	400	2.00	5.00	3.9575	.90706
Uniqueness	400	1.00	5.00	4.0225	.95618
Colour and fit	400	1.00	5.00	4.1225	1.00997
Quality and style	400	1.00	5.00	4.1925	.84985
Good salesmanship	400	1.00	5.00	3.3650	1.33463

*(Source: Computed)*

It is seen from the table that the ratings for the impulsive purchase decision vary between minimum of 1 to a maximum of 5. The highest mean rating is (4.19) for quality and style, which is the mostly preferred factor. The next highest mean rating is (4.12) for color and fit, the next mean rate is (4.1) for purchase through single payment/credit purchase, mean rate of (4.02) for uniqueness, mean rate of (4.01) for offers and discount and the mean rate of (4.01) for worthiness for money value. The lowest mean rating is (3.96) for amount of money spend on purchase, followed by (3.95) for fashion/design, next least preference is (3.76) for raiment is evaluated with proportionate price, (3.75) for confusion due to too many brands. The respondent's rate is very lesser for gift vouchers (3.56) and for good salesmanship (3.36).

## 5.11 DEMOGRAPHIC VARIABLES Vs INFLUENCE OF IMPULSIVE BUYING ON PURCHASE DECISION

ANOVA/ t-Test has been used to test whether the scores obtained for ‘influence of impulsive buying on purchase decision has differed significantly among the respondents classified based on ‘demographic variables’ with the following null hypothesis.

H<sub>0</sub>: The influence of impulsive buying on purchase decision score do not differ significantly among the group of demographic variables namely age, education, occupation, marital status, family monthly income, location of residency, frequency of purchase, time of purchase and place of purchase.

The null hypothesis has been tested for each of the selected demographic variables separately and the results are exhibited in the following table.

**Table 5.11 - Demographic variables Vs Influence of Impulsive Buying on Purchase Decision**

Demographic variables		Influence of Impulse buying on Purchase decision			T value	F-value	Table value	Sig
		Mean	S.D	No.				
<b>Age</b>	Below 20 years	43.09	7.60	22	-	5.359	3.367	**
	21 – 30years	47.90	5.87	216				
	31 – 40 years	45.64	6.60	76				
	41 - 50 years	45.33	4.93	45				
	51 years and above	46.88	5.31	41				
	<b>Total</b>	46.82	6.10	400				
<b>Education qualification</b>	No formal education	50.50	4.01	12	-	4.098	3.367	**
	School level	45.20	4.69	45				
	Graduate	47.65	6.63	186				
	Post Graduate	45.38	6.35	89				
	Professional	46.84	4.61	68				
	<b>Total</b>	46.82	6.10	400				

Demographic variables		Influence of Impulse buying on Purchase decision			T value	F-value	Table value	Sig
		Mean	S.D	No.				
<b>Occupation</b>	Students	45.09	7.91	35	-	1.868	2.237	NS
	Govt employee	44.71	4.65	24				
	Private employee	47.32	6.21	179				
	Businessman	46.95	6.07	88				
	Professionalist	45.86	4.97	37				
	Others	48.00	5.04	37				
	<b>Total</b>	46.82	6.10	400				
<b>Marital status</b>	Married	45.79	5.59	222	3.807	-	2.588	**
	Unmarried	48.09	6.47	178				
	<b>Total</b>	46.82	6.10	400				
<b>Family monthly income</b>	Below Rs.25000	45.86	6.09	86	-	6.241	3.831	**
	25000 – 50000	47.63	6.56	136				
	50000 – 75000	44.97	5.60	88				
	Above 75000	48.31	5.28	90				
	<b>Total</b>	46.82	6.10	400				
<b>Location of residency</b>	Urban	46.76	6.91	131	-	.785	3.018	NS
	Semi-urban	46.36	5.37	129				
	Rural	47.29	5.92	140				
	<b>Total</b>	46.82	6.10	400				
<b>Frequency of purchase</b>	Once a month	47.85	3.94	67	-	9.584	3.831	**
	Once in every 3 months	47.00	4.77	78				
	Once in every 6 months	45.10	6.76	165				
	Once in an year	49.03	6.32	90				
	<b>Total</b>	46.82	6.10	400				

Demographic variables		Influence of Impulse buying on Purchase decision			T value	F-value	Table value	Sig
		Mean	S.D	No.				
Time of purchase	Festival	46.86	6.73	108	-	6.493	3.367	**
	Discount	46.03	5.80	90				
	Function	44.97	5.51	86				
	Regular	49.28	6.06	93				
	Others	46.61	2.25	23				
	<b>Total</b>	46.82	6.10	400				
Place of purchase	Showroom	45.94	7.03	159	-	5.001	3.367	**
	Factory outlet	47.00	5.02	28				
	Shopping malls	46.48	5.68	147				
	Wholesale shop	50.44	3.19	39				
	Retail shop	48.37	4.51	27				
	<b>Total</b>	46.82	6.10	400				

(Source: Computed NS- Not Significant \*- Significant at 5% level \*\*- Significant at 1% level)

### Age

The above table shows that the mean score is found to be high (47.90) in the age group of 21-30 years. The respondent in the age group of above 50 years has the next highest mean score of 46.88 and the respondent in the age group of below 31 - 40 years has the mean score of 45.64. Age group of 41 - 50 years has scored the mean score of 45.33. The respondents are the age group of below 20 years has the lowest mean score of 43.09. The calculated F value (5.359) is greater than the table value. Hence there is a significant difference between occupation and impulsive buying on purchase decision. Hence the null hypothesis has been rejected at 1 percent significance level.

### Education qualification

In the Educational Qualification of the respondents, the highest mean score is for no formal educations (50.50) followed by graduate (47.65), professionals (46.84) and post graduate (45.38). Lowest mean score has been found among the school level

educators (45.20) indicating the low level of knowledge about purchase decision. The calculated F value (4.098) is greater than the table value. Hence there is a significant difference between education qualification and impulsive buying on purchase decision. Hence the null hypothesis has been rejected at 1 percent significance level.

### **Occupation**

Among Occupational Status, other occupational have the highest mean score of 48.00 indicating that they have the highest satisfaction about the purchase decision, followed by private employee (47.32), businessman respondents are with the mean score of (46.86), professionalist respondents are with the mean score of (45.86), students respondents are with the mean score of (45.09) whereas; government employee have the least score of (44.71). The calculated F value (1.868) is lesser than the table value. Hence there is no significant difference between occupation and impulsive buying on purchase decision. Hence the null hypothesis has been accepted.

### **Marital status**

Married respondents (45.79) are more agreeable towards purchase decision than unmarried respondents with the mean score of 48.09. The calculated t value is 3.807 is greater than the table value. Hence there is significant difference between marital status and impulsive buying on purchase decision. Hence the null hypothesis has been rejected.

### **Family monthly income**

The respondents with a family monthly income above Rs.75,000 have a high mean score of 48.31 and a mean score of 47.63 has been found among the respondents whose family monthly income is Rs.25,000 –Rs.50,000. The respondents with a family monthly income between Rs.25,000 have a mean score of 45.86. The lowest mean score of 44.97 with the family monthly income of respondents is Rs.50,000 – Rs.75,000. The calculated F value (6.241) is greater than the table value. Hence there is a significant difference between family monthly income and impulsive buying on purchase decision. Hence the null hypothesis has been rejected.

### **Location of residency**

The rural respondents have the highest mean score of 47.29 and the urban respondent has the lowest mean score of 46.76. The calculated F value is .785 is lesser than the table value. Hence there is no significant difference between location of residency and impulsive buying on purchase decision. Hence the null hypothesis has been accepted.

### **Frequency of purchase**

Respondents make their frequency of purchase for once in a year has the highest mean score of 49.03 and followed by respondents make their purchase for once a month has the mean score of 47.85, respondents make their purchase once in every 3 month are with the mean score of 47.00. Respondents who make frequency of purchase for once in every 6 months is low with the mean score of 45.10. The calculated F value (9.584) is greater than the table value. Hence there is a significant difference between frequency of purchase and impulsive buying on purchase decision. Hence the null hypothesis has been rejected.

### **Time of purchase**

Respondents make purchase regularly has the highest mean score of 49.28, followed by festival purchase (46.86), other time of purchase (46.61) and discount (46.03). The respondents who make purchase during function have the lowest mean score of (44.97). The calculated F value (6.493) is greater than the table value. Hence there is a significant difference between time of purchase and impulsive buying on purchase decision. Hence the null hypothesis has been rejected.

### **Place of purchase**

Respondents make their purchases at wholesale shop has the highest mean score of (50.44) followed by (48.37) respondents make their purchase in retail shop, (47.00) respondents make their purchase in factory outlet and (46.68) respondents make their purchase in shopping malls. The respondents make their purchases at showroom has the lowest mean score of 45.94. The calculated F value (5.001) is greater than the table value.

Hence there is a significance difference between place of purchase and impulsive buying on purchase decision. Hence the null hypothesis has been accepted.

## **5.12 CONCLUSION**

This chapter depicts the branded mostly preferred by customers that have been analyzed by mean rank, fashion accessories influenced to buy has been analysed by applying percentage analysis, descriptive statistics has been applied to the factors mostly preferred by customers impulsive buying behaviour, factor analysis is applied to know the factors scores of impulsive buying behaviour. T-test/ Anova have been applied to know the significance difference between brand identity, brand image, brand advertisement and brand value.

It is clear from the mean rank analyzed that Allen Solly has a lowest mean rank of (4.90) which means, it is the brand mostly preferred by the respondents. Among the several fashion accessories which are influencing the customers to purchase are footwear has received the maximum respondents' rate at 37.1 per cent. The result derived from descriptive statistics is that the mean ratings have shown that the respondents have highly preferred with the statement "Quality" (4.40).

T-test/Anova result show that the brand value score differ significantly with respect to age, education, occupation, marital status, family monthly income and location of residency. The results were significant at 1 % level when compared with table value. Hence the hypothesis was not accepted for all demographic variables expect marital status.

T-test/Anova result show that the brand identity score differ significantly with respect to education, occupation, family monthly income and time of purchase. The results were significant at 5 % level when compared with table value. Hence the hypothesis was not accepted for all demographic variables expect age, marital status, location of residency and frequency of purchase.

T-test/Anova result show that the brand advertisement score differ significantly with respect to age, marital status, occupation, family monthly income and location of residency. The results were significant at 1 % level when compared with table value.

Hence the hypothesis was not accepted for all demographic variables expect education, frequency of purchase and place of purchase.

T-test/Anova result show that the brand image score differ significantly with respect to age, education, occupation, marital status, family monthly income and location of residency. The results were significant at 1 % level when compared with table value.

Descriptive statistes found that highest mean rating is for quality and style and the lowest mean score for the statement good salesmanship.

T-test/anova shows that influence of impulsive buying on purchase decision score differ significantly with respect to age, education, occupation, marital status, family monthly income, place of purchase and time of purchase. Hence the null hypothesis was not accepted for all demographic variables except location of residency.