



Study on Rural Consumers' Family Members Influence on the Purchase of Various Durable Goods

* S. G. Sureshraj

* Asst. Prof. of Buss. Administration, CK College of Engg. and Technology, Cuddalore

ABSTRACT

Consumer satisfaction is predominant in purchase; it may differ person to person by the way of physiological base, though it is measured through various types and ways. Here it is going to measure the influence of Family Members to the rural consumer on the purchase of durable goods. In the present scenario the rural consumers' purchase capacity is distinguished from the past, because of the information literacy. The communication revolution also capsizes the situation of the rural consumers and brought them to the bright. In this context it is discussed on the importance of the Family Members influence the purchase.

Keywords : Purchase decision; Family Members; Durable goods; Rural consumer

Introduction

Normally the consumer purchasing intention is elasticity on various ways. The purchase of durable goods is not easy decision made by the consumer, though the rural consumer case the product must be satisfied their psychological intention. Whether it is recommended by a media or the Family Members influence would be dominated finally. In this study it is recognized the aspect and took survey on the rural consumers.

Family Members influence on the rural consumers' attitude based on their own self- concept and it reflects their identities; it's based on four major psychological factors like motivation (internal/external, personal, non-personal) perception, learning and beliefs & attitudes.

This report recommends to marketers how to approach the consumers and based on the products promotion. The research investigating the buyer's decisions are also influenced by Family Members characteristics such as their experience, life cycle stage, occupation, life style, personality and self concept. Family Members distinct personality influences rural consumers' buying behavior.

Literature Review

Alba, et.al (1987) researched the concept of prior knowledge is defined in term of the extent of experience and familiarity that one has a product (good or service); and commonly refers to information that is (1) accessible from memory and (2) generally accessed before external search occurs. Prior knowledge has been defined in at least three conceptually different ways: (1) experience-based prior knowledge, (2) subjective prior knowledge, and (3) objective prior knowledge.

Park, et.al (1981) defined experience-based prior knowledge has been defined in term of three components of familiarity with products: search experience, usage experience, and ownership. Subjective prior knowledge has been defined as consumer self assessment of product domain knowledge.

Brucks (1985) Objective prior knowledge is the preferred conceptualization of prior knowledge, because it is based on the actual content and organization of knowledge held in memory, i.e. product attributes, general attribute evaluation,

specific attribute evaluation, general product usage, brand facts, and purchasing/decision making procedures.

Purpose

The purpose of the study is to examine the stratified rural consumers' Family Members influence on purchase of various durable goods, and identified consumers' experience would be helpful to the marketers to improve their sales volume against the rural market and purchase.

Research Methodology and Data Collection

The proposed study is descriptive in nature; respondents for this study included 284 male and 166 female residing in rural communities at the Nagapattinam district, in Tamilnadu, so we are applying multi-stage sampling method, and stratified the respondent in occupation wise like Agriculturist, Government workers, Private workers, Business people, Housewives and Students, from each segmented in 75 samples. The statements were measurable on the Likert scale of 1-5; where 5- indicated most important and 1-indicated less important. Among the sample of respondents examine their Family members influence on purchase requirement of varies durable goods such as Television, Audio (music player), Cell Phone, and Two-wheeler.

Table-1 shows the Family members are induce to stratified respondents like Agriculturist, Government and Private employee, Business people, Housewives and Students. They purchased the specified product like Television, Audio, Cell phone and Two- wheeler.

The Family members influence on purchase of the product television to the respondents, the data interpreted overall 15.4% of respondents are represented most important to the factor,

7.6% of respondents are important to the factor of Family members. 17.7% of the respondents are less important to the factor. In particularly 5.9% of Agriculturist, 24% of Government employee, 18.1% of Private employee, 16.7% of Business people and 11.1% of Housewives are represented most important to the factor. ANOVA test employed in the product of television between the segmented groups, the F-ratio is 0.020 and 5% F limit (4, 20) is 2.87, it's greater than F-ratio; so it's resulted that the segmented respondents are not significant between them.

Table-1: stratified respondents' Family members influence on the purchase of varies durable goods

Television						
Occupation	Agriculturist	Government employee	Private employee	Business people	House wives	Total
Most important	4(5.9%)	18(24%)	13(18.1%)	11(16.7%)	7(11.1%)	53(15.4%)
Important	2(2.9%)	6(8%)	9(12.5%)	7(10.6%)	2(3.2%)	26(7.6%)
Undecided	5(7.4%)	0	8(11.1%)	2(3%)	4(6.4%)	19(5.5%)
Less important	37(54.4%)	48(64%)	27(37.5%)	28(42.4%)	45(71.4%)	185(53.8%)
Not at all	20(29.4%)	3(4%)	15(20.8%)	18(27.3%)	5(7.9%)	61(17.7%)
Total	68	75	72	66	63	344
Audio						
Most important	4(5.5%)	12(16%)	9(12.5%)	7(9.9%)	6(8.3%)	38(10.5%)
Important	1(1.4%)	4(5.3%)	5(6.9%)	4(5.6%)	2(2.8%)	16(4.4%)
Undecided	4(5.5%)	0	2(2.8%)	3(4.2%)	5(6.9%)	14(3.9%)
Less important	26(35.6%)	47(62.7%)	27(37.5%)	39(54.9%)	43(59.7%)	182(50.1%)
Not at all	38(52.0%)	12(16%)	29(40.3%)	18(25.4%)	16(22.2%)	113(31.1%)
Total	73	75	72	71	72	363
Cell Phone						
Occupation	Agriculturist	Government employee	Private employee	Business people	Student	Total
Most important	0	0	0	0	12(35.3%)	12(3.8%)
Important	0	0	0	0	3(8.8%)	3(0.9%)
Undecided	3(4.9%)	0	4(5.5%)	0	0	7(2.2%)
Less important	41(67.2%)	59(78.7%)	48(66.7%)	60(80%)	9(26.5%)	217(68.5%)
Not at all	17(27.9%)	16(21.3%)	20(27.8%)	15(20%)	10(29.4%)	78(24.6%)
Total	61	75	72	75	34	317
Two-wheeler						
Most important	2(4.8%)	4(5.6%)	6(9.1%)	0	8(28.6%)	20(7.4%)
Important	3(7.1%)	2(2.8%)	4(6.1%)	0	3(10.7%)	12(4.4%)
Undecided	6(14.3%)	0	5(7.5%)	3(4.7%)	0	14(5.2%)
Less important	22(52.4%)	41(57.8%)	38(57.6%)	47(73.4%)	13(46.7%)	161(59.4%)
Not at all	9(21.4%)	24(33.8%)	13(19.7%)	14(21.9%)	4(14.3%)	64(23.6%)
Total	42	71	66	64	28	271

Table-2: ANOVA for stratified respondents' Family members influence on the purchase of varies durable goods

Products	Sources of Variation	Sum of Square	Mean Square	d.f.	F	Sig.
Television	Between Group	18.16	4.54	4	0.020	NS
	Within Group	4404.4	220.22	20		
	Total	4422.6		24		
Audio	Between Group	1.84	0.46	4	0.002	NS
	Within Group	5162.4	258.12	20		
	Total	5164.2		24		
Cell Phone	Between Group	242.64	60.66	4	0.145	NS
	Within Group	8332.8	416.64	20		
	Total	8575.4		24		
Two-wheeler	Between Group	270.56	67.64	4	0.334	NS
	Within Group	4044.8	202.24	20		
	Total	4315.4		24		

Table-3: ANOVA for Family members' influence against the purchase of varies durable goods of various stratified respondents

Stratified respondents	Sources of Variation	Sum of Square	Mean Square	d.f.	F	Sig.
Agriculturist	Between product	110.80	36.93	3	0.170	NS
	Within product	3472.4	217.03	16		
	Total	3583.2		19		
Government employee	Between product	2.40	0.80	3	0.002	NS
	Within product	6816.8	426.05	16		
	Total	6819.2		19		
Private employee	Between product	5.40	1.80	3	0.008	NS
	Within product	3376.4	211.03	16		
	Total	3381.8		19		
Business people	Between product	14.80	4.93	3	0.014	NS
	Within product	5616.4	351.03	16		
	Total	5631.2		19		

The same factor consider to the product Audio between the segmented groups. Overall 10.5% of respondents are represented most important to the factor, 4.4% of respondents are important in the factor Family members influence. 31.1% of the respondents are less important to the factor. In particularly 5.5% of Agriculturist, 16% of Government employee, 12.5% of Private employee, 9.9% of Business people and 8.3% of Housewives are represented most important to the factor. ANOVA test employed in the product of Audio between the segmented groups, the F-ratio is 0.002 and 5% F limit (4, 20) is 2.87, it's greater than F-ratio; so it's resulted that the segmented respondents are

not significant between them.

The next product Cell phone purchase considers the factor Family members are influence between the segmented groups. Overall 3.8% of respondents are represent most important to the factor, 0.9% of respondents are important to the factor of Family members influence. 24.6% of the respondents are less important to the factor. In particularly 0% of Agriculturist, 0% of Government employee, 0% of Private employee, 0% of Business people and 35.2% of Students are represents most important to consider the factor. ANOVA test employed in the product of cell phone between the segmented groups, the F-ratio is 0.145 and 5% F limit (4, 20) is 2.87, it's greater than F-ratio; so it's resulted that the segmented respondents are not significant between them.

Then next product Two-wheeler purchase to consider the same factor between the segmented groups. Overall 7.4% of respondents are represent most important to the factor, 4.4% of respondents are important in the factor of Family members influence. 23.6% of the respondents are less important to the factor. In particularly 4.8% of Agriculturist, 5.6% of Government employee, 9.1% of Private employee, 0% of Business people and 28.6% of Students are represented most important to consider the factor. ANOVA test employed in the product of Two-wheeler between the segmented groups, the F-ratio is 0.334 and 5% F limit (4, 20) is 2.87, it's greater than F-ratio; so resulted that the segmented respondents are not significant between them.

The above statement inferred that the segmented groups are not significant to purchase of each and every product. The table- 3 ANOVA test employed the Family members influence to Agriculturist on purchase to different product like Television, Audio, Cell phone, and Two-wheeler. The SDs are 14.9, 16.5, 17.5 and 8.1 respectively the above product, the F-ratio is 0.170 and 5% F-limit (3, 16) is 3.24, it's greater than F-ratio; so resulted that the Family members influences to Agriculturist are not significant to different product. The same factor influence to Government employee on purchase to different product like Television, Audio, Cell phone and Two-wheeler, the SDs are 19.7, 18.6, 25.2 and 17.8 respectively the above product, the F-ratio is 0.002 and 5% F-limit (3, 16) is 3.24, it's greater than F-ratio; so resulted that the Family members influences to Government employee are not significant to different product. The same factor influence to Private employee on purchase to different product like Television, Audio, Cell phone and Two-wheeler, the SDs are 7.6, 12.7, 20.5 and 14.3 respectively the above product, the F-ratio is 0.008 and 5% F-limit (3, 16) is 3.24, it's greater than F-ratio; so resulted that the Family members influences to private employee are not significant to different product.

Family members influence to Business people on purchase to different product like Television, Audio, Cell phone and Two-wheeler, the SDs are 10.1, 15.1, 26.1 and 20.1 respectively the above product, the F-ratio is 0.014 and 5% F-limit (3, 16) is 3.24, it's greater than F-ratio; so resulted that the Parents influences to Business people are not significant to different product.

Findings and conclusion

The study interpreted that the stratified respondents are not even their Family Members influence towards the purchase of the sample product like Television, Audio, Cell phone, and Two-wheeler, at the same time every stratified respondent Family Members influence is differs to product wise. The study concludes that the Family Members distinct personality influences rural consumers' buying behavior, and distinct personality experience and familiarity is differ in product wise. The study recommend to marketers' unique promotion tool may not successful lead to the consumers, for the sack it may be identified the potential of consumers in segmented wise, and their promotion.

REFERENCES

Alba, Joseph.W and J.Wesley Hutchinson, (1987), "Dimension of Consumer Expertise" Journal of consumer research, 13 (March), p-411-454. | Bruck,Merries, (1985), "The Effects of product class Knowledge on Information Search Behavior", Journal of consumer Research, 12(June), p-1-16. | Kotler and Armstrong, (2004), "Principles of marketing" (10th Ed.) Pearson Education, Inc. p-177-206. | Park.C.Whan and V.Parker Lessig (1981), "Familiarity and Its Impact on Consumer Decision Biases and Heuristic", Journal of consumer Research 8(September), p-223- 230.