



A STUDY ON DECISION MAKING PROCESS OF DURABLE PRODUCTS WITH REFERENCE TO COIMBATORE CITY

Mrs. M. Akila¹ and Dr. A. Latha²

¹Research Scholar, LRG Government Arts College for Women, Tirupur.

² Assistant Professor, PG & Research Department of Commerce, Government Arts College, Coimbatore.



ABSTRACT

The decision making is important process in the journey of purchase and utilizing of durable products. The impact of wrong decisions will be high expensive to the families, so that all the family members are involving in decision making. Some time the family head may take decision with the help of external factors. The pros and cons are available in the internet to take purchase decisions of durable products. Consumers are clearly mentions the pros and cons of durable products, it helps to new consumers. This study conducted to present the socio economic factors of the sample respondents and anova result. It will help full to the marketers to design and produce the durable products to satisfy the consumers. One hundred and seventy five respondents were taken for this study. The researchers used structured questionnaires and adopted convenient sampling method to collect the data. They concluded that the marketers research and development helps them to give best products, these products reduce the manpower and give best performance in their house. The researchers given suggestions to the marketers and consumers regarding purchase of durable products, it will help the consumers while selecting the durable products and it will help the marketers to reach the targeted consumers.

KEY WORDS: Durable products, word of mouth, decision makers and online reviews.

INTRODUCTION

The decision making is important process in the journey of purchase and utilizing of durable products. The impact of wrong decisions will be high expensive to the families, so that all the family members are involving in decision making. Some time the family head may take decision with the help of external factors. Internal and external factors are influencing the purchase decision of durable products. The buyer's family members and their own knowledge are internal factors. Their colleagues, friends and relatives are external factors, both are influencing the purchase decisions. The consumers are having lot of on line and off line sources to get knowledge about the durable products. Online consumer's reviews are highly influencing the purchase decision.

The pros and cons are available in the internet to take purchase decisions of durable products. Consumers are clearly mentions the pros and cons of durable products, it helps to new consumers. Consumer's are collecting more details regarding durable products before decide the companies and options regarding the durable products. The right decisions of the buyers will prevent them from loss of investments.

The decisions should be correct otherwise there will be loss to the consumers, the purpose of the durable products might be fulfill but the consumers might be dissatisfaction. This dissatisfaction will effect the marketers. The dissatisfied consumers propaganda the company and the products, it will reduce the sales. So the marketers has to concentrate all the products while check the quality. If the consumers

satisfied, they will recommend others to buy the products. The word of mouth has good value in the durable products. The decisions makers need more knowledge about the products to take effective decision.

NEED OF THE STUDY

This study had taken fifteen variable which are influence the decision making of the consumers. This study will help to understand about the decisions making of durable products, it helps to identify the decision makers. The identification of target consumers is very difficult to the marketers. This study conducted to present the socio economic factors of the sample respondents and anova result. It will help full to the marketers to design and produce the durable products to satisfy the consumers.

OBJECTIVES

The following are the objectives of the study

1. To present the socio economic profiles of the sample respondents
2. To find out the variables of purchase decisions
3. To find out the impact variables of purchase decisions

SAMPLING AND TOOLS

The researchers had taken Coimbatore as study area. The structured questionnaire was used to collect the data, it includes socio economic factors and variable for purchase decisions of the durable products. The convenient sampling method was adopted for data collection but the same time all type of respondents were considered as sample. Percentage analysis used to present the socio economic factors of the sample respondents and ANOVA used to present the variance between the socio economic profile of the respondents and purchase decision variables.

ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION

Percentage Analysis

Table 1 : Age group of the respondents

Sl. No.	Age group	Number of Respondents	Percentage
1	Up to 30 years	28	16.00
2	31 years to 40 years	49	28.00
3	41 years to 50 years	60	34.29
4	Above 50 years	38	21.71
	Total	175	100

Source : Survey Data

Twenty eight (16.00%) respondents are come under the age group of up to 30 years. Forty nine (28.00%) respondents are come under the age group of 31 years to 40 years. Sixty (34.29%) respondents are come under the age group of 41 years to 50 years and the remaining thirty eight (21.71%) respondents are come under the age group of above 50 years. Majority (34.29%) of the respondents are come under the age group of 41 years to 50 years.

Table 2 : Gender of the respondents

Sl. No.	Age group	Number of Respondents	Percentage
1	Male	108	61.71
2	Female	63	36.00
3	Transgender	4	2.29
	Total	175	100

Source : Survey Data

One hundred and eight (61.71%) respondents are male respondents. Sixty three (36.00%) respondents are female and the remaining four (2.29%) respondents are transgender. Majority (61.71%) of the respondents are male.

Table 3: Educational Qualification of the respondents

Sl. No.	Educational Qualification	Number of Respondents	Percentage
1	UG level	94	53.71
2	PG Level	67	38.29
3	Others	14	8.00
	Total	175	100

Source : Survey Data

Ninety four (53.71%) respondents are under gradates. Sixty seven (38.29%) respondents are post graduates and the remaining fourteen (8.00%) respondents are other qualified persons.

Table 4 : Marital Status of the respondents

Sl. No.	Marital Status	Number of Respondents	Percentage
1	Married	116	66.29
2	Unmarried	59	33.71
	Total	175	100

Source : Survey Data

One hundred and sixteen (66.29%) respondents are married and the remaining fifty nine (33.71%) respondents are unmarried. Majority (66.29%) respondents are married.

Table 5 : Monthly Family Income of the respondents

Sl. No.	Monthly Family Income	Number of Respondents	Percentage
1	Up to Rs. 25,000	51	29.14
2	Rs. 25,001 to Rs.40,000	91	52.00
3	Above Rs. 40,000	33	18.86
	Total	175	100

Source : Survey Data

Fifty one (29.14%) respondents monthly family income is up to Rs. 25,000. Ninety one (52.00%) respondents monthly family income is between Rs. 25,001 and Rs. 40,000 and the remaining thirty three (18.86%) respondents monthly family income is above Rs. 40,000. Majority (52.00%) of the respondents family monthly income is between Rs. 25,001 and Rs. 40,000.

Table 6 : Family Size of the respondents

Sl. No.	Family size	Number of Respondents	Percentage
1	Up to 4 members	93	53.14
2	Above 4 members	82	46.86
	Total	175	100

Source : Survey Data

Ninety three (53.14%) respondents family size is up to 4 members and the remaining eight two (46.86%) respondents family size is above 4 members. Majority (53.14%) of the respondents family size is up to 4 members.

Table 7 : Family type of the respondents

Sl. No.	Family type	Number of Respondents	Percentage
1	Joint Family	67	38.29
2	Nuclear Family	108	61.71
	Total	175	100

Source : Survey Data

Sixty seven (38.29%) respondents are joint family members and the remaining one hundred and eight (61.71%) respondents are nuclear family members. Majority (61.71%) of the respondents are nuclear family members.

Table 8 : Occupation of the respondents

Sl. No.	Occupation	Number of Respondents	Percentage
1	Private Employee	132	75.43
2	Government employee	19	10.86
3	Business or Profession	24	13.71
	Total	175	100

Source : Survey Data

One hundred and thirty two (75.43%) respondents are private employees. Nineteen (10.86%) respondents are Government employees and twenty four (13.71%) respondents are doing business or profession. Majority (75.43%) of the respondents are private employees.

Table 9 : Decision making of durable products of the respondents

Sl. No.	Decision making	Number of Respondents	Percentage
1	Myself	69	39.43
2	Family members	106	60.57
	Total	175	100

Source : Survey Data

Sixty nine (39.43%) respondents are taking decisions themselves for durable products and the remaining one hundred and six (60.57%) respondents are accepting family members decisions for selection of durable products. Majority (60.57%) of the respondents accepting family members decisions for durable products.

ANOVA

The researcher formulated fifteen variables to measure the purchase decisions. Likert five point scale used to measure the purchase decisions. The total score was taken to compare with personal factors.

Hypothesis

There is no variance between the socio economic factors and purchase decisions.

Table 10 : Age group and purchase decision

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	579.924	3	193.308	4.776	.003
Within Groups	6921.710	171	40.478		
Total	7501.634	174			

Source : Computed Data

Hypothesis : There is no variance between age group and purchase decision.

The above table shows the variance between the age group and purchase decision. The calculated P value is 0.003 ($p < 0.05$). So there is significant variance between the age group and purchase decision. The null hypothesis is rejected.

Table 11 : Gender and Purchase Decisions

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	98.063	1	98.063	2.291	.132
Within Groups	7403.571	173	42.795		
Total	7501.634	174			

Source : Computed Data

Hypothesis : There is no variance between gender and purchase decision.

The above table shows the variance between the gender and purchase decision. The calculated P value is 0.132 ($p > 0.05$). So there is no significant variance between the gender and purchase decision. The null hypothesis is accepted.

Table 12 : Educational Qualification and Purchase Decisions

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	755.755	2	377.877	9.635	.000
Within Groups	6745.880	172	39.220		
Total	7501.634	174			

Source : Computed Data

Hypothesis : There is no variance between Educational Qualification and purchase decision.

The above table shows the variance between the Educational Qualification and purchase decision. The calculated P value is 0.000 ($p < 0.05$). So there is significant variance between the educational qualification and purchase decision. The null hypothesis is rejected.

Table 13 : Marital Status and Purchase Decisions

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	38.429	1	38.429	.891	.347
Within Groups	7463.206	173	43.140		
Total	7501.634	174			

Source : Computed Data

Hypothesis : There is no variance between marital status and purchase decision.

The above table shows the variance between the marital status and purchase decision. The calculated P value is 0.347 ($p > 0.05$). So there is no significant variance between the marital status and purchase decision. The null hypothesis is accepted.

Table 14 : Monthly Income and purchase decisions

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	267.098	3	89.033	2.104	.101
Within Groups	7234.536	171	42.307		
Total	7501.634	174			

Source : Computed Data

Hypothesis : There is no variance between monthly income and purchase decision.

The above table shows the variance between the monthly income and purchase decision. The calculated P value is 0.101 ($p > 0.05$). So there is no significant variance between the monthly income and purchase decision. The null hypothesis is accepted.

Table 15 : Family size and purchase decisions

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	572.809	1	572.809	14.302	.000
Within Groups	6928.826	173	40.051		
Total	7501.634	174			

Source : Computed Data

Hypothesis : There is no variance between family size and purchase decision.

The above table shows the variance between the family size and purchase decision. The calculated P value is 0.000 ($p < 0.05$). So there is significant variance between the family size and purchase decision. The null hypothesis is rejected.

Table 16 : Family type and purchase decisions

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	534.920	1	534.920	13.283	.000
Within Groups	6966.714	173	40.270		
Total	7501.634	174			

Source : Computed Data

Hypothesis : There is no variance between family type and purchase decision.

The above table shows the variance between the family type and purchase decision. The calculated P value is 0.000 ($p < 0.05$). So there is significant variance between the family type and purchase decision. The null hypothesis is rejected.

Table : Occupation of purchase decisions

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	1452.288	4	363.072	10.203	.000
Within Groups	6049.347	170	35.584		
Total	7501.634	174			

Source : Computed Data

Hypothesis : There is no variance between Occupation and purchase decision.

The above table shows the variance between the Occupation and purchase decision. The calculated P value is 0.000 ($p < 0.05$). So there is significant variance between the occupation and purchase decision. The null hypothesis is rejected.

Table : Decision maker of durable products and purchase Decisions

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	29.895	3	9.965	.228	.877
Within Groups	7471.739	171	43.694		
Total	7501.634	174			

Source : Computed Data

Hypothesis : There is no variance between decision maker of durable products and purchase decision.

The above table shows the variance between the decision maker and purchase decision. The calculated P value is 0.877 ($p > 0.05$). So there is no significant variance between the decision makers and purchase decision. The null hypothesis is accepted.

FINDINGS

Suggestions

The following are the suggestion presented by the researcher to the consumers and marketers.

1. The marketers should give training to the sales executives to identify the decision making persons in the family while they visiting the showroom for purchase.
2. The salesman should understand the consumers buying capacity and their utilization to show the right products.
3. The consumers should disclose their requirement while selecting the products.
4. The decision makers should be broad intellect while buying the products. The consumers should think that products life will be next 10 years and pick the opt products.

CONCLUSION

This present study conducted to study the buying decision of durable products of durable products. The decisions maker has more value in their family but the same time they should take right decision while selecting the durable products. The educated people has more sources to decide the products but uneducated discuss with their friends and relatives. The technology is helping them to get details of the durable products. The uneducated depends on the family members experience and external sources. The consumers may be educated or uneducated, the marketers duty to reach them to sale their products. The marketers should reach the decision makers to make them understand the products features. There are many media available to reach the decision makers. The marketers research and development helps them to give best products, these products reduce the manpower and give best performance in their house. The researchers given suggestions to the marketers and consumers regarding purchase of durable products, it will help the consumers while selecting the durable products and it will help the marketers to reach the targeted consumers.

REFERENCE

1. Chundawat D.S., Gupta Seema (2003) "Family Roles and Social Influences in Buying Decision-making", *The IUP Journal of Marketing Management*, Vol. Aug 2003.
2. Clarke, P. (2007), A Measure for Christmas Spirit, *Journal of Consumer Marketing*, Vol. 24(1), pp. 8–17.
3. Geethanjali and Dr. S. Ashok Kumar, "A study on consumer buying behaviour towards home appliances in Salem City", *IJEMR*, Vol. Issue 5, October 2011.
4. Golden, S. A. R. (2016). Customers' Attitude Towards Online Shopping-An Analysis. *International Journal of Business and Administration Research Review*, 1(1), 453-455.
5. Golden, S. A. R., & Regi, S. B. (2013). Mobile commerce in modern business era. *International Journal of Current Research and Academic Review*, 1(4), 96-102.
6. Janaki P. , "A study on consumer involvement in purchase of Home Appliance" *IJMT*, Vol. 2, Issue I, pp. 169 – 185.
7. Kim, J-O., Forsythe, S., Gu, Q. and Moon, S.J., Cross-cultural Consumer Values, Needs and Purchase Behavior, *Journal of Consumer Marketing*, Vol. 19(6), pp. 481–502, 2002.
8. Omesh Chadha , "Study of Consumer Buying Behavior Towards Bikes", *IJRFM* Volume 1, Issue 2, June – 2011.
9. Regi, S. B., & Golden, S. A. R. (2014). A Descriptive Study On The Role Of Consumer Psychology And Behaviour In Product Purchasing. *Indian Streams Research Journal*, 3(12), 1-6.