

## A Study On Chennai Residents' Perspectives On Influencers Of Durable Product Purchase

Dr. ILA. NAKKEERAN

### Abstract

*A wide range of consumer durable products are available in the market and the consumers are often influenced by various factors like newspaper, friends, relatives, celebrities and much more factors. Hence it is necessary for the marketers to understand the opinion of consumers about factors influencing their durable purchase. Hence this study consider the consumers of durable products in Chennai and find how those influencers are influencing the consumers.*

**Keywords:** *Consumer, Durable products, Influencers, Consumer perspective, celebrities.*

### I INTRODUCTION

Whatever be the nature of research, it is vital to study and understand the demographic profile of the respondents for accurate and reliable result, especially studies about consumer behavior, the influence of demographic variables like Age, Gender, Income Social status, Family members like adults and children, Residential Area, occupation and Education are inevitable and these demographic profiles having direct influence over the consumers' attitudes and preferences. Hence this study analysis the following aspects, such as, to examine the Personal Characteristics of Consumer respondents, identify the underlying dimensions of Influencers variables, classify all the Consumers into dominant Influencers groups differentiated by Influencers dimensions

### II REVIEW OF LITERATURE

**Wassana Suwanvijit and Sompong Promsa-ad, (2009)** The knowledge of consumer behaviour helps the marketers to understand how consumers think, feel and select from alternatives like products, brands and the like and how the consumers are influenced by their environment, the reference groups, family and salespersons and so on.

**Mridanish Jha, (2013)** The researcher has Identified the most important factors which influences the urban and rural consumers for making a purchase decision these factors as follows 1. Brand, 2. Feature 3. Users friendly, 4. Quality, 5. Price, 6. Advertisement, 7. After sales services. He also studied the role following influencers & Rural and urban consumers in decision making. 1. Family, 2. Friends, 3. Retailer, 4. Media, 5. Others (reference group)

**Iuliana Cetina, Maria-Cristiana, Munthiu and Violeta Radulescu, (2012)** Actions performed by consumers on the Internet trigger new behavioral dimensions and consumer possibilities to compare products or services as their new status of online consumers are endless. It is thus important for companies to continuously develop their online marketing activity which, by using interactivity, allows bidirectional communication in any moment and

which has become indispensable for successful business development. Any organization should develop its social media component as consumers are part of social networks that influence their online perception and trust in a certain website through word-of-mouth.

**Singh, (1992)** has studied the role played by family members while purchasing a television across five occupational categories: teachers, doctors, businesspeople, lawyers, and engineers and found that Children of engineers and doctors were found to have remarkable influence in the purchase decision.

### III RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The nature of this study is exploratory and analytical with a sample size of 1000 consumer respondents, Non probability convenient sampling method is used for collect data through questionnaire which consist of personal profile of consumers and the variables which are influencing those consumers

#### IV OBJECTIVES:

The objectives of the chapter are as follow:

1. To examine the personal characteristics profile of consumer respondents
2. To identify the underlying dominant dimensions of opinion on influencers on durable goods
3. To classify all the consumers into dominant influencers groups differentiated by influence dimensions.

### V DISCUSSION OF RESULTS

#### I. Personal Characteristics Profile of Consumer Respondents

**Table 1.1 Personal characteristics profiles of consumers respondents**

Description		Consumers
Mean		<b>34.75 Years</b>
Std. Error of Mean		0.355
Median		32.000 Years
Mode		23.000 Years
Std. Deviation		<b>11.223</b>
Skewness		0.600
Std. Error of Skewness		0.077
Kurtosis		-0.506
Std. Error of Kurtosis		0.155
Range		56.00
Minimum		18.00
Maximum		74.00
Quartiles	Q1	25.000
	Q3	43.750

**Table - 1.2 Gender of Consumers**

Gender	Number of Consumers	Percent
Male	575	<b>57.5</b>
Female	425	42.5
<b>Total</b>	<b>1000</b>	<b>100.0</b>

The table 1.2 shows that majority (**57.5%**) of the Consumer respondents belong to the gender group of Male.

**Table - 1.3 Educational Level provided by Consumers**

<b>Educational level</b>	<b>Number of Consumers</b>	<b>Percent</b>
No Formal Education	57	5.7
School Education	215	21.5
UG Degree	440	<b>44</b>
PG & Professional Degree	288	28.8
<b>Total</b>	<b>1000</b>	<b>100.0</b>

The table 1.3 shows that majority (**44%**) of the Consumer respondents are Graduates followed by PG & Professional Degree. (**28.8%**)

**Table 1.4 Occupational Level provided by Consumers**

<b>Occupational Level</b>	<b>Number of Consumers</b>	<b>Percent</b>
Self-employed	172	17.2
Government Employee	171	17.1
Private Employee	527	<b>52.7</b>
Others (Homemakers, Retired etc.)	130	13.0
<b>Total</b>	<b>1000</b>	<b>100.0</b>

The table 1.4 reveals that majority (**52.7%**) of the Consumer respondents are working as Private Employees.

**Table - 1.5 Family Size of Consumers**

<b>Family Size</b>	<b>Number of Consumers</b>	<b>Percent</b>
Two	149	14.9
Three	270	27.0
Four	335	<b>33.5</b>
Five	141	14.1
Six	51	5.1
Seven	38	3.8
Eight	14	1.4
Nine	2	0.2
<b>Total</b>	<b>1000</b>	<b>100.0</b>

The table 1.5 shows that sizeable portion (**33.5%**) of the Consumer Respondents belong to small family of 4 members.

**Table - 1.6 Place of Residence provided by Consumers**

<b>Place of Residence</b>	<b>Number of Consumers</b>	<b>Percent</b>
Rural	256	25.6
Semi-urban	285	28.5
Urban	459	<b>45.9</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>1000</b>	<b>100.0</b>

The table 1.6 reveals that majority (**45.9%**) of the Consumer respondents are residing in Urban areas.

**Table - 1.7 Employed Members in Family Level provided by Consumers**

Employed Members level	Number of Consumers	Percent
Single Employment	456	45.6
Multiple Employment	544	<b>54.4</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>1000</b>	<b>100.0</b>

The table 1.7 reveals that majority (**54.4%**) of the members in Consumer respondents have multiple employment.

**Table - 1.8 Monthly Income Level provided by Consumers**

Monthly Income level	Number of Consumers	Percent
Less than Rs.20K	463	<b>46.3</b>
Between Rs.20K – Rs.40K	390	39.0
More than Rs.40K	147	14.7
<b>Total</b>	<b>1000</b>	<b>100.0</b>

The table 1.8 reveals that majority (**46.3%**) of Consumer respondents have Less than Rs.20,000 as their Monthly Income level. Followed by Rs.20000-40000 (**39%**) level and more than Rs.40,000 level (**14.7%**)

**Table – 1.9 House Ownership Status provided by Consumers**

House Ownership Status	Number of Consumers	Percent
Own House	559	<b>55.9</b>
Rented House	325	32.5
Leased House	116	11.6
<b>Total</b>	<b>1000</b>	<b>100.0</b>

The table 1.9 reveals that majority (**55.9%**) of Consumer respondents have their own house, followed by rented house (**32.5%**) and leased house. (**11.6%**)

**Table - 1.10 Frequency of Durable goods purchased provided by Consumers**

Frequency of Durable goods Purchased	Number of consumers	Percent
Less than 3 years	355	35.5
Between 3- 7 years	395	<b>39.5</b>
More than 7 years	250	25.0
<b>Total</b>	<b>1000</b>	<b>100.0</b>

The table 1.10 reveals that sizeable (**39.5%**) Consumer respondents have frequency of purchase between 3 – 7 years followed by less than 3 years (**35.5%**) and more than 7 years. (**25%**)

**II. Dimensions of Consumer Respondents Variables**

The factor analysis applied to find the underlying dimensions of 12 Consumer respondents' variables and minimized them into a limited number of manageable and independent factors.

**Table – 1.11 Descriptive statistics and Communalities of Influencers Variables**

Influencers Variables	Mean	S.D	Communalities
Newspaper	4.14	1.045	0.641
Television	4.29	0.951	0.439
Magazines	3.32	1.227	0.533
Radio	3.12	1.320	<b>0.416</b>
Internet	3.85	1.253	0.578
Friends	3.91	1.086	0.607
Peer Group	3.46	1.183	0.455
Personal Experience	3.74	1.145	0.574
Relatives	3.31	1.245	0.629
Celebrities	2.85	1.307	0.489
Salesmen	2.92	1.292	<b>0.724</b>
Dealers	2.92	1.305	0.613

**Table - 1.12 KMO and Bartlett's Test for Factorization of Influencers Variables**

Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy	<b>0.706</b>
Bartlett's Test of Sphericity Approx. Chi-Square	<b>1713.910</b>
Df	<b>66</b>
P-Value	<b>0.000</b>

**Table - 1.13 Variance Explained by Influencers Factors**

Rotation Sums of Squared Loadings			
Component	Eigen Values	% of Variance	Cumulative %
1	1.960	<b>16.335</b>	16.335
2	1.641	<b>13.677</b>	30.011
3	1.628	<b>13.565</b>	43.577
4	1.470	<b>12.246</b>	<b>55.823</b>

**Table - 1.14 Influencers Factors and MSA**

Factors	Variables	Factor Loading	MSA
<b>Factor 1 Direct Influencers Factor</b>	Salesmen	0.838	0.640
	Dealers	0.773	0.638
	Celebrities	0.541	0.781

Factor 2 <b>Peer Influencers Factor</b>	Friends	0.743	0.724
	Internet	0.679	0.747
	Peer Group	0.574	0.793
Factor 3 <b>Media Influencers factor</b>	Newspaper	0.772	0.647
	Magazines	0.674	0.735
	Radio	0.516	<b>0.819</b>
	Television	0.442	0.684
Factor 4 <b>Personal Influencers Factor</b>	Relatives	0.748	0.708
	Personal Experience	0.728	<b>0.601</b>

The tables 1.11 to 1.14 shows that with the range of communalities of the 12 Influencers Variables from 0.416 to 0.724 and that of MSA from 0.601 to 0.819, KMO Measure of Sampling Adequacy Value of 0.706 and Chi-Square Value of 1,713.910 at d.f of 66 with P- Value of 0.000 in Barlett's Test of Sphericity, the Factor Analysis is applicable for factorization of the Influencers Variables.

**Four factors** have been extracted and they explain **55.823%** of the variance in the 12 Influencers Variables. The most dominant one is factor 1 with the explained variance of **16.335%** and it has 3 Influencers Variables of which, Salesmen for all has the maximum correlation with it followed by Dealers and Celebrities. Therefore, it has been labeled as **Direct Influencers Factor**.

The second most dominant one is factor 2 with the explained variance of **13.677%** which consists 3 Influencers Variables namely, Friends followed by Internet and Peer group and it has been named as **Peer Influencers Factor**.

The third most dominant one is factor 3 with the explained variance of **13.565%** which consists of 4 variables namely newspaper followed by Magazines, Radio and Television and it has been named as **Media Influencers Factor**.

The last dominant one is factor 4, with the explained variance of **12.246%** which consists of 2 variables namely Relatives and Personal experience and it has been named as **Personal Influencers Factor**.

Thus 12 Influencers variables have been reduced to 4 independent factors of which the most dominant one is Direct Influencers Factor followed by Peer Influencers Factor, Media Influencers Factor and Personal Influencers Factor.

## **DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS OF INFLUENCERS FACTORS AND TOTAL SCORES**

The descriptive statistics of 4 Influencers factors and Influencers total scores have been estimated and shown in table 1.15.

**Table - 1.15 Descriptive Statistics of Influencers Factors and Total Scores**

Description	Direct Influencers Factor	Peer Influencers Factor	Media Influencers Factor	Personal Influencers Factor	Influencers Total Score
Mean	8.868	11.215	14.867	7.050	41.820
Median	9.000	12.000	15.000	7.000	42.000
Mode	9.000	12.000	14.000	7.000	41.000
Std. Deviation	3.035	2.517	2.915	1.918	6.875
Skewness	-0.052	-0.581	-0.322	-0.414	-0.049
Std. Error of Skewness	0.077	0.077	0.077	0.077	0.077
Kurtosis	-0.780	-0.085	0.007	-0.347	-0.154
Std. Error of Kurtosis	0.155	0.155	0.155	0.155	0.155
Minimum	3.000	3.000	4.000	2.000	21.000
Maximum	15.000	15.000	20.000	10.000	60.000
Q1	6.000	10.000	13.000	6.000	37.000
Q3	11.000	13.000	17.000	9.000	47.000
Out of maximum score	15.000	15.000	20.000	10.000	60.000

The table 1.15 indicates that with lesser standard deviation values, the mean values of all 4 Influencers factors and Influencers total scores are the robust measures of them. There is a slight negative skewness not only in each of the four Influencers factor distributions but also in the Influencers total scores.

### III. Formation of MLS Dominant Groups

An attempt made to classify all consumer respondents into Distinctive Dominant clusters significantly differentiated by 4 MLS factors The results given in the tables 1.15 to 1.24

**Table - 1.16 Influencers Factor Wise Initial Influencers Cluster Means**

Influencers Factors	Cluster		
	1	2	3
Direct Influencers Factor	15.000	3.000	3.000
Peer Influencers Factor	15.000	11.000	5.000
Media Influencers Factor	12.000	20.000	5.000
Personal Influencers Factor	10.000	2.000	8.000

**Table - 1.17 Influencers Factor Wise Final Influencers Cluster Means**

Influencers Factors	Cluster		
	1	2	3
Direct Influencers Factor	11.440	5.980	7.760
Peer Influencers Factor	12.490	11.880	8.950

Media Influencers Factor	16.510	15.600	12.070
Personal Influencers Factor	7.780	6.760	6.400

**Table - 1.18 Influencers Cluster Frequency Table**

Clusters	Number of Consumer Respondents	Percent
1	395	39.5
2	296	29.6
3	309	30.9
<b>Total</b>	<b>1,000</b>	<b>100.0</b>

**Table - 1.19 Influencers Factor Wise Test of Equality of Influencers Cluster Mean Values**

Influencers Factors	Wilks' Lambda	F	df1	df2	P-Value	Inference
Direct Influencers Factor	0.412	712.863	2	997	0.000	<b>Significant</b>
Peer Influencers Factor	0.627	296.779	2	997	0.000	<b>Significant</b>
Media Influencers Factor	0.571	374.880	2	997	0.000	<b>Significant</b>
Personal Influencers Factor	0.900	55.353	2	997	0.000	<b>Significant</b>

**Table - 1.20 Eigen Values of Discriminant Functions in Influencers Clusters**

Function	Eigen value	% of Variance	Cumulative %	Canonical Correlation
1	<b>2.026</b>	<b>68.000</b>	68.000	<b>0.818</b>
2	0.952	32.000	100.000	0.698

**Table - 1.21 Wilks' Lambda Test of Discriminant functions in Influencers Clusters**

Test of Function(s)	Wilks' Lambda	Chi-square	Df	P-Value	Inference
1 through 2	0.169	1768.153	8	<b>0.000</b>	<b>Significant</b>
2	0.512	665.920	3	<b>0.000</b>	<b>Significant</b>

**Table - 1.22 Influencers Factor wise Standardized Canonical Discriminant Functional Coefficients**

Influencers Factors	1	2
Direct Influencers Factor	0.589	-0.803
Peer Influencers Factor	0.488	0.550
Media Influencers Factor	0.611	0.518
Personal Influencers Factor	0.161	0.007



**Table - 1.23 Influencers Factor wise structure Matrix of Discriminant Factors in Discriminant Functions**

Influencers Factors	1	2
Media Influencers Factor	<b>0.543</b>	0.404
Peer Influencers Factor	<b>0.475</b>	0.381
Personal Influencers Factor	<b>0.233</b>	-0.034
Direct Influencers Factor	0.677	<b>0.725</b>

**Table - 1.24 Classification Results in Formation of Influencers Clusters**

Cluster Number	Predicted Group Membership			Total
	1	2	3	
1	<b>391</b>	1	3	<b>395</b>
2	5	<b>287</b>	4	<b>296</b>
3	0	11	<b>298</b>	<b>309</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>396</b>	<b>299</b>	<b>305</b>	<b>1000</b>

The tables 1.15 to 1.24 shows that 3 dominant clusters have been formed significantly differentiated by all four Influencers Variables. Of the two Discriminant functions, the most Discriminant function with Eigen value of 2.026 and Canonical correlation of 0.818 and also with Wilk's Lambda value of 0.169 and the Chi-Square value of 1,768.153 at df 8 and 0.000 level of significance, explains 68% of variance in the differentiation. In it the most dominant factor is Media Influencers factor followed by Peer Influencers factor and Personal Influencer factor.

The second Discriminant function with Eigen value of 0.952 and canonical correlation of 0.698 and also with Wilk's Lambda value of 0.512 and Chi-square value of 665.920 at 3 df and 0.000 level of significance explains 32% of variance in the differentiation. In it, the most dominating factor is Direct Influencers factor.

The table 1.19 shows that the first dominant cluster formed has 395 respondents constituting 39.5% of the 1000 total Consumer respondents covered in the study. The second and the third dominant clusters have 296 and 309 respondents comprising of 29.6% and 30.9% of total respondents respectively. The table 1.24 reveals that 97.6% of classification is correct.

#### DESCRIPTION OF DOMINANT INFLUENCERS GROUPS

The description of the Influencers dominant groups which are significantly differentiated by all four Influencers factors has been shown in table 1.25.

**Table - 1.25 Description of Dominant Influencers Clusters/Groups**

Influencers Factors	Clusters	Mean	S.D	Rank	Description
<b>Direct Influencers Factor</b>	1	11.438	1.693	1	Highest Direct Influencers
	2	5.983	1.728	3	High Direct Influencers
	3	7.764	2.402	2	Higher Direct Influencers

<b>Peer Influencers Factor</b>	1	12.494	1.908	1	Highest Peer Influencers
	2	11.875	1.785	2	Higher Peer Influencers
	3	8.948	2.274	3	High Peer Influencers
<b>Media Influencers Factor</b>	1	16.509	2.238	1	Highest Media Influencers
	2	15.598	2.139	2	Higher Media Influencers
	3	12.068	2.224	3	High Media Influencers
<b>Personal Influencers Factor</b>	1	7.780	1.778	1	Highest Personal Influencers
	2	6.757	1.898	2	Higher Personal Influencers
	3	6.398	1.800	3	High Personal Influencers
<b>Influencers Total Score</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>48.221</b>	<b>7.617</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>Highest Influencers</b>
	<b>2</b>	<b>40.213</b>	<b>7.550</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>Higher Influencers</b>
	<b>3</b>	<b>35.178</b>	<b>8.700</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>High Influencers</b>

## VI FINDINGS OF THE STUDY

- The table 1.25 shows that the Most Dominant Influencers Group is Cluster 1. This is formed by all the Highest Direct Influencers, Peer Influencers, Media Influencers and Personal Influencers factors. Therefore, it is named as **Highest Influencers Group**.
- The Second Most Dominant Influencers Group is Cluster 2. This is formed by High Direct Influencer and Higher Peer Influencers, Media Influencers and Personal Influencers factors. Therefore, it is named as **Higher Influencers Group**.
- The Third Most Dominant Influencers Group is Cluster 3. This is formed by Higher Direct Influencers and High Peer Influencers, Media Influencers and Personal Influencers factors. Therefore, it is named as **High Influencers Group**.
- Thus, all 1000 Consumer respondents have been classified into 3 dominant Influencers groups of Highest Influencers group, Higher Influencers group and High Influencers group significantly differentiated by all 4 Influencers factors with 2 significant Discriminant functions

## VII CONCLUSION

To conclude that majority (**57.5%**) of the Consumer respondents belong to the gender group of Male. Originate from small families and having under graduate degree working in private employees, residing in own house in Urban areas. With less than Rs.20000 of monthly income and frequency of purchasing durable product between 3 to 7 years. Four influencer factors of Direct Influencers Factor, Peer Influencers Factor, and Personal Influencers Factor have been extracted and they significantly differentiate all consumer respondents into 3 dominant Influencers groups of Highest Influencers group, Higher Influencers group and High Influencers group

## REFERENCES:

- Edison Anthony Raj. A. I. (2021). Dimensions of Marital Roles on Product Purchase Decision-Making. *Quing: International Journal of Commerce and Management*, 1(2), 54-66. <https://doi.org/10.54368/qijcm.1.2.0004>

Hong Huan, Zhou Lijun Research on Consumer's Purchase Decisio Advances in Social Science, *Education and Humanities Research*, volume 344.2018

Irmam riskiana,Sri wahyuningsi.Factors influencing consumer behavior towards the purchase decision of instant megono of Anglur selur production pekalongan city-International cconference on food science and Enginerein 2023-P1.8

Mridanish Jha, A comparative study of the buying behaviour of rural and urban consumers towards mobile phone in Bihar, *International journal of advanced research in Management and social science*, 2013,volume 2, No.4, P.114-125

Tao chen, Premaratne Samaranayake The Impact of Online Reviews on Consumers' Purchasing Decisions: Evidence From an Eye-Tracking Stud Frontiers Research Foundation 2022 P, 1-13

Wassana Suwanvijit and Sompong Promsa-ad,The insight study of consumer life-styles and purchasing behaviour in Songkla Province,Thailand, *International Journal of Marketing Studies*, 2009, Volume 1, Issue No.2,P.66-73