
Influence of Family's Attitude Towards Buying Decisions in Case of Durable Products

Dr. Dinesh Kumar¹, Dr. Shish Pal², Sarita³, Sujata Bhambu⁴

^{1,3,4}Assistant Professor, Department. of Commerce, F. G. M. Govt. College, Adampur (Hisar)

²Assistant Professor, Gateway Institute of Engineering and Technology, Sonapat, Haryana, 130001

shishpal007@gmail.com

Abstract

The present research study aims to examine the influence of family's attitude in buying decisions in case of durable products. A family is a social unit in which all members are impacted by one another. Family relationships are stronger than those of any other group, and all members of the family act as a unified decision-making unit when purchasing durable goods. Research was conducted on a 100 people of Haryana, India. Findings of study reported that children take more participation in decision making. More than fifty per cent respondents reported that every family play role in decision making. Majority of the respondents do analysis before purchasing. Half of the respondents' expensive product because they have worth it. Most of parents don't prefer online shopping. In the majority of cases family head take the decision. Only one fourth of respondents reported that they purchase products after seeing advertising. For majority of respondents' family culture, quality and EMI facility are important for purchasing in durable product. Nuclear family agreed more than family influence buying decisions rather than joint family.

Keywords: Family, Decision Making, Attitude, Durable Products and India

Introduction

The term "active impacts" refers to patterns of behaviour within a family that are seen as being directed at other people, as opposed to solely the attitudes of family members about their own body image. The ideas and anticipations expressed by members of the family are valued and appreciated by other members of the family, including spouses and other relatives in addition to parents and siblings. The members of a family are able to convey effectively the standards, expectations, and values about body image and looks. Communication may take both direct and indirect forms, depending on how it is conveyed via implicit perceptions and actions. Other kin processes that are unrelated to aesthetics may also have an effect on the body image of family members. The phrase "family life education" refers to educational ideas and experiences that have an impact on one's perspective

towards family life, personal relationships, and sexual development. Family history arose as a separate academic subfield in the 1970s, maintaining close connections to the fields of anthropology and sociology throughout its development. The United States and Canada were the two countries that were most affected by the trend. The emphasis is placed on demographic tendencies as well as public policies. The 15th century saw the beginning of the use of the family term. It is derived from the Latin term *famulus*, which means "servant," and it simply refers to a group of people who lived together under the same roof and comprised both blood relatives and servants.

The traditional model of the joint family unit has finally been abolished. It was patriarchal in character, with a large family size, a low standing for women inside the family, no individual identity among family members, and the ability to make decisions resting

completely in the hands of the family's oldest male member. The family no longer functions as a patriarchy in the conventional sense; rather, it is now organised as a patri-local household. There is a significant amount of freedom for individuals, and the oldest male member of the family is no longer the only one who can make decisions for the family. The bulk of decisions affecting the family are now reached by group consensus, reflecting the more democratic nature of the modern family. However, the degree to which autonomy and democracy are practised varies from region to region, community to community, and caste to caste. This is because the degree to which a community, community, or caste has adapted to contemporary values and urban lifestyles determines the degree to which it has been able to exercise autonomy and democracy.

Review of Literature

Thomson et al. (2007) concluded that children have high involvement in the decision making, they have direct impact on the buying decision. They prove a number of state-of-the-art have an effect on behaviours that protected justifying and highlighting the blessings of purchases, forming coalitions, compromising and final persistent. These behaviours have been underpinned and superior via way of means of using product-associated know-how and information, which become regarded undoubtedly and recommended via way of means of parents.

Roberts et al. (1981) found that at least 3 attitudinal dimensions - economic, health-associated and liberal as opposed to conservative have an effect on the diploma to which moms record youngsters are influential. Degree of affect had a substantial impact on the quantity of own circle of relatives' utilization of a fixed of products, all of that are suitable for intake through a unmarried individual. Areas wherein similarly studies are wanted are discussed, as are managerial implications.

Gunawan (2015) concluded that there is massive effect of patron motivation, belief and mind-set closer to patron buying selection and there are similarity and

variations patron conduct among Surabaya and Jakarta patron.

Lee et al. (2002) concluded that moms who make a contribution to the availability in their households have widespread impact. Further, the quantity of impact exerted with the aid of using children is determined to be depending on their households' sex-function orientation and their moms' occupational status.

Kaur et al. (2006) investigated the difference between the decision making capabilities of children in India and the West and stated that the children in Indian families may not have the purchasing power as compared to westerners but are still the center of attention in Indian families and acted as a pillar in relationship building.

Sangkakoon et al. (2014) concluded that partner and kids have enough courting to are expecting domestic buy purpose. Children play the position in maximum have an impact on while predicting domestic buy purpose accompanied through partner, dad and mom and pals has the least have an impact on.

Objective of study:

- To examine the relationship between buying attitude and family decision.
- To examine the factors affecting buying decision.

Research Methodology:

Research design: The present study is exploratory cum descriptive research design sampling technique.

Target population: The present respondent of present study are middle level families has been collected.

Sampling size: Sample size for the research work has been taken as 101 responses.

Sampling area: sample data has been collected from youngsters, males, females of Haryana only

Sampling technique: for the selection of sample size random sampling technique is used.

Type of data: the data for the study has been collected from males, females and youngsters through the questionnaire so the nature of data collected for the study is primary.

Research Instrument: the data for the study has been collected with the help of self-structured questionnaire.

Statistical tools: in this study for purpose of analysis statistics mean, percentage, t – test etc have been used.

Table 1: Demographics of the Sample

Demographic variable	Group	Frequency	Percentage
Gender	Male	29	71.6%
	Female	72	28.4%
Monthly family income	Up to 15000	26	27.3%
	15001 to 3000	32	29.3%
	30001 to 45000	22	22.2%
	45001 to 60000	6	06.00%
	Up to 60000	15	15.2%
Type of family	Nuclear family	57	55.9%
	Joint family	44	44.1%
No. of members in a family	Up to 2	2	01. 9%
	2 to 4	37	36.3%
	4 to 6	40	40.2%
	Above 6	22	21.6%
Age of group decision maker in your family.	15 to 22	4	4.6%
	22 to 27	3	3.2%
	27 to 36	16	15.7%
	36 to 43	25	24.5%
	Above 43	53	52%
From where you get the information about the durable products.	TV	29	29.7%
	Advertisement	10	9.9%
	Newspaper	44	43.6%
	Social media	16	16.8%
	Outdoor media	99	
What is your insight, regarding TV advertisement?	No effect	40	42.3%
	Decider	23	21.6%
	Switcher	21	21.6%
	Purchase same brand	12	14.4%
For which brand you are most aware	Samsung	43	43.1%
	IG	37	36.3%
	Sony	18	17.6%
	Panasonic	3	03 %
What kind of platform is used detail information about the product	Google	55	53.9%
	You tube	24	23.5%
	Social media	16	16.7%
	Advice of others	6	5.9%

Source: Primary Data

Table 1 Depicts the demographic profile of the respondents. Total of 101 responses collected through the online link of google form. Out of total sample, 71.6% respondents are females and 28.4% are males. Only 15.2% respondent's family income is high (Above 60000) and only 6% respondent's income

belongs to 45001 to 60000 and 27.3% respondent's family income up to 15000. From this survey it is found that 55.9% respondents belong to nuclear family and 44.1% are joint families. Only 21.6% respondents having above 6 members in a family and 40.2% respondents come in 4 to 6 family member category.

Only 1.9% respondents belong to up to 2-member category. The 52% from age group of above 43 years play the most important role in decision making and respondent from the age group 22 to 27 years play less important role in decision making. The 43.6% people are getting the information about the durable product from social media and then 29.7% people are getting from TV advertisement and very few (9.9%) respondents get information from newspaper 42.3% people are having no effect regarding TV

advertisement then 21.6% people lies in both decides or switcher and only 14.4% people or respondent purchase same brand, 43.1% respondents are most nose aware of Samsung brand then 36.3% respondent are L.G only 3% respondent are Panasonic brand aware, 53.9% people users google platforms for detailed information about the product and 23.5% people uses you tube and 5.9% of people taking advice of others for of people taking advice of others for getting the information about the product.

Table 2 frequency and percentage

Variables	Strongly Disagree(%)	Disagree (%)	Neutral (%)	Agree (%)	Strongly Agree(%)
Every person in my family have an active participant in the purchase decision.	7 (6.9%)	5 (5.0%)	23 (22.8%)	33 (22.7%)	33(32.7%)
Analysis is more important before purchasing the products.	4 (4.0%)	5 (5.0 %)	10 (9.9 %)	23 (22.8%)	58 (57.4 %)
I will buy the product which is expensive but still worth because of its quality.	2 (2.0 %)	6 (5.9 %)	17 (16.8 %)	32 (31.7 %)	44 (43.6%)
My parents don't prefer online shopping.	19 (18.8 %)	11 (10.9 %)	35 (34.7 %)	13(12.9 %)	22 (21.8 %)
Family head make all the decision in my Family.	9 (8.9 %)	8 (7.9 %)	23 (22.8 %)	29 (28.7 %)	31 (30.7 %)
My Family buy products after seeing advertisement .	14 (13.9 %)	28 (27.7 %)	27 (26.7 %)	17 (16.8 %)	13 (12.9 %)
Family culture influence purchase decision.	7 (6.9 %)	12 (11.9 %)	26 (25.7 %)	33 (32.7 %)	22 (21.8%)
My family purchases products on recommendation.	4 (4.0%)	13 (12.9%)	35 (34.7%)	26 (25.7%)	21 (20.08%)
Children's influences more in purchasing decision.	7 (6.9%)	20 (19.8%)	26 (25.7%)	31 (30.7%)	15 (14.9%)
My family prefer to buy the products on discounts / offers.	3 (3%)	10 (9.9%)	24 (23.8%)	36 (35.5%)	27 (26.7%)
My Family 's religious practices influence buying decisions .	10 (9.9%)	23 (22.8%)	26 (25.7%)	23 (22.8%)	16 (15.8%)
Quality is more important for my family .	2 (2%)	2 (2%)	9 (8.9%)	23 (22.8%)	61 (60.4%)
After sales services more important for my family .	4 (4%)	0 (0 %)	18 (17.8%)	37 (36.6%)	40 (39.6%)
EMI facility is important for purchasing the durable products.	10 (9.9%)	14 (13.9%)	15 (14.9%)	27 (26.7%)	35 (34.7%)

Source: Primary Data

Table 2 shows the frequency and percentage regarding the role of family in decision making. In case of every

family member participation in decision making only 33% respondent are strongly agreed and 23% respondents are neutral and 5% respondent disagreed.

In case of analysis before purchasing the product 58% respondents are strongly agreed, 23% respondent are neutral and 4% respondent are strongly disagreed. In case of buy the product which is expensive but still worth, only 44% respondent are strongly agreed, 32% respondents are agreed and only 2% people are strongly disagreed. 35% respondent are neutral regarding my parents don't prefer online shopping and 22% people believe in strongly agreed and 19% respondents are strongly disagreed. In case of family head decision making 31% respondents are strongly agreed 23% respondents are neutral and 9% people are strongly disagreed. In case of my family buy product after seeing advertisement only 27% respondents are

neutral and 13% are strongly agreed or 14% respondents are strongly disagreed. In case of family culture influence decision 26% people in neutral 22 % people are strongly agree .35% respondent are neutral and 21% respondent are strongly agreed or 4% respondent are strongly disagreed in case of family purchases product on recommendation 31% people are agree or 7% respondents are strongly disagreed in children's influences more in purchasing decision. In case of quality 61% people are strongly agree or 2% strongly disagree. 40% respondent are strongly agreed or 18% are neutral but 4% respondent are strongly disagreed in case of EMI facility is important for purchasing in durable product.

Table 3. Results of t-test on the basis of gender

Sr. No.	Variables	Gender	N	Mean	SD	t- value	p-value
1.	Every person in my family have an active participant in the purchase decision .	Male	29	3.93	1.132	0.775	0.442
		Female	72	3.74	1.175		
2.	Analysis is more important before purchasing the products .	Male	28	4.36	1.129	0.543	0.589
		Female	72	4.22	1.078		
3.	I will buy the product which is expensive but still worth because of its quality .	Male	29	4.10	1.012	0.90	0.928
		female	72	4.08	1.017		
4.	My parents don't prefer online shopping.	Male	29	2.93	1.438	-0.673	0.504
		female	71	3.14	1.355		
5.	Family head make all the decision in my Family.	Male	29	3.17	1.513	-2.178	0.35
		female	71	3.85	1.078		
6.	My Family buy products after seeing advertisement .	Male	29	2.52	1.243	-1.820	0.075
		female	70	3.01	1.222		
7.	Family culture influence purchase decision.	Male	29	3.45	1.270	-0.320	0.750
		female	71	3.54	1.132		
8.	My family purchases products on recommendation.	Male	29	3.21	1.264	-1.438	0.158
		female	70	3.59	1.000		
9.	Children's influences more in purchasing decision .	Male	29	3.07	1.223	-1.091	0.281
		female	70	3.36	1.130		
10.	My family prefer to buy the products on discounts / offers.	Male	29	3.52	1.184	-1.256	0.216
		female	71	3.83	1.000		
11.	My Family 's religious practices influence buying decisions .	Male	28	2.71	1.272	-2.044	0.047
		female	70	3.29	1.193		
12.	Quality is more important for my family .	Male	28	4.29	1.117	-0.893	0.378
		female	69	4.49	0.797		
13.	After sales services more important for my family .	Male	28	4.29	0.854	1.054	0.297
		female	71	4.08	0.858		
14.	EMI facility is important for purchasing the durable products.	Male	29	3.62	1.449	-0.14	0.989
		female	72	3.63	1.316		

Source: Primary Data

Table shows the results of t-test on family's attitude across the gender. The p-value of t-test is more than .05 which is found to be insignificant for Every person in my family have an active participant in the purchase decision. It concludes that there is no significant difference regarding the statement, every person in my family have an active participant in the purchase decision on the basis of gender.

The p-value of the t-test is found significant for the item, My Family's religious practices influence buying decisions which concludes that there is significant in opinions of male and female regarding My Family's religious practices influence buying decisions. On the basis of mean value, it can be concluded that the female respondents agreed more on that My Family's religious practices influence buying decisions than male.

Table 4: Results of t-test on the basis of family type

Sr. No.	Items	Family type	N	Mean	SD	t- value	P -value
1.	Every person in my family have an active participant in the purchase decision .	Nuclear family	57	3.89	1.160	1.012	0.314
		Joint family	44	3.66	1.160		
2.	Analysis is more important before purchasing the products .	Nuclear family	57	4.39	0.940	1.287	0.202
		Joint family	43	4.09	1.250		
3.	I will buy the product which is expensive but still worth because of its quality .	Nuclear family	57	4.18	0.928	0.954	0.343
		Joint family	44	3.98	1.110		
4.	My parents don't prefer online shopping .	Nuclear family	56	2.84	1.359	-2.005	0.048
		Joint Family	44	3.39	1.351		
5.	Family head make all the decision in my Family.	Nuclear family	56	3.41	1.304	-2.241	0.027
		Joint family	44	3.95	1.120		
6.	My Family buy products after seeing advertisement .	Nuclear family	56	2.84	1.172	-0.263	0.793
		Joint family	43	2.91	1.342		
7.	Family culture influence purchase decision.	Nuclear family	56	3.30	1.127	-2.014	0.047
		Joint family	44	3.77	1.179		
8.	My family purchases products on recommendation.	Nuclear family	56	3.36	1.034	-1.209	0.230
		Joint family	43	3.63	1.155		
9.	Children's influences more in purchasing decision .	Nuclear family	56	3.32	1.097	0.467	0.641
		Joint family	43	3.21	1.245		

10.	My family prefer to buy the products on discounts / offers.	Nuclear family	56	3.66	1.066		
		Joint family	44	3.84	1.055	-0.844	0.401
11.	My Family 's religious practices influence buying decisions .	Nuclear family	56	2.88	1.280		
		Joint family	42	3.45	1.109	-2.387	0.019
12.	Quality is more important for my family	Nuclear family	55	4.45	0.899		
		Joint family	42	3.45	0.912	0.268	0.789
13.	After sales services more important for my family .	Nuclear family	56	4.45	0.796		
		Joint family	43	4.40	0.941	0.19	0.985
14.	EMI facility is important for purchasing the durable products.	Nuclear family	57	3.39	1.424		
		Joint family	44	3.93	1.189	-2.098	0.038

Source: Primary Data

Table 4 shows the results of t-test on family's attitude across the type of family. The p-value of t-test is more than .05 which is found to be insignificant for Every person in my family have an active participant in the purchase, Analysis is more important before purchasing the products, I will buy the product which is expensive but still worth because of its quality, My Family buy products after seeing advertisement, after sales services more important for my family, Quality is more important for my family. From the above this statement we concluded that nuclear family is less agreed upon buy the product which is expensive but still worth due to its quality.

The p- value of the t-test is found significant for the item, my parents don't prefer online shopping, Family head make all the decision in my Family, My Family influence buying decisions, EMI facility is important for purchasing the durable products. This statement value is lower than the (0.05). On the basis of mean value, it can be concluded that nuclear family agreed more than family influence buying decisions rather than joint family.

Conclusion

More than fifty per cent respondents reported that every family play role in decision making. Majority of the respondents do analysis before purchasing. Half of the respondents' expensive product because they have worth it. Most of parents don't prefer online shopping. In the majority of cases family head take the decision. Only one fourth of respondents reported that they purchase products after seeing advertising. For majority of respondents' family culture, quality and EMI facility are important for purchasing in durable product. Nuclear family agreed more than family influence buying decisions rather than joint family.

References

1. Algan, Y., Cahuc, P., Boeri, T., & Fogli, A. (2005, January). The Roots of Low European Employment: Family Culture?[with Comments]. In NBER International Seminar on Macroeconomics (Vol. 2005, No. 1, pp. 65-123).
2. Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press. Balakrishnan, L., & Kumar, C. S. (2011). Effect of Celebrity Based Advertisements on the Purchase Attitude of Consumers towards Durable

- Products (A study with reference to the city of Chennai). *World Review of Business Research*, 1(2), 98-112.
3. Gil, R. B., Andres, E. F., & Salinas, E. M. (2007). Family as a source of consumer-based brand equity. *Journal of product & brand management*.
 4. Gunawan, S. (2015). The Impact of Motivation, Perception and Attitude toward Consumer Purchasing Decision: A Study Case of Surabaya and Jakarta Society on Carl's Junior. *IBuss Management*, 3(2).
 5. Hempel, D. J. (1975). Family role structure and housing decisions. *ACR North American Advances*.
 6. Kumar, R., & Kaushal, S. K. (2017). Examining factors affecting consumers' attitude and purchase intention with special reference to electronic durable goods. *NMIMS Management Review*, 35(3), 25-45.
 7. Lee, C. K., & Beatty, S. E. (2002). Family structure and influence in family decision making. *Journal of consumer marketing*. Thomson, E. S., Laing, A. W., & McKee, L. (2007). Family purchase decision making: Exploring child influence behaviour. *Journal of Consumer Behaviour: An International Research Review*, 6(4), 182-202.
 8. Liobikienė, G., & Bernatoniene, J. (2017). Why determinants of green purchase cannot be treated equally? The case of green cosmetics: Literature review. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 162, 109-120.
 9. Martinez, E., & Polo, Y. (1999). Determining factors in family purchasing behaviour: an empirical investigation. *Journal of consumer marketing*.
 10. Rai, N. (2013). Impact of advertising on consumer behaviour and attitude with reference to consumer durables. *International Journal of Management Research and Business Strategy*, 2(2), 74-79.
 11. Kaur, P., & Singh, R. (2006). Children in family purchase decision making in India and the West: A review. *Academy of marketing science review*, 2006, 1.
 12. Roberts, M. L., Wortzel, L. H., & Berkeley, R. L. (1981). Mothers' attitudes and perceptions of children's influence and their effect on family consumption. *ACR North American Advances*
 13. Sangkakoon, P., Ngarmyarn, A., & Panichpathom, S. (2014). The influence of group references in home purchase intention in Thailand. *IDEAS Working Paper Series from RePEs, St. Louis*.
 14. Sangkakoon, P., Ngarmyarn, A., & Panichpathom, S. (2014). The influence of group references in home purchase intention in Thailand. *IDEAS Working Paper Series from RePEs, St. Louis*.
 15. Spiro, R. L. (1983). Persuasion in family decision-making. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 9(4), 393-402.
 16. Swinyard, W. R., & Sim, C. P. (1987). Perception of children's influence on family decision processes. *Journal of Consumer Marketing*.
 17. Valaskova, K., Klietkova, J., & Krizanova, A. (2018). Consumer perception of private label products: An empirical research. *Journal of Competitiveness*, 10(3), 149.