

# Effects Of Demographic Factors On Impulse Buying Behaviour Of Consumers In Auchi, Edo State, Nigeria

**Ugbomhe O. Ugbomhe (PhD)**

Department of Business Administration  
Ambrose Alli University, Ekpoma, Edo State, Nigeria  
TEL: 08067177484  
e-mail: ugbomhe2017@gmail.com

**Akhator, Akhere Peter (PhD)**

Department of Business Administration  
Ambrose Alli University, Ekpoma, Edo State, Nigeria

**Prof. Audu, E. Dangana (PhD)**

Department of Business Administration  
Kogi State University, Anyagba, Nigeria

*pp 126-138*

## ABSTRACT

The objective of the study was to determine the effects of demographic factors (Age, Gender, Income, Education, Marital Status and Occupation) on impulse buying behaviour of consumers in Auchi. The study adopted survey design. The population of the study consisted all consumers who have made purchases in their present shopping trip in selected shops (supermarkets). The sample size of 384 was determined using Godden's formula cited in Sangatang, Siochi and Plaza (2017). The main research instrument was questionnaire which was used to survey 384 respondents (192 males and 192 females). Non-probability convenience sampling was used in administering copies of questionnaire to the respondents. Multiple regression analysis was used to determine result for the data collected with the aid of SPSS 20.0. The multiple regression analysis result revealed among others that demographic characteristics (age, gender, income, education, marital status) had significant relationship with impulse buying behavior of consumers. The study concluded that demographic characteristics of consumers can explain the impulse buying behavior of consumers. The reason is that the study shows significant relationship between demographic characteristics and impulse buying behaviour of consumers might be related to the respondent's perception about purchasing decision. The study recommended that consumer should arrange their priorities and always weigh specific weight of their preferences in relation to each other according to a particular pattern when purchasing products to prevent buying on impulse.

**Key words:** Age, gender, income, marital status, occupation, impulse buying behavior.

## Introduction

One of the most fundamental topics of buying decision of consumers acknowledge by researcher and workers globally is impulse buying behaviour. It has attracted research investigations because the result seems to be discomformed between what people plan to do or buy and what they finally buy (Utierrez, 2002). Impulse buying is made up of 80% of all purchases and that purchases of new products are due to demographic characteristics than from planned expenditure.

Shopping can be traced to many civilizations in history (<http://en.wikipedia.shopping>). Shopping is the examining of goods and services from retailers with the intent to purchasing at that time. When a consumer is shopping, he/she creates a behavior or impulse buying behavior. That buying behaviour is described as any purchase which a shopper makes but has not planned in advanced. Impulse buyers usually do not set one with the definite aim of visiting some particular store for purchasing certain item (Beatty & Fenell, 1998; Baumeister, 2002; Stern, 1962 cited in [www.ukessey.com](http://www.ukessey.com))

Kacen and Lee (2002) cited in Ekeng, Lifu and Asinya (2012) described impulse buying as an unplanned purchase characterized by somewhat rapid decision-making and a subjective prejudice in favour of immediate possession. It is the unexpected occurrence and immediate purchase decision inside a store with no previous or advanced intention to buy the specific product or products (Gahni, Imran & Jan, 2011). Impulse buying behaviour is made up of previous unplanned purchases (Srivastava & Joshi, 2014). These definitions point out that impulse buying relates to unplanned and unopposed buying decision of a product probably because of its price, fanciful design and the like.

Store layout, browsing, demographic characteristics will encourage consumers to change their shopping habits towards engaging more deeply in buying. This could trigger the impulse buying behaviour. According to Annie Seeley, a food commission nutritionist observed that seventy percent of confectionary products are bought on impulse (Marketing Week, 2003 cited in <http://www.uniasignment.com>). The statement by Annie Seeley can make marketing to realize the importance of triggering the impulse buying behaviour and start placing items near the counters. This is the reason why there are lot of candies and chocolates on the counter or beside the passage way of an exit to trigger the impulse buying behaviour.

Generally, three crucial factors: dynamics incentive, impulsiveness of consumers and situational factors

such as tendency to enjoying shopping and different occasions rather than the product itself can have the power to produce required effects in creating impulse buying behaviour (Mathai & Haridas, 2014). It is of high importance to show factors influencing impulse buying behaviour, acknowledge informed customers in purchase certain products and loyal customers which the most crucial service of communicative advantage in present competitive market, from customers who buy without plan and follow irregular pattern in their selection to develop more effective marketing plan. (Sacednia & Goudozi, 2014; Jalali et al cited in Abbasi, 2017).

## Statement of the Problem

In the literature, many factors have been linked to impulse buying behaviour among consumers. Factors such as consumer characteristics (excitement, self-esteem, new product knowledge). Abasi (2017) customers' mood, Rook and Gardner (1993) culture forces (Kacen & Lee, 2002); product investment, Jones Reynold, Weun (2003); presence of peers (Luo, 2005), emotion (Silvera, Lavack & Kropp, 2008); Chang (Eckman & Yan, 2011). Cultural values and lifestyle (Bashir, Zeeshan, Hussain and Sarki, 2013) have been used to determine impulse buying of consumer. Unfortunately, and sadly, majority of these studies were conducted in western and developed societies, but such studies have not been carried out in Africa. These studies have focused only on certain aspects of impulse buying behaviour in relation to the specific topic. There appears to be few empirical and theoretical studies which investigated demographic characteristics on impulse buying behaviour of consumers particularly in Edo State in particular and Nigeria in general with diverse culture and consumers with different socio-economic background. It is against this background that this study intends giving empirical analysis of the relationship that exists between demographic characteristics and impulse buying behaviour of consumer.

## Objectives of the Study

1. To determine whether demographic factors of income, age, occupation, education, marital status have simultaneous influence on impulse buying behaviour of consumers in Auchi Edo State.
2. To ascertain whether young consumers are prone to impulse buying behaviour than aged consumers in Auchi, Edo State.

## Research Questions

1. Do income, age, occupation, education and marital status have simultaneous influence on impulse buying behaviour of consumer in Auchi, Edo State?
2. Do young consumers prone to impulse buying behaviour than aged consumers in Auchi, Edo State?

### Hypotheses

H<sub>01</sub>: Income, age, occupation, education and marital status have no simultaneous influence on impulse buying behaviour.

H<sub>02</sub>: Impulse buying behaviour is not inversely related to the age of consumer.

## LITERATURE REVIEW

### Conceptual Discussion

#### The Concept of Impulse buying behaviour

The definition of impulse buying is spurring of the moment, unplanned decision to buy, made just before a purchase ([www.bussdictionary.com](http://www.bussdictionary.com)). Stern (1962) cited in Minal, Sanjay and Urvashi (2012) show that impulse buying is synonym with “unplanned buying” and define it as “any purchase which a shopper makes but has not planned in advanced”. Impulse buying is the purchase of goods that may be unnecessary due to sudden urge or desire to have them. Impulse buying behaviour is becoming usual among consumers today (Zimmerman, 2012). Kraken and Lee (2002) stated that impulse buying has been presently described buying behaviour in which careful examination of the quickness of the decision-making process (Brick et al 2010 cited in [www.uniassignment.com](http://www.uniassignment.com)). The urge to consume can arouse emotional responses and is bound to take place without consideration of the consequences (Witmann & Paulus, 2008 cited in [www.uniassignment.com](http://www.uniassignment.com)). Sharma, Sivakumaran and Marshal (2010) has reconceptualise the notion of impulse buying and has identified that it takes place when individual do not plan, anticipate, hesitate when making purchase decisions, that is, when consumer make unintentional, unthoughtful and prompt purchases (Franken et al 2008 cited in [www.uniassignment.com](http://www.uniassignment.com)). The impulse buying behaviour is unintentional because the consumers are not specifically seeking for some products and made no plans to purchase the product. Yet, not all unintentional and unplanned purchases inevitably mean an impulse buying (Jones 2003; Lee & Kacen, 2008). Impulse buying behaviour is unthoughtful because customers do not focus on the outcomes of their purchase, what really matters to them is to satisfy their instant desire. It is a very short sawash

of time between seeing and purchasing the product and buying decision is taken in a lark. Consumers consume impulsively as they realize that they have only one opportunity to buy a specific product, so they have likely to buy right away without any other consideration (Kacen & Lee, 2002).

### Demographic characteristics

These factors define people on the basis of age, sex, income, education, occupation and marital status.

Gender: According to Coley and Burgess (2003) men's and women's buying behaviour is different on several grounds; they possess information differently, purchase different products for separate reasons and perform shopping activity differently (Berni & Chimer, 2001). Several researchers have discovered that women are more likely to engage in impulse consumption as compared to men (Muller et al, 2002; Norum, 2008, Lai, 2010 in [www.uniassignment.com](http://www.uniassignment.com)). The issue is further observed by Dittmer et al (1996) cited in Bhuvana, Swan & Kushnan (2015) who state that because women constitute the larger part of customers and shopping is perceived be a womanly activity, they make more impulse buying decisions. This theory conclude with the study made by Banking Giant First Direct (2010) in [www.uniassignment.com](http://www.uniassignment.com) which reveals that 74% of women accepted they do not always have a shopping list compared to 68% of men. On the other hand, Hausman (2004) did not find significant correlation between gender and impulse buying bahaviour. Recent studies made by Npower (2011), Diriscol (2011), Collier (2011) cited in [www.uniassignment.com](http://www.uniassignment.com) controverts these studies by placing that men are mainly impulse buyers. Men spend an average of 25 pounds per week on products they bought in an urge while woken spend around 19 pounds per week. However, the study find that men are little better than women in controlling their temptation to shop. 60% of women said they are frequently tempted to buy impulsively if there is a sale on, while 40% of men said alike.

Women opt for products with more emotional value while men prefer functional product. Gender difference and impulse buying suggest that men seem to impulsively purchase functional and leisure item representing independence and activity while women are impulsive buyers of emblematic and self-expensive products related to appearing and sentimental facet of self (Coley & Burgess, 2003, Dittmer, Reattie & Frees (1996) cited in Bhuvane, Swan and Krishman, (2015) while Leggatt (2011) suggested that some 77% of women and 71% of men said they bought groceries on impulse (The impulse buying behavior marketing

www.unassignment.com).

**Age:** The relationship of age with impulse buying behaviour has been investigated in several studies (Wood, 1998, Belenger, Roberts, and Hirschman 1978 cited in Ghani & Jan, 2011). Rowlings, Boldero and Wiseman (1995) cited in Ghani and Jan (2011) investigated the age- impulse buying relationship in an adult sample in United States of America and found a non-linear relationship between them. Impulse buying increased in the ages 18 – 39 but then fell down after the age of 39. Belenger, Robertson and Hirschman (1978) cited in Ghani and Jan (2011) uncovered that younger people show more impulsively than the older people. In similar study, it was revealed that customers under the age of 35 showed more impulsive behavior than the old customers. Younger people are more likely to be pioneers in adopting new lifestyles. They buy new and fashionable items, enjoy shopping on new markets and hence, are prone to more impulse buying. On the other hand, adult is likely to be more free from anger and anxiety and stable who have the ability to control their urge to make purchase decision without planning (Mai, Jung, Lantz Loels, 2003). Impulsive urges are inversely related to age (Mischel et al, 1989, and Green et al 1994 cited in Geetha and Bharadhwaj, 2016). These findings suggest that as consumer's age, they learn to control their impulse buying tendencies (Geetha and Bharadhwaj, 2016).

**Income:** Income has been uncovered to have positive relationship between pocket money pocket of adolescents and their impulse buying behaviour. The impulse of adolescent increased with the increase in their pocket money (Cox 1964 in Ghani, and Jan, 2011). Abratt and Goodey (1998) found a positive relationship between income and impulse buying and they unbridled that one of the reasons for more impulse buying by consumers in United States than other countries is due to higher income level of consumers in American. However, it is suggested that consumers with higher income have less constraints in acting on their impulse as this have less difficulty in making payment for them. However, they did not found a significant relationship with income in their investigation (Mai, Jung, Lantz, Loeb cited in Ghani & Jan 2011). Income is inversely related to impulse buying. This is because, as income may make consumers wastefully extravagant in spending and may be influenced to purchase items unplanned for, because the money is ready available. On the contrary, consumers with low income may arrange their spending as they only spend money on their already planned for, and even when the urge comes to mind,

they are limited in the money out their hand (Ekeng, Lifu & Arsinya, 2012).

**Marital Status:** Sangalang, Siochi and Plaza (2007) investigated the factors influencing consumers' impulse buying behaviour in the fifth District of Cavite. Descriptive correlation design was adopted. The findings revealed that marital status has a significant influence on impulse buying behaviour. The result was further backed by the study of Bashar, Ahmad and Wasi (2012) that impulse buying could be more by married persons than single. This implies that a person who is single without any dependent is more likely to spend without preparation than a married person. On the other hand, people married with dependents children are more likely to have restrictions on the available resources. Married employers do shopping without purchase [browsing behaviour] (Bloch & Richins, 1993) than unmarried but less of impulse buying.

**Occupation:** Priyanka and Raoble (2012) said that people in better occupation show more impulse buying behaviour of their affordability to buy the products. Their findings was affirmed by Sangalang, Siochi and Plaza (2017) that occupation has no significant influence on the impulse buying behaviour of consumers. A consumer in higher class status seems to have saving fervent and a person of lower class status is likely to have spending aspiration (Martineam, 1997 cited in Geetha & Bharadhwaj, 2016). Wood (1998) stated that people in high occupational status are more rational to have a future orientation and a longer time horizon in decision making. In comparison, the consumers in lesser occupational persons are presented oriented and with a limited time horizon. In decision making, Geetha and Bharadhwaj (2016) citing Coleman (1977) stated that consumers in low levels of occupation are towards enjoying life and living well for the day than saving for the future or caring. These findings suggest that consumer of a low occupational status seem to show impulse buying behaviour than consumers of a high status.

**Education:** Peter and Osilon (1991) pointed out that a study relationship between college education and purchasing power and is a crucial determination of impulse buying. Wood (1998) stated that individuals with higher educational status make less impulse buying. This is because more educated people appear to make planned buying. On the contrary, individuals with low educational qualifications have an immediate need gratification status and a less planning skyline and thus may cosset in more impulse buying.

### Theoretical Framework

This work is rested on the emotional/impulse decision making theory and impulse buying guided and theoretically underpinned within the emotional or impulse decision making view to decision-making by Schiffman and Kanuk (2007). This view says that consumers are likely to associate some highly involving emotions or feelings such as fear, sexuality, joy, hope, fantasy and some little magic with certain buying behaviour. According to this theory, consumers are just as likely to make many of their purchases on impulse, on a lark due to the fact that they are emotionally driven, rather than carefully searching, deliberately and evaluating alternative before buying. Park, Kim & Forney, (2006) had earlier pointed out that retailers can distinguish their store by capitalizing on the relationship between the atmosphere of the store and the emotional state of the consumers, unless a store has a unique item offering or privacy strategy. Even if consumers are in a negative emotional state upon entering a shop, they may become emotionally charmed and spend more than planned (Bhuvaneshwan & Krishnan, 2015). The theory is relevant to the study because impulse buying may likely be an unconscious buying behaviour pushed by an effective force beyond the control of the consumer.

### Empirical Review

Ekenge, Lifu and Asinya (2012) study the effect of demographic characteristics of consumers' impulse buying behaviour among consumers of Calabar municipality Cross River State, Nigeria. Data were obtained through administration of questionnaire. Multiple regression analysis was adopted in testing hypotheses for the study. The ANOVA result reviewed that consumers' demographic characteristics had significant influence on impulse buying. Age and education of consumers have significant association with impulse buying while income and gender are inversely related to impulse buying.

Awan and Abbas (2015) conducted a research on impact of demographic factors on impulse buying behaviour of consumers in Muntan – Pakistan. The study adopted qualitative approach where questionnaire was the main research instrument. Different statistical techniques with multiple regression, chi-square and simple descriptive technique were used to derived result from the data collected. The result showed that gender and age, income and education were significantly and inversely associated with impulse buying behaviour of consumers.

Rana and Tirthani (2012) examined the effect of

demographic factors like income, education and gender in impulse buying behaviour of Indian consumers in the urban area of Indian, a third world country. The findings of their study revealed that there is negative relationship between education and impulse buying behaviour of consumers.

Balakumar (2017) investigated impulse buying behaviour of customers on apparel's in Bangahire. The objective is to find the various factors influencing impulse buying behaviour of customer and to studying the satisfaction level of customer in relation to buying behaviour has the level to compare it against plan purchase. One hundred (100) samples of respondents were collected with the help of questionnaire survey and z-test and descriptive study was conducted to get the final outcome. The study revealed that the younger people are more prone to impulse buying than the older people as the older people have a different set of perception to judge and shop. Hence, there was a positive relationship between the age group and impulse buying.

Lee and Kacen (2008) investigated cultural differences in consumer's satisfaction with their planned and impulse purchase and obtained data from consumers in four countries: two individualists (United States of America & Australia) and two collectivistic (Singapore & Malaysia) countries. They found that people from collectivistic cultures will be more satisfied with their impulse buying when they are shopping with an important other person at the time of buying as compared to when they are alone.

Awan and Arooj (2014) investigated the effect of demographic factors like age, gender and income on impulse buying behaviour of urban consumers in Bahawalpur area of Pakistan. They found that there is inverse relationship between age and impulse buying behaviour of urban consumers. They also found that there is no significant association between gender and impulse buying behaviour. Further, they observed that there is insignificant relationship between income and impulse buying behaviour of consumers (Ghani & Jan, 2011).

### Methodology

#### Research Design

The study adopted the descriptive cross-sectional design to explore the relationship between demographic factors and impulse buying behaviour of consumers from different socio-economic background in Auchi. The purpose of the research design was to make sure that the evidence gotten from the study enable the researchers answer the research questions as unambiguously as possible.

### Population of the Study

The population of the study consisted all consumers who have shopped at some of the supermarkets (retail stores) in Auchi, Edo State. The stores included Bendel Super Market.

### Sample and Sampling Technique

The sample size of 384 was adopted in the study. This was determined with the aid of Godden's formula cited in Sanagalang, Siochi and Plaza (2017). A non-probability accidental sampling was used for administering copies of questionnaire to the respondents. The survey took place at various times of the day and on various days of the week based on Awan (2015). Copies of questionnaire were administered to the respondents as monitored on-site by the researchers and then collected on the spot, i.e. the researchers.

### Instrument of Data Collection

The main research instrument was structure questionnaire. The technique was adopted for its usefulness, as well as the accuracy of the data because every respondent was asked the same questions of questionnaire (Boyd, Westfall & Stasch 1989 cited in Awan, 2015). The instrument contained questions that were developed on a 5-point Likert scale anchored with 5 - strongly agree (SA), 4 denoting Agree (A), 3 denoting Neutral (N), 2 denoting Disagree (D), 1 denoting Strongly Disagree (SD).

### Method of Data Analysis

The main statistical method used in the study was multiple regression analysis. It was used in testing hypotheses formulated. Data analysis was performed with the aid of Statistical Package for

Social Science (SPSS) version 2.0. Multiple regression was used to determine effect of independent variables on the decision rule. The findings were presented with the aid of table and means. This was done to give a clear picture of the result at a glance. Accept the null hypothesis when the probability value (p-value) is greater than 0.5 critical value, otherwise reject null hypothesis. Regression analysis was used to distinguish the relationship between parameters to be measured and the dependent variable.

### Validity of the Instrument

The face and content validity of the instrument was adopted to ensure that the instrument measures what is expected to measure. Validators in the University of Benin, Benin-City, Edo State, Nigeria were used for this purpose. They reviewed the contents items of the questionnaire for clarity of words, content coverage, relevance and effectiveness in measuring the problem under investigation and also reviewed the

### Reliability of the Instrument

**Table 1: Reliability of Instrument**

Cronbach's Alpha	Cronbach's Alpha Based on Standardized Items	N of Items
.913	.969	25

appropriateness of language expressions and instruments to the consumers.

From the analysis above, it can be seen that Cronbach's alpha is 0.913 which indicates a high level of internal consistency for the research instrument used for the study

### Data Presentation and Analysis

This section tends to present and analyze data with aim to determine the extent to which independent variables relate with dependent variable of the study. It further interprets and discusses the results of finding s.

**Table 2: Age Wise Percentage**

Age	SA N(%)	A N(%)	N N(%)	D N(%)	SD N(%)	TOTAL N(%)
- - -	41(35.3)	33(28.4)	8(6.9)	20(17.2)	14(12.1)	136(35.4)
31 – 40yrs	53(35.6)	41(27.5)	11(7.4)	28(18.8)	16(10.7)	149(38.8)
41 – 50 yrs	23(33.8)	20(29.4)	5(7.4)	11(16.2)	9(13.2)	68(17.7)
Above 50yrs	18(35.3)	13(25.5)	3(5.9)	10(19.6)	7(13.7)	51(8.1)

Source: Field Survey, 2018

### Demographic Characteristics of Consumers to Buy on Impulse (Independent Variables)

**Table 2** above shows that 35.3 per cent of respondents within the age range of 20-30yrs strongly agreed that age makes them to buy on impulse, 28.4 per cent also agreed to that, and 6.9 per cent of total responses could not decide whether or not age influences consumer's impulse buying behavior. 17.2 per cent while 12.1 per cent also strongly disagree to that effect

35.6 per cent of respondents within the age range of 31-40yrs strongly agreed that consumer age makes them to buy on impulse. 27.5 per cent of respondents also agreed to that. 7.4 per cent were undecided. In same vein, 18.8 per cent disagreed while 10.7 per cent

of respondents strongly disagree.

33.8 per cent of total respondents within the age range of 41-50yrs were of the view that age makes them to buy on impulse, and 29.4 per cent also agreed to such claim while 7.4 per cent of respondents could not ascertain whether or not consumer age influences their impulse buying habit. 16.2 per cent disagree while 13.2 per cent strongly disagreed

35.3 per cent of respondents within the age range of 50yrs and above strongly agreed that age as a factor influence consumer to buy on impulse, 25.5 per cent agreed. 5.9 per cent of total respondents were

**Table 3: Income wise Percentage to buy on Impulse**

Income	SA N(%)	A N(%)	N N(%)	D N(%)	SD N(%)	TOTAL N(%)
Below N50,000	23(36.5)	16(25.4)	4(6.3)	11(17.5)	9(14.3)	63(16.4)
? 50,000 - ? 100,000	27(37.5)	18(25.0)	3(4.2)	13(18.1)	11(15.3)	72(18.8)
? 100,00 – 150,000	37(36.6)	25(24.8)	8(7.9)	18(17.8)	13(12.9)	101(26.3)
Above ? 150,000	51(34.5)	43(29.1)	11(7.4)	24(16.2)	19(12.8)	148(38.5)

Source: Field Survey, 2018

indifferent. But 19.6 per cent of total responses disagreed. 13.7 per cent of respondents strongly disagreed.

Table 3 revealed that 36.5 per cent of total respondents below N50,000 income range strongly agreed that consumer income makes them to buy on impulse, 25.4 per cent of respondents within same income range also agreed. 6.3 per cent of total respondents could not ascertain whether or not consumer income level influences their impulse buying behavior. 17.5 per cent and 14.3 per cent respectively of total responses disagreed and strongly disagreed.

37.5 per cent of respondents within the income range of N50,000 – N100,000 strongly agreed that their income level makes them to buy on impulse, 25.0 per cent also agreed to such claim. But 4.2 per cent could

not decide if consumer income level plays an active role on their impulse buying behavior. While 18.1 per

**Table 4: Education Wise Percentage to buy on Impulse**

Education wise to buy on impulse	SA N(%)	A N(%)	N N(%)	D N(%)	SD N(%)	TOTAL N(%)
Primary	23(37.1)	21(33.9)	3(4.8)	9(14.5)	6(9.7)	62(16.1)
Secondary	25(37.9)	18(27.3)	5(7.6)	10(15.2)	8(12.1)	66(17.2)
Tertiary	31(33.3)	24(25.8)	8(8.6)	18(19.4)	12(12.9)	93(24.2)
Others	35(31.5)	28(25.2)	11(9.9)	21(18.9)	16(14.4)	111(28.9)
No education	16(30.8)	14(26.9)	4(7.7)	10(19.2)	8(15.4)	52(13.6)

Source: Field Survey, 2018

education makes them to buy on impulse, 28.5 per cent agreed while 8.6 per cent were undecided. But 19.4 per cent disagreed while 12.9 per cent strongly disagreed

31.5 per cent of respondents (other form of education) strongly agreed that education makes them to buy on impulse, 25.2 per cent agreed. 9.9 per cent of total respondents were undecided. 18.9 per cent were against the view that education exposure has a greater influence on impulse buying behavior and 14.4 per cent strongly disagreed.

Despite their level of illiteracy, 30.8 per cent of total respondents strongly agreed that consumer education level influences their impulse buying habit, 26.9 per cent also agreed, 7.7 per cent of respondents who do not possess any form of education qualification could not decide if consumer education level makes them to buy on impulse. 19.2

per cent were against such view, while 15.4 per cent strongly disagreed to that.

Table 5 above revealed that 35.2 per cent of total male respondents strongly agreed that gender makes them to buy on impulse, 24.1 per cent of total respondents also agreed. 9.3 per cent could not ascertain whether or not gender influences consumers to buy on impulse. 16.7 per cent and 14.8 per cent respectively of respondents were against such claim that gender influences consumer to buy on impulse.

28.6 per cent of total female respondents were of the view that gender makes consumer impulse to buy on impulse, 25.7 per cent agreed to such claim. 7.6 per cent of respondents were indifferent. In same vein, 21.0 per cent of total respondents were against such claim that gender influences impulse buying habit, 17.0 per cent strongly disagreed.

**Table 5: Gender wise percentage to buy on impulse**

Gender to buy on Impulse	SA N(%)	A N(%)	N N(%)	D N(%)	SD N(%)	TOTAL N(%)
Male	38(35.2)	26(24.1)	10(9.3)	18(16.7)	16(14.8)	108(28.1)
Female	79(28.6)	71(25.7)	21(7.6)	58(21.0)	47(17.0)	276(71.9)

Source: Field Survey, 2018

**Table 6: Questions item for Marital Status to buy on Impulse**

Marital Status to buy on Impulse	SA N(%)	A N(%)	N N(%)	D N(%)	SD N(%)	TOTAL N(%)
Single	71(30.5)	63(27.0)	13(5.6)	44(18.9)	42(18.0)	233(60.7)
Married	46(30.5)	40(26.5)	11(7.3)	33(21.9)	21(13.9)	151(39.3)

Source: Field Survey, 2018

In respect of marital factor, 30.5 per cent of total respondents (unmarried) strongly agreed that marital status influences consumers to buy on impulse, 27.0 per cent agreed. 5.6 per cent respondents were indifferent, 18.9 per cent and 18.0 per cent of total respondents respectively disagreed.

30.5 per cent of total respondents (married) were of the view that consumer marital status influences impulse consumers to buy on impulse, 26.5 per cent also agreed to such claim. 7.3 per cent of total respondents were neutral. 21.9 per cent were against the view that marital status influences consumers to buy on impulse, 13.9 per cent strongly disagreed.

**Table 7: Question Item for Occupation to buy on Impulse**

Occupation to buy on Impulse	SA N(%)	A N(%)	N N(%)	D N(%)	SD N(%)	TOTAL N(%)
Civil servant	31(34.4)	26(28.9)	8(8.9)	14(15.6)	11(12.2)	90(23.4)
Teaching (Private)	26(36.6)	21(29.6)	5(7.0)	10(14.1)	9(12.7)	71(18.5)
Trading	23(28.0)	22(26.8)	9(11.0)	15(18.3)	13(15.9)	82(21.4)
Unemployed	28(37.3)	22(29.3)	5(6.7)	12(16.0)	8(10.7)	75(19.5)
Others	21(31.8)	18(27.3)	4(6.1)	14(21.2)	9(13.6)	66(17.2)

Source: Field Survey, 2018

34.4 per cent of respondents (civil servants) of various levels strongly agreed that consumer occupation status influences consumers to buy on impulse, 28.9 per cent agreed to such view. 8.9 per cent could not decide, 15.6 per cent of respondents disagreed while 12.2 per cent strongly disagreed.

36.6 per cent of respondents that are into teaching in private institutions were of the view that occupation influences them to buy on impulse, 29.6 per cent also agreed. 7.0 per cent could not decide. 14.1 per cent of respondents disagreed while 12.7 per cent strongly disagreed

28.0 per cent of total respondents (trading) strongly agreed that occupation influences them to buy on impulse, 26.8 per cent agreed, while 11.0 per cent were undecided. 18.3 per cent disagreed while 15.9 per cent of respondents strongly disagreed.

37.3 per cent of respondents (unemployed) strongly agreed that occupation influences consumers to buy on impulse, 29.3 per cent agreed. 6.7 per cent were undecided. 16.0 per cent disagreed while 10.7 per cent of respondents strongly disagreed

**Table 8: Percentage Analysis of ..... Variables Influencing Impulse Buying Behaviour**

Questionnaire Item for Dependent Variables	SA N(%)	A N(%)	N N(%)	D N(%)	SD N(%)
The product is novelty	121(31.5)	104(27.1)	31(8.1)	68(17.7)	60(15.6)
I feel a strong emotional want.	109(28.4)	95(24.7)	35(9.1)	77(20.1)	68(17.7)
Low price of the product	116(30.2)	93(24.2)	39(10.2)	71(18.5)	65(16.9)
I see the product for the first time.	112(29.2)	99(25.8)	33(8.6)	73(19.0)	67(17.4)
I need the product because I am out of it back home	107(27.9)	101(26.3)	30(7.8)	75(19.5)	71(18.5)
I have a previous knowledge which makes me to buy a product.	119(31.0)	91(23.7)	36(9.4)	76(19.8)	62(16.1)

Source: Field Survey, 2018

Table 8 above revealed that 31.5 per cent of total respondents strongly agree and 27.1 per cent agreed that the product is novelty, but 8.1 per cent could not ascertain whether or not the product is novelty. 17.7 per cent disagreed and 15.6 per cent strongly disagreed.

28.4 per cent strongly agreed that, they normally have a strong emotional want for every commodity they purchase, while 24.7 per cent agreed. 9.1 per cent of respondents were undecided. 20.1 per cent

disagreed while 17.7 per cent of respondents strongly disagreed.

30.2 per cent of respondents strongly agreed that low price of the product influences their buying behaviour, 24.2 per cent agreed to such claim. 10.2 per cent of respondents could not decide. 18.5 per cent of total respondents disagreed while 16.9 per cent strongly disagreed.

29.2 per cent of total respondents strongly agreed that

seeing the product for the first time influences their impulse buying behavior, while 25.8 per cent agreed, 8.6 per cent were undecided. 19 per cent of total respondents disagreed while 17.4 per cent strongly disagreed.

27.9 per cent of the respondents strongly agreed that their impulse buying behavior is influenced due to the fact that they need the product because they have run out of it back home, while 26.3 per cent of

respondents also agreed. 7.8 per cent of respondents were undecided. 19.5 per cent disagreed while 18.5 per cent of respondents strongly disagreed.

31 per cent of total respondents strongly agreed that their impulse buying behavior is influenced as a result of them having a previous knowledge which makes them to buy the product, 23.7 agreed, 9.4 per cent were undecided. 19.8 per cent of respondents disagreed while 16.1 per cent strongly disagreed.

### Hypothesis 1: Income, age, occupation, education and marital status have no simultaneous influence on impulse buying behavior

Summary of multiple regression result

Variables	$\beta$	.	t cal	P value	R	R <sup>2</sup>	Fcal	Pvalue
Age	0.13	0.03	4.46	0.042	0.951	0.905	4.557	0.033
Income	-1.50	-0.92	-31.98	0.038				
Occupation	0.17	0.02	5.94	0.027				
Education	0.16	0.06	1.88	0.108				
Marital Status	0.19	0.03	1.78	0.218				

From the analysis above, it shows that consumer demographic variables (age, income, occupation, education and marital status) simultaneously influence consumer impulse buying behavior. At 95% there is a strong positive relationship between consumer demographic variables and impulse buying behavior. Value for the coefficient of determination (R square) depict that at 91%, the independent variables (age, income, occupation, education and marital status) was able to explained the total variation that will occur in the dependent variable (Impulse buying behaviour).

Analysis on the strength of the predictor variables using the regression coefficient show that marital status was insignificant but has a stronger influence on impulse buying behaviour (0.19), followed by occupation (0.17), education (0.16) which was not

also significant, age (0.13) and income (-0.50). The strength of the predictor implies that a unit increase in marital status of consumers holding other variables constant will bring about a corresponding 19% increase in impulse buying. Also a unit increase in level of occupation holding other variables constant will result in a corresponding 17% increase in impulse buying behaviour. A unit increase in consumer education level will result to 16% corresponding unit increase in impulse buying behavior. Moreso, a unit increase in consumer age will result in a corresponding 13% increase in their impulse buying behavior. Based on ANOVA, given the fact that the p value (0.03) that is associated with the value (F-ratio 4.56) is less than 5% critical level which indicate that Income, age, occupation, education and marital status have simultaneous influence on impulse buying behavior

### Hypothesis 2: Impulse buying behaviour is not inversely related to the age of consumer

Regression Analysis Between Consumer Age and Impulse Buying

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
	B	Std. Error	Beta		
1 (Constant)	2.022	.417		4.853	.040
Age	-.115	.004	.951	-4.370	.039

a. Dependent Variable: Impulse

Despite the fact that there is a strong positive relationship between consumer demographic variables and impulse buying behavior of consumers, the analysis as for age of consumers which is significant at (P, 0.039) has an inverse relationship on impulse buying behavior which shows that impulse buying behavior is high among the adolescents with no stronger responsibility and commitments thereby enabling them not to have a rethink when spending money as many of them are living a luxurious life style. A unit increase in consumer age holding every other variable constant will result in 12% decrease in impulse buying behavior. Thus we infer that Impulse buying behaviour is inversely related to the age of consumer

### Discussion of Findings

Hypothesis one revealed that demographic factors (Age, gender, income, marital status, occupation and education) have simultaneous influence on impulse buying behaviour of consumers. The finding is in agreement with the study of Bashar, Ahmad & Wasi (2012), Awan (2015) who revealed that demographic characteristics (Age, gender, income, marital status, occupation, education) affect simultaneously on impulse buying behaviour of consumers.

Hypothesis two revealed that young consumers are prone to impulse buying behaviour than aged consumers. This means that younger consumers buy more on impulse than aged consumer because young consumers are fundamentally influenced by their lifestyle, new fashion, novelty, etc. They buy new and fashionable products than aged consumers who are quiet and stable on their purchase decisions. The result is consisted with the findings of the study of Belenger, Robertson and Hirschman 1978 cited in Ghani and Jan (2011); Mai, Jung, Lantz and Loel (2003); Ekeng, Lifu and Asinya (2012). They established that younger consumers buy more on impulse than aged consumers. That is, there is inverse relationship between age and impulse buying behaviour of consumers.

### Conclusion

The study has examined the demographic factors that can explain the impulse buying behaviour of consumers. The study indicated that the demographic characteristics have simultaneous significant relationship with impulse buying behaviour of consumers. The consumers related their impulse buying behaviour to their demographic factors. The study revealed that age, gender income, marital status, education and occupation impact the impulse buying behaviour of consumers positively.

### Recommendations

Based on the findings of the study, the following recommendations are suggested:

1. Consumers should arrange their preferences in relation to each other according to a particular pattern, and always weigh specific weight of the preference when making purchasing products to prevent buying on impulse.
2. Word-of-mouth communication must be improved by managements of retail stores because word-of-mouth can directly influence new product knowledge of consumers and impulse buying behaviour to avoid making product purchase on unplanned manner.
3. Managers should advice the young consumers to reset their principles when buying products, abort shadow hunt and set their heart on the needful.

### References

- Abasi, B. (2017). Relationship between consumer characteristics and impulse buying behaviour: The marketing role of buying intention of new clothing buyers. *International Review of Management and Marketing*, 7(1), 26-33.
- Abbrat, R. and Gooddey, S.O. (1990). Unplanned buying and in-store stimuli in supermarkets. *Managerial and Decision Economics*, 11(2), 111-121.
- Awan, A.G. (2015). Demographic factors on impulse buying behaviour of consumers in Multan-Pakistan. *European Journal of Business Management*, 7(220), 1-11.
- Awan, A.G. and Abbas, N. (2015). Impact of demographic factors on impulse buying behaviour of consumer in Muva-Pakistan. *European Journal of Business Management*, 7(22), 96-105.
- Awan, A.G. and Arooj, F. (2014). Impact of marketing strategies on youth purchasing behaviour: A case study of Mobile Phone Industry. *British Journal of Marketing Studies*, 2(4), 72-88.
- Balakumar, U. (2017). A study on impulsive buying behaviour of consumers on Apparels in Bangalore. *International Journal of Engineering Technology, Management and Applied Sciences*, 5(7), 501-509.
- Bashar, A. Ahmad, I. and Wasi, M. (2012). A study of influence of demographic factors on consumer impulse buying behaviour. *International Journal of Management and Strategy*, 3(5), 209-239.
- Bashir, Zeeshan, Sabar, Hussain and Sarki (2013). Impact of cultural values and lifestyle on

- impulse buying behaviour: A case study of Pakistan. *International Review of Management and Business Research*, 2(1), 193-200.
- Behaviour online (2015). [Internet] Consumer Impulse Buying. Accessed on April 13, 2018 from [www.ukessays.com](http://www.ukessays.com).
- Bhuvane, N., Swan, V. and Krishnan, J. (2015). A review of literature on impulse buying behaviour on consumers in Bride & Mortar and click only stores. *International Journal of Management Research and Social Science*, 2(3), 84-90.
- Bloch, P.H. and Richins, M.L. (1993). Shopping without purchase: An investigation of consume browsing behaviour. *Association for Consumer Research*, 10, 389-393.
- Business Dictionary [Internet]. Retrieved on April 4, 2018 from: [www.bussdictionary.com](http://www.bussdictionary.com)
- Chang, H.J., Eckman, M. and Yan, R.N. (2011). Application of the Stimulus – or ... response model to the retail environment: the role of hedonic motivation in impulse buying behaviour. *The International Review of Retail, distribution and Consumers Research*, 21(3), 233-249.
- Coley, A. and Burgess, B. (2003). Gender differences in cognitive and affective impulse buying. *Journal of Fashion Marketing and Management*, 7(3), 282-295.
- Ekeng, A.B., Lifu, F.L. and Asinya, F.A. (2012). Effect of demographic characteristics on consumer impulse buying among consumers of Calabar municipality, Cross River State. *Academic Research International*, 3(2), 568-574.
- Geetha, M. and Bharadhwaj, S. (2016). Impulse buying bahaviour in India: An overview. *Asian Journal of Business Research*, 6(1), 49-66.
- Ghani, U. and Jan, F.A. (2011). An exploratory study of the impulse buying behaviour of urban consumers in Peshawar. *International Conference on Business and Economic Research*, Kude, Malaysia, JACSIT press, vol 1, pp 15.
- Hausman, A. (2000). A multi-method investigation of consumer motivation on impulse buying behaviour. *Journal of Consumer Marketing*, 17(5), 403-419.
- Impulse Buying Behaviour Marketing Essay- Uni Assignment [Internet]. Access on 18 May 2018 from : <https://www.uniassignment.com>.
- Jones, M., Reynolds, K., Weun, S. and Bealty, S. (2003). The product specific nature of impulse buying tendency. *Journal of Business Research*, 56(7), 505-571.
- Kacen, J.J. and Lee, J.A (2002). The influence of culture on consumer impulsive buying behaviour. *Journal of Consumer Psychology*, 12(2), 163-176.
- Kracken and Lee (2002). The buying behaviour marketing essay – Visit Assignment [Internet]. Accessed on 18 May, 2018 from <http://www.unassignment.com>
- Lee, J.A. and Kacen, J. J. (2008). Cultural influence on consumer satisfaction with impulse and planned purchase decision. *Journal of Business Research* 6(3), 205-272.
- Luo, X. (2005). How does shopping with others influence impulse purchasing? *Journal of Consumer Psychology*, 15(4), 288-294.
- Mai, N.T.T., Jung, K., Lantz, G. and Loes, S.G. (2003). An exploratory investigation into impulse buying behaviour in a transitional economy: A study of urban consumers in Vietnam. *Journal of International Marketing*, 11(2), 13-35.
- Mathai, S.T. and Haridas, R. (2004). Personality: its impact on impulse buying behaviour among the retail customers in Kochin City. *Journal of Business and Management*, 16(4), 48-55.
- Minal, S. S, Sanjay, G. and Urvashi, S. (2012). Effect of emerging trends in retail sector on impulse buying behaviour with reference to Chhattisgarh region. *International Journal of Engineering and Management Sciences*, 3(2), 142-145.
- Park, E.J., Kim, E.Y and Forney, J.C. (2006). A structural model of fashion-oriented impulse buying behaviour. *Journal of Fashion Marketing and Management*, 60(4), 433-446.
- Peter, J. and Olson, J.C. (1999). *Consumer Behaviour and Marketing Strategy*, Boston: Irwin/McGraw-Hill.

- Priyanka, V. and Raoble, V. (2012). An on-field survey of the impulse buying behaviour of consumers in consumer non-durable sectors in the retail outlets in the city of Indore, India. *Research Journal of Management Sciences*, 1(4), 1-5.
- Rana, S. and Trithani, J. (2012). Effect of education, income and gender on impulsive buying among Indian consumers: An empirical study of readymade garment on customers. *Indian Journal of Applied Research*, 1(2), 145-156.
- Rock, D.W. and Gardner, M.P. (1993). In the mood: impulse buying's affective antecedents. *Research in Consumer Behaviour*, 6(7), 1-28.
- Sangalang, R.A., Siochi, J. and Plaza, M. (2017). Factors influencing consumers' impulse buying behaviour in the fight district of cavite. Presented of the DLSU Research congress, De La Save University, Manila, Philippines, June 20 – 22.
- Schiffman, I.G. and Kanuk, I.I. (2007). *Consumer Behaviour* (9th ed.) New Jersey: Prentice Hall.
- Sharma, P., Sivakumaran, B. and Marshall, P. (2010). Impulse buying and variety seeking: A trait correlates perspective. *Journal of Business Research*, 63, 276-283.
- Shopping [Internet]. Retrieved on June 26, 2018 from: <http://en.wikipedia.shopping>
- Silvera, D.H; Lavack, A.M. and Kropp, F. (2008). Impulse buying; The role of affect, social influence and wellbeing. *Journal of Consumer Marketing*, 25(1), 23-33.
- Srivastava, R. and Joshi, S. (2014). Relationship between self-concept and self-esteem in adolescents. *International Journal of Advanced Research*, 2(2), 36-43.
- Stern, H. (1962). The significance of impulse buying today. *Journal of Marketing*, 26, 321-355.
- Wood, M. (1998). Socio-economic status: Delay of gratification, and impulse buying. *Journal of Economic Psychology*, 19, 295-320.