

A STUDY OF THE FACTORS THAT AFFECT THE IMPULSE BUYING OF WOMEN CONSUMERS AT VALANCHERY REGION

Deepika KP, Assistant Professor, Department of commerce, Markaz Arts and Science College, Athavanad.

ABSTRACT

Impulse buying—unplanned purchasing triggered by emotional or situational cues—has become increasingly common. This study examines the factors that stimulate impulse buying among women consumers in Valanchery (Kerala), using primary data from 50 respondents and statistical tools including the chi-square test, Z-test for two proportions, and mean analysis. Results indicate no significant association between occupational status and impulse buying, and no significant difference between working and non-working women in preferring low prices. Offers, in-store display, and price emerged as the most influential drivers, and mean scores on Likert items suggest women frequently buy products they like even when unplanned. These insights can guide retailers in designing promotions and store stimuli targeted at women consumers.

INTRODUCTION

Impulse buying is typically defined as an unplanned decision to purchase a product or service, often spurred by

affective or psychological triggers at the point of sale. In contemporary retail environments, stimuli such as packaging, product displays, offers, and ease of self-selection can catalyze spontaneous decisions. Given evidence that women shoppers often respond strongly to such cues, understanding the drivers of women's impulsive purchases has practical implications for retail strategy and consumer welfare. This paper empirically explores those drivers in the Valanchery region.

PROBLEM STATEMENT

Although impulse buying is widely observed, the specific motivational factors behind women's unplanned purchases in Valanchery remain under-explored. With women undertaking a substantial share of household shopping in Kerala, mapping the link between impulse buying and key drivers (e.g., price, offers, display) can aid both researchers and practitioners.

OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

1. To examine women's buying behavior with a focus on impulse purchases.

2. To identify the factors that stimulate impulsivity among women.
3. To test the association between occupational status (working vs. non-working) and impulse buying.
4. To compare working and non-working women in their concern for low prices.

SCOPE OF THE STUDY

- Geographic focus: Valanchery.
- Population: Women residents (both working and non-working).
- Usefulness: A reference point for future work on women's impulse buying behavior in similar retail contexts.

METHODOLOGY

Design & Sample. A quantitative, cross-sectional survey was administered to 50 women in Valanchery using a structured questionnaire (12 items). Sampling followed a convenience approach.

Data Sources. Primary data were collected via questionnaire. Secondary material included books, journals, and online resources (e.g., Indian Journal of Commerce and Management Studies; ASA University Review; Wiley Online Library).

Analytical Tools. Descriptive statistics were complemented with a chi-square test for association, a Z-test for two proportions, and mean analysis for Likert-type items.

ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION

1) Demographic Profile

Among respondents, 80% were married; the age distribution was 22% below 25 years, 30% between 25–35, 34% between 35–45, and 14% above 45. Education spanned SSLC (48%), Plus Two (8%), graduates (32%), and postgraduates (12%). Occupationally, 12% were self-employed, 18% professionals, 8% unemployed, and 62% reported “other.”

Interpretation. The sample is predominantly married and middle-aged, with a broad education mix—useful dispersion for exploring impulse buying across life stages.

2) Hypothesis Tests

H1: Occupational Status vs. Impulse Buying (Chi-square Test).

- **Null (H0):** No association between occupational status and impulse buying.
- **Test Result:** $\chi^2(1, N = 50) = 0.416, p > .05 \rightarrow$ Fail to reject H0.
- **Conclusion:** Occupational status (working vs. non-working) is not

significantly associated with impulse buying behavior in this sample.

H2: Low-Price Preference—Working vs. Non-Working (Z-test for Two Proportions).

- **Null (H0):** No difference in the proportion preferring low price between working and non-working women.
- **Test Result:** $Z = 1.53$, critical $|Z|$ at $5\% = 1.96 \rightarrow$ Fail to reject H0.
- **Conclusion:** Working and non-working women are similarly attracted to low prices.

Interpretation. Within this cohort, impulse buying appears widespread regardless of whether women are

employed; value sensitivity (low price) is similarly shared across both groups.

3) Motivational Factors for Impulse Buying

The most frequently cited motivators were **offers (n = 22)**, **product display (n = 20)**, and **price (n = 19)**, followed by advertisement (n = 13), ease of selection (n = 10), location (n = 8), and salesperson (n = 8).

Interpretation. Promotional levers and in-store merchandising (offers and display) strongly prime impulsive responses. Price acts as a complementary trigger, suggesting that deal framing and visual salience can be powerful in this market.

Table 1

Motivators of Impulse Buying among Women (Valanchery, N = 50)

Factor	n (%)
Offers	22 (44%)
Display of product	20 (40%)
Price	19 (38%)
Advertisement	13 (26%)
Ease of selection	10 (20%)
Location	8 (16%)
Salesperson	8 (16%)

4) Mean Analysis of Impulsive Tendencies (Likert Items)

- “I buy the product if I really like it even though it was not planned”:

Mean = 4.46 (Strongly Agree–Agree skew).

- “Buy now, I think about it later”:
Mean = 3.82.

- “Normally I love to shop with no particular list”: Mean = 3.38.
 - “After I make impulse buying I regret”: Mean = 3.04 (mixed feelings).
 - “I buy only what is on my shopping list” (reverse indicator): Mean = 1.96.
- Interpretation. The highest mean (4.46) underscores a strong tendency to purchase liked items spontaneously. Lower endorsement of list-only buying (1.96) further supports pervasive impulsivity.

Table 2
Mean Scores for Impulse-Related Statements (N = 50)

Item	Mean
I buy the product if I really like it even though it was not planned	4.46
Buy now, I think about it later	3.82
Normally I love to shop with no particular list	3.38
After I make impulse buying I regret	3.04
I buy only what is on my shopping list (reverse)	1.96

FINDINGS

1. No significant association between occupational status and impulse buying; both working and non-working women engage similarly in impulse purchases.
2. No significant difference between working and non-working women in attraction to low prices.
3. Offers, product display, and price are the leading motivators of impulse buying.
4. Mean analysis shows a strong propensity to buy liked items even when unplanned; list-only buying is less common.

5. Non-monetary promotions (e.g., display, ease of selection) play an important role alongside price-based tactics.

SUGGESTIONS

- Leverage offers and price framing. Structure frequent, clearly communicated promotions targeted at women shoppers.
- Optimize visual merchandising. Invest in eye-level product placement, impactful endcaps, and clean, navigable layouts to amplify impulsive cues.
- Adopt non-monetary promotions. Sampling, attractive packaging, and

ease of self-selection can stimulate impulsive choices without eroding margins.

- Refine advertising strategy. Since ads ranked lower as a motivator, creative formats and localized messaging could increase salience for this segment.
- Train frontline staff. Empathetic, low-pressure advisory selling can complement in-store cues while respecting shopper autonomy.

CONCLUSION

This study adds localized evidence that women in Valanchery frequently engage in impulse buying, with behavior shaped most strongly by offers, in-store display, and price. Occupational status does not significantly differentiate impulsive tendencies, nor does it alter price sensitivity. Retailers seeking growth in this segment should combine compelling promotions with thoughtful merchandising and non-monetary stimuli to encourage discovery and spontaneous purchase—while maintaining consumer trust and satisfaction.

References

Nair, P., & Rathor, J. B. (2011). *Indian Journal of Commerce and Management Studies*, 2(6).

Wahida Shahan Tinne (2011). *ASA University Review*, 5(1).

Taushif, M. R., & Gupta, M. (2013). *A Management Review (IJRDMR)*, 2(2).

Hualin Wang (2015). *Management Science and Research*, 4(2).

Tendai, M., & Crispen, C. (2009). 1(4), 102–108.

Hausman, A. (2000). *Journal of Consumer Marketing*.

Beatty, S. E., & Ferrell, M. E. (1998). *Journal of Retailing*.