



Full length research paper

Impact of consumer demographic variables on their satisfaction with household purchases

AMFANI-JOE C.E^{1*} and OSABO P.O²

¹Department of Home Science and Management, Faculty of Agriculture, Nasarawa State University, Keffi, Nigeria.

²Department of Home Science and Management, College of Food Science, University of Agriculture, Makurdi, Benue State, Nigeria.

Received 11 May, 2017 Accepted 02 June, 2017

The study assessed demographic variables influencing the satisfaction levels of consumers with household purchases. The descriptive survey research design was adopted as the research design for the study. The instrument constructed comprised the demographic factors as the independent variables, sixteen (16) open ended questions and twenty one (21) item question on a five point Linkert scale as the dependent variable. The instrument was validated and cronbachs Alpha coefficient reliability was determined at 0.816. A convenient sampling techniques was used to collect data from two hundred and fifty (250) respondents for statistical analysis using the SPSS, Frequencies, percentages regression estimates, t-test and ANOVA at $P > 0.05$ were used for the analysis. Estimated beta coefficient for the multinomial regression model showed that age and years of marriage of respondents were found to be significant ($P < 0.05$) while religion account for satisfaction at ($P < 0.10$). Other variables did not have much impact with household purchases. T-test revealed that males did not differ significantly from females in their satisfaction with household purchases. Age ranges of respondents observed F-value at 5,244 df was 3.110 with probability level of significance of 0.010 ($P < 0.05$). Satisfaction was observed in the age range grouping of 55yrs and above. Obtained f-value observed at 6,243 df was 2.903 at significant level 0.009 ($P < 0.05$). Educational attainment post hoc test showed that those with primary education were least satisfied than those with tertiary certificates who had highest level of satisfaction. For family lifecycle, there was significant difference at observed f-value of 6.082df was 2.247 significant level 0.003 ($P < 0.03$). Post hoc test concluded that early family lifecycle stage was not significantly different from the expanding stage but at the contracting stage. Level of satisfaction was not found to be significantly different from the family type. F-value obtained at 2,247 df was 1.302 at level of significance 0.274 ($P < 0.05$). It can be concluded that age, educational attainment and family lifecycles only were demographic factors that constituted significant difference with household purchase. It is recommended that this study be extended to other cities of Nasarawa State in order to determine if the results of this study is peculiar only to residents of Lafia, the capital city of Nasarawa State.

Keywords: Consumer, demographic, household, impact, purchases, satisfaction

INTRODUCTION

The family is the primary decision-making unit in the society, be it purchasing or marketing of many products and services of the family. A considerable share of consumption decision takes place within the family context, while major influences on the consumer behavior of its members, spouse and children are

considered relevant to decisions within the unit. Hitherto, decisions are collective rather than individual. Various types of decision-making processes include the emboldened decision which is the decision made by discussion and consensus making the family members each have a voice and feel they have contributed to the

eventual discussion reached. Families that discuss and are conscious of their mode of reaching a decision seem to be committed to the principles of democratic process. De-factor decision is made by default. It occurs when the family fails to actively engage in a specific process. Decisions made by values are based on value strongly articulated principles explicitly stated or communicated indirectly and through practice such as religion, social practice or some other classified values. Technical decisions are related to a variety of processes that needs to be taken in order to arrive at a main decision. However, this depends on the kind of decision made at the stage of their development than on a variety of technical decisions that may be employed to avert that behavior. Social decisions focus on choices about living and gathering family resources such as whether when a child has reached the official adult age should be required to get a job and contribute to the family income. Authority or status decisions are guided by the person in the family with the most authority or status. The father or husband in most cases is mandated to make decision on behalf of the family. Affective decisions boards on choices related to feelings and emotions (BaderJahn, 1988, Noller and Firpatrick, 1993, Stovic, 2000).

Families are faced with many difficult situations which have an important impact on the decision behavior pattern of the family. Decision-making is essentially the process of making selection from a course of action among alternative scenario to the extent that decision-making produces a final choice for which the output can be an action or option of choice. Hence, logical choice of decision can be achieved when the decision-maker considers the decision-making process which serves as a guide for effective decision-making activity as to whether the decision is rational or irrational. Keji, (2000), explained that rational decision-making as time spent in analyzing the costs and benefits of a decision which encompasses the notion that we maximize benefit and minimize costs. Decision-making process of a family on household unit in consumer behavior is relevant to their consumer behavior for the reasons that many products are playing a significant role in the purchasing decisions that is complicated some of which role include determining what product should be bought, which retail outlet to use and when and how products are used, who should buy and so on. This is because it is a complicated process involving a variety of roles (Williams and Burns, 2002). However, most decisions are made unconsciously that tend to wrong decisions. Chikuede, Samson and Fletcher (2012), said family purchasing is one in which all family members are involved in the decision – making process. This then explains why the family decision as a process can be full of extreme tension or slightly tensed as family decision-making has an extricable bond to values which when communicated within the family group can become part of the family assumptive foundation as its members coordinate future activities (James and Timothy 2000, Galvin and Bronnel (2004).

Consumer decision-making process is influenced by various factors such as social, psychological and personal factors. The level of influence also depends on several factors such as economic, love, sympathy, anger and guilt (Stovic, 2001, Wang, Italloway, Beatty and Hill, 2007). Lee and Beatty, (2002), also observed that the influence of parents is significant because of how parents help their children to develop politically, religiously and in lifestyle choices. Other factors influencing purchase of the family decision are sex-role stereotype, spousal resources, experience, and socioeconomic status. (Assel 1991), Age is an internal factor that is often considered in purchasing decision of the family. Different ages influence the needs and want of the family in the purchase of their goods and services over life time (Kotter, 2009). The educated individual tend to find more information on the purchase of products than the uneducated as the fulfillment in the education field is the most reliable index for income potential attitudes and the way of spending of the family. The educated family has different purchasing decision behavior compared to the uneducated family even though they might stand in the same family life cycle. The basic assumption in the family life cycle is that the purchasing decision of a family is dependent on the family size rather than the age or income. Invariably, family life cycle may be based on the contribution of the head of the family, marital status, present ages of children and age of house wife (Assel, 1981; Donne and Lush 1991). Lifestyle is the individual's whole way of living. It is influenced by family type, children, which materially affect the way the families react when confronted with purchasing decisions. At each stage family members have new constant needs for goods and services according to the way of their living. Consumption patterns change, as lifestyle which determines what products categories to budget change and not concerned with the amount to spend on each category (Scott, 2004). Occupation of the individual influences their purchases made for goods and services (Kotler and Amstrong, 2008).Solomon, 2006, defined culture as a societal character that includes theoretical ideas like values, ethics and physical matters and services that are delivered or respected by the society. It is a set of belief, norms, values and tradition that is shared among its members. Purchasing decision of the family is therefore influenced by the culture.

Family purchasing decisions play a vital role in family decision-making. Therefore, the power to make rational or irrational decision depends on how each family member plays its role as expected. In view of the various factors affecting the family members such as societal structural changes and individual characteristics and attitude, this study, thus, examined demographic factors of the individual family member to determine their satisfaction in their consumer purchasing decisions.

Objective

The broad objective of this study was to determine the

influence of some selected demographic factors on household satisfaction in purchase decision of the consumer. Specifically, it determined the regression estimate for some selected variables impact on household satisfaction; the significant difference for each variables and satisfaction of husband and wife decision and determined ANOVA for some selected variables.

METHODOLOGY

Research design

The descriptive survey research design was adopted.

Area of the study

The study was carried out in Lafia, in Lafia local government of Nasarawa State, Nigeria. Lafia lies between latitude 09.33 North of the equator and longitude 09.335 East of the Greenwich meridian. It is bordered by Doma LGA to the West and Kokona to the North West, Akwanga to the North, Assakio to North East and Kokona to the East of Nasarawa State.

Population of the Study.

The population of the study comprised males and females as consumers, who were educated, employed, married with children and/or have other non-related family members living with them, residing in Lafia and Shabu Development Area of Lafia Local Government.

Sample Size

Two hundred and fifty (250) questionnaires were administered to the subjects comprising of males and females who responded to open ended questions which included demographic variables of respondent on questions bordering on family purchase decision.

Sampling Technique

A convenient sampling technique was adopted for data collection.

Instrument

The instrument was formulated and structured into three (3) sections. Section A comprised Ten (10) questions which provided background information about the respondents. Section B comprised sixteen (16) questions which provided information about the family purchasing decision of husband and wife. Section C comprised twenty five (25) item questions that provided information on the satisfaction level of husband and wife on their purchasing decisions on a five (5) point likert scale structured very often (5) often (4) undecided (3) Not often (2) and Not at all (1).

Validity

The instrument was validated by three professionals in the subject area.

Reliability

The reliability of the instrument was determined at 0.876 Chrombach Alpha Coefficient.

Data analysis technique

Data analysis employed a non-parametric analysis multivariate approach (Anderson and Geberba, 1988) using a statistical program, SPSS. This was due to the variable measurement. Demographic variables were measured nominally. Satisfaction with household purchases was measured on interval scale. Two sample t-test and one way ANOVA were used with a post hoc test procedure for determining the classes of levels of the independent variable that was significantly different from the others, determination of significant difference in overall scores for each of the variables.

RESULTS

Hypothesis 1: Determination of the significance of each demographic variable on the level of satisfaction with household purchases.

Table 1 showed the estimated Beta coefficient from the multinomial regression model involving the variables with the rated satisfaction with household purchases. From the estimates, age and years in marriage of the respondents were found to be significant at $P < 0.05$ while religion account for satisfaction at $P < 0.10$ with household purchase. Other demographic variables did not impact much on the satisfaction with household purchases ($P > 0.10$). By implication, satisfaction with household purchases could be seen as a function of age, marital status and religion of the respondents.

Hypothesis 2: Determination of significant difference in overall scores for each of the variables and the satisfaction of husband and wife on household purchases.

The result in table 2 below revealed that the males did not differ significantly from the female in their satisfaction with the household purchases ($P > 0.05$). For the Christian and the Moslems, no significant difference was observed in the levels of their satisfaction with the household purchases ($P > 0.05$). To determine the satisfaction of the husband and wife, the mean scores was divided by twenty five (25) items computed for the aggregate and the scores for husband and wife were 3.189 and 3.106 respectively. These scores were higher than the midpoint aggregate of 3.00 for the five point interval scale used in the test. This implies that the husbands and wives could be said to be satisfied with household purchases.

Hypothesis 3: Determination of the significance of the variability in the satisfaction of household purchases for some selected demographic variables.

Table 3 below showed that for age ranges of respon-

Table 1. Regression estimates of the selected variable impact on household satisfaction

Effects	Model Fitting Criteria -2 Log Likelihood of Reduced Model	Likelihood Ratio Tests		
		Chi-Square	DF	Sig.
Intercept	636.568 ^a	.000	0	.
Gender	683.265 ^b	46.698	42	.285
Age	925.760 ^b	289.192	210	.000
Occupation	720.191 ^b	83.623	210	1.000
Years in marriage	879.137 ^b	242.569	126	.000
Educational levels	724.090 ^b	87.522	252	1.000
Income	691.999 ^b	55.431	252	1.000
Social class	719.963 ^b	83.395	84	.498
Religion	693.641 ^b	57.073	42	.060
Lifecycle	642.234 ^b	5.666	84	1.000
Culture	701.833 ^b	65.266	84	.935
What purchasing strategies are taken by you and your spouse	743.487 ^b	106.919	168	1.000

Table 2. Two sample t-test procedure on purchases of household satisfaction by male and female with Christian and Moslem respondents.

Gender	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	t-value	DF	Sig. (2-tailed)
Male(Husband)	138	79.7246	12.99173	1.10593	1.313	248	190
Female(wife)	112	77.6429	11.77940	1.11305			
Christian	184	78.0217	13.31582	.98166	1.635	248	103
Muslim	66	80.9394	9.55290	1.17588			

(t-critical = 1.96)

dents, the observed F-value obtained at 5,244 degree of freedom was 3.16 with probability significance of 0.0110 (P<0.005), implying significant difference in the age groupings on the satisfaction with family purchases. From the Post hoc test it was observed that significant difference in the satisfaction with the household purchases was between respondents who were above fifty five (55) years and the rest groupings. There was no significant difference observed between the age ranges 18-26 and 49 to 55 years in their level of satisfaction with household purchases. Analysis of Variance was summarized along with occupation, income, social status, family lifecycle and family type. Significant difference was not observed for occupation for the different orientations. The observed F-value was 0.861 obtained at 5,224 degree of freedom. The observed probability level of significance for the test was 0.508 (P>0.05). The observed level of satisfaction

with household purchases by respondents of different years in marriage was not found to be significant. The observed F-value obtained at 3,246 degree of freedom was 0.524 and the significant level obtained for the test was 0.667 (P>0.05).

Level of satisfaction with household purchases was found to differ significantly by respondents' level of educational qualifications. The observed F-value obtained at 6,243 degree of freedom was 2,903 and the level of significance observed for the test was 0.009 (P<0.05). The post hoc test, revealed that respondents with primary education were found to have the least level of satisfaction and those with tertiary education had the highest level of satisfaction and were significantly different from those with primary school certification. No significant difference was observed between those with secondary and tertiary certificates in their levels of satisfaction. Test for differences in the

Table 3. One way analysis of variance model by the selected demographic variables.

Variables	Source of variations	Sum of Squares	DF	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Age	Between Groups	2324.473	5,244	464.895	3.110	.010
	Within Groups	36468.711		149.462		
	Total	38793.184	249			
Occupation	Between Groups	672.630	5,244	134.526	.861	.508
	Within Groups	38120.554		156.232		
	Total	38793.184	249			
Years in marriage	Between Groups	246.159	3,2486	82.053	.524	.666
	Within Groups	38547.025		156.695		
	Total	38793.184	249			
Educational qualification	Between Groups	2594.905	6,243	432.484	2.903	.009
	Within Groups	36198.279		148.964		
	Total	38793.184	249			
Income level	Between Groups	1533.611	6,243	255.602	1.667	.130
	Within Groups	37259.573		153.332		
	Total	38793.184	249			
Social status	Between Groups	447.517	2,247	223.758	1.441	.239
	Within Groups	38345.667		155.246		
	Total	38793.184	249			
Family cycle	Between Groups	1820.681	2,247	910.341	6.082	.003
	Within Groups	36972.503		149.686		
	Total	38793.184	249			
Family type	Between Groups	404.797	2,247	202.399	1.302	.274
	Within Groups	38388.387		155.419		
	Total	38793.184	249			

satisfaction of household purchases by the respondents with different income levels did not differ significantly. The observed F-value was 1.667 and the observed level of significance for the test at the 6,243 degree of freedom was 0.130 ($P>0.05$).

For the social status, no significant difference was observed in the levels of satisfaction with the household purchases by those in the low, medium and high income groups. The observed F-value obtained at 2,247 degree of freedom was 1.1441 with a level of

significance of 0.239 ($P>0.05$). The test of difference in the satisfaction with household purchases according to life-cycle of respondents, it was observed that significant differences between the respondents revealed that the observed F-value was 6.082 at 2,247 degree of freedom and the significant level obtained in the test was 0.003 ($P<0.05$). From the post hoc test it was observed that those in the early family life cycle were not significantly different from those of the stages of expanding family life cycle but were significantly dif-

-ferent from those in the contracting stage of the family life cycle. Between the expanding and contracting stages significant difference was observed in the levels of satisfaction with household purchases.

The levels of satisfaction was not found to differ significantly by the type of family i.e. in terms of whether traditionalist, progressivist and modern families. The observed F-value at 2,247 degree of freedom was 1.302 and the level of significance was tested at 0.274 ($P>0.05$).

DISCUSSION

Table 3 showed that satisfaction with household purchases could be seen as a function of age, marital states and religion of the respondents Solomon, 2006, defined culture as a societal character that includes theoretical ideas like values, ethics and physical matter and services that are delivered or respected by the society. It is a set of beliefs, norms, values, and traditions that is shared among its members. By implication purchasing decisions of the family is therefore, influenced by religion. In Table 2 the results implied that despite differences in their religious backgrounds respondents, husbands and wives, seemed to be satisfied with their household purchases. In Table 3, age of couple, their educational qualification and family lifecycle are demographic factors that constituted significant differences with household purchases. Kotler and Armstrong 2009 said age is an internal factor that is often considered in purchasing decisions of the family. Different age influence the needs and wants of the family in the purchase of their goods and services over life time. The educated individual tend to find more information on the purchase of products than the uneducated as the fulfillment in the education field is the most reliable index for income potential attitudes and the way of spending of the family. The educated family has different purchasing decision behavior compared to the uneducated family even though they might stand in the same family lifecycle. The basic assumption in the family lifecycle is that the purchasing decision of the family is dependent on the size rather than the age or income. Family lifecycle may be based on the contribution of the head of the family, marital status present age of children and age of household wife. (Donne and Hush 1991, Assel 1981).

Conversely the table 5 revealed that occupation, years in marriage, income level, social status and family type, have no significant bearing on the satisfaction levels with household purchases made in the family Kotler and Armstrong 2009, said the occupation of the individual influences their purchases made for goods and services, that is, satisfaction for purchases made can be a fact only by the individual who is doing the occupation and who him/herself does the purchase of goods and services for the household. In view of family type, (traditionalist, progressivists or modern). Scott, (2004), proffered that consumption patterns change as lifestyle which determines what purchase categories to budget change and is not concerned about the amount

to spend in each category. Thus, suggesting that satisfaction of purchase decision depends on the lifestyle of the family which also is dependent on the type or category of lifestyle adopted whether it is traditional, progressives or modern.

CONCLUSION

It can be concluded that satisfaction with household purchases could be seen as a function of age marital status and religion. Despite different religions backgrounds of respondents, husbands and wives could be said to be satisfied with household purchases. Age of respondents, their educational attainment and family lifecycle are demographic factors that constituted significant differences with household purchases, while occupation, years in marriages income level, social status and family type have no, significant bearing on the satisfaction levels with household purchase made in the family.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Though Lafia is the capital of Nasarawa State, the bustle and hassle of capital cities like Lagos, Abuja, Kaduna or Port-Harcourt etc cannot be compared with that of Lafia. Differences in demography such as culture, family lifecycle, social structure, provision of facilities and infrastructure could make a difference in the results of this a study. It is, therefore, recommended that a comparative study on similar variables be conducted in other parts of the country to determine if differences exist on the satisfaction of purchase decision by couples across Nigeria.

Further study is also recommended to expand this study to other parts of Nasarawa State to ascertain if the results of this study are peculiar only to couples resident in Lafia.

REFERENCES

- Assel H, (1981). *Consumer Behaviour and Marketing Action*, Boston, Kent Pub. Com. Pp. 348 – 365.
- Bader John I, (1988). Personality Variable and Environmental Attitudes as Predictor of Ecologically responsible consumption patterns. *J. of Business Research* 17(1). Pp 51 – 66.
- Chikwede T, Solomon R, Fletcher, (2012). Family Purchase decision-making at the bottom of the pyramid. *J. of Consumer Marketing* 29 (3). Pp. 202 – 213.
- Donne B and Lush L, (1999). The influence of purchase Behaviour, *J. of Consumer Marketing* Vol. 20 Pp. 56 – 80.
- Galvin K and Brunnel B, (2004). *Family communication: Cohesion and Change*. New York. Thousand Oaks. CA Safe Pub. (3) Pp. 311 – 316.
- Janes A and Timothy S, (1990). Family Decision-making processes, Authority and status. *J. on Decision management* Pp.5
- Keji D, (2012). Decision-making current opinion *Neurobiology* 22(6) Pp. 911 – 913.

- Ketter J, (2009). The demand of personnel automobile. *J. of consumer Buying Behaviour* Vol. 18. Pp 111 – 120.
- Kotler P and Armstrong G, (2008). *Principles of marketing*. 12th Ed. New Jersey. Prentice hall.
- Lee C and Beatty S, (2002). Judgments of Relative Influence in Family Decision Making using observation. *Asia pacific Advances in Consumer Research*, 5 (1): 223
- Noller P and Fitz Patrick M, (1993). Family Decision-making process. *J. on Decision-Making* Pp. 352.
- Scott P, (2001). Psychological study of Human Development: Implication for Investment decision making *J. of Psychology and financial Market* Vol. 2 Pp. 160 – 172.
- Siovic P, (2001). Psychological study of human judgment: Implication for Investment decision-making *J. of Psychology and Financial market* (2) Pp 160 – 172.
- Solomon O, (2006). Consumer behavior; An European perspective. *Financial Times* Pp. 482 – 491.
- Wang S, Halloway E and Hill W, (2007). Adolescent influence in family purchase decisions. An update and cross national extension *J. of Business Research* 60(11) 117 -1124.
- Williams L and Burns A, (2000). Exploring the Dimensionality of children direct influence attempts. *Advances in Consumer Research* 64 – 71.