

**Study on Existing users influence to Rural Consumers for the  
Purchase of varies durable goods**

**Sureshraj.S.G <sup>1</sup>**

Assistant Professor of Business Administration, CK College of Engineering and Technology,  
Cuddalore- 607003, Tamil Nadu.

---

**Abstracts**

Consumer satisfaction is predominant in the purchase; it may differ to person to person by the way of physiological base, though it is measured through various types and ways. Here it is going to measure the influence of existing users to rural consumer on the purchase of durable goods. In the present scenario the rural consumers' purchase capacity is distinguished from the past, because of the information literacy. The communication revolution also capsizes the situation of the rural consumers and brought them to the bright. In this context it is discussed the importance of the existing users influence to the rural consumers in the purchase.

**Key words:** purchase decision; existing users; durable goods; rural consumer

---

<sup>1</sup> corresponding author

**Aauthor Bio-data**

**\*S.G.SURESHRAJAN:** I have completed M.Sc (Mathematics), M.B.A., M.Com. M.Phil., degree from Annamalai University, Tamil Nadu and cleared UGC-NET examination. Now I am currently Ph.D Scholar in Bharathidasan University, Tricharapalli. I am 10 years Marketing experience in varies Market like Durable, FMCG, and Service Marketing. And I have 8 years in teaching experience. Now I am working as Assistant Professor of Business Administration, CK College of Engineering and Technology, Cuddalore- 607003, Tamil Nadu, India.

---

## Introduction

Normally the consumer purchasing intention is elasticity on various ways. The purchase of durable goods is not easy decision made by the consumer, though the rural consumer case the product must be satisfied their psychological intention. Whether it is recommended by a media or a person of existing users would be dominated finally. In this study it is recognized the aspect and took survey on the rural consumers.

Existing users influence to consumers, based on their self- concept (self image) premise is that people's possessions contribute to and reflect their identities; that is four major psychological factors motivation (internal/external, personal, non-personal) perception, learning and beliefs & attitudes.

The report sample data analyzed the existing users influence to stratified rural consumers are significantly to purchase the entire product or differ. This report recommends to marketers how to approach the consumers and based on the products promotion. The research investigating to buyer's decisions also are influenced by other personal characteristics such as the influencer's age and life cycle stage, occupation, economic situation, life style, personality and self concept. Person's (users) distinct personality influences his or her buying behavior; personality refers to the unique psychological characteristics that lead to relatively consistent and lasting responses to one's own environment.

## Literature Review

**Alba**, et.al (1987) researched the concept of prior knowledge is defined in term of the extent of experience and familiarity that one has a product (good or service); and commonly refers to information that is (1) accessible from memory and (2) generally accessed before external

search occurs. Prior knowledge has been defined in at least three conceptually different ways: (1) experience-based prior knowledge, (2) subjective prior knowledge, and (3) objective prior knowledge.

**Park**, et.al (1981) defined experience-based prior knowledge has been defined in term of three components of familiarity with products: search experience, usage experience, and ownership. Subjective prior knowledge has been defined as consumer self assessment of product domain knowledge.

**Brucks** (1985) Objective prior knowledge is the preferred conceptualization of prior knowledge, because it is based on the actual content and organization of knowledge held in memory, i.e. product attributes, general attribute evaluation, specific attribute evaluation, general product usage, brand facts, and purchasing/decision making procedures.

### **Purpose**

The purpose of the study is to examine the stratified rural consumers influenced by existing users in the purchase of various durable goods, and identified consumers' experience would be helpful to the marketers to improve their sales volume against the rural market and purchase.

### **Research Methodology and Data Collection**

The respondents for this study included 450 consumers residing in rural communities at the Nagapattinam district, in Tamilnadu South India. Rural communities were defined as rural and surrounding rural areas, so we are applying multi-stage sampling method, and stratified the respondent in occupation wise like Agriculturist, Government workers, Private workers, Business people, Housewives and Students, from the each segmented in 75 samples. The respondents' ages ranged from 20 to above 60, the level of education is segmented from

under secondary to professional in six categories, and family monthly income level segmented below Rs. 5,000 to above Rs. 20,000 in five categories. In this study 284 male and 166 female respondents are participated, a questionnaire is administered on different items related to attitudes of the consumers. The statements were measurable on the Likert scale of 1-5; where 5- indicated most important and 1-indicated less important. The questionnaires were pretested on set of 50 respondents to assess validity and reliability of the questionnaires. Among the sample of respondents examine existing users influence to consumers on purchase requirement of varies durable goods such as Television, Audio (music player), Cell Phone, and Two-wheeler.

**Table-1: Existing users influence to stratified rural respondents on the purchase of varies durable goods**

<b>Television</b>						
<b>Occupation</b>	<b>Agriculturist</b>	<b>Government employee</b>	<b>Private employee</b>	<b>Business people</b>	<b>House-wives</b>	<b>Total</b>
<b>Important levels</b>						
Most important	28(41.2%)	16(21.3%)	34(47.2%)	9(13.6%)	15(23.8%)	102(29.7%)
Important	13(19.1%)	5(6.7%)	11(15.3%)	3(4.6%)	7(11.1%)	39(11.3%)
Undecided	6(8.8%)	0	5(6.9%)	8(12.1%)	9(14.3%)	28(8.8%)
Less important	17(25%)	19(25.3%)	7(9.7%)	13(19.7%)	11(17.5%)	67(19.5%)
Not at all	4(5.9%)	35(46.7%)	15(20.9%)	33(50%)	21(33.3%)	108(31.4%)
<b>Total</b>	<b>68</b>	<b>75</b>	<b>72</b>	<b>66</b>	<b>63</b>	<b>344</b>
<b>Audio</b>						
Most important	35(47.9%)	21(28%)	33(45.8%)	16(22.5%)	24(33.3%)	129(35.5%)
Important	16(21.9%)	9(12%)	12(16.7%)	9(12.7%)	13(18.1%)	59(16.3%)
Undecided	7(9.6%)	0	4(5.6%)	7(9.9%)	9(12.5%)	27(7.4%)
Less important	12(16.5%)	17(22.7%)	9(12.5%)	17(23.9%)	14(19.4%)	69(19%)
Not at all	3(4.1%)	28(37.3%)	14(19.4%)	22(31%)	12(16.7%)	79(21.8%)
<b>Total</b>	<b>73</b>	<b>75</b>	<b>72</b>	<b>71</b>	<b>72</b>	<b>363</b>
<b>Cell Phone</b>						
<b>Occupation</b>	<b>Agriculturist</b>	<b>Government employee</b>	<b>Private employee</b>	<b>Business people</b>	<b>Students</b>	<b>Total</b>
<b>Important levels</b>						
Most important	41(67.2%)	21(28%)	33(45.8%)	27(36%)	19(55.9%)	141(44.5%)
Important	12(19.7%)	14(18.6%)	9(12.5%)	9(12%)	4(11.8%)	48(15.1%)
Undecided	3(4.9%)	0	4(5.5%)	6(8%)	0	13(4.1%)
Less important	5(8.2%)	17(22.7%)	11(15.4%)	14(18.7%)	9(26.5%)	56(17.7%)

Not at all	0	23(30.7%)	15(20.8%)	19(25.3%)	2(5%)	59(18.6%)
Total	<b>61</b>	<b>75</b>	<b>72</b>	<b>75</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>317</b>
<b>Two-wheeler</b>						
Most important	21(50%)	20(28.2%)	26(39.4%)	19(29.7%)	16(57.1%)	102(37.7%)
Important	10(23.9%)	11(15.5%)	17(25.8%)	10(15.6%)	7(25%)	55(20.3%)
Undecided	3(7.1%)	0	5(7.6%)	4(6.3%)	0	12(4.4%)
Less important	5(11.9%)	16(22.5%)	14(21.2%)	18(28.1%)	2(7.2%)	55(20.3%)
Not at all	3(7.1%)	24(33.8%)	4(6%)	13(20.3%)	3(10.7%)	47(17.3%)
Total	<b>42</b>	<b>71</b>	<b>66</b>	<b>64</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>271</b>

**Table-2: Statistics of existing users' influence to stratified rural respondents on the purchase of varies durable goods**

<b>Television</b>					
<b>Occupation</b>	Agriculturist	Government employee	Private employee	Business people	House-wives
<b>Statistics</b>					
Mean	13.6	15.0	14.4	13.2	12.6
Std. Deviation(SD)	9.6	13.6	11.6	11.6	5.6
Std. Error(SE)	4.3	6.1	5.2	5.2	2.5
<b>Audio</b>					
Mean	14.6	15.0	14.4	14.2	14.4
Std. Deviation(SD)	12.4	10.8	11.1	6.1	5.7
Std. Error(SE)	5.5	4.8	4.9	2.7	2.5
<b>Cell Phone</b>					
<b>Occupation</b>	Agriculturist	Government employee	Private employee	Business people	Students
<b>Statistics</b>					
Mean	12.2	15.0	14.4	15.0	6.8
Std. Deviation(SD)	16.7	9.1	11.1	8.3	7.6
Std. Error(SE)	7.5	4.0	4.9	3.7	3.4
<b>Two-wheeler</b>					
Mean	8.4	14.2	13.2	12.8	5.6
Std. Deviation(SD)	7.6	9.3	9.1	6.1	6.3
Std. Error(SE)	3.4	4.1	4.0	2.7	8.3

**Table-3: ANOVA for existing users' influence to stratified rural respondents on the purchase requirement of varies durable goods**

<b>Products</b>	<b>Sources of Variation</b>	<b>Sum of Square</b>	<b>Mean Square</b>	<b>d.f.</b>	<b>F</b>	<b>Sig.</b>
<b>Television</b>	Between Group	18.16	4.54	4	<b>0.039</b>	NS
	Within Group	2314.4	115.72	20		
	<b>Total</b>	<b>2332.6</b>		<b>24</b>		
<b>Audio</b>	Between Group	1.84	0.46	4	<b>0.004</b>	NS
	Within Group	1856.4	92.82	20		
	<b>Total</b>	<b>1858.2</b>		<b>24</b>		
<b>Cell Phone</b>	Between Group	242.64	60.66	4	<b>0.495</b>	NS
	Within Group	2448.8	122.44	20		
	<b>Total</b>	<b>2691.4</b>		<b>24</b>		
<b>Two-wheeler</b>	Between Group	270.56	67.64	4	<b>1.110</b>	NS
	Within Group	1218.8	60.94	20		
	<b>Total</b>	<b>1489.4</b>		<b>24</b>		

**Table-4: ANOVA for existing users' influence against the purchase of varies durable goods of various stratified rural respondents**

<b>Stratified respondents</b>	<b>Sources of Variation</b>	<b>Sum of Square</b>	<b>Mean Square</b>	<b>d.f.</b>	<b>F</b>	<b>Sig.</b>
<b>Agriculturist</b>	Between product	110.80	36.93	3	<b>0.253</b>	NS
	Within product	2332.4	145.78	16		
	<b>Total</b>	<b>2443.2</b>		<b>19</b>		
<b>Government employee</b>	Between product	2.40	0.80	3	<b>0.006</b>	NS
	Within product	1886.8	117.93	16		
	<b>Total</b>	<b>1889.2</b>		<b>19</b>		
<b>Private employee</b>	Between product	5.40	1.80	3	<b>0.015</b>	NS
	Within product	1854.4	115.9	16		
	<b>Total</b>	<b>1859.8</b>		<b>19</b>		
<b>Business people</b>	Between product	14.80	4.93	3	<b>0.070</b>	NS
	Within product	1120.4	70.02	16		
	<b>Total</b>	<b>1135.2</b>		<b>19</b>		

Table 1 shows the existing users are induces to stratified respondents like Agriculturist, Government and Private employee, Business people, House wives and Students. They purchased the specified product like Television, Audio, Cell phone and Two- wheeler.

The existing users influence on purchase of the product television to the respondents, the data interpreted overall 29.7% of respondents are represented most important to the factor, 11.3%

of respondents are important to the factor of existing users influence. 31.4% of the respondents are less important to the factor. In particularly 41.2% of Agriculturist, 21.3% of Government employee, 47.2% of Private employee, 13.6% of Business people and 23.8% of Housewives are represented most important to the factor. ANOVA test employed in the product of television between the segmented groups, the F- ratio is 0.039 and 5% F – limit (4, 20) is 2.87, it's greater than F- ratio; so it's resulted that the segmented respondents are not significant between them.

The same factor consider to the product Audio between the segmented groups. Overall 35.5% of respondents are represented most important to the factor, 16.3% of respondents are important in the factor existing users influence. 21.8% of the respondents are less important to the factor. In particularly 47.9% of Agriculturist, 28% of Government employee, 45.8% of Private employee, 22.5% of Business people and 33.3% of Housewives are represented most important to the factor. ANOVA test employed in the product of Audio between the segmented groups, the F- ratio is 0.004 and 5% F – limit (4, 20) is 2.87, it's greater than F- ratio; so it's resulted that the segmented respondents are not significant between them.

The next product Cell phone purchase considers the factor existing users are influence between the segmented groups. Overall 44.5% of respondents are represent most important to the factor, 15.1% of respondents are important to the factor of existing users influence. 18.6% of the respondents are less important to the factor. In particularly 67.2% of Agriculturist, 28% of Government employee, 45.8% of Private employee, 36% of Business people and 55.9% of Students are represent most important to consider the factor. ANOVA test employed in the product of cell phone between the segmented groups, the F- ratio is 0.495 and 5% F – limit (4, 20) is 2.87, it's greater than F- ratio; so it's resulted that the segmented respondents are not significant between them.

Then next product Two-wheeler purchase considers the same factor between the segmented groups. Overall 37.7% of respondents are represent most important to the factor, 20.3% of respondents are important in the factor of existing users influence.17.3% of the respondents are less important to the factor. In particularly 50% of Agriculturist, 28.2% of Government employee, 39.4% of Private employee, 29.7% of Business man and 57.1% of Students are represented most important to consider the factor. ANOVA test employed in the product of Two-wheeler between the segmented groups, the F- ratio is 1.110 and 5% F – limit (4, 20) is 2.87, it's greater than F- ratio; so resulted that the segmented respondents are not significant between them.

The above statement inferred that the segmented groups are not significant to purchase of each and every product. The table-4 ANOVA test employed the existing users influence to Agriculturist on purchase to different product like Television, Audio, Cell phone, and Two-wheeler. The SDs are 9.6, 12.4, 16.7 and 7.6 respectively the above product, the F- ratio is 0.253 and 5% F-limit (3,16) is 3.24, it's greater than F-ratio; so resulted that the existing users influences to Agriculturist are not significant to different product. The same factor influence to Government employee on purchase to different product like Television, Audio, Cell phone and Two- wheeler, the SDs are 13.6, 10.8, 9.1 and 9.3 respectively the above product, the F- ratio is 0.006 and 5% F-limit (3, 16) is 3.24, it's greater than F-ratio; so resulted that the existing users influences to Government employee are not significant to different product.

The same factor influence to Private employee on purchase to different product like Television, Audio, Cell phone and Two- wheeler, the SDs are 11.6, 11.0, 11.1 and 9.0 respectively the above product, the F- ratio is 0.015 and 5% F-limit (3, 16) is 3.24, it's greater



than F-ratio; so resulted that the existing users influences to private employee are not significant to different product.

Existing users influence to Business people on purchase to different product like Television, Audio, Cell phone and Two- wheeler, the SDs are 11.6, 6.1, 8.3 and 6.1 respectively the above product, the F- ratio is 0.070 and 5% F-limit (3, 16) is 3.24, it's greater than F-ratio; so resulted that the existing users influences to Business people are not significant to different product.

### **Findings and conclusion**

The study interpreted that the stratified rural respondents are not even their influenced by existing users towards the purchase of the sample product like Television, Audio, Cell phone, and Two-wheeler, at the same time every stratified respondent are influenced by existing users is differs to product wise. The study concludes that the distinct personality influences to his or her own buying behavior, and distinct personality experience and familiarity is differ in product wise. The study recommend to marketers' unique promotion tool may not successful lead to the consumers, for the sack it may be identified the potential of consumers in segmented wise, and their promotion. So it is possible to emphasize the product way in multi dimension approach.

### **References**

1. Alba.Joseph.W and J.Wesley Hutchinson, (1987), "Dimension of Consumer Expertise" Journal of consumer research, 13 (March), p-411-454.
2. Bruck.Merries, (1985), "The Effects of product class Knowledge on Information Search Behavior", Journal of consumer Research, 12(June), p-1-16.

3. Kotler and Armstrong, (2004), "Principles of marketing" (10<sup>th</sup> Ed.) Pearson Education, Inc. p-177-206.
4. Park.C.Whan and V.Parker Lessig (1981), "Familiarity and Its Impact on Consumer Decision Biases and Heuristic", Journal of consumer Research 8(September), p-223-230.