

An analysis to determine the impact of deceptive advertisements on the consumer purchase behavior

¹Monika Jindal & ²Dr. Lalit Singla

¹Research Fellow, School of Commerce and Management, Sri Guru Granth Sahib World University, Fatehgarh Sahib, Punjab (India)

²Assistant Professor, School of Commerce and Management, Sri Guru Granth Sahib World University, Fatehgarh Sahib, Punjab (India)

ARTICLE DETAILS

Article History

Published Online: 05 July 2018

Keywords

Deceptive, Advertising, Consumer behavior, Misleading

ABSTRACT

Consumer behavior is a very complex process as there is presence of different determinants of human behavior. Consumer behavior is the study of different processes which takes place between individuals or groups while selecting, purchasing, using or disposing of the product in order to satisfy their needs. The objective of the study is to find out factors involved in consumer purchase behavior regarding deceptive advertisements and to evaluate the effect of deceptive advertisements on the consumer purchase behavior. For achieving this objective 305 respondents each from rural and urban areas were interviewed for the study. The data were collected on a specially structured pre-tested questionnaire from the respondents through personal interview method. The data were analyzed by using chi-square test, t-test. The study shows that There were 5 factors derived out of consumer purchase behavior. These were Preference to product attributes, Inducement by advertisements, Advertisements misleading, Stick to the brand already using and Decision after comparing different source.

1. Introduction

Consumer behavior is defined as "study of the processes involved when people select, purchase, use, or dispose of products, ideas, or experiences to satisfy needs and desires" (Boveé, Arens, 1989). Customers are people who buy or use product or adopt ideas that satisfy their needs and wants. Consumer behavior is a very complex process as there is presence of different determinants of human behavior. Consumer behavior is the study of different processes which takes place between individuals or groups while selecting, purchasing, using or disposing of the product in order to satisfy their needs. As a marketing concept the term consumer refers to not an act of purchase for itself but refers to different patterns of aggregate buying including pre purchase and post-purchase activities. Complexity of consumer behavior cannot be understood by simple observation, there is a need to learn their instincts in advance and behave accordingly for better implications of results. So Behavioral researchers are providing with more reliable concepts and modified methods of investigation in order to fully understand and predict their behavior more effectively.

2. Review of literature

Engel, et al. (1986) define consumer behavior as "those acts of individuals directly involved in obtaining, using, and disposing of economic goods and services, including the decision processes that precede and determine these acts". Jaspal, Namrata, (2011) have explored the impact of television commercials on the social and moral behavior of viewers. The study focuses on the sample size of 520 respondents from India and used survey technique. The study analyzed multiple factors by using regression method. John, Rosemary, Matthew, (2011) have revealed that the weight loss advertisements affect the

consumers negatively due to its product's consumption. The area of study confined to America and sample size of sample size of 50 respondents were used. Muhammad Wasim, Wajahat, (2011) studied about presence of unethical material in advertisements and there may be creation of greater disorder in society. The research carried out on respondents of Pakistan and focused upon qualitative research approach. Ajay Vasanthi, (2014) has examined the perception of consumers towards advertising. The study focuses on adolescents and focuses upon FMCG sector. The research carried out in India and used qualitative approach. Imran, (2014) has presented that deceptive advertising performs persuasive function and binds the consumers to purchase their products; there is a greater use of false strategies for selling their products. The study focuses on the sample size of 100 respondents from India. Heru, (2015) has analyzed that there is an impact of customer's affected behavior on customer's attitude towards organic food. The research carried out in Indonesia with a sample size of 200 respondents and used qualitative approach. The study focuses on the sample size of 200 respondents from Indonesia. The study tests multiple factors by using regression method.

3. Materials and Methods

Punjab has been divided into 3 socio-cultural regions i.e. Malwa, Majha and Doaba region. Out of 22 districts in the state, 14 districts fall in Malwa region, 4 districts each in Majha and Doaba region. Keeping in view the variation in number of districts in the three regions, 2 districts from Malwa region and 1 district each from Majha and Doaba region were selected having highest population in the respective region. One block from each selected district and 2 villages from each selected block were selected randomly. The district cities also became the part of the study sample. A sample of 300 respondents from rural areas and an equal number from urban areas was planned

to be selected. However, 305 respondents each from rural and urban areas were interviewed for the study. The data were collected on a specially structured pre-tested questionnaire from the respondents through personal interview method. The data were analyzed by using Kendall's Coefficient of Concordance (K-W), chi-square test, Z-test, t-test and factor analysis.

4. Results and Discussion

The respondents were asked to rank different attributes of product as per the influence of attributes on consumer purchase behavior for personal care products.

Table 1: Mean rank score assigned to different attributes of the product as per their influence

Attribute of Product	Rural		Urban	
	Mean	Overall	Mean	Overall
Brand Name	3.23	4	3.18	4
Features	2.56	2	2.53	1
Price	2.93	3	2.95	3
Store Layout	5.33	6	5.46	6
TV advertisements	2.51	1	2.55	2
Packaging	4.54	5	4.34	5
K-W	0.971	chi-sq.	9.71**	

It is clear from Table 4.1 that in rural areas the mean rank score was lowest to the tune of 2.51 for TV advertisements, followed by 2.56 for product features, 2.93 for product price and 3.23 for brand name. The highest mean rank score came to be 5.33 for store layout, followed by 4.54 for packaging. In urban areas, the lowest mean rank score was 2.53 for product features, followed by 2.55 for TV advertisements, 2.95 for price of the product and 3.18 for brand name. The highest mean rank score was 5.46 for store layout, followed by 4.34 for packaging. On the basis of mean rank scores, in rural areas, 1st rank was secured by TV advertisements, 2nd by product features, 3rd by product price, 4th by brand name, 5th by packaging and 6th by store layout. This indicated that first two influencing attributes emerged as TV advertisements and product features, while store layout and packaging emerged as the least influencing attributes for the rural consumers. In case of urban consumers, 1st rank was secured by product features, 2nd by TV advertisements, and 3rd by product price, 4th by brand name, 5th by packaging and 6th by store layout. This indicated that first two influencing attributes emerged as product features and TV advertisements, while store layout and packaging emerged as the least influencing attributes for the urban consumers.

It can be observed that, by and large, the overall ranking pattern was similar in rural and urban areas. This finding was also confirmed by the significant value of K-W, which indicated that there was significant concordance regarding influence of different attributes on purchase behavior of rural and urban consumers.

The distribution of respondents according to the decision-maker in the family for purchase of personal care products has been shown in Table 2.

Table 2: Decision-maker in the family for purchase of personal care products

Decision-Maker	Rural		Urban	
	No.	%age	No.	%age
Self	168	55.08	188	61.64
Family Members	127	41.64	117	38.36
Children	3	0.98	0	0.00
Others	7	2.30	0	0.00
chi-square value		12.58**	d.f.=2	YC

A perusal of Table 2 showed that in highest proportion i.e. 55.08 percent of the families of rural customers, the respondent itself was the decision-maker for purchase of personal care products, followed by family members (41.64%). In 0.98 percent of rural families, children were found to be decision makers for purchase of personal care products, while the other persons were the decision-makers in 2.30 percent of rural families.

It often comes to the notice that consumers make purchase decision for personal care products, but they do not purchase the products at the same time. There occurs a delay between the purchase decision and actual purchase. The reasons working behind this delay have been given in Table 3.

Table 3: Reasons for delay between purchase decision and the actual purchase (Multiple Response)

Reason	Rural		Urban		Z-value
	No.	%age	No.	%age	
Financial Constraints	235	77.05	124	40.66	9.13**
Waiting for more innovative product	111	36.39	103	33.77	0.68
Waiting for market response	164	53.77	155	50.82	0.73

The Table clearly showed that in rural families, the main reason for delay between purchase decision for personal care products and actual purchase was financial constraints as reported by 77.05 percent of the respondents. In urban families, the main reason for delay between purchase decision for personal care products and actual purchase was their wait for the market response as reported by 50.82 percent of the respondents.

Factor Analysis of Consumer Behavior towards TV advertised Personal Care Products

KMO-MSA and Bartlett's Test of Sphericity in Factor Analysis of Consumer Purchase Behavior for TV advertised Personal Care Products

The dimensions of extent of agreement regarding consumer purchase behavior in rural and urban areas were identified through factor analysis with the help of Principal Component Technique. The magnitude of KMO-MSA came to be 0.884, which was found to be

highly significant (Table 4). This proved that the data set is adequate for the factor analysis.

Table 4: KMO-MSA and Bartlett's Test of Sphericity for factor analysis of consumer behavior

Particular	Coefficient
KMO-MSA	0.884
Bartlett's Test of Sphericity	5486.21
d.f.	231
Significance	0.000

Eigen Values and Variance Explained in Factor Analysis of Consumer Purchase Behavior TV advertised Personal Care Products

The Eigen values of variance explained by different factors have been shown in Table 5

Table 5 Eigen values and variance explained by different factors of consumer behavior

Particular	Factor-1	Factor-2	Factor-3	Factor-4	Factor-5
Eigen Value	3.49	3.22	2.40	1.89	1.19
Variance (%)	29.62	10.02	9.00	6.46	5.42
Cumulative Variance (%)	29.62	39.64	48.64	55.10	60.52

The Eigen value came to be 3.49 for factor-1, 3.22 for factor-2, 2.40 for factor-3, 1.89 for factor-4 and 1.19 for factor-5. As much as 29.62 percent of variance was explained by factor-1, 10.02 percent by factor-2, 9.00 percent by factor-3, 6.46 percent by factor-4 and 5.42 percent by factor-5. In this way, total variance explained by the 5 factors worked to be 60.52 percent.

The statements contributing each of the 5 factors were identified through component matrix of statements related to the consumer purchase behavior. The statement having coefficient greater than or equal to .5 was taken for identification of a factor.

Comparison of Factors of Consumer Purchase Behavior towards TV advertised Personal Care Products between Rural and Urban Consumers

The factors of consumer purchase behavior towards personal care products derived through Principal Component Technique were compared between rural and urban consumers through t-test. The results have been shown in Table 6 .The statements contributing each of the 5 factors were identified through component matrix of statements related to the consumer purchase behavior. The statement having coefficient greater than or equal to .5 was taken for identification of a factor.

Table 6: Comparison of factors of consumer purchase behavior between rural and urban respondents

Factor	Rural			Urban			t-value
	Mean	SD	Overall	Mean	SD	Overall	
Preference to product attributes	3.50	0.42	A	4.01	0.45	A	14.33**
Inducement by advertisements	3.53	0.38	A	3.38	0.54	N	4.09**
Advertisements misleading	3.94	0.50	A	4.14	0.41	A	5.29**
Stick to the brand already using	2.19	0.75	DA	3.35	0.78	N	18.70**
Decision after comparing different sources	1.95	0.92	DA	4.00	0.53	A	33.68**

The analysis given in Table 6 showed that the extent of agreement on preference to product attributes, misleading advertisements, stick to the brand already used and purchase decision after comparing the information gathered from different sources was significantly higher among urban consumers as compared to that among rural consumers. On the other hand, the extent of agreement on inducement by advertisements was significantly higher among rural consumers as compared to that among urban consumers.

5. Conclusions

The study concludes that features and TV advertisements emerged as the major factors determining the consumer purchase behavior. Financial constraints were significantly higher among rural consumers as compared to that among urban consumers of personal care products. Agreement was

significantly higher on 'When I see an advertisement, I feel excited and buy something new', 'I straightway purchase any product believing upon personal care TV advertisements', 'I consider price while making purchase decision of personal care products', 'I buy personal care products when I see some celebrity using them in TV advertisement', 'In my opinion the personal care advertisements does not match with actual personal care products' and 'after facing deception my state of mind feels disappointed' among rural consumers as compared to that among urban consumers. There were 5 factors derived out of consumer purchase behavior. These were Preference to product attributes, Inducement by advertisements, Advertisements misleading, Stick to the brand already using and Decision after comparing different source.

References

1. Aaker, D.A. (1974) 'Deceptive advertising,' in Aaker, D. and Day, G.S. 2nd (eds), *Consumerism*, New York, Free Press, pp. 137-157.
2. Aditya, R. N. (2001). "The Psychology of Deception in Marketing: A Conceptual Framework for Research and Practice," *Psychology & Marketing*, Vol. 18, Issn7, Pg. 735.
3. Ajay, V. (2014). Perception of Indian consumers regarding Indian advertisements. *International Journal of Humanities, Arts and Management*, 89-114.
4. Anderson, C.A. (1983) 'abstract and concrete data in the perseverance of social theories: when weak data lead to unshakable beliefs', *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 19, 93-108.
5. Heru. (2015). Consumers' attitude and intention towards organic food purchase: An Extension of Theory of Planned Behavior in Gender Perspective. *International Journal of Management, Economics and Social Sciences*, 17-31.
6. Imran. (2014). An Empirical Research on Misleading Advertisements and Its Impact on Consumer Buying Behavior. *Proceedings of the Second International Conference on Global Business, Economics, Finance and Social Sciences*, 1-6.
7. Jaspal, N. (2011). Impact of television commercials on the social and moral behavior of Indian viewers— Empirical Evidence. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences*, 178-187.
8. John, D.R. (1999). "Consumer socialization of children: A retrospective look at twenty-five years of research". *Journal of Consumer Research*, p183-213.
9. John, D.R., & Cole, C.A. (1986). "Age differences in information processing: Understanding deficits in young and elderly consumers" *Journal of Consumer Research*, p297-315.
10. John, R. M. (2011). The Effect of Advertising and Deceptive Advertising on Consumption: The Case of Over-the-Counter Weight Loss Products. *Working Paper*. 2011, 1-70.
11. Muhammad Wasim, W. (2011). The influence and techniques of modern advertising. *Gomal University Journal of Research*, 91-99.