Asian Journal of Business and Economics
Volume 4, No.4.4 Quarter IV 2014
ISSN: 2231-3699

# THE IMPACT OF VISUAL MERCHANDISING ON IMPULSIVE BUYING BEHAVIOR OF YOUNG CONSUMERS

Deepak Sahni
Professor, SGRRITS, Dehradun, India
Vipul Jain
Associate Professor, SGRRITS, Dehradun, India
Arvind Jain
Associate Professor, UPES, Dehradun, India

ABSTRACT

Impulse buying has been considered a pervasive and distinctive phenomenon in the American lifestyle and has been receiving increasing attention from consumer researchers. The retailers today are using the visual merchandising tool to differentiate themselves from their competitors and to be a prominent leader in the market to attract the customers. The reason of writing this paper is to identify the relationship among consumer impulsive buying and visual merchandising on buying behavior of customers in retail stores.

Key Words: Visual merchandising, Impulse buying, Window display, Floor Merchandising.

## Introduction

Visual merchandising, or visual presentation, is the means to communicate a store/company's fashion value and quality image to prospective customers. The purpose of visual merchandising is to educate the customer, to enhance the store/company's image, and to encourage multiple sales by showing apparel together with accessories. Therefore, each store/company tries to build and enhance its image and concept through visual presentations, which appeal to shoppers and ultimately transform them into customers by building brand loyalty and encouraging customers' buying behaviors. Visual merchandising is defined as the presentation of a store/brand and its merchandise to the customer through the teamwork of the store's advertising, display, special events, fashion coordination, and merchandising departments in order to sell the goods and

services offered by the store/company. Visual merchandising ranges from window/exterior displays to interior displays including form displays and floor/wall merchandising as well as promotion signage. It also broadly includes advertising and brand/store logo.

The store stimuli serves as a type of information aid for those who go to the store without any predetermination of what they need or buy, and once they get into the store, they are reminded or get an idea of what they may need after looking around the store. In other words, consumer's impulse buying behavior is a response, made by being confronted with stimuli that provoke a desire that ultimately motivate a consumer to make an unplanned purchase decision upon entering the store. The initial step to getting customers to purchase is getting them in the door. The purpose of this paper is to examine the relationship and effectiveness of different selected visual merchandising techniques on young customers' impulse buying behaviour.

**Objectives of the Study**

The objectives for the research can be drawn are:

1. Determine whether there was a significant relationship between college students' impulse buying behavior and window display.

.

2. Determine whether or not there was a significant relationship between college students' impulse buying behavior and in-store form/mannequin display.

3. Determine whether or not there was a significant relationship between college students' impulse buying behavior and floor merchandising.

4. Determine whether or not there was a significant relationship between college students' impulse buying behavior and in-store promotional signage.

**Research Hypothesis**

Hypothesis was developed to investigate relationships between young consumers' tendency to purchase on impulse and four types of visual merchandising:

**H1.** College students who purchase on impulse are influenced by window displays.

**H2.** College students who purchase on impulse are influenced by in store form/mannequin display.

**H3.** College students who purchase on impulse are influenced by floor merchandising.

**H4.** College students who purchase on impulse are influenced by promotional signage.

## Operational Definitions of Variables

### Dependent Variable

The dependent variable of this study was young consumer's impulse buying tendency. Five questions measuring young consumers' impulse buying tendency were included in the survey (Table 1, question numbers 1-5; Appendix. 1).Responses were measured using a five-point Likert scale, which ranged from never=1 to frequently=5.

### Independent Variables

Independent variables of this study were four types of visual merchandising: Window display, in-store form/mannequin display, floor merchandising, and promotional signage. It was hypothesized that these variables influence shoppers to buy on impulse. In other words, these four types of visual merchandising will influence young consumer's impulse buying behavior. Each independent variable was comprised of at least three questions designed to measure each variable. Responses were recorded using five-point scale with choice options of never=1 to frequently=5.Responses were measured using a five-point Likert scale, which ranged from never=1 to frequently=5.

## Methodology

### Sample

Young consumers' overspending has grown as they have more purchasing power than before with relatively easy access to credit cards .In fact, they have grown up with debt and use it freely.

Therefore, the consumer behavior of an important sector of the young adult consumer group, mostly college students, is worth researching.

**Survey Development**

The instrument used for this study was in survey format. Questions were adopted from previous research or were created by the researcher with the help of the researcher's thesis committee. External factors examined were forms of visual merchandising likely to be encountered in many retailing contexts. The research, therefore, focused on the effects of both in-store information and window display on young consumers' impulse buying behavior.

The questionnaire consisted of six major sections measuring young consumers' impulse buying tendency, influence of visual merchandising and demographics. The first section of the survey measured young consumers' impulse buying tendency. Sections two through the section five included questions measuring four distinctive visual merchandising practices that were expected to influence young consumers' buying tendency. These were window display, in-store form/mannequin display, floor merchandising, and promotional signage. Finally, the last section consisted of questions to determine the respondents' demographic profile, such as age, gender, disposable income, residential status, school status, major, and job status. Participants were asked to circle the number that best described their response. Some demographic items were measured using open-ended answer formats. All instructions and consent information were included in the questionnaire. The survey was printed on both sides of one sheet and consisted of five sections

Questions in the first section concerned young consumers' impulse buying tendency in respect to this criteria. Form/mannequin display provides customers information about new products, new and current trend, and coordination tips .The third section included questions concerning young consumers' buying behavior influenced by in-store form/mannequin display to find out if the respondent was influenced by in-store form/mannequin display when he/she made a purchase decision. Many retailers make a floor merchandising plan-o-gram/zone-o-gram and strategically place focused merchandise near the isle so that it can grab the young customers' attention when they pass by. Therefore, the fourth section included questions concerning young consumers'

buying behavior influenced by floor merchandising (i.e., merchandise itself hanging on the hangers/racks or folded on tables) to find out if the respondent was influenced by floor merchandising when he/she made a purchase decision (Appendix 1,section 4). The fifth section included questions concerning Young consumers' buying behavior influenced by promotional signage (i.e., clearance, reduced price, semi-annual sale, holiday sales.) to find out if the respondent was influenced by any kind of signs in store when he/she made a purchase decision(Appendix1,section 5).

The final section included demographic questions related to age, gender, income, residential status, school status, and job status, to see the respondents' demographic profile. Because of the nature of impulse buying, a strong relationship between emotional/affective reactions and behavior was expected despite of the possible fact that it might have been more likely influenced by external factors. Thus, respondents were asked to base their answers on their recent impulse purchase experiences.

**Data Analysis Methods**

Statistical Packages for Social Sciences' (SPSS) software is used for the data analysis. The plan for analysis is as follows: First, descriptive statistics and frequency tables were generated by SPSS for a data entry error check and demographic analysis. Then, principal component analysis with reliability test was conducted. The Pearson correlation test was conducted to see the correlations between young consumers' impulse buying tendency and each of four types of visual merchandising practices. Finally, regression analysis was conducted for hypotheses testing to find out the relationship between young consumers' impulse buying tendency (dependent variable) and the four types of visual merchandising (independent variables). Table 2 shows the hypotheses and survey location along with the planned analysis for each hypothesis.

**Limitations**

The following limitations were considered in this study:

1. The sample was geographically limited and the age range was narrow. Data collected in other areas may produce different results.

2. Participants were limited to mostly students enrolling in the College. Students' shopping traits and dependability on visual merchandising as an information aid may differ depending on their area of study.

3. The instrument was limited to a quantitative method. The survey asked participants to answer the questions based on their recent impulse buying experiences as long as they were aware of their behavior and influences. However, the qualitative research methods may bring different results.

4. Participants had time constraints. Since the survey was asked to be completed and to be returned immediately, the time pressure of the respondents may have affected the quality of the data.

**Table 1: Research hypotheses, related questions, and planned preliminary and hypothesis statistical tests.**

| **Hypothesis** | **Hypothesis Survey** | **Planned Statistical Tests** | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | **Preliminary Tests** | **Hyp. Test** |
| **H1.** College students who purchase on impulse are Influenced by window displays. | Section 1: Questions 1-5 Section 2: Questions 6-8 | Frequency table Principal component analysis Reliability test Pearson correlation | Regression analysis |
| **H2.** College students who purchase on impulse are Influenced by in-store form/mannequin display. | Section 1: Questions 1-5 Section 3: Questions 9-12 | Frequency table Principal component analysis Reliability test Pearson correlation | Regression analysis |
| **H3.** College students who purchase on impulse are influenced by floor Merchandising. | Section 1: Questions 1-5 Section 4: Questions 13-15 | Frequency table Principal component analysis Reliability test Pearson correlation | Regression analysis |
| **H4.** College students who purchase on impulse are influenced by promotional Signage. | Section 1: Questions 1-5 Section 5: Questions 16-19 | Frequency table Principal component analysis Reliability test Pearson correlation | Regression analysis |

**Table 2: Descriptive Statistics for Demographics**

| **Demographics** | | **Frequency** | **Valid Frequency Percent (%)** |
|---|---|---|---|
| Gender | Male | 30 | 12.7 |
| | Female | 201 | 84.8 |
| Age | 18 | 6 | 2.5 |
| | 19 | 46 | 19.4 |
| | 20 | 73 | 30.8 |
| | 21 | 53 | 22.4 |
| | 22-25 | 28 | 11.8 |
| | 26-55 | 10 | 4.1 |
| Residence | Residence Hall | 37 | 15.6 |
| | Apartment | 131 | 55.3 |
| | House | 66 | 27.8 |
| Living Arrangement | Alone | 10 | 4.2 |
| | Roommate | 205 | 86.5 |
| | Parents | 6 | 2.5 |
| | Spouse | 5 | 2.1 |
| Disposable income | Under $49 | 9 | 3.6 |
| | $50-99 | 23 | 9.7 |
| | $100-199 | 45 | 18.9 |
| | $200-299 | 45 | 19.0 |
| | $300-399 | 16 | 6.7 |
| | $400-499 | 22 | 5.0 |
| | Over $500 | 17 | 7.0 |
| School Classification | Freshman | 15 | 6.3 |
| | Sophomore | 109 | 46.0 |
| | Junior | 85 | 35.9 |
| | Senior | 21 | 8.9 |
| | Graduate | 5 | 2.1 |
| Job Status | Unemployed | 109 | 46.0 |
| | Part-time | 108 | 45.6 |
| | Full-time | 13 | 5.5 |

## Analysis and Findings

Statistical methods used for the data analysis in this study were descriptive statistics and frequency tests, principal component analysis and reliability tests, Pearson correlation tests, and regression analyses. SPSS was used .The significance level chosen for this study was .01.

## Descriptive Findings

First, a descriptive statistic analysis was conducted to examine whether or not there was an error in the data entry. In addition, frequency tables were generated to describe the sample in terms of demographics as well as respondents' impulse buying tendency and the influence of four types of visual merchandising on their buying behaviors. The frequency tables included frequency, percent, valid percent, and cumulative percent as well as mean and standard deviation for each data set.

## Descriptive Statistics for demographics

Descriptive statistics for the sample can be found in Table 3, providing information regarding the respondents' demographical profile, such as age, gender, disposable income, residential status, school classification, major, and job status. The majority of respondents were women (85%) whereas only 13% of respondents were men (Table 3). Since women are the major purchasers of soft goods (e.g., apparel and household textiles this demographical limitation is not considered to affect the result in a negative way. The majority of respondents lived in an apartment (55%), followed by houses (28%) including rental and purchased, and residence halls (16%), and the majority of the respondents (87%) appeared to live with roommates. Most respondents (72%) were ages 20 (31%), 21 (22%), and 19 (19%), as expected, and the average age of respondents was 21 years old. The disposable income of the respondents ranged from $2 to $1400. The distribution of disposable income was skewed with an average of $224. The largest proportion (21%) of the respondents was majoring in Child Development followed by Fashion Merchandising (15%) and Nursing (13%). Eighty-two percent of respondents were either sophomores (46%) or juniors (36%). Almost one half (46%) of respondents were unemployed and the other half had a part-time job (45.6%).

**Descriptive Statistics for variables**

Since responses were measured using a five-point Likert-type scale, which ranged from never=1 to frequently=5, a respondent scoring above three (3) on this scale in section 1 through 5 could be considered to support the variables (i.e., consumers buying tendency, influence of window display on consumers impulse buying behavior, influence of in-store form/mannequin display on consumers impulse buying behavior, influence of floor merchandising on consumers impulse buying behavior, and influence of promotional signage on young consumers' impulse buying behavior). The descriptive statistics for each variable is shown in Table 4.The mean score (3.32) for the first section of the survey, measuring consumers' impulse buying tendency, suggested respondents tended to purchase on impulse. Section two through section five measured influences of four types of visual merchandising on consumers' shopping behavior. As long as Consumers were aware of the influences on their buying decision from their recent shopping experience, it appeared that they tended be influenced by window display, floor merchandising, and promotional signage when they made a purchase decision (Table 4). However, for the fifth section of the survey, measuring influence of in-store form/mannequin display on young consumers' buying behavior, the mean scale exhibited 2.62; in-store form/mannequin display was not rated as strongly as the in-store visual merchandising variables. Bivariate correlation among variables and directional relationships between young consumers' impulse buying behavior and the influencing factors will be discussed later in Pearson correlation and regression analysis section.

**Data Reduction and Reliability Test**

Three to five items were constructed to measure each variable under study. Principal component analyses with Varimax rotation were conducted for five variables(i.e., consumers' impulse buying tendency, young consumers' buying behavior influenced by window display, in-store form/mannequin display, consumers' buying behavior influenced by floor merchandising, promotional signage) to reduce these measures into single variables. Components with Eigen values over one for each of the five multi-item scales were extracted. Once the five sets of multi-item measures were condensed to one component each, internal consistency was checked using Cronbach's alpha to ensure the reliability of data reduction.

**Table 3: Descriptive Statistics for Variables**

| Variables | Number of Cases | Mean | Standard Deviation |
|---|---|---|---|
| Impulse Buying Tendency | 237 | 3.32 | 0.7944 |
| Influence of Window Display | 237 | 3.35 | 0.9486 |
| Influence of Form/Mannequin Display | 237 | 2.62 | 0.7673 |
| Influence of Floor Merchandising | 237 | 3.49 | 0.7826 |
| Influence of Promotional Signage | 237 | 3.89 | 0.7654 |

Scale values: Never =1 to Frequently =5

The items in the first section of the survey, measuring young consumers' impulse buying tendency, initially loaded into two components with Eigen values over one (Table 5). Four of the five items loaded into the first component, and one Item loaded into the second component. This result suggests that one item (i.e., "3. After I make an impulse purchase, I feel regret.") represented a concept different from that of the other four items.

**Table 4: Initial Component Matrix of Multi-item scale for Impulse Buying**

.

| **Items (Impulse Buying Tendency)** | **Component** | |
|---|---|---|
| | 1 | 2 |
| 1. I go shopping to change my mood | 0.689 | -0.207 |
| 2. I feel a sense of excitement when I make an Impulse purchase. | 0.722 | -0.409 |
| 3. After I make an impulse purchase, I feel regret. | 0.104 | 0.882 |
| 4. I have difficulty controlling my urge to buy when I see a good offer. | 0.798 | 0.278 |
| 5. When I see a good deal, I tend to buy more than that Iintended to buy. | 0.679 | 0.183 |
| **Component Eigen value** | 2.105 | 1.099 |
| **% of Variance Explained** | 42% | 22% |

**Table 5: Component Matrix for Impulse Buying Tendency after Eliminating Item three**

| **Items (Impulse Buying Tendency)** | **Component** |
|---|---|
| | 1 |
| 1. I go shopping to change my mood | 0.690 |
| 2. I feel a sense of excitement when I make an Impulse purchase. | 0.734 |
| 4. I have difficulty controlling my urge to buy when I see a good offer. | 0.790 |
| 5. When I see a good deal, I tend to buy more than that I intended to buy. | 0.679 |
| **Component Eigen value** | 2.100 |
| **% of Variance Explained** | 53% |

**Table 6: Reliability Test Result for Internal Consistency**

| **Survey Questions** | | **Cronbach Alpha (Correlation toTotal)** |
|---|---|---|
| | **Section 1: Impulsive Buying** | **0.70** |
| 1. | I go shopping to change my mood | (0.66) |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | | |
| 2. | I feel a sense of excitement when I make an impulse purchase. | (0.62) |
| 3. | . (Excluded from analysis.) | |
| 4 | I have difficulty controlling my urge to buy when I see a good offer. | (0.58) |
| 5. | When I see a good deal, I tend to buy more than that I intended to buy. | (0.66) |
| | **Section 2: Influence of window display** | **0.85** |
| 6. | I tend to enter a store when I am attracted by an eye-catching window display. | (0.75) |
| 7. | I feel compelled to enter the store when I see an interesting window display. | (0.76) |
| 8. | I tend to choose which store to shop in depending on eye-catching window displays. | (0.86) |
| | **Section 3: Influence of in-store Form / mannequin display** | **0.83** |
| 9. | I get an idea of what I want to buy after looking through in-store form/mannequin displays. | (0.80) |
| 10. | When I see clothing featuring a new style or design on display, I tend to buy it. | (0.76) |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | | |
| 11. | When I see clothing that I like on in-store form/mannequin display, I tend to buy it. | (0.76) |
| 12. | I tend to rely on store displays when I make a decision to purchase clothing. | (0.81) |
| | **Section 4: Influence of floor merchandising** | **0.64** |
| 13. | When I see clothing that catches my eye I tend to try it on without looking through the whole section | (0.55) |
| 14. | When I walk along the isle, I tend to look through the clothing close to me | (0.55) |
| 15. | I tend to try on clothing that catches my eye when I pass by. | (0.53) |
| | **Section 5: Influence of promotional signage** | **0.84** |
| 16. | If I see an interesting promotional offer (reduced price, sales promotion, and etc.) on in-store signs, I tend to buy. | (0.84) |
| 17. | Sale/clearance signs entice me to look through the clothing. | (0.77) |
| 18. | When I see a special promotion sign, I go to look at that clothing. | (0.78) |
| 19. | I am more likely to make an unintended purchase if the clothing has a sale or clearance sign. | (0.80) |

**Table 7: Component Matrix for Influence of Window Display**

| **(Influence of Window Display)** | **Component** |
|---|---|
| | 1 |
| 6. I tend to enter a store when I am attracted by an eye-catching window display | 0.904 |
| 7. I feel compelled to enter the store when I see an interesting window display. | 0.808 |
| 8. I tend to choose which store to shop in depending on eye catching window displays. | 0.691 |
| **Component Eigenvalue** | 2.316 |
| **% of Variance Explained** | 77% |

**Table 8: Component Matrix for Influence of Form/Mannequin Display**

| **Items (Influence of Form/Mannequin Display)** | **Component** |
|---|---|
| | **1** |
| 9. I get an idea of what I want to buy after looking through instore form/mannequin displays. | 0.788 |
| 10. When I see clothing featuring a new style or design on display, I tend to buy it. | 0.843 |
| 11. When I see clothing that I like on in-store form/mannequin display, I tend to buy it. | 0.844 |
| 12. I tend to rely on store displays when I make a decision to purchase clothing. | 0.772 |
| **Component Eigenvalue** | 2.639 |
| **% of Variance Explained** | 66% |

**Table 9: Component Matrix for Influence of Floor Merchandising**

| **Items (Influence of Floor Merchandising) Component** | **Component** |
|---|---|
| | **1** |
| 13. When I see clothing that catches my eye I tend to try it on without looking through the whole section. | 0.767 |
| 14. When I walk along the isle, I tend to look through the clothing close to me. | 0.758 |
| 15. I tend to try on clothing that catches my eye when I pass by. | 0.770 |
| | |
| **Component Eigenvalue** | 1.756 |
| **% of Variance Explained** | 59% |

**Table 10: Component Matrix for Influence of Promotional Signage**

| **Items (Influence of Promotional Signage)** | **Component** |
|---|---|
| | **1** |
| 16. If I see an interesting promotional offer (reduced price, sales promotion, and etc.) on in-store signs, I tend to buy. | 0.748 |
| 17. Sale/clearance signs entice me to look through the clothing. | 0.864 |
| 18. When I see a special promotion sign, I go to look at that clothing. | 0.851 |
| 19. I am more likely to make an unintended purchase if the clothing has a sale or clearance sign. | 0.826 |
| **Component Eigenvalue** | 2.712 |
| **% of Variance Explained** | 68% |

For the second section of the survey, measuring the influence of window display, the principal component analysis resulted in one component with an Eigen value of 2.32 (Table 8). This component consisted of three questions. These three questions (see Table 8, question numbers 6-8) were closely related, representing the same concept: consumers' buying behavior influenced by window display. The overall variance explained by this component was 77% (Table 8). The reliability test for internal consistency resulted in a Cronbach alpha of .85 indicating good internal consistency of the component (Table 7). Because all three items in this section loaded in one component, conducting an additional principal component test was not necessary for this section.

In the analysis of the third section of the survey, measuring influence of in-store form/mannequin display, the result of the principal component analysis showed that all four

items in this section loaded in one component with an Eigen value of 2.64 accounting for 66% of the variance (Table 9). This result suggested that these four questions (see Table 9, question numbers 9-12) were relevant and representing the same concept: college students' buying behavior influenced by in-store form/mannequin display. The reliability test exhibited good internal consistency of a component with a Cronbach alpha of .83 (Table 7). Therefore, all four Items were retained for use in analysis.

The result of the principal component analysis for the fourth section of the survey, measuring influence of floor merchandising, all three items loaded in one component with an Eigenvalue of 1.76 (Table 10). This result suggests that all three questions (Table 10, question numbers 13-15) in this section were closely related and represented the same concept: college students' buying behavior influenced by floor merchandising. The reliability test for internal consistency resulted in a Cronbach alpha of 0.64 indicating the good internal consistency of the component (Table 7).

The principal component analysis for the fifth section, measuring influence of promotional signage, resulted in one component with an Eigen value of 2.71 accounting 68% of variance (Table 11). This component consisted of four questions. These four questions (Table 11, question numbers 16-19) were closely related representing the same concept: young consumers' buying behavior influenced by promotional signage. The reliability test for internal consistency resulted in a Cronbach alpha of .85 exhibiting good internal consistency of the component (Table 7). Therefore, all four items were retained for use in analysis. All multi item scales were successfully reduced to individual variables representing each of the intended variables. The following section outlines the use of these variables to test the hypotheses tests.

**Analysis and Discussion of Hypotheses Findings**

**Pearson Correlation and Regression Analysis**

Pearson correlation tests were conducted to see the correlations between the independent variable and dependent variables. In addition to the Pearson correlation test, a simple bivariate analysis, a multiple regression analysis was conducted for the hypotheses testing using impulse buying tendency as a dependent variable and each visual merchandising variable as predictors in order to

see if there is relationships that were uncovered in a multiple context and to determine the relative importance of the various type of influences on college students' impulse buying behavior.

The regression analysis found that window display did not significantly influence young consumers' impulse buying behavior (Table 13) even though the Pearson correlation test showed the significant relationship between impulses buying and window display (Table 12). Since the p-value (.281) from the regression analysis was greater than the level of alpha .01, the null hypothesis was not rejected. This suggested that there was not a directional relationship where window display significantly influenced young consumers' impulse buying behavior. The data did not provide sufficient evidence that there was a significant relationship between young consumers' impulse buying behavior and window display suggesting that although young consumers' impulse buying behavior and window display are correlated, the directional relationship (i.e., influence of window display on impulse buying) was not found to be statistically significant.

**Table 12: Correlation with Impulse Buying**

| Variables | Coefficient (r) | Significance (p) |
|---|---|---|
| Window Display | 0.292** | 0.000** |
| Form/mannequin Display | 0.406** | 0.000** |
| Floor Merchandising | 0.286** | 0.000** |
| Promotional Signage | 0.404** | 0.000** |

**Table 13: Hypotheses and conclusion with determining coefficients and p-values from regression analysis**

| Hypothesis | Coefficient (□) | p-value | Conclusion |
|---|---|---|---|
| **H1.** College students who purchase on impulse are more likely influenced by window displays. | 0.069 | 0.281 | Although college students' impulse buying behavior and window display are correlated, the directional relationship was not found to be statistically significant. |
| **H2.** College students who purchase on impulse are more likely influenced by in-store form/mannequin display. | 0.287 | 0.000** | In-store form/mannequin display significantly influences college students' impulse buying behavior. |
| **H3.** College students who purchase on impulse are more likely influenced by floor merchandising. | 0.072 | 0.249 | Although college students' impulse buying behavior and floor merchandising are correlated, the directional relationship was not found to be statistically significant. |
| **H4.** College students who purchase on impulse are more likely influenced by promotional signage. | 0.297 | 0.000** | Promotional signage significantly influences college students' impulse buying behavior. |

**. Relationship is significant at p< .001

**Dependent Variable:** Young consumers' impulse buying tendency

**Predictors:** Influence of window display, in-store form/mannequin display, floor merchandising and promotional signage on young consumers' buying behavior.

## Conclusion and Implications

### Conclusion

Impulse buying is a sudden and immediate purchase with no pre-shopping intentions either to buy the specific product or to fulfill a specific buying task. Researchers have attempted to determine if consumers' who frequently engage in impulse buying behavior have some common personality traits. This study further investigated some external factors that influence impulse buying behavior. In attempt to examine this relationship, this study primarily tried to explain the relationship between young consumers' impulse buying behavior and various types of visual merchandising. An important finding of this study was that visual merchandising practices certainly influence young consumers' impulse buying behavior. The results proved that there were significant relationships between young consumers' impulse buying behavior and in-store form/mannequin display and promotional signage. Even though the window display and floor merchandising did not appear to significantly lead to young consumers' impulse buying behavior, the results still suggested that these variables and consumers' impulse buying behavior are significantly correlated. It can be agreed that all four types of visual merchandising (i.e., window display, in-store form/mannequin display, floor merchandising, and promotional signage) are significantly interrelated and that relationship generates the influences on young consumers' impulse buying behavior.

A significant contribution of the present study is its elucidation of the relationship between impulse buying and visual merchandising, which has been neglected in academic research. Despite the utilization of visual merchandising to improve desirability of products and to encourage consumers' buying behavior, a dearth of research exists that investigates its influence on consumer buying behavior. The result of the present study proves that there is a pivotal

relationship between young consumers' impulse buying behaviors and two types of visual merchandising practices: in-store form/mannequin display and promotional signage. When consumers are exposed to these visual stimuli, they more likely make purchase decisions on impulse. This suggests that these visual merchandising practices, serving as stimuli that provoke a desire that ultimately motivates a consumer to make an unplanned purchase decision upon entering the store, significantly influence consumers' impulse buying behaviors. In-store browsing appears to be positively affected by young consumers' impulse buying tendency, and in turn, has a positive impact on consumers' positive feelings and impulse buying urges. Despite the importance of this relationship, visual merchandising, which was relevant of browsing, has received minimal attention from researchers. This study showed usefulness of visual merchandising in understanding impulse buying.

**BIBLIOGRAPHY**

1. Abrams, R.M. (1996). Make your store a work of art. *Advertising Age*, April 4, report.
2. Morgan, F.W. & Stoltman J. J. (1999). An investigation of retail shopping situations, *International Journal of Retail &DistributionManagement*,27 (4),145-153.
3. Beatty, S.E. & Ferrell, M.E. (1998). Impulse buying: Modeling its precursors. *Journal Of Retailing*, 74 (2), 169-191.
4. Levy, M. (1992). An experimental approach to making retail store environmental decisions. *Journal of Retailing*, 68 (4), 445-460.
5. Cobb, C.J. &Hoyer, W.D. (1986). Planned versus impulse purchase behavior. *Journal of Retailing*, 62, 384-409.
6. Fernie, S. (1996).The future of factory outlet centers in the UK: the impact of changes in planning policy guidance on the growth of a new retail format. *International Journal of Retail& Distribution Management*, 24 (6), 11-21.
7. Fernie, J. & Fernie, S.I. (1997). The development of a US retail format in Europe: the case of factory outlet centers. *International Journal of Retail & Distribution Management*, 25(11), 342-50
8. Gardner, M.P. & Rook, D.W. (1988). Effects of impulse purchases on consumers' affective states. *Advances in Consumer Research*, 15, 127-130.

9. Han, Morgan, Kotsiopulos, A. & Kang-Park, J. (1991). Impulse buying behavior of apparel purchasers. *Clothing and Textile Research Journal*, 9, 15-21.
10. Hausman, A. (2000). A multi-method investigation of consumer motivations in impulse buying behavior. *Journal of Consumer Marketing*, 17, 403-019
11. Michael Levy, & Barton A Weitz (2005) Mc Graw –Hill: Retailing Management
12. Chien-Huang L, Hung-Ming L (2005). An exploration of Taiwanese adolescents' impulsive buying tendency.[Online]. Retrieved 19 April 2010 from the World Wide
13. Babin, B. J. and Babin, L. (2001), "Seeking something different? A model of schema typically, consumer affect. Purchase intentions and perceived shopping value", Journal of Business Research, Vol. 54 No.2, pp. 89-96
14. Rook, D. W. (1987),"The buying Impulse," Journal of Consumer Research, Vol. 14 (2), pp.189-199.
15. Kollat, and Willett, Ronald. P. (1967), "Customer Impulse Purchasing behavior," Journal of Marketing Research, 4 (February), pp. 21-31.
16. Weinberg, P. and Gottwald, W. (1982), "Impulsive consumer buying as a result of emotion", Journal of Business research, Vol. 10 No.1, pp. 43-57.
17. Youn, S. and Faber, R. J. (2000),"Impulse buying: its relation to personality traits and cues", Advances in Consumer Research, Vol. 27, pp. 179-185.
18. www.businessmapsofindia.com/Indian-retail-industry/
19. Web: www.encyclopedia.com
20. 2www.marketresearch.com
21. www.google.com