



IMPACT OF IN-STORE FACTORS ON IMPULSE PURCHASING BEHAVIOUR OF SUPERMARKET CONSUMERS: EMPIRICAL EVIDENCE FROM CHENNAI CITY

Mr. Rubul Bora

Department of Commerce & Management, Bharath Institute of Higher Education and Research, Chennai, India 600073.

Article DOI: <https://doi.org/10.36713/epra11477>
DOI No: 10.36713/epra11477

ABSTRACT

There has been a lot of discussion in the marketing literature on how in-store features affect customer impulsive buying, but surprisingly few researches have looked at how in-store elements relate to demographic profiles. Researcher conducted a field study at supermarkets in Chennai, India to understand more about the factors that influence buyers' impulse purchases while they are in the store. A primary survey is conducted among supermarket shoppers in Chennai, India, to identify in-store factors (window display, visual merchandising, sales promotion, and store environment) influencing consumer impulse buying behaviours via demographic variables. A self-administered questionnaire on a Likert scale was developed, and it was used to interview 125 customers who shop at supermarkets in Chennai city. Data analysis was performed using the SPSS program, and an ANOVA was used to validate the study's stated hypothesis. The findings indicated that there is no significant relation between consumer groups' impulse purchasing behaviour and their demographics (gender, age, education, and income) except visual merchandising on both male and female customers.

KEY WORDS: *Impulse buying behaviour, In-store factors, Window display, Store environment, Visual merchandising, Sales promotion.*

1. INTRODUCTION

Impulsive buying is described as "unplanned" and purchase decisions that a buyer makes without first considering the product (Vishnu, Parmar & Raheem, Ahmed, 2013). Understanding consumer behaviour is a critical component of marketing. The Indian retail industry is rapidly expanding, with many key developments such as the arrival of many global businesses, greater adoption of contemporary trade forms, the success of numerous speciality retail formats, and more rivalry in regional marketplaces throughout the world. Malls, hypermarkets, multiplexes, and mega marts are the emerging forms of modern retailing trade environments in India's main cities. As a result, it is critical for marketers and merchants to understand impulsive buying behaviour since it may assist ensure the firm's sales. According to (Pallikkara et al., 2021), external variables such as in-store advertising, appealing offers and discounts, and huge items have emerged as key drivers to impulsive purchasing. Indian retailers strive to entice customers with enticing bargains. Due to this, consumers are now more likely to actively seek discounts and offers at each stage of the purchasing process.

In this setting, the function of impulsive buying behaviour is critical for modern merchants and, by extension, academics. Retailers are doing all they can to get customers to spend as much money as possible. Many in-store aspects, such as sales promotion, window display, visual merchandising, and shop atmosphere, might influence impulsive purchase. According to (Pradhan, 2018), impulsive purchases are rising among customers as a result of an increase in the number of supermarkets, access to online retailers, the joint family structure shrinking to a nuclear size. Numerous studies have been conducted across the world, and it has been found that impulsive shopping occurs often in both grocery shops and retail establishments. To objectively examine the links between all of these affecting factors and impulse buying behaviour, this paper aims to understand the in-store factors impacting customers' impulsive purchasing decisions.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

(Pallikkara et al., 2021) discovered that impulsive purchases in the retail checkout area are modest and irregular for the majority of product categories. A number of variables, such as the ambiance of the shop, the availability of credit cards, the buyer's mood, in-store promotions, offers and discounts, and wide product options, might impact impulsive purchases at the checkout. In addition, the research revealed that Indian consumers are cautious about impulse buys at the checkout counter and are health-conscious.

According to (Ali & Zubairi, 2020), demographic factors including gender, age, and income have a substantial impact on both pure impulse purchasing behaviour and suggestive impulsive purchase behaviour. Pure impulse purchasing occurs when a product arouses feelings that prompt an unplanned purchase.



(Pradhan, 2018) found that the majority of supermarket shoppers buy impulsively. Most people do not plan ahead of time while going to the market. Personal care goods, groceries, and accessories are more frequently purchased impulsively by respondents than electronics and kitchenware. According to research, product category has no influence on impulsive purchasing.

According to (Vyas & V., 2015), demographic characteristics such as age, gender, professional participation, and educational position influence packaging reaction. Packaging impacts customer reaction to the goods, leading to spontaneous purchases and differentiating the brand.

(Chaturvedi & Yadav, 2015) revealed that Consumer attitudes toward marketing variables such as price element, trial element, friendliness of staff, merchandizing, convenience & shop image—have no strong relation to purchasing behaviour via demographic characteristics like gender, age, and education.

(Abdul & Awan, 2015) reported, demographic aspects of customers have a powerful effect on impulse purchasing. In Multan, Pakistan, demographic indicators (gender, age, income, and education) directly affect consumers' impulsive purchasing behaviour.

According to (Cho et al., 2014), in-store browsing and customer optimism are the most powerful indicators of impulse purchase behaviour. When shoppers are feeling upbeat, they explore more areas and aisles of the store, and it encourages them to take particular groups of people (peers, friends, or family) purchasing with them. This raises the level of shoppers.

(Vishnu, Parmar & Raheem, Ahmed, 2013) discovered that when a retailer gives free products and price discounts, Pakistani consumers are more inclined to buy impulsively. In Larkana, Pakistan, income level and visual merchandising have a substantial impact on consumers' impulse purchasing inclination for FMCG's (items). Furthermore, a well-decorated, pleasant, and quiet retail atmosphere, as well as colourful surrounds, encourages consumers to buy impulsively and create excitement in their minds.

(Ekeng, 2012) noted that demographic variables have a major effect on customers' impulsive purchase behaviour. Because of their spontaneous attraction to and liking fanciful items, female consumers experience the phenomenon of impulse buying more frequently than male consumers do. Similar to this, there is an inverse relationship between customer age ranges and impulsive purchase behaviour since young people are less responsible and have less concern for their financial decisions than adults.

According to (Banerjee & Saha, 2012), sensory signals of sight and visual merchandising have a substantial influence on customer perception and attitude toward impulse purchase. Consumers like shopping without the presence of a salesman.

(Tendai & Crispen, 2009) found that employee behaviour was the second most significant factor in influencing customers' purchase decisions after price. To ensure that store employees strike a balance between being convincing and friendly to customers, retailer employee training programs may be important.

According to (Chen, 2008), product type influences impulse purchases among Taiwan's youthful population. Internet shopping is not tied to spontaneous purchases and involvement with clothing products like traditional retail shopping is. On the other hand, online impulse purchase is favourably linked with product engagement and impulsive purchasing proclivity, but not with traditional stores.

3.OBJECTIVES

- To identify the in-store factors that affect consumers' impulsive purchasing decisions based on their demographic profile, such as gender, age, income and education level.
- To critically investigate the impact of such factors on consumers' impulse purchase behaviour in Chennai.

4. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

4.1. Research Design

This is a exploratory research that uses quantitative analysis to identify the effect of in-store factors (window display, visual merchandising, sales promotion, and shop atmosphere) on the impulsive buying behaviour of Chennai customers based on their demographic profile (gender, age, education and income).

4.2. Sampling Technique

The convenience based random sampling method is used. In this study, data were collected through survey of 125 respondents using questionnaire who visit supermarkets for shopping in Chennai city.

4.3. Data Collection

To carry out the research, a self-administered likert scale questionnaire was created. The questionnaire is separated into two sections: the first portion asks about demographic information, and the second section asks about in-store factors. Demographic data such as Age [with a ten-year class interval where lower range is less than 25 years and the higher range is more than 46 years. Gender [Male (82), Female (43)], Education [High school (4), UG (26), PG (85), PhD (2), and Other (8)] and Income [Under 150000 (7), 150001-300000 (9), 300001-500000 (71) and Above 500001 (38) of responses. The second section includes questions about in-store factors indicated in the objectives affecting customer impulsive buying behaviour. A total of 15 items are used to collect data on the four previously stated factors. To assess respondents' attitudes on each item, 7-point Likert scale rating questions starting from Disagree entirely =1 to Agree fully =7 are used. Following the collection of completed surveys, data is coded (Male-1, Female-2), high school-1, undergraduate-2, postgraduate-3, PhD-4, others-5. Income level less than \$150,000=1,



150001 to \$300,000=2, 300001 to \$500000=3, 500001 and above=4, and age interval less than 25 years=1, 26-35=2, 36-45=3, 46 and above=4, and then a data sheet was put into the SPSS program for analysis.

5. ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION

5.1. Data analysis: All of the data gathered from respondents was tabulated and analysed using SPSS version 22 software.

5.2. Proposition of hypotheses

On the basis of prior results and studies on consumer impulsive purchase behaviour, the following hypotheses have been presented to answer the research question.

- H1: Both male and female customers' impulsive purchase behaviour is significantly impacted by window displays.
- H2: The impact of window displays on customers of various age groups' impulsive purchasing behaviour is significant.
- H3: Consumers at various educational levels' impulsive purchasing behaviour is significantly influenced by window displays.
- H4: Window displays have a significant impact on customers' impulsive purchasing decisions at various income levels.
- H5: Both male and female customers' impulsive purchasing behaviour is significantly impacted by visual merchandising.
- H6: The impact of visual merchandising on customers' impulsive purchase tendencies across age groups is significant.
- H7: Consumers of all educational levels' impulsive purchasing behaviour is significantly impacted by visual marketing.
- H8: Consumers at various income levels' impulsive purchasing behaviour is significantly impacted by visual marketing.
- H9: Both male and female customers' impulsive purchasing behaviour is significantly impacted by sales promotion.
- H10: The impact of sales promotions on customers across age groups' impulsive purchasing behaviour is significant.
- H11: Sales promotions have a major impact on customers' impulsive purchasing decisions at various educational levels.
- H12: Sales promotions have a positive relation on customers' impulse purchasing decisions at various income levels.
- H13: Both male and female customers' impulsive purchasing behaviour is significantly impacted by the store environment.
- H14: The store environment has a substantial effect on shoppers' impulsive purchasing decisions across a range of age groups.
- H15: Consumers at various educational levels' impulsive purchasing behaviour is significantly impacted by the store environment.
- H16: Consumers at all income levels' impulsive purchasing behaviour is significantly impacted by the store environment.

5.3. Data analysis

The ANOVA test is used to measure respondents' attitudes toward impulsive purchasing.

One way ANOVA of window display on impulse buying behaviour by Gender

Table 1: Test of Homogeneity of Variances

Window Display			
Levene Statistic	df1	df2	Sig.
.122	1	123	.728

Table 2: ANOVA between groups and within groups

Window Display					
	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	.212	1	.212	.210	.647
Within Groups	123.788	123	1.006		
Total	124.000	124			

Analysis: According to the results of Levene's test in Table 1 [F (1, 123) =.122, P=0.728], the variances of the groups are equal. The results of the ANOVA analysis from Table 2 between the categorical variables of gender, Male and Female have a significant value (p) of 0.647. Just because P>0.05 we reject the above-stated hypothesis H1 [F (1, 123) =0.210, p=0.647]. This implies that the impact of window displays on impulse purchases is similar for both male and female respondents.

One way ANOVA of window display on impulse buying behaviour by Age

Table 3: Test of Homogeneity of Variances

Window Display			
Levene Statistic	df1	df2	Sig.
.965	3	121	.412

Table 4: ANOVA between groups and within groups

Window Display					
	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	.196	3	.065	.064	.979
Within Groups	123.804	121	1.023		
Total	124.000	124			

Analysis: Based on Table 3, Levene's test demonstrates that the group variances are identical [F (3, 121) =0.965, P=0.412]. As can be seen from table 4, the outcomes of the ANOVA analysis show that there is insignificant link between respondents' impulsive purchasing behaviour and their age factor, with a p-value of 0.979. H2 cannot be accepted as a result [F (3, 121) =0.064, P=0.979].

One way ANOVA of window display on impulse buying behaviour by Education:

Table 5: Tests of Homogeneity of Variances

Window Display			
Levene Statistic	df1	df2	Sig.
.935	4	120	.446

Table 6: ANOVA between groups and within groups

Window Display					
	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	2.804	4	.701	.694	.597
Within Groups	121.196	120	1.010		
Total	124.000	124			

Analysis: According to the results of Levene's test in Table 5 [F (4, 120) =0.936, P=0.446], the variances of the groups are identical. The ANOVA test findings from Table 6 demonstrate that respondents with varying levels of education got a p-value of 0.597. This shows that the relationship between impulsive purchases and p>0.05 is not significant. Therefore, H3 [F (4, 120) =0.694, P=0.597] is rejected.

One way ANOVA of window display on impulse buying behaviour by Income:

Table 7: Tests of Homogeneity of Variances

Window Display			
Levene Statistic	df1	df2	Sig.
2.911	3	121	.037

Table 8: ANOVA between groups and within groups

Window Display					
	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	.245	3	.082	.080	.971
Within Groups	123.755	121	1.023		
Total	124.000	124			

Levene's test results from Table 7 indicate that the variances of the groups are not equal ($F(3, 121) = 2.911, P = 0.037$). ANOVA is needed because the homogeneity of variance exhibits substantial importance. The influence of window displays on impulsive purchases of respondents' income level is shown in Table 8 and has a significant value (p) of 0.971. Therefore we reject the presumptive hypothesis H4 [$F(3, 121) = 0.080, P = 0.971$] based on the basis of the results. It indicates that there is no discernible association between window displays and customer impulse purchases across a range of income levels.

One way ANOVA of visual merchandising on impulse buying behaviour by Gender

Table 9: Test of Homogeneity of Variances

Visual Merchandising			
Levene Statistic	df1	df2	Sig.
.137	1	123	.712

Table 10: ANOVA between groups and within groups

Visual Merchandising					
	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	3.973	1	3.973	4.072	.046
Within Groups	120.027	123	.976		
Total	124.000	124			

Table 11: Robust Tests of Equality of Means

Visual Merchandising				
	Statistic ^a	df1	df2	Sig.
Welch	4.009	1	83.586	.049
Brown-Forsythe	4.009	1	83.586	.049

a. Asymptotically F distributed.

Analysis: According to the results of Levene's test in Table 9 [$F(1, 123) = 0.137, P = 0.712$], the variances of the groups are identical. As a result, the homogeneity of variance test indicates that it is "non-significant," whereas the ANOVA test from Table 10 indicates that it is "significant" [$F(1, 123) = 4.072, P = 0.046$]. We now look directly at Table 11's Welch and Brown-Forsythe test, which demonstrates great value. Therefore, we agree with the above-stated hypothesis H5. Therefore, it may be concluded that the impact of visual marketing on impulsive purchases varies between male and female respondents.

One way ANOVA of visual merchandising on impulse buying behaviour by Age

Table 12: Test of Homogeneity of Variances

Visual Merchandising			
Levene Statistic	df1	df2	Sig.
1.881	3	121	.136

Table 13: ANOVA between groups and within groups

Visual Merchandising					
	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	1.267	3	.422	.416	.742
Within Groups	122.733	121	1.014		
Total	124.000	124			

Analysis: According to Levene's test from Table 12 [$F(3, 121) = 1.881, P = 0.136$], the variances of the groups are identical. The influence of visual merchandising on impulsive purchases of respondents' various age groups is shown in Table 13 and has a significant value (p) of 0.742. Therefore we reject the presumptive hypothesis H6 [$F(3, 121) = 0.0416, P = 0.742$] based on the basis of the results. It indicates that there is no discernible association between visual merchandising and customer impulse purchases across a range of age groups.

One way ANOVA of visual merchandising on impulse buying behaviour by Education

Table 14: Test of Homogeneity of Variances

Visual Merchandising			
Levene Statistic	df1	df2	Sig.
1.158	4	120	.333

Table 15: ANOVA between groups and within groups

Visual Merchandising					
	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	.375	4	.094	.091	.985
Within Groups	123.625	120	1.030		
Total	124.000	124			

Analysis: According to Levene's test from Table 14 [$F(4, 120) = 1.158, P = 0.333$], the variances of the groups are identical. The influence of visual merchandising on impulsive purchases of respondents' education level is shown in Table 15 and has a significant value (p) of 0.985. Therefore we reject the presumptive hypothesis H7 [$F(4, 120) = 0.091, P = 0.985$] based on the results. It means that there is no conclusive connection between the impulsive purchasing tendencies of different educational levels.

One way ANOVA of visual merchandising on impulse buying behaviour by Income

Table 16: Test of Homogeneity of Variances

Visual Merchandising			
Levene Statistic	df1	df2	Sig.
.709	3	121	.548

Table 17: ANOVA between groups and within groups

Visual Merchandising					
	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	2.584	3	.861	.858	.465
Within Groups	121.416	121	1.003		
Total	124.000	124			

Analysis: According to the results of Levene's test in Table 16 [$F(3, 121) = 0.709, P = 0.548$], the variances of the groups are identical. The influence of visual merchandising on impulsive purchases of respondents' income level is shown in Table 17 and has a significant value (p) of 0.465. Therefore we reject the presumptive hypothesis H8 [$F(3, 121) = 0.858, P = 0.456$] based on the results. It indicates that there is no discernible association between the effects of visual marketing on customer impulse purchases at various income levels.

One way ANOVA of Sales promotion on impulse buying behaviour by Gender

Table 18: Test of Homogeneity of Variances

Sales Promotion			
Levene Statistic	df1	df2	Sig.
.089	1	123	.766

Table 19: ANOVA between groups and within groups

Sales Promotion					
	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	.874	1	.874	.874	.352
Within Groups	123.126	123	1.001		
Total	124.000	124			

Analysis: According to Levene's test from Table 18 [F (1, 123) =0.089, P=0.766], the variances of the groups are identical. The categorical variable between Males and Females has a significant value (p) of 0.352, which is greater than 0.05, according to the findings of the ANOVA analysis from Table 19. The aforementioned hypothesis H9 is thus rejected [F (1, 123) =0.874, P=0.352]. As a result, it can be concluded that both male and female respondents exhibit a similar effect of sales advertising on impulsive purchasing.

One way ANOVA of Sales promotion on impulse buying behaviour by Age

Table 20: Test of Homogeneity of Variances

Sales Promotion			
Levene Statistic	df1	df2	Sig.
1.102	3	121	.351

Table 21: ANOVA between groups and within groups

Sales Promotion					
	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	2.245	3	.748	.744	.528
Within Groups	121.755	121	1.006		
Total	124.000	124			

Analysis: According to Levene's test from Table 20 [F (3, 121) =1.102, P=0.351], the variances of the groups are identical. The influence of Sales promotion on impulsive purchases of respondents' age groups is shown in Table 21 and has a significant value (p) of 0.528. Therefore we reject the presumptive hypothesis H10 [F (3, 121) =0.744, P=0.528] based on the results. It indicates that there is no discernible association between the effects of sales promotion on customer impulse purchases at various age groups.

One way ANOVA of Sales promotion on impulse buying behaviour by Education

Table 22: Test of Homogeneity of Variances

Sales Promotion			
Levene Statistic	df1	df2	Sig.
1.841	4	120	.125

Table 23: ANOVA between groups and within groups

Sales Promotion					
	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	2.156	4	.539	.531	.713
Within Groups	121.844	120	1.015		
Total	124.000	124			

Analysis: According to Levene's test from Table 22 [$F(4, 120) = 1.841, P = 0.125$], the variances of the groups are identical. The influence of Sales promotion on impulsive purchases of respondents' education is shown in Table 23 and has a significant value (p) of 0.713. Therefore we reject the presumptive hypothesis H11 [$F(4, 120) = 0.531, P = 0.713$] based on the results. It indicates that there is no discernible association between the effects of sales promotion on customer impulse purchases at various educations.

One way ANOVA of Sales promotion on impulse buying behaviour by Income

Table 24: Test of Homogeneity of Variances

Sales Promotion			
Levene Statistic	df1	df2	Sig.
.980	3	121	.405

Table 25: ANOVA between groups and within groups

Sales Promotion					
	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	1.247	3	.416	.410	.746
Within Groups	122.753	121	1.014		
Total	124.000	124			

Analysis: Based on table 24, Levene's test findings indicate that the group variances are identical [$F(3, 121) = 0.980, P = 0.405$]. Table 25 displays the impact of sales promotions on respondents' income levels and impulsive purchases, a significant value (p) of 0.713. Based on the findings, we disprove hypothesis H12 [$F(3, 121) = 0.410, P = 0.746$]. It indicates that there is no discernible association between the effect of sales promotions and consumers' impulsive purchases regardless of their financial level.

One way ANOVA of Store environment on impulse purchasing behaviour by Gender

Table 26: Test of Homogeneity of Variances

Store Environment			
Levene Statistic	df1	df2	Sig.
.070	1	123	.792

Table 27: ANOVA between groups and within groups

Store Environment					
	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	.562	1	.562	.560	.456
Within Groups	123.438	123	1.004		
Total	124.000	124			

Analysis: According to Levene's test from Table 26 [F (1, 123) =0.070, P=0.792], the variances of the groups are identical. According to table 27's p-value for the independent variable for respondents' gender, there is no statistically significant correlation between respondents' impulsive purchasing and gender. Therefore, it cannot be agreed upon that hypothesis H13 [F (1, 123) =0.560, P=0.456]. As a consequence, this study's findings indicate that neither gender has any discernible impact on customers' impulsive purchases.

One way ANOVA of Store environment on impulse purchasing behaviour by Age

Table 28: Test of Homogeneity of Variances

Store Environment			
Levene Statistic	df1	df2	Sig.
.407	3	121	.748

Table 29: ANOVA between groups and within groups

Store Environment					
	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	7.468	3	2.489	2.585	.056
Within Groups	116.532	121	.963		
Total	124.000	124			

Analysis: According to Levene's test from Table 28 [F (3, 121) =0.407, P=0.748], the variances of the groups are identical. Table 29's finding reveals that, at the 5% significant level, there is no positive relation between respondents' impulsive purchasing behaviour and their age demographic. The p-value of 0.056 for the shop environment across different respondent age groups suggests this. H14 is therefore disproved [F (3, 121) =2.585, P=0.056].

One way ANOVA of Store environment on impulsive purchasing behaviour by Education

Table 30: Test of Homogeneity of Variances

Store Environment			
Levene Statistic	df1	df2	Sig.
1.042	4	120	.389

Table 31: ANOVA between groups and within groups

Store Environment					
	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	3.799	4	.950	.948	.439
Within Groups	120.201	120	1.002		
Total	124.000	124			

Analysis: According to Levene's test from Table 30 [F (4, 120) =1.042, P=0.389], the variances of the groups are identical. Table 31's ANOVA test findings show that respondents with different levels of education had p-values of 0.439, showing that there is no statistically positive relationship between impulsive spending and education (p> 0.05). Therefore, we disagree with the prediction H15 [F (4, 120) =0.948, P=0.439].

One way ANOVA of Store environment on impulse purchasing behaviour by Income

Table 32: Test of Homogeneity of Variances

Store Environment			
Levene Statistic	df1	df2	Sig.
.834	3	121	.478



Table 33: ANOVA between groups and within groups

Store Environment					
	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	.268	3	.089	.087	.967
Within Groups	123.732	121	1.023		
Total	124.000	124			

Analysis: According to the results of Levene's test from Table 32, the variances of the groups are equal [F (3, 121) =0.834, P=0.478]. Table 33 shows the impact of store ambiance on respondents' impulsive purchasing levels, with a (p) value of 0.967 which is more than 0.05. Based on the findings [F (3, 121) =0.087, P=0.967], we reject hypothesis H16. It indicates that there is no discernible association between shop atmosphere and customer impulsive buying across a range of income levels.

6. FINDINGS

- Consumers' demographic profile (gender, age, education, and income) when visiting Chennai retail malls and supermarkets is unlikely to have a substantial impact on the influence of window displays on their impulsive purchasing behaviour.
- There is unlikely to be a substantial correlation between the effect of visual merchandising on consumers' impulsive purchasing behaviour and their demographic profile (age, education, and income) when they visit Chennai's shopping malls and supermarkets.
- In Chennai, shopping malls, and supermarkets, visual merchandising is expected to have a major impact on both male and female customers' impulsive purchases.
- There is unlikely to be a substantial correlation between the impact of sales promotions on customers' impulsive purchasing behaviour and their demographic profile (gender, age, education, and income) when they visit Chennai's shopping centres and supermarkets.
- Consumers' demographic characteristics (gender, age, education, and income) while visiting Chennai's shopping malls and supermarkets are unlikely to have a substantial impact on how the store environment influences their impulsive buying behaviour.

7. SUGGESTIONS AND CONCLUSION

The goal of this research is to understand how respondents' impulse purchases are influenced by window displays, visual merchandising, sales promotions, and retail environments about their demographic profile, including age, gender, education level, and income. The results show that when using demographic factors such as age, gender, income and education, fifteen of the sixteen hypotheses window display, visual merchandising, sales promotion, and shop environment exhibit an insignificant association with impulse buying behaviour. On the other side, it was found that visual merchandising by gender had a strong association with impulsive purchasing behaviour. Considering the results of this study, customers in Chennai, India, do not contribute significantly to the development of the marketing techniques used by the shops, except for the exception of visual merchandising. In conclusion, it is determined that every in-store factor aside from visual merchandising is unsupported.

8. REFERENCES

1. Abdul, P., & Awan, G. (2015). *Impact of Demographic Factors on Impulse Buying Behavior of Consumers in Multan-Pakistan*. *European Journal of Business and Management*, 7(22), 96–106.
2. Ali, M. A.-B., & Zubairi, S. A. (2020). *Impact of Demographic Factors on Impulse Buying Behavior: A Study of consumer behavior in Supermarkets of Karachi*. *European Journal of Business and Management Research*, 5(3), 1–7. <https://doi.org/10.24018/ejbmr.2020.5.3.355>
3. Banerjee, S., & Saha, S. (2012). *Impulse Buying Behaviour in Retail Stores –*. 1(2).
4. Chaturvedi, R. K., & Yadav, S. K. (2015). *Influence of Product Characteristics, Promotions and Reference Factors on Impulse Buying*. *PRERANA: Journal of Management Thought & Practice*, 7(2), 43–55. <https://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=bth&AN=116944084>
5. Chen, T. (2008). *Online impulse buying and product involvement*. *Innovation and Knowledge Management in Business Globalization: Theory and Practice - Proceedings of the 10th International Business Information Management Association Conference*, 1–2, 936–943.
6. Cho, J., Ching, G. S., Luong, T.-H., Cho, V., Ching, J., & Luong, G. S. (2014). *-Non Commercial-NoDerivs CC BY-NC-ND Impulse buying behavior of Vietnamese consumers in supermarket setting Impulse buying behavior of Vietnamese consumers in supermarket setting*. *International Journal of Research Studies in Management*, 3(2), 33–50.
7. Ekeng, A. B. (2012). *EFFECT OF DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS ON CONSUMER IMPULSE BUYING AMONG CONSUMERS OF CALABAR MUNICIPALITY , CROSS RIVER STATE*. 3(2), 568–574.



8. Pallikkara, V., Pinto, P., Hawaldar, I. T., & Pinto, S. (2021). *Impulse buying behaviour at the retail checkout: An investigation of select antecedents*. *Business: Theory and Practice*, 22(1), 69–79. <https://doi.org/10.3846/btp.2021.12711>
9. Pradhan, V. (2018). *Study on Impulsive Buying Behavior among Consumers in Supermarket in Kathmandu Valley*. *Journal of Business and Social Sciences Research*, 1(2), 215. <https://doi.org/10.3126/jbssr.v1i2.20926>
10. Tendai, M., & Crispen, C. (2009). *In-store shopping environment and impulsive buying*. *African Journal of Marketing Management*, 1(4), 102–108.
11. Vishnu, Parmar & Raheem, Ahmed, R. (2013). *Factors Influencing Impulse Buying Behavior*. *European Journal of Scientific Research*, 100(3), 67–79.
12. Vyas, H. V., & V., B. (2015). *Packaging Design Elements and Users Perception: A Context in Fashion Branding and Communication*. *Journal of Applied Packaging Research*, 7(2), 95–107. <https://doi.org/10.14448/japr.04.0005>