Chapter-IV

Impact of Marital Status, Sex, Age and Residence on Consumer's Lifestyle

1. Marital Status and Lifestyle of Consumers
2. Sex and Lifestyle of Consumers
3. Age and Lifestyle of Consumers
4. Location of Residence and Lifestyle of Consumers
An attempt has been made to ascertain whether demographic factors i.e. material status, sex, age and location of residence of selected consumers contribute to shaping lifestyles. For this purpose, the following variables were examined for each of the seven lifestyles: marital status, sex, age, location of residence.

1. **Marital Status and Lifestyle of Consumers**

The total sample of 436 respondents consisted of 203 unmarried and 233 married persons. In order to ascertain whether the lifestyles of the married respondents were different from the lifestyles of unmarried respondents, the means, the standard deviations and the t-values with reference to the seven lifestyles were computed. The results are shown in Table 4.1.

As revealed by the Table, the married and the unmarried respondents differ significantly with respect to five factors, namely, ‘stay-at-home traditionalists’, the ‘social climbers’, the ‘security seekers’, the ‘privileged’ and the ‘independents’. These differences were found to be significant at 0.01 level of significance.

As shown in the Table, there are no significant differences on account of marital status for two lifestyles factors, viz., ‘progressive providents’ and the ‘conservatives’.

On reviewing the mean Values, we find that the mean for the married respondents belonging to the ‘stay-at-home traditionalists’ lifestyle...
Table 4.1
Marital Status and Lifestyles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S. No.</th>
<th>Lifestyles</th>
<th>Unmarried (N = 203)</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>Married (N = 233)</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>d.f.</th>
<th>t-values</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Progressive Providents</td>
<td>15.28</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td>14.91</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>434</td>
<td>1.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Social-Climbers</td>
<td>6.52</td>
<td>1.74</td>
<td>6.07</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td>434</td>
<td>2.72**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Security-Seekers</td>
<td>6.95</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>6.57</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>434</td>
<td>2.87**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Conservatives</td>
<td>10.58</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>10.93</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>434</td>
<td>1.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Privileged</td>
<td>2.46</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>434</td>
<td>4.33**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Independents</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>2.35</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>434</td>
<td>5.02**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Significant at 0.01 level of significance (P < 0.01)
(factor 1), ‘privileged’ lifestyle (factor 6) and the lifestyle of the ‘independents’ (factor 7) are significantly higher as compared to the unmarried respondents. On the other hand, the mean values for the ‘social climbers’ (factor 3) and the ‘security-seekers’ (factor 4) are significantly higher for the unmarried respondents.

Thus, the married respondents appear to be represented by three lifestyles, the ‘stay-at-home traditionalists’, the, ‘privileged’ and the ‘independents’. The ‘social climbers’ and the ‘security-seekers’ are likely to be unmarried.

The unmarried respondents appear to be more outgoing and socially active. They seek the security of social interaction and urban life. The results suggest that marriage is likely to promote the feelings of security among individuals and at the same time, it tends to reduce social interaction and interests outside the family. This partially explains why married respondents seem to belong to the ‘stay-at-home traditionalists’ lifestyle.

The lifestyles of the ‘conservatives’ (factor 5) and the ‘progressive providents’, (factor 2) are not likely to be influenced by their marital status. The married as well as the unmarried respondents can both belong to the ‘conservative’ and the ‘progressive providents’ lifestyles.

Thus, there are significant differences in the lifestyles of the middle-class respondents on account of whether they are married or not. Thus, marital status influences, to a significant extent, the lifestyles of the middle-class respondents of Meerut Division.
2. **Sex and Lifestyle of Consumers**

In order to ascertain whether the lifestyles of males and females were different, relevant means, standard deviations and the t-values were computed on a sample of 195 males and 241 females. The results are presented in Table 4.2. The Table reveals that the differences are significant at 0.01 level of significance for the lifestyles of the ‘security-seekers’ (factor 4), and the ‘conservatives’ (factor 5). Differences are significant (at 0.05 level of significance) for the lifestyles of the ‘progressive providents’ (factor 2), the ‘social climbers’ (factor 3) and the ‘independents’ (factor 7).

No significant differences were, however, found on account of sex for the ‘stay-at-home traditionalists’ (factor 1) and the ‘privileged’ (factor 6) lifestyles.

The mean values were found to be higher for males for the lifestyles of the ‘security-seekers’, the ‘conservatives’, the ‘progressive providents’ and the ‘social climbers’. The mean values were higher for females in the case of the lifestyle of ‘independents’.

This implies that the males are more likely to belong to the lifestyle of ‘security-seekers’, the ‘conservatives’, the ‘progressive providents’ and the ‘social climbers’. Women, on the other hand, are likely to be represented more by the ‘independent’ lifestyle. Both men and women, however, tend to be represented by the lifestyles of the ‘stay-at-home traditionalists’ and the ‘privileged’. 
### Table 4.2
Sex and Lifestyles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S. No.</th>
<th>Lifestyles</th>
<th>Males (N = 195)</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>Females (N = 241)</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>d.f.</th>
<th>t-values</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Stay-at-Home Traditionalists</td>
<td>22.85</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>22.43</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td>434</td>
<td>1.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Progressive Providents</td>
<td>15.38</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td>14.84</td>
<td>2.39</td>
<td>434</td>
<td>2.37*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Social-Climbers</td>
<td>6.47</td>
<td>1.82</td>
<td>6.13</td>
<td>1.65</td>
<td>434</td>
<td>2.01*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Conservatives</td>
<td>11.19</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>10.42</td>
<td>2.05</td>
<td>434</td>
<td>3.83**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Privileged</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>434</td>
<td>0.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Independents</td>
<td>2.02</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>434</td>
<td>2.44**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant at 0.05 level of significance (P < 0.05)
**Significant at 0.01 level of significance (P < 0.01)
Thus, men are likely to feel more insecure than women; perhaps due to the formers’ role as bread winners of the family and decision-makers for the family’s matters. Furthermore, men are likely to be more progressive in their views on education, dowry, and sharing of household responsibilities with their spouses. They appear to be more concerned about making savings and are likely to be more socially active than women. They also appear to be more conservative on issues regarding the necessity of marriage and children, prefer a job-oriented education, and are likely to be more regular voters as compared to females.

This also implies that as compared to men, more women favour nuclear families. Thus, while women like to lead an independent family life, men appear to prefer staying with their own parents and brother(s) or sister(s) in the joint family.

It has been found that males are more likely to seek house-ownership and prefer social interaction and living in urban settlements. They seem to agree that marriage cannot be done away with and that procreation is essential for its survival. Being more ‘others-oriented’ they are likely to be comparatively more active information-seekers and information-givers and give importance to the opinions of their peer group.

With an increase in the number of working women, there is likely to be an increase in the number of nuclear families in the years to come. This, in turn, would lead to an increase in the demand for houses,
household products and appliances and related services. The above findings point out that lifestyles are influenced by the sex of the respondents.

3. **Age and Lifestyle Of Consumers**

   According to age, the respondents were classified in five groups:

   1. Those between 12 years and 18 years (the ‘adolescent’), totalling 76.
   2. Those between 19 years and 24 years (the ‘youth’), totalling 92.
   3. Those between 25 years and 35 years (the ‘adult’), totalling 133.
   4. Those between 36 years and 49 years (the ‘middle-aged’), totalling 102 and
   5. Those of 50 years and above (the ‘young-old’) totalling 33.

   In order to ascertain whether people belonging to different lifestyles belonged to different age groups, an Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) was conducted for the seven-lifestyle factors and these age groups to test the significance of differences among sample means. This was done by applying the F-test for testing the significance of differences between two variances: variance amongst the samples and variance within the samples. Significant values of $F$ indicate that the means are significantly different from one another,

   This is followed by the multiple comparison-of-means procedure to identify which pairs of groups are significantly different. The results
for each of the factors on age and lifestyles of selected consumers are as under.

The findings as per study clear that in terms of lifestyles, the adolescents seem to be following the lifestyle patterns of the ‘social climbers’; the youth are likely to belong to the ‘stay-at-home traditionalists’ lifestyle; the adults have been found to belong to the ‘stay-at-home traditionalists’, ‘security-seekers’ and the ‘independents’ lifestyle.

While the middle-aged are likely to subscribe to three lifestyles: the ‘stay-at-home traditionalists’, the ‘privileged’ and the ‘independents’, the young-old are likely to subscribe to the lifestyles of the ‘stay-at-home traditionalists’ and the ‘independents’.

Putting the above findings differently, we can say that the ‘stay-at-home traditionalists’ are likely to belong to the age group of above 19 years. For the ‘progressive providents’ and the ‘conservatives’, age seems to be no bar. Such people are likely to belong to any age group. The ‘social-climbers’ appear to belong to the 12 to 18 years age group. The ‘security-seekers’ seem to belong to the adult age group, that is, from 25-35 years of age. The ‘privileged’ are likely to be between 36-49 years of age, and the ‘independents’ are likely to be above 25 years of age. There is, thus, an indication that lifestyles are likely to change with age. The age is, therefore, an important variable influencing the lifestyles.
The findings are in agreement with the conclusions of an earlier study by Moschis and Churchill on age and advertising. It stressed that the effectiveness of marketing communication would differ according to the age and social class of the adolescent consumers. The study revealed that interaction of socio-economic status with age affected the adolescents’ attitudes towards advertising. Younger lower class adolescents held more favourable attitudes towards advertising than their middle-class counterparts. While the attitudes of middle-class adolescents towards advertising remained relatively stable as they aged, those of lower class adolescents tended to decline. The findings suggested that message content emphasising the expressive aspects of consumption might be relatively appealing to younger lower class and older middle-class teenagers than to younger middle class and older lower class adolescents.

4. Location of Residence and Lifestyle of Consumers

In an attempt to ascertain whether there were differences in the lifestyles of the buyers on the basis of the location of their residence, the residential areas of the Meerut division were divided into five districts i.e., Meerut, Ghaziabad, Bulandhshahar, Gautam Budh Nagar & Baghpat. Comparisons were between the lifestyles of the respondents and the location of their residence through ANOVA. The results are reported as under—
The analysis shows that the ‘stay-at-home traditionalists’ are confined to the Ghaziabad, Bulandshar, G.B. Nagar and Baghpat districts of Meerut Division. The ‘progressive providents’ are primarily residents of Bulandshar district. The ‘social-climbers’ are not significantly associated with any specific residential area. They could, thus, be found residing all over Meerut Division. The ‘security-seekers’ and the ‘conservatives’ generally reside in Ghaziabad and G.B. Nagar, the privileged generally stay in Meerut and G.B. Nagar and the ‘independents’ are not significantly associated with any residential area.

Thus, each of the subdivisions of residential areas has people of distinct lifestyles, as for example, the residents of Meerut belong to the lifestyle of the ‘privileged’. Ghaziabad has groups of residents belonging to at least three lifestyles, including the ‘stay-at-home traditionalists’, the ‘security-seekers’ and the ‘conservatives’. G.B. Nagar represents people from four different lifestyles, viz., the ‘stay-at-home traditionalists’, the ‘security-seekers’, the ‘conservatives’ and the ‘privileged’. Residents of Baghpat appear to be subscribing to the lifestyle of the ‘stay-at-home traditionalists’. The people in Bulandshar appear to belong to two distinct lifestyles: the ‘stay-at-home traditionalists’, and the ‘progressive providents’.

The ‘conservatives’ have been found to reside mainly in Ghaziabad and G.B. Nagar. This is likely to result in a slow adoption of new product innovations in these areas.
The ‘progressive providents’ were found to be residing mainly in Bulandshar. As a result, low price appeals are likely to be more successful for prospective buyers in Bulandshar as compared to those in Meerut, Ghaziabad, Baghpat and G.B. Nagar.

The ‘social-climbers’ were found to be free from the barriers of any residential area and were found to be residents in any part of Meerut division.

It was found that residents of G.B. Nagar belonged to a variety of lifestyles. This suggests that newly developed products possibly be test-marketed in G.B. Nagar before being launched all over Meerut division since G.B. Nagar constitutes a more representative group of buyers.

The findings thus, signify that people staying in different districts of Meerut division subscribe to different lifestyles.

The study indicated that if the sample was representative, individuals who had recently undergone a long distance move when compared to local movers and non-movers were likely to be above average in present purchasing power, above average in potential growth in purchasing power, important customers for particular products and services including major durables and household furnishing and undertook considerable brand and store-switching in the course of the move. He emphasised that measurement of geographic mobility should be used in future analysis of consumer markets to describe both the positions in lifestyle at any point in time and changes in lifestyle over time.