



ISIR Journal of Business and Management Studies (ISIRJBMS)

ISSN: 3048-7684 (Online)

Frequency: Bimonthly

Published By ISIR Publisher

Journal Homepage Link- <https://isirpublisher.com/isirjbms-home/>



DETERMINANTS OF IMPULSE BUYING BEHAVIOUR: AN EMPIRICAL ANALYSIS OF TRIGGER FACTORS AND DEMOGRAPHIC INFLUENCES IN RETAIL OUTLETS - A STUDY IN NORTH GOA

By

¹Apurva Anand Naik*, ²Vishakha Anand Parsekar

¹Assistant Professor in Commerce, Department of Commerce, Sant Sohirobanth Ambiyee Government College and Research Centre, Virnoda, Pernem - Goa, India ORCID:0009-0005-6033-3047

²Master of Commerce student, Department of Commerce Sant Sohirobanth Ambiyee Government College and Research Centre, Virnoda, Pernem - Goa, India



Article History

Received: 05/04/2026

Accepted: 16/04/2026

Published: 18/04/2026

Vol – 3 Issue – 2

PP: -63-72

DOI:10.5281/zenodo.19661235

Abstract

Whether impulse buying is triggered by universal retail factors or varies systematically across consumer demographics remains an unresolved question, particularly in emerging markets. This study investigates impulse buying determinants across four retail formats (malls, supermarkets, hypermarkets, specialty stores) in North Goa, India, using survey data from 400 consumers. Factor analysis reveals eight triggering factors with strong reliability ($\alpha = 0.909$): store environment, product features, social influencers, promotional offers, emotional triggers, price incentives, consumer comfort, and purchase convenience. We extend prior research by identifying consumer comfort—kids' play zones and warranties—as a novel impulse buying factor previously overlooked in retail literature. Our findings reveal significant demographic heterogeneity: gender influences five factors, while monthly income influences six factors (both $p < 0.05$). Notably, rural-urban location shows minimal differences, suggesting Behavioural convergence through media and digital connectivity. Rather than treating impulse buying as uniform across consumers, retailers should develop targeted strategies based on gender and income segments. Store environment and product features emerge as the most reliable predictors, guiding retail investment priorities.

Index terms: Impulse buying Behaviour, retail outlets, store environment, consumer demographics, factor analysis, North Goa.

INTRODUCTION

Impulse buying: spontaneous, unplanned purchasing driven by emotions rather than rational deliberation represents a significant proportion of consumer spending in retail environments (Akram et al., 2016). Consumers make sudden decisions after encountering product displays, promotional messages, or environmental stimuli. The phenomenon affects all consumer segments and often results in expenditure exceeding initial intentions (Menezes, 2020).

Retail outlets serve as the physical context where impulse buying occurs, encompassing diverse formats such as malls, supermarkets, hypermarkets, and specialty stores. Each format presents unique environmental characteristics that may differentially influence consumer impulse buying Behaviour. Understanding these format-specific influences is crucial for

retailers seeking to optimize store environments and marketing strategies.

This study addresses four gaps: (1) limited multi-format retail comparison, (2) no impulse buying research in North Goa's unique tourism-influenced market, (3) contradictory demographic findings in literature, and (4) unexplored consumer comfort factors (kids' zones, warranties).

1. LITERATURE REVIEW

Store environment positively influences impulse buying (Akram et al., 2016; Pooja et al., 2018; Vinish et al., 2020). Product attributes also drive impulse purchases (Yeboah & Owusu-Prempeh, 2017; Menezes, 2020). Social influence significantly affects impulse buying, with both traditional and digital sources mattering (Yue et al., 2022; Bansal & Kumar, 2018; Shahpasandi et al., 2020). Promotional offers consistently trigger impulse purchases (Diwate et al., 2020;



Tinne, 2011; Paul, 2021). Visual merchandising elements like window displays and signage are significant triggers (Thomas et al., 2018; Bashar et al., 2014; Iberahim et al., 2019).

Demographic effects show contradictions: Gender differences are debated (Tifferet & Herstein, 2012; Badgaiyan & Verma, 2015). Income effects vary (Awan & Abbas, 2015; Muthukattu & Philip, 2018). Age effects are similarly contested (Akram et al., 2016; Chaudhuri et al., 2021). These contradictions justify context-specific investigation in North Goa.2.6 Demographic Influences: Contradictions in Literature

2. Research Gap

Despite extensive research on impulse buying Behaviour, four significant gaps remain. First, most studies examine single retail formats—supermarkets (Diwate et al., 2020; Pradhan, 2018), malls (Gupta & Taushif, 2013), or specialty stores (Iberahim et al., 2019)—rather than comparing across multiple outlet types simultaneously. Second, no research exists in North Goa, a unique tourism-influenced market, as Indian studies focus on metropolitan areas like Delhi, Pune, and Mumbai (Gupta & Taushif, 2013; Diwate et al., 2020; Menezes, 2020). Third, demographic findings are contradictory—gender effects are debated (Tifferet & Herstein, 2012; Badgaiyan & Verma, 2015), income effects vary (Awan & Abbas, 2015; Muthukattu & Philip, 2018), and age effects are contested (Akram et al., 2016; Chaudhuri et al., 2021). Fourth, consumer comfort factors—kids' play zones and warranties—remain unexplored in impulse buying literature. This study addresses all four gaps by: (1) examining impulse buying across four retail formats simultaneously, (2) investigating demographic associations in North Goa's unique context, and (3) identifying consumer comfort as a potential novel factor.

3. Theoretical Framework: Stimulus-Organism-Response (SOR) Model

This study is grounded in the Stimulus-Organism-Response (SOR) framework (Mehrabian & Russell, 1974). Stimuli (store environment, product features, promotions) influence organism (social influencers, emotional triggers), leading to response (impulse purchase). Demographics moderate these relationships.

Based on the SOR framework and the factors identified through factor analysis, we propose an integrated conceptual model. **Table No. 1** presents the complete framework showing the relationship between stimuli, organism, response and demographic moderators.

Table 1: Conceptual Framework- Integrated SOR Model with Factors and Demographic Moderation.

SOR Component	Factor	Factor Loading Range	Cronbach's alpha	Significant Moderators (p<0.05)
STI	F1: Store	0.485-	0.821	Monthly

MULI	Environment	0.693		Income (p=0.037)
	F2: Product Features & Offerings	0.440 - 0.690	0.838	None
	F4: Promotional offers	0.439- 0.719	0.797	Monthly Income (p=0.006) Location (p=0.033)
	F6: Price Incentives	0.521- 0.767	0.663	Gender (p=0.001) Monthly Income (p=0.021) Rural/Urban(p =0.015)
	F7: Consumer Comfort & Assurance	0.600- 0.743	0.601	Gender (p=0.000) Age(p=0.003) Monthly Income(p=0.001)
ORGANISM	F8:Purchase Convenience	0.488- 0.729	0.437	Gender (p=0.049)
	F3: Social Influencer	0.654- 0.731	0.829	Gender (p=0.002) Monthly Income (p=0.001)
RESPONSE (Behavioural Outcome)	F5: Emotional Triggers	0.545- 0.746	0.705	Gender (p=0.005) Monthly Income (p=0.023)
	Impulse Buying	-	-	All demographics (as moderator)

(Source: Adapted from Mehrabian and Russell (1974) and factor analysis from this study.)

This framework guide the empirical investigation in this study. The eight factors (F1-F8) were derived through factor analysis as described in the methodology section. The demographic moderators were tested using chi-square analysis, with results reported in subsequent sections.

4. Objectives

The present study is guided by two primary objectives:

Objective 1: To identify and analyze the key factors that trigger impulse buying Behaviour among consumers in retail outlets of North Goa.

Objective 2: To examine the moderating role of demographic characteristics on impulse buying factors.

5. Hypothesis

Hypothesis Statement

H₁ There is a significant association between gender and the factors influencing impulse buying Behaviour

H₂ There is a significant association between monthly income and the factors influencing impulse buying Behaviour

H₃ There is a significant association between age and the factors influencing impulse buying Behaviour

H₄ There is a significant association between place of residence (rural/urban), location and the factors influencing impulse buying Behaviour.

6. METHODOLOGY

Research Design & sample

A descriptive research design with quantitative approach was used. Cluster sampling distributed respondents across six talukas of North Goa. Using 95% confidence level and 5% margin of error, 400 respondents were surveyed (minimum required: 385). Data was collected through a structured questionnaire via Google Forms.

Table 2: Sample Distribution across talukas.

Taluka	Frequency (n)	Percentage (%)
Pernem	66	16.5
Bardez	67	16.8
Bicholim	64	16.0
Tiswadi	69	17.2
Sattari	68	17.0
Ponda	66	16.5
Total	400	100.0

(Source: Primary Data Analysis using SPSS)

6.1 Research Area

The study covered the entire North Goa district, encompassing all six talukas. Responses were collected from both rural and urban areas within each taluka to enable rural-urban comparison.

6.2. Data collection

A well-structured questionnaire was administered through Google Forms, circulated online across all six talukas.

6.3. Questionnaire structure

The questionnaire comprised three sections Section A (Demographic profile), Section B (Shopping pattern), Section c (Impulse buying factors) measured on a 5 point Likert Scale.

6.4. Statistical Analysis

Data was analyzed using IBM SPSS version 26 with: Descriptive analysis, Reliability analysis (Cronbach's α), Factor analysis (PCA with varimax rotation), KMO and Bartlett's Test, and Chi-square tests for demographic associations

6.5. Ethical Considerations

Respondents were informed about the research purpose. Participation was voluntary. Anonymity and confidentiality were maintained. Data was used solely for academic purpose.

7. RESULTS

7.1 Demographic Profile of Respondents

Table 3: Demographics Characteristics of Respondents (n=400).

Demographic Variables	Category	Frequency (n)	Percentage (%)
Place of residence	Rural	271	67.8
	Urban	129	32.2
Gender	Male	146	36.5
	Female	254	63.5
Marital Status	Married	153	38.3
	Unmarried	247	61.7
Age	20 years and below	90	22.5
	21-30 years	161	40.3
	31-40 years	93	23.2
	41-50 years	39	9.8
	51 years & above	17	4.2
Education	SSC	26	6.5
	HSSC	72	18.0
	Under graduate	114	28.5
	Post graduate	109	27.3
	Others	79	19.7
Occupation	Student	111	27.8
	Profession	37	9.2
	Business	41	10.3
	Service	115	28.7
	House wife	42	10.5
	Any other	54	13.5
Monthly	Below	134	33.5

Income	15,000		
	15,000-30,000	95	23.8
	30,000-45,000	75	18.7
	Above 45,000	96	24.0

(Source: Primary Data Analysis using SPSS)

The sample comprised predominantly rural respondents (67.75%) with female majority (63.50%). The largest age group was 21-30 years (40.25%), followed by 31-40 years (23.25%). Most respondents were unmarried (61.75%). Educationally, graduates (28.50%) and post-graduates (27.25%) dominated. Service (28.75%) and student (27.75%) were the primary occupations. Income distribution showed 33.50% earning below Rs.15,000 monthly.

7.2 Shopping Pattern Analysis

Table 4: Shopping pattern of the respondents.

Shopping Pattern	Frequency	Percentage	Total
How often do you engage in impulse buying			
Always	80	20%	100%
Sometimes	222	55.5%	
Often	25	6.25%	
Rarely	73	18.25%	
Items bought impulsively from retail store			
Home care/ Kitchen/ Electronic	34	8.5%	100%
Clothes	203	50.75%	
Grocery/ Beverage	105	26.25%	
Accessories/ Jewellery	15	3.75%	
Beauty/ Personal care	43	10.75%	
Type of retail outlet preferred to purchase from			
Malls	140	35%	100%
Supermarkets	101	25.25%	
Hypermarkets	38	9.5%	

(Source: Primary Data Analysis using SPSS)

The majority (55.50%) engage in impulse buying "sometimes," with clothes being the most impulsively purchased items (50.75%). Malls (35%) and specialty stores (30.25%) are the preferred retail outlets. Notably, 33.25% of respondents spend above Rs.4,000 on impulse purchases.

7.3 Reliability and Sampling Adequacy

Table 5: Reliability Statistics.

RELIABILITY STATISTICS	
Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
.909	35

(Source: Primary Data Analysis using SPSS)

The overall Cronbach's alpha of 0.909 indicates excellent internal consistency and reliability of the questionnaire responses, exceeding the recommended threshold of 0.70.

Table 6 : KMO and Bartlett's Test

KMO and Bartlett's Test			
Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy		.894	
Bartlett's Test	Approx. Chi-square	5983.534	
	df	595	
	Sig.	.000	

(Source: Primary Data Analysis using SPSS)

Test results which evaluates the correlation between the items on Likert scale and its suitability in performing the factor analysis. The range of the coefficient is between 0 to 1 where higher value close to 1 suggest the adequacy of the sampling and suitability of factor analysis on account of significant correlation between the items. The derived value is 0.894 which is considered to be desirable justifying the adequate sampling and analysis using factor analysis.

7.4 Factor Analysis Results (Objective 1)

Principal Component Analysis with varimax rotation revealed eight factors with eigenvalues greater than 1, explaining 68.4% of total variance. Table 7 presents the rotated component matrix with factor loadings and reliability coefficients.

Table 7: Rotated Component Matrix - Factors Influencing Impulse Buying

Items	Factor Loading	Cronbach's Alpha
FACTOR 1- STORE ENVIRONMENT		
Store design	.656	.821
Window display	.644	
Layout presentation of merchandise	.693	
Space availability at store	.522	
Less waiting time at cash/bill counter	.689	

Trial facility	.540	
Convenient payment options (debit/credit card, UPI etc)	.656	
Variety of mix of shops for complete shopping	.485	
FACTOR 2- PRODUCT FEATURES & OFFERINGS		
Product appearance	.627	.838
Brand image of the product	.440	
Wide range of products	.690	
Product availability	.480	
Product uniqueness/ alternatives	.656	
Reasonable price	.580	
Budget conscious	.465	
FACTOR 3- SOCIAL INFLUENCERS		
Influence from family, friends, relatives, opinion leaders etc.	.696	.829
Fear of not availability of the same product offer in future, forced me to buy	.654	
Influence from social media	.721	
Addiction to shop/buy	.689	
My companion affects my buying Behaviour and choice	.731	
FACTOR4- PROMOTIONAL OFFERS		
Advertising (print, electronic media)	.500	.797
Coupon/gift voucher	.719	
Free trial of the product	.439	
Cash back offers/ Clearance sale	.703	
Combo offers (buy 1 get 1 free)	.590	
LED display/ Audio announcement of offers or schemes	.670	
FACTOR5- EMOTIONAL TRIGGERS		
Purchase out of emotions	.746	.705
One of the ways to spend time	.545	

FACTOR 6- PRICE INCENTIVES		
Price discount	.767	.663
Less than competitors' price	.521	
Lowest price assurance	.686	
FACTOR 7- CONSUMER COMFORT & ASSURANCE		
Play zone for kids	.743	.601
Guarantee/ warranty	.600	
FACTOR 8- PURCHASE CONVENIENCE		
Product packaging/ labelling	.729	.437
Easy return policy	.488	

(Source: Primary Data Analysis using SPSS)

The factor analysis revealed eight distinct factors triggering impulse buying Behaviour.

Product Features & Offerings ($\alpha = 0.838$) and Social Influencers ($\alpha = 0.829$) emerged as the most reliable predictors, while Store

Environment ($\alpha = 0.821$) and Promotional Offers ($\alpha = 0.797$) also demonstrated strong internal consistency. The identification of Consumer Comfort & Assurance ($\alpha = 0.601$) as a distinct factor represents a significant contribution, suggesting that retail amenities such as kids' play zones and warranties can facilitate impulse purchases. Purchase Convenience ($\alpha = 0.437$) showed lower reliability, indicating the need for improved measurement in future studies.

7.5 Demographic Association (Objective 2)

Gender influenced five factors, supporting Tifferet and Herstein (2012) and Khan et al. (2015), while contradicting Badgaiyan and Verma (2015). This suggests gender effects are context-dependent. Monthly income influenced six factors, supporting Awan and Abbas (2015) and Harshith (2019). Rural-urban minimal differences represent a significant contribution – media and digital connectivity are homogenizing consumer Behaviour, challenging geographic segmentation assumptions.

Table 8: Summary of Demographic profile of the respondents by impulse buying factors.

Demographic variables	Factors with significant association	Chi-Square value	Df	P-value	Level of significance
Gender	F3: Social influencers	42.341	19	0.002	P<0.01
	F5: Emotional Triggers	21.752	8	0.005	P<0.01

	F6:Price Incentives	27.15 9	9	0.001	P<0.01
	F7: Consumer comfort and assurance	32.55 0	8	0.000	P<0.001
	F8: Purchase convenience	12.65 3	6	0.049	P<0.05
Monthly Income	F1: Store environment	80.94 3	60	0.037	P<0.05
	F3:Social influencers	96.13 7	57	0.001	P<0.01
	F4: Oromotional offers	79.87 3	51	0.006	P<0.01
	F5: Emotional triggers	39.67 9	24	0.023	P<0.05
	F6:Price Incentives	43.99 7	27	0.021	P<0.05
	F7: Consumer comfort and assurance	50.39 3	24	0.001	P<0.01
Age	F7: Consumer comfort and assurance	58.85 8	32	0.003	P<0.01
Place of residence (Rural/Urban)	F6:Price Incentives	20.58 5	9	0.015	P<0.05
Location (Taluka)	F4: Promotional offers	110.5 43	85	0.033	P<0.05

(Source: Primary Data Analysis using SPSS)

Chi-square analysis revealed significant demographic associations:

Gender Differences

Gender showed significant associations with five of the eight factors: Social Influencers (p = 0.002), Emotional Triggers (p = 0.005), Price Incentives (p = 0.001), Consumer Comfort & Assurance (p = 0.000), and Purchase Convenience (p = 0.049). These findings indicate that female consumers are significantly more responsive to:

1. Social Influencers – Females are more influenced by family, friends, social media, and companion effects when making impulse purchases

2. Emotional Triggers – Females are more likely to make impulse purchases driven by emotions and as a way to spend time
3. Price Incentives – Females respond more strongly to discounts, price comparisons, and lowest price assurances
4. Consumer Comfort & Assurance - Females place greater value on kids' play zones and warranties
5. Purchase Convenience - Females are more influenced by product packaging and easy return policies

These results align with Tifferet and Herstein (2012) and Khan et al. (2015), who found women exhibit higher impulse buying tendencies. However, they contradict Badgaiyan and Verma (2015) and Muthukattu and Philip (2018b), who reported no gender differences. This contradiction suggests that gender effects may be context-dependent, with North Goa's cultural and social environment amplifying gender-based differences in shopping Behaviour.

Monthly Income Effects

Monthly income demonstrated the most consistent influence, with significant associations for six of the eight factors: Store Environment (p = 0.037), Social Influencers (p = 0.001), Promotional Offers (p = 0.006), Emotional Triggers (p = 0.023), Price Incentives (p = 0.021), and Consumer Comfort & Assurance (p = 0.001). Key insights include:

1. Store Environment - Higher income consumers are more responsive to store layout, window displays, and payment convenience
2. Social Influencers- Higher income consumers are more influenced by family, friends, and social media
3. Promotional Offers - Higher income consumers respond more to combo offers, free trials, and advertising
4. Emotional Triggers - Higher income consumers are more emotionally driven in their impulse purchases
5. Price Incentives - Higher income consumers are more price-sensitive despite having greater disposable income
6. Consumer Comfort & Assurance - Higher income consumers value kids' play zones and warranties more

These findings strongly support Awan and Abbas (2015), Harshith (2019), and Chaudhuri et al. (2021), who established positive relationships between income and impulse buying. The breadth of income influence across six factors suggests that disposable income fundamentally shapes how consumers interact with retail environments.

Age Effects

Age showed limited association, significant only for Consumer Comfort & Assurance (p = 0.003). This indicates that older consumers are more likely to value kids' play zones and warranties when making impulse purchases. No other factors showed significant age-based differences.

This finding supports the nuanced perspective of Chaudhuri et al. (2021) and Muthukattu and Philip (2018b), who found limited age effects on impulse buying. The specific significance for consumer comfort suggests that age-related differences emerge primarily in assurance-seeking Behaviours, with older consumers valuing guarantees and family-oriented amenities more than younger shoppers.

Place of Residence (Rural vs. Urban)

Place of residence showed significance only for Price Incentives ($p = 0.015$), indicating that rural consumers are more responsive to price discounts and incentives compared to urban consumers. For all other seven factors, no significant rural-urban differences were observed.

This finding represents a significant contribution to impulse buying literature. Most previous research has assumed rural and urban consumers behave differently (Kaur, 2016). However, our findings suggest that in North Goa, media exposure, social media penetration, and improved connectivity may be homogenizing consumer Behaviour across geographic areas. Retailers may not need substantially different strategies for rural and urban locations within the district.

Location (Taluka)

Location (taluka) showed significance only for Promotional Offers ($p = 0.033$), indicating minimal geographic variation within North Goa. For all other factors, no significant differences were observed across the six talukas (Pernem, Bardez, Bicholim, Tiswadi, Satter, and Ponda). This suggests that promotional strategies may need slight geographic customization, but other impulse buying triggers are consistent across the district.

8. DISCUSSION

8.1 Discussion of Factor Analysis Findings (Objective 1)

The factor analysis revealed eight distinct factors triggering impulse buying Behaviour among consumers in North Goa's retail outlets. These findings provide a comprehensive framework for understanding the multi-dimensional nature of impulse purchases.

Store Environment ($F1, \alpha = 0.821$) emerged as a significant factor, confirming the work of Akram et al. (2016), who found store atmosphere positively influences impulse buying. The high loadings for layout presentation (0.693) and less waiting time (0.689) suggest that both aesthetic and functional elements matter. This extends previous research by Pooja, Mittal, and Kamakshi (2018) and Vinish et al. (2020), who focused primarily on visual elements. The inclusion of convenient payment options (0.656) in this factor reflects modern retail expectations not captured in earlier studies.

Product Features & Offerings ($F2, \alpha = 0.838$) showed the highest reliability, indicating product-related attributes are the most consistent predictors of impulse buying in North Goa. This finding supports Yeboah and Owusu-Prempeh (2017) while contradicting their finding of weak associations. The strong reliability suggests that in the North Goan context,

product attributes play a more decisive role than in other settings. The loading of "budget consciousness" (0.465) is particularly noteworthy, suggesting consumers engage in mental accounting even during impulse purchases.

Social Influencers ($F3, \alpha = 0.829$) demonstrated strong reliability, corroborating Yue et al. (2022) and Zainal and Abd (2021). A novel contribution of this study is that traditional social influence (family/friends: 0.696) and digital influence (social media: 0.721) load on the same factor. Previous research has treated these separately (Bansal & Kumar, 2018; Kaur, 2016). Our findings suggest these influences have converged in contemporary consumer experience.

Promotional Offers ($F4, \alpha = 0.797$) confirms the established role of promotions in triggering impulse purchases (Diwate et al., 2020; Tinne, 2011). The high loadings for combo offers (0.719) and free trials (0.703) suggest these are the most effective promotional formats.

Consumer Comfort & Assurance ($F7, \alpha = 0.601$) represents the most significant contribution of this study. Kids' play zones (0.743) and guarantees/warranties (0.600) have received minimal attention in previous impulse buying research. This factor suggests that reducing shopping-related stress (through child care) and post-purchase risk (through warranties) facilitates impulse purchases by removing psychological barriers.

8.2 Discussion of Demographic Associations (Objective 2)

Gender Differences: Gender significantly influenced five factors, strongly supporting Tifferet and Herstein (2012) and Khan et al. (2015). The specific factors—Social Influencers, Emotional Triggers, Price Incentives, Consumer Comfort, and Purchase Convenience—suggest females are more responsive to social validation, emotional states, and value-oriented triggers. This finding contradicts Badgaiyan and Verma (2015) and Muthukattu and Philip (2018b), who reported no gender differences. The contradiction may be explained by North Goa's unique cultural context, where traditional gender roles may be more pronounced.

Income Effects: Monthly income influenced six factors, supporting Awan and Abbas (2015) and Harshith (2019). The breadth of income influence suggests disposable income fundamentally shapes how consumers interact with retail environments. Higher income consumers are more responsive to store ambiance, social influence, promotions, emotional appeals, price incentives, and comfort features. Rural-Urban Convergence: The absence of significant rural-urban differences for most factors represents a significant contribution. This finding suggests that in North Goa, media exposure, social media penetration, and improved connectivity are homogenizing consumer Behaviour across geographic areas. This challenges assumptions about geographic segmentation in retailing (Kaur, 2016).

Age Effects: Age influenced only Consumer Comfort & Assurance, supporting the nuanced perspective of Chaudhuri

et al. (2021). This suggests age-related differences emerge primarily in assurance-seeking Behaviours.

9. THEORETICAL IMPLICATIONS

This study extends the Stimulus-Organism-Response (SOR) framework (Mehrabian & Russell, 1974) by:

1. Identifying specific stimuli – Rather than treating "store environment" as a single stimulus, we identify eight distinct stimulus categories
2. Demonstrating demographic moderation – Gender, income, and age moderate stimulus-organism relationships
3. Adding novel stimuli – Consumer comfort and assurance represent new stimulus categories not previously incorporated.

10. MANAGERIAL IMPLICATIONS

For Retail Store Managers:

1. Invest in Store Environment: Prioritize layout presentation, reduce waiting time, and ensure convenient payment options
2. Segment by Gender: For female consumers, emphasize social validation and emotional appeals; for male consumers, focus on product features
3. Differentiate by Income Level: Higher income consumers respond to store ambiance and social influence; lower income consumers respond to price incentives
4. Leverage Social Media: Integrate social media campaigns with in-store promotions
5. Enhance Consumer Comfort: Provide kids' play zones and strong warranties to facilitate impulse purchases
6. Recognize Rural-Urban Convergence: Unified marketing strategies can work across geographic areas in North Goa

11. CONCLUSION

This study investigated impulse buying determinants among 400 consumers across four retail outlet types in North Goa. The factor analysis revealed eight factors: Store Environment ($\alpha = 0.821$), Product Features & Offerings ($\alpha = 0.838$), Social Influencers ($\alpha = 0.829$), Promotional Offers ($\alpha = 0.797$), Emotional Triggers ($\alpha = 0.705$), Price Incentives ($\alpha = 0.663$), Consumer Comfort & Assurance ($\alpha = 0.601$), and Purchase Convenience ($\alpha = 0.437$). Demographic analysis showed gender influences five factors, monthly income influences six factors, while rural-urban location showed minimal differences, suggesting Behavioural convergence.

11.1 Contributions of the Study

1. First multi-format retail study in North Goa
2. Novel factor identification : Consumer comfort (kids' zones, warranties) as distinct impulse trigger
3. Rural-urban convergence : Challenging geographic segmentation assumptions

4. Factor-specific demographic effects : Helping resolve literature contradictions.

11.2 Limitations of the Study

1. Geographic restriction to North Goa limits generalizability
2. Only four retail outlet types examined.
3. Cross-sectional design captures Behaviour at one time point
4. Self-reported data subject to recall bias

11.3 Scope for Future Research

1. Expand to South Goa or entire Goa state
2. Include additional retail formats (department stores, factory outlets)
3. Compare online vs. offline impulse buying
4. Examine mobile commerce features (push notifications, one-click purchase)
5. Refine purchase convenience measurement
6. Conduct longitudinal studies.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The authors received no financial support for the research, authorship, and/or for publication of this article.

REFERENCE

1. Akram, U., Hui, P., Khan, M. K., Hashim, M., & Rasheed, S. (2016). Impact of store atmosphere on impulse buying behaviour: Moderating effect of demographic variables. *International Journal of U- and e- Service, Science and Technology*, 9(7), 43–60. <https://doi.org/10.14257/ijunesst.2016.9.7.05>
2. Arulalan, N., & Fields, A. (2021). The impulse-buying behaviour of working women purchasing clothing in New Zealand. *Southern Institute of Technology Journal of Applied Research*, 13(3), 1–22. <https://doi.org/10.34074/sitj.13303>
3. Awan, A. G., & Abbas, N. (2015). Impact of demographic factors on impulse buying Behaviour of consumers in Multan-Pakistan. *European Journal of Business and Management Research*, 5(3), 96–106.
4. Badgaiyan, A. J., & Verma, A. (2015). Does urge to buy impulsively differ from impulsive buying behaviour? Assessing the impact of situational factors. *Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services*, 22, 145–157. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jretconser.2014.10.002>
5. Bansal, M., & Kumar, S. (2018). Impact of social media marketing on online impulse buying behaviour. *Journal of Advances and Scholarly Researches in Allied Education*, 15(5), 136–139. <https://doi.org/10.29070/15/57560>
6. Bashar, A., Ahmad, I., & Wasiq, M. (2014). Visual merchandising and consumer impulse buying Behaviour: An empirical study of Delhi & NCR. *International Journal of Research in Management*, 7(3), 360–366.

7. Chaudhuri, S., Kumar, A., & Bhardwaj, A. (2021). The impact of demographics on the impulse buying behaviour with respect to the purchase of grocery products. *International Journal of Electrical Engineering and Technology*, 12(8), 158–166.
8. Chauhan, S., Banerjee, R., & Mittal, M. (2020). An analytical study on impulse buying for online shopping during Covid-19. *Journal of Content, Community and Communication*, 12, 198–209. <https://doi.org/10.31620/JCCC.12.20/18>
9. Dalvi, C. S. (2015). Impulsive buying behaviour at Big Bazaar Kolhapur [Unpublished master's dissertation]. Shivaji University.
10. Diwate, A., Sinha, B., & Bhatt, V. (2020). Study on impulsive buying behaviour among consumers in supermarket in Pune city. *International Journal of Advanced Research*, 22(12), 131–144.
10. Gogoi, B. J. (2017). Effects of store design on perceived crowding and impulse buying behaviour. *International Journal of Business and Management*, 12(5), 123–135.
11. Gupta, M., & Taushif, M. R. (2013). A study of factors affecting impulse buying behaviour of consumers at malls (Delhi). *International Journal of Research and Development - A Management Review*, 2(2), 46–50.
12. Hair, J. F., Black, W. C., Babin, B. J., & Anderson, R. E. (2010). *Multivariate data analysis* (7th ed.). Pearson.
13. Harshith, M. (2019). A study on impulsive purchase behaviour of customers at Big Bazaar [Unpublished master's dissertation]. Acharya Institute of Technology.
14. Husnain, M., & Akhtar, M. W. (2016). Impact of branding on impulse buying Behaviour: Evidence from FMCG's sector Pakistan. *International Journal of Business Administration*, 7(1), 59–68. <https://doi.org/10.5430/ijba.v7n1p59>
15. Hussain, S., & Siddiqui, D. A. (2019). The influence of impulsive personality traits and store environment on impulse buying of consumer in Karachi. *International Journal of Business and Management*, 14(5), 1–25.
16. Ibrahimi, H., Rosli, N. S., Zulkurnain, N., & Ainal Shah, S. (2019). Visual merchandising and customers' impulse buying Behaviour: A case of a fashion specialty store. *International Journal of Service Management and Sustainability*, 4(1), 1–. <https://doi.org/10.24191/ijSMS.v4i1.8141>
17. Kaur, A. (2016). The impact of visual merchandising on impulse buying behaviour in organised retail stores. *International Journal of Research in Management*, 5(3), 20–24.
18. Kaur, G. (2016). Factors influencing unplanned buying Behaviour of rural market. *International Journal of Applied Research*, 5(3), 96–106.
19. Khade, S., & Sharma, S. (2023). The impulse buying behaviour of working women towards purchasing fashion apparel in Guwahati city. *International Journal of Research in Business Management*, 11(4), 45–58.
20. Khan, N., Hui, L., & Chen, T. B. (2015). Impulse buying behaviour of generation Y in fashion retail. *International Journal of Business and Management*, 11(1), 144–152. <https://doi.org/10.5539/ijbm.v11n1p144>
21. Kumar, A., Chaudhuri, S., & Bhardwaj, A. (2020). Impulse buying and post-purchase regret: A study of shopping behaviour for the purchase of grocery products. *International Journal of Management*, 11(12), 1424–1435.
22. Lakshmi, V. V., & Kumari, P. S. (2022). A study on impulsive buying behaviour among consumers in shopping malls. *International Journal of Business and Management Research*, 11(5), 108–116.
23. Mehrabian, A., & Russell, J. A. (1974). *An approach to environmental psychology*. MIT Press.
24. Menezes, M. J. (2020). A study on impulse buying Behaviour of consumers with reference to brick and mortar and online shopping product. *Dogo Rangsang Research Journal*, 7, 1–12.
25. Muthukattu, V. M., & Philip, M. P. (2018a). A study on consumer impulse buying Behaviour in Facebook commerce with reference to demographic variables. *Journal of Emerging Technologies and Innovative Research*, 5(8), 2012–2015.
26. Muthukattu, V. M., & Philip, M. P. (2018b). Demographic impact on impulsive buying behaviour of online consumers. *Journal of Emerging Technologies and Innovative Research*, 5(8), 435–440.
27. Nandi, S. (2021). Factors affecting impulse buying of beauty products. *AIMS International Journal of Management*, 15(1), 59–71. <https://doi.org/10.26573/2021.15.1.5>
28. Nyagba, E., & Tsetim, J. T. (2022). Visual merchandising and consumer buying behaviour among retail stores in Makurdi metropolis. *Quest Journals Journal of Research in Business and Management*, 10(1), 20–28.
29. Paul, M. (2021). Study on impulse buying behaviour on consumer goods. *Research Review International Journal of Multidisciplinary*, 6(5), 33–36. <https://doi.org/10.31305/rrijm.2021.v06.i05.004>
30. Pooja, Mittal, S., & Kamakshi. (2018). A study on impulse buying Behaviour of females towards cosmetics with reference to in-store environment. *International Journal of Management Studies*, 5(3), 9–15. [https://doi.org/10.18843/ijms/v5i3\(5\)/02](https://doi.org/10.18843/ijms/v5i3(5)/02)
31. Pradhan, V. (2018). Study on impulsive buying Behaviour among consumers in supermarket in Kathmandu Valley. *Journal of Business and Social Sciences Research*, 1(2), 215–228. <https://doi.org/10.3126/jbssr.v1i2.20926>
32. Raj, S. M. S., & Selvan, K. G. (2022). A study on the factors promote impulse buying on ready to

- wear garments at Thanjavur. *International Journal of Health Sciences*, 6(April), 5380–5393. <https://doi.org/10.53730/ijhs.v6ns2.6348>
33. Sandilya, S. K., Bisht, U., Rani, N. M., & Cubio, H. (2021). A study on impulsive buying Behaviour of consumers with reference to Big Bazaar outlets in Bangalore, India. *International Journal of Management and Commerce*, 3(2), 1–8.
34. Shahpasandi, F., Zarei, A., & Nikabadi, M. S. (2020). Consumers' impulse buying Behaviour on Instagram: Examining the influence of flow experiences and hedonic browsing on impulse buying. *Journal of Internet Commerce*, 19(4), 437–465. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15332861.2020.1816324>
35. Thomas, A., Louise, R., & Vp, V. (2018). The impact of visual merchandising on impulse buying Behaviour of retail customers. *International Journal for Research in Applied Science & Engineering Technology*, 6(3), 887–893.
36. Tifferet, S., & Herstein, R. (2012). Gender differences in brand commitment, impulse buying, and hedonic consumption. *Journal of Product and Brand Management*, 21(3), 176–182. <https://doi.org/10.1108/10610421211228793>
37. Tinne, W. S. (2011). Factors affecting impulse buying Behaviour of consumers at superstores in Bangladesh. *ASA University Review*, 5(1), 209–220.
38. Vinish, P., Pinto, P., Hawaldar, I. T., & Pinto, S. (2020). Impulse buying Behaviour among female shoppers: Exploring the effects of selected store environment elements. *Innovative Marketing*, 16(2), 54–70. [https://doi.org/10.21511/im.16\(2\).2020.05](https://doi.org/10.21511/im.16(2).2020.05)
39. Yeboah, A., & Owusu-Prempeh, V. (2017). Exploring the consumer impulse buying behaviour from a range of consumer and product related factors. *International Journal of Marketing Studies*, 9(2), 146–155. <https://doi.org/10.5539/ijms.v9n2p146>
40. Yue, C. Y., Abidin, A. Z., & Razak, A. (2022). Factors influencing impulse buying Behaviour among working ladies in Selangor, Malaysia. *International Business Education Journal*, 15(2), 65–78.
41. Zainal, A., & Abd, A. (2021). Impulse buying Behaviour among working ladies: A literature review. *International Journal of Accounting*, 6(1), 26–34.