

## **Contemporary study on consumer preferences and financial determinants in the purchase of luxury IT products : Evidence from Ahmedabad**

Chintan A. Joshi \*

Sunil Patel <sup>†</sup>

*Department of MBA*

*Unitedworld Institute of Management*

*Karnavati University*

*Gandhinagar 382422*

*Gujarat*

*India*

---

### **Abstract**

This study examines consumer preferences and financial considerations in purchasing luxury IT products in Ahmedabad. Questionnaire responses from 60 consumers were analysed using descriptive statistics, one-way ANOVA and multiple regression. Discount interest, pre-purchase research and opinion seeking received the highest mean ratings. The regression model explained 43.8% of variation in overall purchase perception (adjusted  $R^2 = .349$ ;  $F = 4.959$ ,  $p < .001$ ). Discount interest and opinion seeking were negatively associated with the outcome, while status symbolism was positively associated. Financial capability and personality fit were not statistically significant predictors in this model. The ANOVA table contains inconsistencies in group degrees of freedom, so demographic conclusions require verification. The findings provide exploratory evidence of the relationship between value considerations, social meaning and perceptions of luxury IT purchases.

---

**Subject Classification (2020):** 62P20, 62J05, 62J10, 91B42.

**Keywords:** Consumer behavior, Financial capabilities, Buying decisions, Luxury IT products, Consumer perception, Gujarat.

---

\* ORCID-ID: 0000-0002-9147-9111

<sup>†</sup> ORCID-ID: 0000-0002-4669-7005

\* E-mail: [chintanajoshi@gmail.com](mailto:chintanajoshi@gmail.com); (Corresponding Author)  
[Chintan2022phd@karnavatiuniversity.edu.in](mailto:Chintan2022phd@karnavatiuniversity.edu.in)

<sup>†</sup> E-mail: [sunil@karnavatiuniversity.edu.in](mailto:sunil@karnavatiuniversity.edu.in)

## **1. Introduction**

Luxury IT purchases combine functional requirements with affordability, brand preferences and social meaning. This study examines how consumers in Ahmedabad select premium devices for personal and family use, focusing on financial capability, demographic characteristics and purchase perceptions. It considers personality fit, information search, brand preference, media influence, discounts, opinion seeking and status symbolism.

## **2. Research Objectives**

1. To identify consumer preferences when purchasing luxury IT products.
2. To examine differences in consumer behaviour across demographic groups.
3. To assess the relationship between financial capability, purchase-related preferences and overall purchase perception.

## **3. Review of Literature**

Smartphone research identifies price, product features, brand and social influence as recurring purchase considerations. Rahim et al. [1] examine purchase intentions among Malaysian university students, while Rahman and Sultana [2] investigate mobile-phone buying behaviour in Bangladesh. Indian evidence [3] and related smartphone studies [4], [5] identify affordability, features, service and brand-related considerations as relevant to consumer choice.

Digital-channel studies examine Huawei purchases in China [6] and digital marketing in Pakistan [7]. Research in the UAE [8], Bahrain [9] and Oman [10] also addresses smartphone purchase decisions.

Abdullah et al. [11] examine quality, affordability and brand-related factors in Apple purchase intentions. Studies in Turkey [12] and Indonesia [13] address smartphone brand preference and social influences on iPhone purchase intentions.

Studies in Nepal [14] and China [15] connect purchase behaviour with product characteristics, brand image, perceived value and word of mouth. These themes support examining financial, informational and symbolic considerations together in the Ahmedabad setting.

#### 4. Scope of Study

Questionnaire responses from 60 Ahmedabad consumers were analysed using descriptive means, one-way ANOVA and multiple regression. Eight purchase-related statements were examined in relation to overall luxury IT purchase perception.

#### 5. Limitations of Study

The small, single-city sample limits generalisation and causal inference. ANOVA coding and degrees of freedom require verification. Reported perceptions do not measure actual expenditure.

#### 6. Factors influencing Consumer Behavior

The analysis covers personality fit, financial capability, research, brand preference, media, discounts, opinion seeking and status symbolism. Table 1 presents the demographic profile.

**Table 1**  
**Demographic Details of the respondents**

| Demographic Factors   | Classifications | No of Respondents | Percentage |
|-----------------------|-----------------|-------------------|------------|
| <b>Age</b>            | Less than 25    | 13                | 21%        |
|                       | 25-35           | 10                | 16%        |
|                       | 36-45           | 29                | 48%        |
|                       | More than 45    | 8                 | 15%        |
| <b>Total</b>          |                 | 60                |            |
| <b>Gender</b>         | Male            | 24                | 40%        |
|                       | Female          | 36                | 60%        |
| <b>Total</b>          |                 | 60                |            |
| <b>Marital Status</b> | Married         | 44                | 74%        |
|                       | Unmarried       | 16                | 26%        |
| <b>Total</b>          |                 | 60                |            |
| <b>Family Income</b>  | >500000         | 5                 | 8%         |
|                       | 500000-1000000  | 15                | 25%        |
|                       | 1000000-1500000 | 19                | 32%        |
|                       | 1500000 +       | 21                | 35%        |
| <b>Total</b>          |                 | 60                |            |
| <b>Occupation</b>     | Public Sector   | 20                | 34%        |
|                       | Private Sector  | 14                | 24%        |
|                       | Business        | 26                | 42%        |
| <b>Total</b>          |                 | 60                |            |

Of the 60 respondents, 29 were aged 36–45, 36 were women and 44 were married. Business respondents formed the largest occupational group (26), followed by the public sector (20) and private sector (14). Table 2 reports purchase-preference means.

**Table 2**  
**Consumer behavior in selection of luxury IT products**

| Sr. No | Consumer Behavior                                     | Mean |
|--------|-------------------------------------------------------|------|
| 1      | I buy IT products which suits my personality          | 4.47 |
| 2      | Financial Capabilities decide my IT product purchase  | 4.48 |
| 3      | I do research before purchasing IT product            | 4.65 |
| 4      | I am particular about brand of particular product.    | 4.42 |
| 5      | Media Plays a significant role in my product purchase | 4.35 |
| 6      | I am interested in purchase of discounted IT product  | 4.67 |
| 7      | I believe in seeking Opinion while buying IT products | 4.60 |
| 8      | My IT product symbolizes my status                    | 4.37 |

Discount interest recorded the highest mean (4.67), followed by pre-purchase research (4.65) and opinion seeking (4.60). Financial capability averaged 4.48, personality fit 4.47 and brand preference 4.42. Status symbolism (4.37) and media influence (4.35) also received high ratings. Sharma, Agarwal, and Aggarwal [16] connect social media marketing with brand awareness and image, providing context for these brand-related considerations.

## 7. ANOVA

One-way ANOVA was used to examine demographic differences in consumer behaviour at the 5% significance level. The null hypotheses were:

H01–H05: Consumer behaviour does not differ significantly across age, gender, marital status, family income and occupation groups, respectively.

The results of the one-way ANOVA are presented in Table 3.

**Table 3**  
**ANOVA Table**

| Factor         | Source  | SS     | df | MS    | F     | Sig. |
|----------------|---------|--------|----|-------|-------|------|
| Age            | Between | 4.635  | 3  | 1.545 | 1.922 | .136 |
|                | Within  | 45.015 | 56 | .804  |       |      |
|                | Total   | 49.650 | 59 |       |       |      |
| Gender         | Between | 1.499  | 3  | .500  | 2.138 | .106 |
|                | Within  | 13.085 | 56 | .234  |       |      |
|                | Total   | 14.583 | 59 |       |       |      |
| Family Income  | Between | 1.094  | 3  | .365  | 1.775 | .162 |
|                | Within  | 11.506 | 56 | .205  |       |      |
|                | Total   | 12.600 | 59 |       |       |      |
| Marital Status | Between | 6.960  | 3  | 2.320 | 2.951 | .040 |
|                | Within  | 44.023 | 56 | .786  |       |      |
|                | Total   | 50.983 | 59 |       |       |      |
| Occupation     | Between | 3.995  | 3  | 1.332 | 2.417 | .076 |
|                | Within  | 30.855 | 56 | .551  |       |      |
|                | Total   | 34.850 | 59 |       |       |      |

## 8. Explanation

As labelled in Table 3, marital status has  $p = .040$ ; age (.136), gender (.106), family income (.162) and occupation (.076) exceed .05. However, all tests report between-group  $df = 3$ , despite different category counts in Table 1. The demographic results therefore require verification against the original statistical output. Boutaleb [17] reports gender differences in another market, illustrating the need for context-specific interpretation.

## 9. Multiple Regression Model

Multiple regression examined the association of eight purchase-related predictors with overall perception of buying luxury IT products. Tables 4, 5, and 6 report model fit, overall significance and coefficients.

**Table 4**  
**Model Fit**

| Model | R    | R <sup>2</sup> | Adjusted R <sup>2</sup> | Std. error |
|-------|------|----------------|-------------------------|------------|
| 1     | .661 | .438           | .349                    | .621       |

The model explained 43.8% of outcome variance (adjusted  $R^2 = .349$ ), with a standard error of .621.

**Table 5**  
**Regression ANOVA**

| Source     | SS     | df | MS    | F     | Sig. |
|------------|--------|----|-------|-------|------|
| Regression | 15.306 | 8  | 1.913 | 4.959 | .000 |
| Residual   | 19.677 | 51 | .386  |       |      |
| Total      | 34.983 | 59 |       |       |      |

Table 5 shows that the overall regression model was significant ( $F = 4.959$ ,  $p < .001$ ). SS denotes sum of squares; MS denotes mean square.

**Table 6**  
**Coefficients**

| Predictor             | B      | Std. error | Beta  | t      | Sig. |
|-----------------------|--------|------------|-------|--------|------|
| Constant              | 12.181 | 2.424      |       | 5.026  | .000 |
| Personality fit       | .246   | .159       | .199  | 1.550  | .127 |
| Financial capability  | .202   | .206       | .132  | .982   | .331 |
| Pre-purchase research | -.306  | .180       | -.191 | -1.703 | .095 |
| Brand preference      | -.326  | .249       | -.262 | -1.310 | .196 |
| Media influence       | -.316  | .247       | -.249 | -1.281 | .206 |
| Discount interest     | -.699  | .195       | -.432 | -3.584 | .001 |
| Opinion seeking       | -.733  | .209       | -.470 | -3.508 | .001 |
| Status symbolism      | .259   | .099       | .318  | 2.604  | .012 |

Table 6 identifies discount interest, opinion seeking and status symbolism as significant predictors at the 5% level.

## 10. Interpretation

Discount interest ( $B = -.699$ ,  $p = .001$ ) and opinion seeking ( $B = -.733$ ,  $p = .001$ ) were negatively associated with purchase perception; status symbolism was positively associated ( $B = .259$ ,  $p = .012$ ). The other five predictors were not significant at .05. These associations do not establish causation.

## 11. Conclusion

Value seeking, information gathering and status considerations are relevant to luxury IT purchase perceptions. Financial capability was not a significant regression predictor. Demographic findings require verification, and the small Ahmedabad sample limits generalisation.

## References

- [1] S. A. Rahim, S. Z. Safin, L. C. Kheng, N. Abas, and S. Ali, "Factors influencing purchasing intention of smartphone among university students," *Procedia Economics and Finance*, vol. 37, pp. 245–253, (2016). doi: 10.1016/S2212-5671(16)30121-6.
- [2] M. Rahman and R. Sultana, "A study on factors influencing consumer buying behavior towards mobile phones in Bangladesh," *Open Access Library Journal*, vol. 9, no. 8, pp. 1–12, (2022).
- [3] V. Agarwal, R. Sahoo, and A. Agarwal, "Consumer buying behavior towards mobile phones," *Indian Journal of Marketing*, vol. 49, no. 4, pp. 31–47, (2019).
- [4] G. Y. L. Erno, "Factors influencing consumer buying behavior towards smartphones," *International Journal of Early Childhood Special Education*, vol. 14, no. 1, pp. 676–684, (2022).
- [5] M. Tanveer, H. Kaur, G. Thomas, H. Mahmood, M. Paruthi, and Z. Yu, "Mobile phone buying decisions among young adults: An empirical study of influencing factors," *Sustainability*, vol. 13, no. 19, Art. no. 10705, (2021), doi: 10.3390/su131910705.
- [6] W. Jiacheng, A. Traiwannakij, and K. Srisuk, "Consumer buying behaviour toward Huawei mobile phone through online shopping in China," *Human Resource and Development Journal*, vol. 11, no. 2, pp. 29–44, (2020).
- [7] S. Khan, S. Qabool, I. Ul Haque, and H. Javed, "Elevating consumer purchase intentions in Pakistan: The power of digital marketing,"

- South Asian Journal of Management Sciences*, vol. 17, pp. 1–24, (2023). doi: 10.21621/sajms.2023172.03.
- [8] N. A. Almuraqab and S. Mansoor, “Determining factors that influence smartphones purchasing intention in UAE,” *Academy of Marketing Studies Journal*, vol. 25, no. 4, pp. 1–11, (2021).
  - [9] O. Almuhatresh, A. Rahman, and R. Haque, “Factors influencing online purchase intention of smartphones in Bahrain,” *International Journal of Quality and Market Research*, (2022).
  - [10] R. Kumar and D. Fernandez, “A study on consumers’ buying behavior towards smartphones in Oman,” *Journal of Marketing and Consumer Research*, vol. 72, pp. 10–20, (2020).
  - [11] W. B. S. Abdullah, W. Jingbin, W. Junhan, W. Jingsong, T. K. Ban, and J. A. Lukman, “A study of purchase intention on Apple products,” *Journal of the Community Development in Asia*, vol. 5, no. 3, pp. 98–116, (2022).
  - [12] E. Çelik, S. Eygü, and E. Oktay, “Factors influencing young consumers’ smartphone brand preference: A study in Erzurum, Turkey,” *European Journal of Business and Economics*, vol. 15, no. 2, pp. 45–59, (2020).
  - [13] N. Benita and T. Teguh, “The influence of theory of planned behavior factors on Apple iPhone purchase intention among Gen Z consumers in Indonesia,” *Jurnal Ilmu Bisnis dan Manajemen*, vol. 10, no. 1, (2023).
  - [14] A. Rai, N. Dahal, and R. Ghimire, “Factors affecting consumer behavior in smartphone purchases in Nepal,” *Innovative Marketing*, vol. 19, no. 1, pp. 89–102, (2023).
  - [15] Y. Yang and Y. Zhan, “Research on the influence of online value perception on consumers’ online purchase of Huawei smartphones,” *Social Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences*, vol. 8, no. 9, pp. 1–11, (2025).
  - [16] A. Sharma, R. Agarwal, and S. Aggarwal, “Factors influencing social media marketing having the impact on brand awareness and brand image,” *Journal of Statistics and Management Systems*, vol. 26, no. 3, pp. 745–754, (2023). doi: 10.47974/JSMS-1063.
  - [17] A. Boutaleb, “A study on smartphone purchasing behavior and gender differences in Arar City, Saudi Arabia,” *Business Ethics and Leadership*, vol. 8, no. 3, pp. 61–71, (2024).

*Received June, 2026*