

IMPACT OF COGNITIVE DISSONANCE ON CONSUMER BEHAVIOUR ON T- SHIRTS WITH REFERENCE TO SUBAM KNIT WEAR (P) LTD TIRUPUR***A.JOHN WILLIAM ** R.SANTHOSHKUMAR *** S.NAGAMANI****ABSTRACT**

This paper has explored the impact of cognitive dissonance on consumer behaviour on t-shirts .The factors leading to dissonance have been comprehensively studied in this article and the study was conducted in tirupur city and the sample taken for the study was 392 was taken using a structured questionnaire method and the statistical tools such as chi square analysis was used to find the relationship of variables such as belief, change behaviour and the perception of the consumers were evaluated for T-shirts and the study also portray the significance of opinion form the consumers

Key Words : Cognitive behaviour, dissonance, descriptive research, chi square test

INTRODUCTION

The Indian textile industry is one of the largest and oldest sectors in the country and among the most important in the economy in terms of output, investment and employment. The sector employs nearly 35 million people and after agriculture, is the second highest employer in the country. Its importance is underlined by the fact that it accounts for around 4% of Gross Domestic Product, 14% of industrial production, 9% of excise collections, 18% of employment in the industrial sector, and 16% of the country's total export earnings.

In the Textile industry, the Apparel industry is one of the important value chains of the vertical and is India's second largest industry after IT. At present, it is amongst the fastest growing industry segment and is also the second largest foreign exchange earner for the country. Also the retail segment in India is booming up at a very fast phase.

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Leon Festinger (1957), cognitions are elements of knowledge that people have about their behavior, their attitudes, and their environment. As such, a set of cognitions can be unrelated, consonant, or dissonant with each other. Two cognitions are said to be dissonant when one follows from the obverse of the other. The resultant motivation to reduce dissonance is directly proportional to the magnitude and importance of the discrepant cognitions, and inversely proportional to the magnitude and importance of the consistent cognitions.

Kassarjian and Cohen (1965). Dissonance though is a psychological concept but has a great bearing on the way consumers plan their purchase and effect of the purchase made on their future alliance with the organisation. In an era of marketing, where a consumer is spoilt with a plethora of choices as regarding the product to buy, it is difficult to avoid a situation of confusion which leads to dissonance among the consumers. However, consumers make their efforts in different ways to reduce the conflicting views which arise in their mind.

Smith and Bristor, (2006) Purchase involvement is considered to be high when the buyer invests a great degree of time and concern while making a purchase decision. In such a scenario, a more positive confirmation could be expected from the buyer.

Koller and Salzberger (2007). Cognitive dissonance can categorically be found not only in the post purchase stage but is easily visible in the pre decision stage as well.

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

- Lack in perceptual originality
- Lack in product familiarity
- Belief changes periodically
- Change action and opinion on purchase behavior

OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

- To analysis the dissonance factors among consumer
- To study the belief and the factor influences
- To analysis why change action repaid by the consumer
- To study the opinion factors and the place

CHI-SQUARE CALCULATION**SELECT APPARELS AND YEARS OF BUYING**

H_0 =There is no relationship between select apparels and years of buying T-shirts.

H_1 =There is a relationship between influenced select apparels and years of buying T-shirts.

Select apparels \ Years of buying	Brand	Quality	price	durability	Total
One month	26	30	24	16	96
Two month	20	26	28	12	88
1year	24	30	30	20	104
Above 2year	26	34	22	22	104
Total	96	120	104	72	392

Calculation:

O	E	(O-E)	(O-E) ²	$\frac{(O-E)^2}{E}$
26	23.5	2.5	6.25	0.26
30	29.3	0.7	0.49	0.01
24	25.4	-1.4	1.96	0.07
16	17.6	-1.6	2.56	0.14
20	21.5	-1.5	2.25	0.10
26	26.9	-0.9	0.81	0.03
28	23.3	4.7	22.09	0.94
12	16.1	-4.1	16.81	1.10
24	25.4	-1.4	1.96	0.07
30	31.8	-1.8	3.24	0.10
30	27.5	2.5	6.25	0.22
20	19.1	0.9	0.81	0.04
26	25.4	0.6	0.36	0.01
34	31.8	2.2	4.84	0.15
22	27.5	-5.5	30.25	1.1
22	19.1	2.9	8.41	0.44
				4.78

DEGREES OF FREEDOM:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{DOF} &= (r-1)*(c-1) \\ &= (4-1)*(4-1) \\ &= 9 \end{aligned}$$

Level of significant 0.05%

INTERPRETATION: From the table it is noted that the calculated value (**4.78**) is lesser than tabulated value (**16.919**) Hence, Null hypothesis (H₀) is accepted

BUYING T –SHIRTS AND PURCHASE ABOUT

H₀=There is no relationship between buying T shirts and know about.

H₁=There is a relationship between buying T shirts and know about

Buying t-shirts Know about	Buying t-shirts				Total
	One month	Two month	1 year	Above 2 year	
Family	32	20	18	18	88
Friend	30	20	22	26	98
Relatives	34	28	22	32	116
Advertisement	22	26	20	22	90
Total	118	94	82	98	392

Calculation:

O	E	(O-E)	(O-E) ²	$\frac{(O-E)^2}{E}$
32	26.4	5.6	31.36	1.18
20	21.1	-1.1	1.21	0.05
18	18.4	-0.4	0.16	8.69
18	22	-4	16	0.72
30	29.5	0.5	0.25	8.47
20	23.5	-3.5	12.25	0.52
22	20.5	1.5	2.25	0.10
26	24.5	1.5	2.25	0.09
34	34.9	-0.9	0.81	0.02
28	27.8	0.2	0.04	1.43
22	24.2	-2.2	4.84	0.2
32	29	3	9	0.31
22	27.0	-5	25	0.92
26	21.5	4.5	20.25	0.94
20	18.8	1.2	1.44	0.07
22	22.5	-0.5	0.25	0.01
				23.72

DEGREES OF FREEDOM:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{DOF} &= (r-1)*(c-1) \\ &= (4-1)*(4-1) \\ &= 9 \end{aligned}$$

Level of significant 0.05%

INTERPRETATION: From the table it is noted that the calculated value (**23.72**) is greater than tabulated value (**16.919**) Hence, Alternative hypothesis (H1) is accepted

**BUYING ABOUT T- SHIRTS
AND**

FACTORS CHANGED

H₀=There is no relationship between buying about T-shirts and factors changed.

H₁=There is a relationship between buying about T-shirts and factors changed.

Buying about t-shirts Factors changed	Good	Satisfactory	No bad	Dissatisfied	Total
Quality	22	24	26	26	98
Price	24	18	28	22	92
Springiness	26	16	26	26	94
Elasticity	34	22	32	20	108
Total	106	80	112	94	392

Calculation:

O	E	(O-E)	(O-E) ²	$\frac{(O-E)^2}{E}$
22	26.5	-4.5	20.25	0.76
24	20	4	16	0.8
26	10.8	15.2	231.04	21.3
26	9.11	16.89	285.2	31.3
24	24.8	-0.8	0.64	0.02
18	18.7	-0.7	0.49	0.026
28	26.2	1.8	3.24	0.12
22	22.06	-0.06	3.6	0.16
26	25.4	0.6	0.36	0.01
16	19.1	-3.1	9.61	0.50
26	26.8	-0.8	0.64	0.02
26	6.23	19.77	390.8	62.72
34	29.2	4.8	23.04	0.78
22	22.0	0	0	0
32	8.8	23.2	538.2	61.1
20	25.8	-5.8	33.64	1.30
				180.91

DEGREES OF FREEDOM:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{DOF} &= (r-1)*(c-1) \\ &= (4-1)*(4-1) \\ &= 9 \end{aligned}$$

Level of significant 0.05%

INTERPRETATION: From the table it is noted that the calculated value (**180.91**) is greater than tabulated value (**16.919**) Hence, Alternate hypothesis (H1) is accepted.

CHNGE ACTION AND OPINION

H₀=There is no relationship between change action on buying and opinion about durability.

H₁=There is a relationship between change action on buying and opinion about durability.

Change action \ Opinion	Quick delivery	Customer support	Credit facility	Packaging	Total
High	26	24	28	26	104
Medium	24	26	22	18	90
Low	34	28	24	16	102
Very low	34	30	22	10	96
Total	118	108	96	70	392

Calculation:

O	E	(O-E)	(O-E) ²	$\frac{(O-E)^2}{E}$
26	31.3	-5.3	28.09	0.89
24	28.6	-4.6	21.16	0.73
28	25.4	2.6	6.76	0.26
26	18.5	7.5	56.25	3.04
24	27.0	-3	9	0.33
26	24.7	1.3	1.39	0.05
22	22.04	-0.04	1.6	0.07
18	16.07	1.93	3.72	0.23
34	30.7	3.3	10.8	0.35
28	28.1	-0.1	0.01	3.55
24	24.9	-0.9	0.81	0.03
16	18.2	-2.2	4.84	0.26
34	28.8	5.2	27.04	0.93
30	26.4	3.6	12.9	0.48
22	23.5	-1.5	2.25	0.09
10	17.1	-7.1	50.41	2.94
				14.23

DEGREES OF FREEDOM:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{DOF} &= (r-1)*(c-1) \\ &= (4-1)*(4-1) \\ &= 9 \end{aligned}$$

Level of significant 0.05%

INTERPRETATION: From the table it is noted that the calculated value (**14.23**) is lesser than tabulated value (**16.919**) Hence, Null hypothesis (Ho) is accepted.

OPINION ABOUT DISTRIBUTION AND OPINION ABOUT DURABILITY

H₀=There is no relationship between opinion about distribution and opinion about durability.

H₁=There is a relationship between opinion about distribution and opinion about durability.

Opinion about Distribution \ Opinion about Durability	Very good	Good	satisfactory	High satisfactory	Total
High	22	22	20	26	90
Medium	26	22	28	22	98
Low	26	24	18	34	102
Very low	32	24	26	20	102
Total	106	92	92	102	392

Calculation:

O	E	(O-E)	(O-E) ²	$\frac{(O-E)^2}{E}$
22	24.3	-2.3	5.29	0.21
22	21.1	0.9	0.81	0.03
20	21.1	-1.1	1.21	0.05
26	23.4	2.6	6.76	0.28
26	26	0	0	0
22	23	-1	1	0.04
28	23	5	25	1.08
22	25.5	-3.5	12.25	0.48
26	27.5	-1.5	2.25	0.08
24	23.9	0.1	0.01	4.18
18	23.9	-5.9	34.81	1.45
34	26.5	7.5	56.25	2.12
32	27.5	4.5	20.25	0.73
24	23.9	0.1	0.01	4.18
26	23.9	2.1	4.41	0.18
20	26.5	-6.5	42.25	1.59
				16.68

DEGREES OF FREEDOM:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{DOF} &= (r-1)*(c-1) \\ &= (4-1)*(4-1) \\ &= 9 \end{aligned}$$

Level of significant 0.05%

INTERPRETATION: From the table it is noted that the calculated value (**16.68**) is lesser than tabulated value (**16.919**) Hence, Null hypothesis (Ho) is accepted.

FINDINGS**CHI-SQUARE:**

- ❖ From the CHI – SQUARE it was found that there is no relationship between select apparels and year of buying. Since the calculated value (4.78) lesser then table value (16.919).so null hypothesis is accepted
- ❖ From the CHI – SQUARE it was found that there is relationship between buying T-shirts and purchase about . Since the calculated value (23.72) grater then table value (16.919).so alternative hypothesis is accepted.
- ❖ From the CHI – SQUARE it was found that there is relationship between buying T-shirts and factor changed. Since the calculated value (180.91) grater then table value (16.919).so alternative hypothesis is accepted.
- ❖ From the CHI – SQUARE it was found that there is no relationship between changes action and opinion. Since the calculated value (14.23) lesser then table value (16.919).so null hypothesis is accepted
- ❖ From the CHI – SQUARE it was found that there is no relationship between opinion about distribution and opinion about durability. Since the calculated value (16.68) lesser then table value (16.919).so null hypothesis is accepted.

CONCLUSION

In today business seen no the customer belief, change action are the highly influencing factors and the increasing competitor made the customer on behave with more dilammas so that a high level of cognitive dissonance factor with influence the consumer on purchase decision further the such enlight the causes behaviour the cognitive dissonance which includes quality, price, durability and so on.

References

1. Festinger Leon (1957), a theory of Cognitive Dissonance, Stanford University Press,Stanford, CA.
2. Cognitive dissonance. (2012). In Wikipedia. Retrieved March14,fromen.wikipedia.org/wiki/Cognitive_dissonance.
3. Koller Monika and Salzberger Thomas (2007), “Cognitive Dissonance as a Relevant Construct Throughout the Decision-Making and Consumption Process:An Empirical Investigation Related to a Package Tour”, Journal of Customer Behavior, Vol. 6, No. 3
4. Smith J Brock and Bristor J M (2006), “Uncertainty Orientation: Explaining Differences in Purchase Involvement and External Search”, Psychology and Marketing, Vol. 11, No. 6, pp. 587-607.