Family Demography and Purchase Decision on Speciality Goods in Enugu State, Nigeria.

Dr Ogbodo Hyacinth Igwesi[1], Dr Vitus Chinedu Ogbunuju[2], Dr. Nwankwo Pilip Abuchi[3], Tawo Francis Abang Ph. D[4], Ebigwu Kerry Ijeoma[5]

[1]Department of Marketing; Ebonyi State University Abakaliki Nigeria

[2]Department of marketing Chukwuemeka Odumegwu Ojukwu University Igbariam Anambra State

[3]Department of Commerce and Cooperative School f Business Education, Federal college of education (Technical) Umunze Anambra State

[4]Department marketing ; university of Calabar

[5]Department of Entrepreneurship ; University of Delta Agbor

DOI: https://doi.org/10.47772/IJRISS.2026.100400204

Received: 15 April 2026; Accepted: 20 April 2026; Published: 01 May 2026

ABSTRACT

The study focused on family demography and purchase decision on Speciality goods in Enugu State, Nigeria. The study specifically sought to determine the extent family demographic variables such as family education status, family perceived income level, and family size influences purchasing decision making for specaility goods in Enugu urban, Enugu state, Nigeria. Descriptive survey research design was adopted for the study. A population size of 1,268,831, out of which a sample size of 400 was gotten using Taro Yamen's formula at 5% error tolerance and 95% level of confidence. Instrument used for data collection was structural questionnaire. Out of 400 copies of the questionnaire that were distributed, 354 copies were returned while 46 were not returned. The hypotheses were tested using Pearson product moment correlation coefficient and simple linear regression statistical tools. The findings indicate that Education status has a significant influence on family purchasing decision making for specialty goods in Enugu State Nigeria. There was a positive relationship between Family size and family purchasing decision making for specialty goods in Enugu State Nigeria. Perceived income has a significant influence family purchasing decision making for specialty goods in Enugu State Nigeria.. The implications of study revealed that education status perceived income , and family size has a significant effect on family purchase decision. The study concluded that a family is the key element that affects the consumption and disposal of the products. It is vital for a seller to identify the issues related to family structure, buying patterns, buying roles and motives of the family members. The study recommended that families should send their families members to school so as to help them to be well placed in life, as well as making them to purchase product of their choose.

Keywords: Education Status ; Family Size; Family Perceived Income family Purchasing Decision Making; Specialty Goods

INTRODUCTION

Family decision making as a subject of research has been of immense value to the marketers and academicians alike. Family as a unit of analysis is of importance in consumer behavior because of various reasons. One, it acts as a primary reference group affecting purchase decision making. Two, it acts not only as a consumption but also as an economic unit. Therefore, the purchases done by the family is decided together and individual purchases are also influenced by members in the family. Consumer buying behavior refers to the process or stages undertaken by individuals and households who buy goods and services for consumption. All of these individuals and households consumers combined make up the consumer market. Consumers around the world

vary tremendously in terms of attributes such as age, income, education level, and tastes. So also family as a consumption unit varies in age, income, education level, family size etc which influence their buying behavior. They also buy an incredible variety of goods and services. How these diverse consumers connect with each other and with other elements of the world around them impact their choices among various products, services, and companies (Kotler, 2008). Family members can strongly influence buyer behavior. The family is the most important consumer buying organization in society. A family may be defined as a group of persons related to a specific degree, through blood, adoption, or marriage. In most cases, they live together, sharing common house, properties, food etc. Family comprises husband wife, children, house-helps and other relatives. Marketers are interested in the roles and influence of the husband, wife, and children on the purchase of different products and services (Norgaard, 2007).

In marketing and consumer behaviour, the family is a central phenomenon in the buying decision making process which plays a significant mediating role. (Commuri and Gentry, 2020).The family combines with the individual within a larger society. Guneri, Kaplan and Delea (2009) stated two traits in the family buying decision process: the dyadic and triadic. The dyadic studies investigated the effects of husband and wife in the family buying decision process whereas the triadic studies investigated the relationships incorporated in the role of children in the family buying decision-making process which was relatively not investigated previously. In a family unit in this twenty-first century, independent of the family structure, the youngest members of the family are gaining more buying power by the day. This power has grown not only over the things that they use themselves but even in major family decisions such as buying a car or deciding where to go on a vacation (White, 2018). Families act like democracies where every member‘s opinion is valued and taken into consideration the same way. Family demography is a subfield of demography that uses demographic methods to study family behavior and structure. Family demographers study the formation (e.g., cohabitation and marriage), change (e.g., childbearing and family life cycle), and dissolution (e.g., widowhood and divorce) of families as well as interactions and behaviors (e.g., gender roles and intergenerational kinship interactions,) within families. . Demographic data refers to socioeconomic information expressed statistically including employment, education, income, marriage, rates, birth and death rates and more. Demographic also uses marketing research to assess the changing trends of consumer’s behavior. Family purchase decision is the purchasing decision process used by the consumers regarding the market transaction before, during and after the purchase of good or services. It can also be seen as a particular form of a cost benefit analysis in the presence of multiple alternatives. 3 The demographic development significantly influences the functioning of society and it is projected in many business areas. Correct decisions and predictions in the fields of economics, social affairs, employment, education, management cannot be made without proper, exact and appropriately structured demographic information (Vaňo, Jurčová & Mészaros, 2002). E.g. socioeconomic status is determined by aggregate of income, education level, occupation, and wealth of an individuals of a family. Life stage is based on an individual’s age, family status, and relationships. Education, location, activities, interests, opinions, socioeconomic status, and life stage determine lifestyle. All of these characteristics are helpful to businesses as they are valuable predictors of consumer spending trends (demodirt.com). Marketers need detailed information about consumers in order to understand their behavior and needs. The more information they have the likelihood that better decision they can make. Understanding the effect of key demographics such as age, income, education, family size and gender of consumers is important. “When marketers think like demographers, they gain an understanding of how things work that can help them increase market size, deepen market penetration, and carve out market share” (Exter, , 1988). With the changes in demographic structure, expansion of middle class, higher education opportunities, inclusion of the married female in economic structure, rise in disposable incomes, and finally evolution of gender role attitudes, transformation in the family, thereby, the interaction of its members and decision making process was imminent.

Family size is the number of persons that make up a family. For instance, some families are made up of husband and wife, one of them in the case of death of one spouse, one child or two or more children, in-law etc so families can be small or medium or big. Family size is the number of people living together as household with interdependent life Family size has effect on quality of life. These include health, nutrition, educational attainment of children, social status of families as well as their ability to adequately cater for the needs of their families. A family size of five including parents is considered sizeable. Such a family is able to cater for the

needs of its members. Sizeable family is likely to enjoy the comfort of life with the choice to afford and enjoy identifiable luxuries of life (Gouxet al, 2005).however when the family size change it will effect their purchasing decision Education refers to formal training and learning required from schools which influence person's level of skill, reasoning and behaviour.

Educational level refers to possession of certificates such as primary certificate, O'level certificate, national diploma/high diploma, national certificate of education, first degree, master's degree Ph.D.and professional/skill acquisition certificate awarded by primary and secondary school and tertiary institution respectively. This to determine the persons behaviour, income and status in the society. So also one the major characteristic of family is common of product or services such like foods, houses, car, household equipment's or electronic/electrical gadgets, furniture's etc. Products are classified into convenience products, shopping products and specialty products

Speciality goods are a category of fast moving consumer goods which a significant group of buyers are habitually willing to make a special purchasing effort. They are those consumer goods with unique characteristics and brand identification for which certain significant buyers are habitually willing to make a special purchasing effort (Vaňo, Jurčová & Mészaros, 2002).

Statement of the Problem

Marketing professionals and academics appreciated the importance of keeping track of the changes in household structures and composition. Family decision making has been frequently studied because of the influence it has on consumer behavior. Individuals rarely make purchase decisions without some influence from family members such as husband/wife, children, cousin/nephew, uncle/aunt, in-laws, house helps etc. Likewise, purchase decisions in families, even if made by an individual family member, are influenced either directly or indirectly by the entire family demography. Indeed, it is believed that the background of individual consumers varies and likewise individual families such background factors include age, occupation, income, education, etc which determines family demographic status. Truly, family demography of many families varies in terms of education, income, family size and occupational status which may likely also result to variation on family purchase behaviour. But it has not been clearly ascertained or validated of the degree of influence of these selected family demography factors have on family purchase decision on specialty goods. The role played by different members of the family varies with demographic parameters as well as the need for the purchase of specialty goods. Specialty goods such as cars, furniture, refrigerator etc are most times seen to be costly and as well have long life span usage in purchase decision process is all will attract getting maximum satisfaction for the purchase of such goods. It is assumed that family members are usually involve in the purchase decision process and the individual family members are of different backgrounds. Therefore if family demographic 7 parameters are important set of factors, it cannot be overlooked in attempting to understand purchase decision on specialty good. This presupposes that producers of specialty goods are therefore compelled to produce such specialty goods that will take into cognizance the background and different families in order to attract high sales and consumer satisfaction for high market performance. Marketing strategies for specialty goods can be ineffective if the producers of specialty goods cannot establish the relationship between family demography and purchase behaviour. Hence a need for an in-depth study of these family demography and purchase decision on specialty goods is necessary to help professionals and marketers understand more the roles played by family demography in family purchase decision.

Objectives of the Study

The general objective of the study is to establish the relationship between some selected family demography factors and purchase decision making for specialty goods in Enugu State Nigeria. The specific objectives are

1. To determine the extent to which family education status influence purchase decision making for specialty goods in Enugu State Nigeria
2. To ascertain the nature of the relationship between family size and purchase decision making for specialty goods in Enugu State Nigeria

3. To ascertain the influence of perceived family income level on purchase decision making for specialty goods in Enugu State Nigeria

Research Hypotheses

The following hypotheses were formulated for the study:

Ho1 Family education status does not influence purchase decision making for specialty goods in Enugu State Nigeria

Ho2 There is no relationship between Family size and purchase decision making for specialty goods in Enugu State Nigeria

Ho3 Perceived family income level does not influence purchase decision making for specialty goods in Enugu State Nigeria

Family Demographic

Family becomes one of the important constituents in the purchase decision making. Family decision making concept has obtained the attention of marketing viewpoint and created interest in social scientists. Family is a unique social system where all members of the family influence and get influenced by each other to take a buying decision. They act as a common unit when buying a product for common consumption. Family as a system in the society with specific values, is undergoing changes thereby enabling multiplicity of models in family values. Family is a dynamic entity which changes with the changing time. It is a unique social system with psychological and emotional bonding of the members with established traditions in every community. Family Demographic factors include gender, age ranges and education level, family background include parents' employment status and parents' immigrant status.. Demographic 12 factors play an important role in the purchasing process. Income, age, occupation, and other demographic factors may influence decision-making (Anderson & Gaile-Sarkane, 2008)184

Level of Education

Fisher, Bashyal and Bachman (2012) discovered that the most significant factor in intention to buy green product is education. Based on previous research, it is concluded that higher educated consumers are more knowledgeable of green goods and know the benefits of green products (Roslin et al., 2017). Do Paco, Raposo, and Walter. (2009) discovered that the level of education influences purchase intention for the green products buying. Straughan and Robert (1999) found that those with a higher level of education were more likely to exhibit environmentally friendly behaviors, whereas Laroche, Bergeron, and Forleo (2001) discovered that there is no significant difference in purchase intention according to level of education. Omar, Nazri, Osman, and Ahmad, (2016) reported that the degree of consumer awareness and purchasing intention has a significant relationship in the Malaysian purchase of organic foods. Kumar and Kumar (2019) found that less informed customers were firmly in agreement on taking advice while others were moderately in agreement on this. It was also discovered that educated consumers were much aware to buy the durable goods and take the buying decision independently. Past studies showed that education level was also identified as a significant 13 factor influencing consumer attitudes towards buying organic foods. Bio food consumers tend to be more highly educated than non-organic consumers according to Storstad and Bjorkhaug (2003).

Family income

Parents' income is a very critical factor in the buying decision process. At the same time, children rely on their parents' ability and willingness to buy. Lower-income parents spend more of their income on food products than the higher income group. Low-income parents spend more on buying the healthier products and are more concerned with avoiding waste and spend economically within the limited budget. Children from lower income families are more concerned about the socioeconomic aspects in their early childhood years (Turner, Kelly and Mc Kenna, 2006). On the other hand, two working parents tend to spend more money with their children as a

way of compensating for the time they spend at their workplaces. (Mintel, 2002). McNeal and Yeh, (2003) added that parents are given more freedom to make the decisions independently from their children. Turner, Kelly and Mc Kenna (2006) also stated that parents give their children quite more freedom in the buying process.

Family Size

The reduction of the family size could be attributed partly to economic difficulties, low levels of income, the high cost of living, the costs of education of children and the desire to maintain a better standard of living, which is best achieved 5 within the more affordable smaller size family. Consequently, the nuclear family with its parents and children, became the model of society and soon ruled out the traditional, extended family usually constituting three generations Dimensions of family authority are likely to b affected by family size such as single parent, step-parent or intact families (Carlson and Gross bart, 2018) and are expected to affect 15 children's influence on family and child-related purchase decisions (Kaur and Singh, 2016). The changes in the size of the traditional family have been found to elevate children's decision making status (Flurry, 2007). Thus, the influence that adolescents have on the decision making in their family may vary across different types of families, particularly in an emerging market context (Alam and Khalifah, 2009). Mazloumi, Efteghar, Ghaladari, Saifi and Aghadeh, (2013) propose that in some families, children are treated as equals by parents, whereas, in others, children are viewed as subordinate to their parents' authority Adolescents in single-parent families appear to have greater influence than adolescents in step and intact families (Kaur and Singh, 2016). Ahuja and Stinson (2019) found that children in single parent households are three times more likely to sop with their family as well as sop along for their family. These findings are due to difference in socialization with respect to family authority relations and the child assuming greater independence and responsibilities than those who live in dual-parent households (Kaur and Singh, 2016).

Family Purchase decisions

Family as a consuming and decision making unit is a central phenomenon in marketing and consumer behaviour. There are many shared decisions, made by the consumers with the family members, which in turn have an effect on other family members' wish and attitude (Desai, 2016).The family is a major influence on the consumer behaviour of its members. For instance, a child learns how to enjoy candy by observing an older brother or sister; learns the use and value of money by listening to and watching his or her parents (Perner, 2010). Decisions about a new car, a vacation trip, or whether to go to a local or an out-of-town college are consumption decisions usually made within the context of a family setting. As a major consumption unit, the family is also a prime target for the marketing of many products and services. How families or households make purchase decisions depends on the roles of the various family members in the purchase, consumption, and influence of products (Marshal, 2010).

THEORETICAL REVIEW

Grand Theory

Grand theory considers consumers as rational people who spend a considerable amount of time to search information, evaluate available alternatives and then choose the greatest product that best satisfy ^heir need. Whild scholar discuss that for many products consumers may just spend a little time and effort and never get engage in some of the sequential activities suggested to be very important in decision-making process (Bozinoff, 1982). Grand theory which illustrates consumer decision-making as a multi-staged and complex process involves five main stages: (1) problem recognition, (2) information search, (3) alternative evaluation and selection, (4) outlet selection and purchase, and (5) post-purchase processes. This theory discusses decision-making process as a funnel-like one, in that travelers narrow down choices among alternatives. The choices influenced by socio-psychological factors like attitudes, motives, values, personal characteristics and also non-psychological factors like product design, price and advertising (Sirakayaa and Woodsideb, 2005). Gilbert (1991) explains that grand theory have six (6) common points: (1) it perceives consumer behavior to be a constant decision making process; (2) the behavior of individual consumer is emphasized; (3) behavior is treated as a functional (or utilitarian) concept that can be explained; (4) a buyer is viewed as an individual who searches, evaluates and stores information; (5) buyers narrow down the range of information in time, and choose from the alternatives they

developed during the decision process; (6) and feedback from the final purchase is included in the theory to emphasize the effect of the decision on future purchases. Grand theory has been also criticized for generalizing the decision-making process for any consumer product. This view implies a biased approach to the consumer decision-making process and discuss that the more important a product, the more complex the decision-making 60 process; therefore not all consumers go through extensive five stages of decision-making; they may simply skip some stages and decide based on their perception if the product is not of great importance to them (Burns and Gentry, 1990).

METHOD AND MATERIAL

The study was carried out using survey design. Primary data was obtained through the use of questionnaire and observations while Secondary data were obtained through books, journals, and the internet. The population of the study was drawn from Enugu (367,958) East Enugu North (321,510) Enugu South (0262,943) Udi (316,420) with a total number (1,268,831). . The study adopted Taro yamane sample size determination having sample size of 400. The instrument used for data collection was questionnaire structured in 5- point Likert scale and validated with content face validity . The reliability test was done using test-retest method. The result gave a reliability coefficient of 0.887, indicating a high internal consistency of the items. Four hundred (400) copies of the questionnaire were distributed and three and fifty four (354) copies were returned while forty six copies (46) were not returned. The three hypotheses formulated were tested at 0.05 level of significance. Simple linear regression was used to test hypothesis one and three while hypotheses two was tested using pearsons product moment correction coefficient. A computer aided Microsoft special package for social science (SPSS Version 25.00) was used to aid analysis.

DATA ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION

The data obtained from the field were presented and analyzed with descriptive statistics to provide answers for the research questions while the corresponding hypotheses were tested with Pearson product moment correlation coefficient and Simple linear regression at 0.05 alpha level. The five Likert scale form was design as SA = strongly agree, A= Agree, U= Undecided, D = Disagree and SD = Strongly Disagree

Table 4.1: Responses on Family education status.

S/N	Questions	Strongly Agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Total
1	Empowering children to participate in purchasing processes	11(59.61%)	130(36.72%)	5(1.41%)	4(1.13%)	4(1.13%)	354
2	Family education status promote democratic decision-making in the house	256(72.32%)	86(24.29%)	4(1.13%)	3(0.85%)	5(1.41%)	354
3	Higher education levels foster a more informed consumer base	240(67.80%)	100(28.25%)	3(0.85%)	6(1.70%)	5(1.41%)	354

Source: Fieldwork 2025

Item 1 of table 4.1 Indicates that 211(59.61%) of the respondents strongly agreed that Empowering children to participate in purchasing processes. 130(36.72%) agreed, 5(1.41%) were undecided, 4(1.13%) disagreed while 4(1.13) strongly disagreed to the statement.

Item 2 of table 4.1 states that Family education status promote democratic decision-making in the house, 256 (72.32%) strongly agreed with the statement, 86(24.29%) agreed, 4(1.13%) were undecided,5(1.41%) disagreed while 6(1.70%) strongly disagreed to the statement.

Item 3 of table 4.1 shows that 240(67.80%) of the respondents strongly agreed that Higher education levels foster a more informed consumer base, 100(28.25%) agreed, 3(0.85%) of the respondents were indifference about the statement, 6(1.70%) disagreed to the statement while 5 (1.41%) of the respondents strongly disagree with the statement.

Table 4.2: Responses on Family size

S/N	Questions	Strongly Agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Total
4	Family size affects consumption patterns	172(48.59%)	151(42.66%)	9(2.54%)	12(3.39%)	10(2.82%)	354
5	Family size affects family member roles	209(59.04%)	130(36.72%)	4(1.13%)	5(1.41%)	6(1.70%)	354
6	Family size affects resource allocation	201(56.78%)	140(39.55%)	4(1.13%)	6 (1.70%)	3(0.85%)	354

Source: Fieldwork 2025

Item 4 of table 4.2 Indicates that 172(48.59%) of the respondents strongly agreed that Family size affects consumption patterns, 151(42.66%) agreed, 9(2.54%) were undecided, 12(3.39%) disagreed while 10(2.83)strongly disagreed to the statement.

Item 5 of table 4.2 states that Family size affects family member roles , 209 (59.04%) strongly agreed with the statement, 130(36.72%) agreed, 4(1.31%) were undecided, 5(1.41%) disagreed while 6 (1.70)strongly disagreed to the statement

Item 6 of table 4.2 Indicates that 201(56.78%) of the respondents strongly agreed that Family size affects resource allocation, 140(39.55%) agreed, 4(1.13%) were undecided, 6(1.70%) disagreed while 3(0.85)strongly disagreed to the statement

Table 4.3: Responses on Family Perceived income level.

S/N	Questions	Strongly Agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Total
7	higher-income families often prioritizing quality and appearance	164(46.33%)	174(49.15%)	5(1.41%)	4(1.13%)	7(1.98%)	354
8	lower-income families tend to focus on price, budget, and necessity	220(62.15%)	122(34.46%)	3(0.85%)	6(1.70%)	3(0.85%)	354

9	Lower-income families may engage in more joint decision-making to manage limited resources	239(67.51%)	104(29.38%)	3(0.85%)	3(0.85%)	5(1.41%)	354

Source: Fieldwork 2025

Item 7 of table 4.3 indicates that 164(46.33%) of the respondents strongly agreed that higher-income families often prioritizing quality and appearance., 174 (49.15%) agreed, 5 (1.41%) were undecided, 4(1.13) of the respondents disagree while 7(1.98%) strongly disagreed to the statement.

Item 8 of table 4.3 Indicates that 220(62.15%) of the respondents strongly agreed that lower-income families tend to focus on price, budget, and necessity, 122(34.46%) agreed, 3(0.85%) were undecided, 6(1.70%) disagreed while 3(0.85) strongly disagreed to the statement.

Item 9 of table 4.3 Indicates that 239(67.51%) of the respondents strongly agreed that Lower-income families may engage in more joint decision-making to manage limited resources. 104(29.38%) agreed, 3(0.85%) were undecided, 3(0.85%) disagreed while 5(1.41) strongly disagreed to the statement.

Table 4.4: Responses on purchase decision making.

S/N	Questions	Strongly Agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Total
10	personal (age, lifestyle)determine purchasing decision	208(58.76%)	130(36.72%)	5(1.41%)	4 (1.13%)	7(1.98%)	354
11	Economic (income, prices), is a key factor purchasing decision	155(43.79%)	178(50.28%)	8(2.26%)	7(1.10%)	4(1.13%)	354
12	social (family, friends), goes a long way to influence purchasing decision making	187(52.82%)	148(41.81%)	5(1.41%)	10(2.83%)	4(1.13)	354

Source: Fieldwork 2025

Item 10 of table 4.4 states that personal (age, lifestyle)determine purchasing decision, 208 (57.67%) strongly agreed with the statement, 130(36.72%) agreed, 5(1.41%) were undecided,4(1.31%) disagreed while 7(1.98%) strongly disagreed to the statement.

Item 11 of table 4.4 shows that 155(43.79%) of the respondents strongly agreed that Economic (income, prices), is a key factor purchasing decision,.178(50.28%) agreed, 8(2.26%) of the respondents were indifference about the statement, 7(1.10%) disagreed to the statement while 4 (1.13%) of the respondents strongly disagree with the statement.

Item 12 of table 4.4 indicates that 187(52.82%) of the respondents strongly agreed that social (family, friends), goes a long way to influence purchasing decision making, 148 (41.81%) agreed, 5 (1.41%) were undecided, 10(2.83) of the respondents disagree while 4(1.31%) strongly disagreed to the statement

Hypothesis One

Ho: Family education status does not influence purchase decision making for specialty goods in Enugu State Nigeria

Table 4.5. Model Summary[b]

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Durbin-Watson
1	.881[a]	.776	.775	.41753	.130

a. Predictors: (Constant), Family Education Status

b. Dependent Variable: Purchase Decision

Table 4.6 ANOVA[a]

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	212.386	1	212.386	1218.279	.000[b]
	Residual	61.365	352	.174		
	Total	273.751	353			

a. Dependent Variable: Purchase Decision

b. Predictors: (Constant), Family Education Status

Table 4.7 Coefficients[a]

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	.230	.045		5.051	.000
	Family Education Status	.995	.029	.881	34.904	.000

a. Dependent Variable: Purchase Decision

R = 0.881

R^2 = 0. 776

F = 1218.279

T = 34.904

DW = 0. 130

Interpretation:

The regression sum of squares (212.386) is less than the residual sum of squares (61.365), which indicates that more of the variation in the dependent variable is not explained by the model. The significance value of the F statistics (0.000) is less than 0.05, which means that the variation explained by the model is not due to chance.

R, the correlation coefficient which has a value of 0.881, indicates that there is positive relationship between family education status and purchase decision. R square, the coefficient of determination, shows that 77.6% of the variation in purchase decision is explained by the model.

With the linear regression model, the error of estimate is low, with a value of about . .79202. The Durbin Watson statistics of 0.130, which is not more than 2, indicates there is no autocorrelation.

The family education status coefficient of 0. 881 indicates a positive significance between family education status and purchase decision, which is statistically significant (with t = 34.904). Therefore, the null hypothesis should be rejected and the alternative hypothesis accordingly accepted.

Hypothesis Two

Ho: There is no relationship between **Family size** and purchase decision making for specialty goods in Enugu State Nigeria

Table 4.8 Descriptive Statistics

	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
Family Size	1.7119	1.11468	354
Purchase Decision	1.6158	.88062	354

Table 4.9 Correlations

		Family Size	Purchase Decision
Family Size	Pearson Correlation	1	.929**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000
	N	354	354
Purchase Decision	Pearson Correlation	.929**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	
	N	354	354

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Table (4.8) shows the descriptive statistics of the Family Size via, Purchase Decision with a mean response of 1.7119 and std. deviation of 1.11468 for Family Size and a mean response of 1.6158 and std. deviation of 0.88062 for purchase decision and number of respondents (354). By careful observation of standard deviation values, there is not much difference in terms of the standard deviation scores. This implies that there is about the same variability of data points between the dependent and independent variables.

Table (4.9) is the Pearson correlation coefficient for family Size and, purchase decision. The correlation coefficient shows 0.929. This value indicates that correlation is significant at 0.05 level (2tailed) and implies that there is a significant positive relationship between family Size and, purchase decision. (r = .929). The computed correlations coefficient is greater than the table value of r = .195 with 352 degrees of freedom (df. = n-2) at alpha level for a two-tailed test (r = .929, p< .05). However, since the computed r = .929, is greater than the table value of .195 we reject the null hypothesis and conclude that there is a positive relationship between family size and, purchase decision (r =. 929, P<.05).

Hypothesis Three

Ho Family Perceived income level does not influence purchase decision making for specialty goods in Enugu State Nigeria

Table 4.10 Model Summary[b]

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Durbin-Watson
1	.880[a]	.775	.774	.41819	.094

a. Predictors: (Constant), Family perceived income level

b. Dependent Variable: Purchase Decision

Table 4.11 ANOVA[a]

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	212.192	1	212.192	1213.322	.000[b]
	Residual	61.560	352	.175		
	Total	273.751	353			

a. Dependent Variable: Purchase Decision

b. Predictors: (Constant), Family perceived income level

Table 4.12 Coefficients[a]

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	.481	.039		12.182	.000
	Family perceived income level	.672	.019	.880	34.833	.000

a. Dependent Variable: Purchase Decision

R = 0.880

R^2 = 0. 775

F = 1213.322

T = 34.833

DW = 0. 094

Interpretation:

The regression sum of squares (212.192) is less than the residual sum of squares (61.560), which indicates that more of the variation in the dependent variable is not explained by the model. The significance value of the F statistics (0.000) is less than 0.05, which means that the variation explained by the model is not due to chance.

R, the correlation coefficient which has a value of 0.880, indicates that there is positive relationship between family perceived income level and purchase decision . R square, the coefficient of determination, shows that 77.5% of the variation in purchase decision is explained by the model.

With the linear regression model, the error of estimate is low, with a value of about .41819. The Durbin Watson statistics of 0.094, which is not more than 2, indicates there is no autocorrelation.

The family perceived income level coefficient of 0. 880 indicates a positive significance between family perceived income level and purchase decision, which is statistically significant (with t = 34.833). Therefore, the null hypothesis should be rejected and the alternative hypothesis accordingly accepted.

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary of Findings

i. Family education status has a significant positive influence purchase decision making for specialty goods in Enugu State Nigeria ($r = 0.881$; $F = 1218.279$; $t = 34.904$; $p < 0.05$)
ii. There is a positive relationship between family perceived family income level and purchase decision making for specialty goods in Enugu State Nigeria ($r =. 929$, $P<.05$).
iii. Family size significantly influence purchase decision making for specialty goods in Enugu State Nigeria ($r = 0.880$. $F= 1213.322$; $t = 34.833$; $p< 0.05$)

CONCLUSION

The study concluded that family demography, including factors like income, age, education, and family structure, significantly influences the purchase of specialty goods in Enugu State, Nigeria, by shaping purchasing power and influencing decision-making roles within the family. High-income families may have a greater ability to purchase specialty goods, while factors such as changing marital roles and the increased involvement of children in the buying process also modify how and what specialty items are bought. Marketers can use this demographic information to segment markets and tailor their strategies to appeal to different family profiles and their unique needs for specialty products

RECOMMENDATIONS

i. Business should implement educational marketing campaigns targeting educated families, develop products that appeal to their informed preferences, leverage digital platforms for targeted advertising, and empower these families through informative content creation to foster loyalty and informed purchasing behavior
ii. Businesses should target high-income households with tailored marketing, develop accessible premium products for broader appeal, offer financing options, and leverage influencer marketing to build trust
iii. Businesses should consider household dynamics, such as the number of children or dependents impacting needs and budget, and analyze how these factors interact with socioeconomic conditions, like the specific income levels and priorities within different family sizes in the local context

REFERENCES

1. Alam, B. G. S. (2018), 'Some customers would rather leave without saying goodbye,' Marketing Science, 37(1), pp. 54–77
2. Andersene, I., & Gaile-Sarkane, E. (2008). Influence of factors on consumer behavior. 5th International Scientific Conference (pp. 331-337). Vilnius: Technika
3. Bonfield, E.H. (1978), "Perception of metical roles in decision process; replication and extension" in Hunt, H.K. (Ed.), Advances in Consumer Researcli, Association for Consumer Research, pp. 303- 07.
4. Burns, A. C., and Gentry, J. W. (1990), "Toward improving household consumption behavior research", Advances in Consumer Research XVII: 518-523
5. Carlson M and Gross N. (2018) The female labour force in metropolitan areas: An international comparison', economic development and cultural change, 10(4): 367-38
6. Cummuri, S. and Gentry, J.W. (2000). "Opportunities for family research in making", Academy making Science Review, pp 1-32
7. Desia, R.,(2016). Archival research: A neglected method in organization Studies, Benchmarking: An International Journal
8. Do Paco, A., Raposo, M. and Walter, F.L. (2009). Identifying the green consumer: A segmentation study. Journal of Targeting, Measurement and Analysis for Marketing 17 (1), 17–25
9. Exter, P. (1988). How to think like a demographer, The insider's guide to demographic know how. (pp. 6). Ithaca: American Demographic Press.
10. Fisher, C., Bashyal, S. and Bachman, B. (2012). Demographic impacts on environmentally friendly purchase behaviors. Journal of Targeting, Measurement and Analysis for Marketing, 20 (3–4), 172–
11. Gouxet, D., Maurin, E.,. (2005). The effect of over crowded housing on children's performance at school. Journal of Public Economics , 89(5-6), 797- 819
12. Guneri, B., Kaplan M. and Delea M (2009) The influence of children on family purchasing decisions in Turkey, Advances in Consumer Research 7(3)5
13. Kaur, P. & Singh, R. (2006). Children in family purchase decision making in India and the West: A review. Academy of Marketing Science Review, 8, 1-32
14. Kotler,P, (2008). Marketing management and organizations, 4th Ed: international editions, prentice
15. Kumar, R. and Kumar, R. (2019). Impact of various demographic factors on consumer behavior – an empirical study of electronic products in rural Himachal, Indian Journal of economics and business, 19 (1), 109-127
16. Laroche, M., Bergeron, J. and Forleo, G.B. (2001). Targeting consumers who are willing to pay more for environmentally friendly products. Journal of Consumer Marketing 18 (6): 503– 520
17. Marshall, D. (2010). Understanding children as consumers. New York: Sage
18. Mazloumi, S.S.S., Efteghar, A., Ghalandari, A., Saifi, B., & Aghandeh, I. (2013). Evaluating the effect of demographic differences on consumers' purchasing behavior (Case Study: Tetra Pak Consumers). International Research Journal of Applied and Basic Sciences, 4(7), 1866-1867
19. Mintel, V. (2002). Socioeconomic disadvantage and child development. American Psychologist 53:185–204
20. Norgaard, M., Bruns, K., Christensen, P. and Mikkelsen, M. (2007). Children's influence on and participation in the family decision process during Food Buying. Journal of Young Consumers, 8
21. Omar, N. A., Nazri, M. A., Osman, L.H. and Ahmad, M.S. (2016). The effect of demographic factors on consumer intention to purchase organic products in the Klang Valley: An empirical study. Malaysian Journal of Society and Space, 12(2), 68 – 82
22. Perner, L. (2010). Consumer behavior: The psychology of marketing. Retrieved November 2, 2010, from http://www.consumerpsychologist.com
23. Roslin, A. R., Zuraidah, S., Thoo, A. C., Mohd, S. M. A. and Mohd, H. A. H. (2017). E-WOM review adoption: consumers' demographic profile influence on green purchase intention. IOP Conf. Series: Materials Science and Engineering, 215.
24. Sirakaya, E., and Woodside, A. G., (2005), "Building and testing theories of decision making by travellers", Tourism Management, 26 (2005), 815–832

25. Storstad, O. and Bjorkhaug, H. (2003). Foundations of production and consumption of organic food in Norway: Common attitudes among farmers and consumers. Agriculture and Human Values, 20, 151- 63
26. Straughan, R. D. and Roberts, J. A. (1999). Environmental segmentation alternatives: A look at green consumer behavior in the new millennium. Journal of Consumer Marketing 16 (6): 558–575
27. Turner, R Kelly N and Mc Kenna, J. (2006). Essentials of business research: A guide to doing your research project: SAGE Publications
28. Vaňo, B., Jurčová, D., & Mészáros, J. (2002). Population projection of Slovakia until 2050. (pp. 12-17). Bratislava: Akty
29. White,N (2018). Consumer behavior, 9th Edition, Pearson- prentice Hall, India, ISBN: 81 7758- 999-7, Page no: 550-567