

Divya George “Gambling and decision making: A study on selected games.” Thesis. Research Department of Commerce, St Thomas’ College (Autonomous) Thrissur, University of Calicut, 2020.

## CHAPTER 6

# THE INFLUENCE OF SWEEPSTAKES ON THE CONSUMER BUYING BEHAVIOUR OF KERALITES.

### 6.1 Introduction

After analysing the influence of Kerala State Government Lottery and Gambling Related Sales Promotion tools (Sweepstakes) on the saving habits and spending culture of disposable income of people in Kerala, now researcher is focusing on the impact of sweepstakes on the Consumer Buying Behaviour. Sweepstakes are gambling natured sales promotion tool, which have two, of the three features of the lottery. Chance, prize and consideration are the three requirements of lottery gambling. Sweepstakes possess two of these features except consideration.. In this chapter the researcher is trying to analyse the influence of only sweepstakes type promotion tools on buying behaviour of Keralites.

For examining the influence of sweepstakes on the buying behaviour of customers, five dependent variables were identified and, they are stock piling, repeated purchase, purchase acceleration/delay, brand/shop switching and change in purchase initialization. Customers may express different changes in their buying behaviour because of the influence of sweepstakes offered by the shops. The majority of the customers fail to recognize the gambling nature of sweepstakes. They consider sweepstakes as a normal sales promotion tool. But the fact that they fail to recognize is that sweepstakes can attract and make some changes in the buying behaviour of those customers who have an affinity towards gambling and such customers will go in search of shops and brands which offer sweepstakes. Such changes were identified and analysed here. Every sales promotion tool is expected to have a short- term impact on the customer's behaviour. That's why business houses offer such promotion tools continuously, to keep the impact on consumer buying behaviour for a long term.

**6.1.1 Stock Piling:** Over stocking of the products, to enjoy the sweepstakes is one of the commonly observed changes in buying behaviour. Customers are buying

products not because of the necessity but because of the particular purchase at an unnecessary time helped them to enjoy the sweepstakes offers by the business houses, which possess a gambling nature. Unwanted stocking of products, definitely increase the spending habit and also end up in deterioration of the saving culture. All sales promotion tools may end up in stock piling, but those who get attracted to sweepstakes and end up in stock piling, identifies an enjoyment of gambling in it. Unused items in the house, always stocking consumables for more than four months, buying for more amount, than actual requirement, to get involved in the sweepstakes slabs offers, those who cannot ensure fuller utilization of their purchase all result in stock piling. Here from CBB 96 to CBB 100 is used by the researcher to measure whether sweepstakes result in stockpiling.

**6.1.2 Repeated Purchase Behaviour:** Sweepstakes may motivate employees to buy again and again. Repeated purchase behaviour is done by customers simply to get more participation and more chance to win the sweepstakes. Customers will be aware of the time limits of sweepstakes offered by the business houses and during this period they may repeat purchases several times similar to bulk buying of lottery tickets. By doing so they expect that their chance to win sweepstakes will be more. Visiting shops frequently during the time of sweepstakes even without an intention to buy, but at the sight of sweepstakes offers, these visits end up in purchase decisions that bring about changes in the buying behaviour and this shows the influence of sweepstakes. Statements CBB 101 to CBB 103 are used in the questionnaire to analyse the repetitive buying behaviour of the customers due to the influence of sweepstakes.

**6.1.3 Purchase acceleration/delay:** Change in the purchase timings by the consumer is denoted by purchase acceleration and purchase delay. Purchase acceleration means, customer speed up their purchase decision before the actual need arises and purchase delay means the customer is delaying the actual purchase even if they are in the real need of the product. Here researcher is examining whether this speedy purchase or delayed purchase is due to the influence of sweepstakes or not. Postpone or prepone, buying decisions for getting the sweepstakes benefits, searching for the timing of sweepstakes in media, purchase during festival seasons in expectation of sweepstakes are some of the recognized changes in the buying behaviour of customers which will result either in purchase acceleration or in purchase delay. In the present study CBB

104 to CBB 107 were used to measure the purchase acceleration and purchase delay, behaviour exhibited by the customers.

**6.1.4 Brand/Shop Switching:** Another change expected in the buying behaviour of the customers because of the sweepstakes are switching brands or shops. Attracted to those brands or shops which offer sweepstakes was an observed change in the buying behaviour. Now the business houses observed that brand/ shop loyalty is decreasing tremendously. One of the main reasons for this is the sales promotion offers by various brands, which tempt the customers to jump from one brand/shop to another. The customers who are shifting from one brand/shop to another because of the only influence of sweepstakes offers are analysed here. Sweepstakes offers are closely related to gambling and customers who are not aware of this and may have an affinity towards gambling products will easily shift to those brands/shops that offer sweepstakes. The influence of sweepstakes can be depicted because of the reduced level of brand loyalty. This instinct towards sweepstakes may be expressed even after the purchase of the product by the customers. By showing a tendency to return a brand without sweepstakes and avail another one with sweepstakes can be considered as an affinity towards the gambling natured sales promotion tool, i.e. sweepstakes. Searching for the shops offering sweepstakes and avoiding those shops with the required product but without sweepstakes are always counted as the attraction towards sweepstakes. Here in the questionnaire from CBB 108 to CBB 112 researcher measures the tendency of the customers to change their brand/ shop because of the influence of sweepstakes.

**6.1.5 Buying Initiation:** Customers are taking the first step towards a purchase because of a severe motivation. Sweepstakes can act as this initial motivation for purchase. This can be recognized by analysing when, who, where and what provoked the customer to make a buying decision. The presence of sweepstakes in these answers has to be checked which will help us to conclude the influence of sweepstakes in customer's buying behaviour. When customers come to know about the presence of sweepstakes through media or from reference groups or with their own knowledge, at that moment itself they will decide to initiate the purchase. At this moment the actual cost of the product, quality of the product, other benefits derived from the products were not judged by the customer. They have initiated their purchase decision only because of the presence of sweepstakes. A purchase initiation decision is taken by the customers

because of a variety of reasons. CBB 113 to CBB 125 is designed to measure the influence of sweepstakes in purchase initiation decisions by the customers that is only because of the existence of the sweepstakes they initiated their purchase or not.

## 6.2 Ordinal Logistic Regression Model for Measuring the Significance of Variables on Consumer Buying Behaviour of Keralites

Categorical order	Corresponding Score
Highly Influenced	>90 percent
Frequently Influenced	80-90 percent
Influenced	70-80 percent
Occasionally Influenced	55-70 percent
Not Influenced	0-55 percent

Source: Compiled Data

### 6.2.1 Case Processing Summary of OLRM Applied to Analyse the Influence of Sweepstakes on CBB of Keralites.

In the Case Processing Summary table, we can see the number and percentage of cases in each level of our response variable.

		N	Marginal Percentage
Consumer Buying Behaviour	Not influenced	74	12.3%
	Occasionally influenced	86	14.3%
	Influenced	202	33.7%
	Frequently influenced	225	37.5%
	Highly influenced	13	2.2%
Total		600	100.0%

Source: Primary Data

### 6.2.2 Model Fitting Information of CBB

The model fitting information contains the -2 log likelihood for an intercept only model and the full model (containing all the independent variables). The model fitting information also contains the likelihood ratio Chi-square test to test whether there is a significant improvement in the fit of the final model relative to the intercept only model.

Model	-2 Log Likelihood	Chi-Square	df	Sig.
Intercept Only	1624.692			
Final	0.000	1624.692	5	0.000

Source: Primary Data

In this case, since the p value is less than 0.05, we can see a significant improvement in the fit of the final model over the intercept only model.

### 6.2.3 Parameter Estimates of Consumer Buying Behaviour

In the Parameter Estimates table, we can see the coefficients, their standard errors, the Wald test and associated p-values (Sig.).

		Estimate	Std. Error	Wald	df	Sig.
Threshold	Not influenced	48.155	3.957	148.122	1	.000
	Occasionally influenced	60.808	4.882	155.116	1	.000
	Influenced	70.836	5.629	158.373	1	.000
	Frequently influenced	79.713	6.201	165.260	1	.000
Location	Stock piling	.721	.112	41.340	1	.000
	Repeated purchase	.903	.150	36.499	1	.000
	Purchase timing	.251	.131	3.687	1	.055
	Switch brand	.708	.096	54.347	1	.000
	Purchase initiation	.515	.058	77.875	1	.000

Source: Primary Data

The table shows that the stock-piling, repeated purchase, brand/shop switching and purchase initiation are statistically significant as their corresponding p values are less than 0.05 and another variable is not statistically significant.

So, for the stock-piling factor, we would say that for a one-unit increase in for stock piling factor, we expect a 0.721 increase in the ordered log odds of being in a higher level of change in the consumer buying behaviour because of the influence of sweepstakes, given all the other variables in the model are held constant. That means as the stock-piling factor increases, change in consumer buying behaviour, because of sweepstakes are likely to be increased. Similar results hold for other significant variables also. That means as the corresponding score of stock-piling, repeated purchase, brand/shop switching and purchase initialisation increase, people are more likely to change their consumer buying behaviour because of the influence of sweepstakes. For every unit of increase in the repeated purchase, brand/shop switching and purchase initiation decision a corresponding increase of .903, .708 and .515, on the influence on consumer buying behaviour because of the participation in sweepstakes are expected. Unwanted accumulation of stocks, over-stocking of products to get the benefit of sweepstakes is observed commonly now. Among the Kerala population it was observed that they are ready to engage in uncertain or risky events, there by testing their probability to win attractive outcomes. It is usual among the Keralites to visit the shops covering Gambling Related Sales Promotion tools (Sweepstakes) repeatedly. These people also search for such offers and buy for more amount only for getting the benefits of sweepstakes. Today customers are willing to change their brand or shops, even after making a purchase decision of a brand or from a shop, only to get the offers related to sweepstakes. The purchase initiation decision taken by the people are heavily influenced by the sweepstakes offers

#### **6.2.4 Test of Parallel Lines on Consumer Buying Behaviour**

The Test of parallel lines table shows that the test does not reject the hypothesis that the relationship between each pair of outcome groups is the same and it indicates that the proportional odds assumption is not violated.

<b>Table: 6.1.4 Test of Parallel Lines</b>				
Model	-2 Log Likelihood	Chi-Square	df	Sig.
Null Hypothesis	0.000			
General	.000	0.000	15	1.000
The null hypothesis states that the location parameters (slope coefficients) are the same across response categories.				

Source: Primary Data

The Wald test of Ordinal Logistic Regression Model suggested that among the five variable four are statistically significant because the p-value of the 4 variables is less than 0.05, they are stock piling (p=0.000), repeated purchase (p=0.000), brand/shop switching (p=0.000) and purchase initiation (p=0.000). Variable purchase timing is not statistically significant. For stock-piling factor, we would say that for a one unit increase in stock-piling factor, we expect a 0.721 increase in the ordered log odds of being in a higher level of change in the consumer buying behaviour because of the influence of sweepstakes, given all the other variables in the model are held constant. That means as the stock piling factor increases, change in consumer buying behaviour, because of sweepstakes will also likely to be increased. Similar results hold for other significant variables also. That means as the corresponding score of stock piling, repeated purchase, brand/shop switching and purchase initialisation increase, people are more likely to change their consumer buying behaviour because of the influence of sweepstakes. For every unit of increase in the repeated purchase, brand/shop switching and purchase initiation decision a corresponding increase of .903, .708 and .515, on the influence on consumer buying behaviour because of the participation in sweepstakes are expected.

### **6.3 One-Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test for Normality, on the changes in CBB because of the influence of Sweepstakes**

Hypothesis 1: The data set related to the Influence of Gambling Related Sales Promotion tools on consumer buying behaviour is normally distributed



**Table: 6.2 One-Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test for Normality, on the changes in Consumer Buying Behaviour because of the influence of Sweepstakes**

Variable	Category		Influence of GRSP tools on consumer buying behaviour	
Gender	Male	Test Statistic	3.294	
		p Value	0.000	
	Female	Test Statistic	3.445	
		p Value	0.000	
Age	18-25	Test Statistic	2.053	
		p Value	.000	
	25-35	Test Statistic	2.598	
		p Value	.000	
	35-45	Test Statistic	1.723	
		p Value	.005	
	45-55	Test Statistic	1.666	
		p Value	.008	
	Above 55	Test Statistic	1.890	
		p Value	.002	
	Income	< 1 Lakh	Test Statistic	1.745
			p Value	.005
1 - 3 Lakhs		Test Statistic	2.044	
		p Value	.000	
3-7 Lakhs		Test Statistic	3.159	
		p Value	0.000	
7-12 Lakhs		Test Statistic	2.696	
		p Value	.000	
12 Lakhs and above		Test Statistic	.859	
		p Value	.451	
Education level		Below 10th	Test Statistic	.868
			p Value	.438
	10th Pass	Test Statistic	1.898	

	Plus Two	p Value	.001
		Test Statistic	2.253
	UG	p Value	.000
		Test Statistic	2.759
	PG	Test Statistic	2.396
		p Value	.000
Occupation status	Unemployed	Test Statistic	1.343
		p Value	.054
	Labour/Self employed	Test Statistic	2.196
		p Value	.000
	Private employee	Test Statistic	3.275
		p Value	0.000
	Govt. employee	Test Statistic	2.056
		p Value	.000
	Business	Test Statistic	1.618
		p Value	.011
	Professional	Test Statistic	.839
		p Value	.482
Age	Unmarried	Test Statistic	2.067
		p Value	.000
	Married	Test Statistic	3.010
		p Value	.000
	Widow/Widower	Test Statistic	.532
		p Value	.939
Religion	Hindu	Test Statistic	2.629
		p Value	.000
	Muslim	Test Statistic	2.007
		p Value	.001
	Christian	Test Statistic	1.977
		p Value	.001

Source: Primary Data

Since the  $p$  value of all items is less than 0.05, it is identified that the variables related to the Influence of Gambling Related Sales Promotion tools on consumer buying behaviour is not following a normal distribution. Hence the hypothesis is rejected at 5% level of significance. So, the non-parametric tests are applied to examine the significance of the difference occurred. Here researcher applied Mann -Whitney U test for two variable data i.e. gender and the Kruskal-Wallis test to check the difference in the mean value found in the independent factors with more than two variables, they are age, occupational status, education level, annual income, marital status and religion.

#### 6.4 Influence of Gender on Consumer Buying Behaviour

Hypothesis 2: Gender has no significant influence on consumer buying behaviour because of the presence of Gambling Related Sales Promotion Tools, (sweepstakes).

**Table 6.3 Mann-Whitney U Test Shows the Influence of Gender on the Consumer Buying Behaviour of Keralites because of Participation in Sweepstakes**

Variables	Gender	N	Mean Rank	Sum of Ranks	Test Statistic	p Value
Consumer Buying Behaviour	Male	300	372.43	111730.00	-10.171	0.000
	Female	300	228.57	68570.00		

Source: Primary Data

Since  $p$  value (0.000) is less than 0.01, the hypothesis is rejected for a 1% level of significance, hence we can conclude that the gender of the respondents has a significant influence on consumer buying behaviour because of the Gambling Related Sales Promotion Tools (sweepstakes). Based on the mean rank, consumer buying behaviour of males (372.43) are more influenced than females (228.57) because of the presence of Gambling Related Sales Promotion (GRSP) tools i.e. sweepstakes in this study. Gender is one of the major factors which influence buying behaviour. Because the purchase motives of both men and women are entirely different in all aspects. The nurturing of males and females varies along with the societal and emotional aspects. The involvement of rationality in decision making, is also different in all aspects of life for both the genders. This difference will also reflect in consumer behaviour of customers when sweepstakes are attached to a product. Usually men are more attracted

to gambling products, similarly men are also attracted to sweepstakes because it possesses a gambling nature. The element of uncertainty in winning the prize made women, withdraw themselves from the sweepstakes-based sales promotion offers, Potenza M N, et.al.,(2001) Globally it is identified that the risk bearing capacity of men is more than women.

### 6.5 Influence of Age on Consumer Buying Behaviour

Hypothesis 3: Age has no significant influence on consumer buying behaviour because of the presence of Gambling Related Sales Promotion Tools (Sweepstakes)

**Table: 6.4 Kruskal - Wallis Test Shows the Influence of Age on the Consumer Buying Behaviour of Keralites because of Participation in Sweepstakes**

Variables	Age	N	Mean Rank	Test statistic	p value
Consumer Buying Behaviour	18-25	103	287.88	22.625	0.000
	25-35	139	294.58		
	35-45	142	355.81		
	45-55	132	259.47		
	Above 55	84	296.74		

Source: Primary Data

Since  $p$  value (0.000) is less than 0.01, the hypothesis is rejected for a 1% level of significance. Hence it can be inferred that influence of age of the respondents on consumer buying behaviour because of the presence of Gambling Related Sales Promotion Tools (Sweepstakes) is significant. The consumer behaviour of age category 35-45 with a mean rank of 355.81 is influenced heavily by the presence of sweepstakes in product offers. As when age increases, this influence on the buying behaviour is reduced. Youngsters and lower middle-aged group are more attracted because they are willing to take risk, and have a high expectation towards life. It is easy to attract the youngster and lower middle-aged category (35-45), with attractive prizes and jackpots attached to the sweepstakes. This can be depicted as an important reason for the youngsters and lower middle-aged group was influenced by the sweepstake offers. A Post hoc test has been performed for pairwise comparisons and the results are given below.

### 6.5.1 Pairwise Comparison of Different Age Groups and Consumer Buying Behaviour of Keralites

**Table: 6.4.1 Post Hoc Test for Pairwise Comparisons Between Different Age Group and Influence of Sweepstakes on the Consumer Buying Behaviour of Keralites.**

Variable	Age group		Test Statistic	Std. Error	Sig
Consumer Buying Behaviour	18-25	35-45	-67.923	22.422	0.002
	25-35	35-45	-61.224	20.67	0.003
	45-55	35-45	96.337	20.946	0.000
	Above 55	35-45	59.062	23.846	0.013

Source: Primary Data

From the corresponding  $p$  values, it is clear that the age group 35-45 is significantly different from the influence on the consumer buying behaviour because of their involvement in Gambling Related Sales Promotion Tools, (sweepstakes). The age category of 35-45 is significantly different from all other age categories. Their consumer buying behaviour is heavily influenced by the presence of sweepstakes attached to products. Other age groups are not showing any significant difference because of the influence of sweepstakes, on consumer buying behaviour. So, we can conclude that the presence of Gambling related Sales Promotion Tools (sweepstakes), influence consumer buying behaviour, with respect to age groups.

### 6.6 Influence of Income Level on Consumer Buying Behaviour

Hypothesis 4: Income level has no significant influence on consumer buying behaviour because of the presence of Gambling Related Sales Promotion Tools, (sweepstakes).

**Table: 6.5 Kruskal - Wallis Test Shows the Influence of Income Level on the Consumer Buying Behaviour of Keralites because of their Participation in Sweepstakes**

Variable	Income	N	Mean Rank	Test statistic	p value
Consumer Buying Behaviour	< 1 Lakh	98	310.04	14.749	0.005
	1 - 3 Lakhs	177	309.79		
	3-7 Lakhs	229	292.21		
	7-12 Lakhs	69	333.70		
	12 Lakhs and above	27	190.50		

Source: Primary Data

Since  $p$  value (0.005) is less than 0.01, the hypothesis is rejected for a 1% level of significance. Hence it can be inferred that influence of income level of the respondents on the consumer buying behaviour because of the involvement in Gambling Related Sales Promotion Tool (Sweepstakes) is significant. On the basis of mean score, we can observe that, the consumer behaviour of people belongs to an income level of 7-12 (333.70) lakhs is more influenced by sweepstakes. The middle- and lower-income groups are more attracted to sweepstakes. Higher income groups (190.50) are not much influenced by the sweepstakes. Higher income groups have their resources to satisfy their dreams and needs, so this type of chance-based event may not attract them. But low- and middle-income group is lacking resources, at the same time they are expecting to improve their standard of living towards the upper class. This will make them depend on these chance-based promotion tools like sweepstakes. The attractive prizes attached to the sweepstakes may prompt the lower- and middle-income groups to buy more, or switch brands or shop to get an opportunity to win that prize in addition to their usual purchase. Displaying attractive prizes of sweepstakes in front of shops and mall Post hoc tests has been performed for pairwise comparisons and the results are given below.

### 6.6.1 Pairwise Comparison of Different Income Level and Consumer Buying Behaviour of Keralites

Table: 6.5.1 Post hoc test for Pairwise comparisons between Different Income Level and influence of sweepstakes on the Consumer Buying Behaviour of Keralites.					
Variable	Income		Test Statistic	Std. Error	Sig
Consumer Buying Behaviour	12 Lakhs and above	< 1 Lakh	119.536	37.654	0.002
	12 Lakhs and above	1 - 3 Lakhs	119.288	35.793	0.001
	12 Lakhs and above	3-7 Lakhs	101.707	35.251	0.004
	12 Lakhs and above	7-12 Lakhs	143.196	39.326	0.000

Source: Primary Data

From the corresponding  $p$  values, it is clear that the people who belong to the income level of '12 Lakhs and above' is significantly different from all other income groups with respect to the influence on the consumer buying behaviour, because of their involvement in Gambling Related Sales Promotion Tools (sweepstakes). Other age groups are not showing any significant difference with each other regarding the influence of sweepstakes on consumer buying behaviour. From the post hoc test it is evident that only the high-income group is showing a difference in their consumer

buying behaviour because of the presence of sweepstakes. The high-income group is less attracted to sweepstakes because of their self-sufficiency. All other income groups are showing a similar type of influence on their buying behaviour because of Gambling Related Sales Promotion tools.

### 6.7 Influence of Education Level on Consumer Buying Behaviour

Hypothesis 5: Education Level has no significant influence on the consumer buying behaviour because of the presence of Gambling Related Sales Promotion Tools, (sweepstakes).

**Table 6.6 Kruskal - Wallis Test shows the Influence of Education Level on the Consumer Buying Behaviour of Keralites because of their Participation in Sweepstakes**

Variable	Education Level	N	Mean Rank	Test statistic	p value
Consumer Buying Behaviour	Below 10th	11	513.64	51.134	0.000
	10th Pass	86	348.82		
	Plus Two	163	334.01		
	UG	224	246.59		
	PG	116	301.47		

Source: Primary Data

Since  $p$  value (0.000) is less than 0.01, the hypothesis is rejected for a 1% level of significance. Hence it can be inferred that the influence of the education level of the respondents on the consumer buying behaviour because of the involvement in the Gambling Related Sales Promotion Tool is significant. This is evident from the mean rank that, the people with lower educational status i.e. below the 10<sup>th</sup> (513.64) showed a maximum change in their buying behaviour, if sweepstakes are available in the market. This change in buying behaviour is gradually decreasing when the education level increases. So, we can conclude that the education and affinity towards Gambling Related Sales Promotion tools, sweepstakes are inversely related. This finding is also supported universally. Rationality in decision making is comparatively low in the uneducated group. They believe blindly what was propagated by the sellers. Their unawareness with regards to the winning probability is exploited by the marketers. A Post hoc test has been conducted for pairwise comparisons and the results are given below.

### 6.7.1 Pairwise Comparison of Different Education Level and Consumer Buying Behaviour of Keralites

<b>Table: 6.6.1 Post hoc Test for Pairwise Comparisons between the Different Education Categories and Influence of Sweepstakes on the Consumer Buying Behaviour of Keralites.</b>					
Variable	Education Level		Test	Std.	Sig
			Statistic	Error	
Consumer Buying Behaviour	10th pass	Below 10th	164.817	55.474	0.003
	Plus two	Below 10th	179.624	53.968	0.001
	UG	Below 10th	267.045	53.501	0
	UG	10th pass	102.228	21.976	0
	UG	Plus two	87.421	17.836	0
	UG	PG	-54.883	19.817	0.006
	PG	Below 10th	212.162	54.654	0

Source: Primary Data

From the corresponding  $p$  values, it is clear that the consumer buying behaviour of Under Graduates and 'Below 10<sup>th</sup>' education level is significantly different from others because of their involvement in Gambling Related Sales Promotion Tools (sweepstakes). Other educational levels are not showing any significant difference to the influence on the consumer buying behaviour, because of the presence of sweepstakes. These two educational categories show a significant difference from other educational classes. But here the Under Graduates are less influenced, when compared to other groups but 'Below 10<sup>th</sup>' category is highly influenced by the sweepstakes in comparison with other educational groups. The educated and uneducated groups are showing a significant difference in buying behaviour because of the influence of Gambling Related Sales Promotion tools (Sweepstakes).

### 6.8 Influence of Occupation Status on Consumer Buying Behaviour

Hypothesis 6: Occupational status has no significant influence on consumer buying behaviour because of the presence of Gambling Related Sales Promotion Tools (sweepstakes).



**Table 6.7 Kruskal - Wallis Test shows the influence of Occupational Status on the Consumer Buying Behaviour of Keralites because of their Participation in Sweepstakes**

Variable	Occupation status	N	Mean Rank	Test statistic	p value
Consumer Buying Behaviour	Unemployed	95	309.41	35.948	0.000
	Labour/Self employed	102	363.19		
	Private employee	212	265.64		
	Govt. employee	60	248.58		
	Business	120	336.33		
	Professional	11	206.55		

Source: Primary Data

Since  $p$  value (0.000) is less than 0.01, the hypothesis is rejected for a 1% level of significance. Hence it can be inferred that influence of the occupational level of the respondents on the consumer buying behaviour because of the involvement in Gambling Related Sales Promotion Tool (Sweepstakes) is significant. While comparing the mean rank of the occupational status, the consumer behaviour of the labour/self-employed segment with a mean rank of 363.19 is highly influenced by sweepstakes. Followed by them comes the business category with a mean rank of 336.33. Professional with 206.55 is the occupational category which is least influenced by sweepstakes. This pattern of change in consumer behaviour regarding occupational status, shows that those who have a fixed and regular income is not that much attracted towards these types of Gambling Related Sales Promotion tools, (sweepstakes). The uncertainty in income level will create an affinity towards gambling, and related products. Because they find it as a source to improve the life style and as a method to gain easy money. This is the reason why the people who belong to the uncertain income group i.e. business people and labour/self-employed were more influenced by sweepstakes. The unemployed group is also influenced by sweepstakes. Their attraction towards these types of promotion tools may be more, but this category is not having any source of income. It is the reason that, they could not change their buying behaviour as per the availability of sweepstakes promotions. A Post hoc test has been performed for pairwise comparisons and the results are given below.

### 6.8.1 Pairwise Comparison of Different Occupational Status and Consumer Buying Behaviour of Keralites

**Table: 6.7.1 Post hoc Test for Pairwise Comparisons between Different Occupational Status and Influence of Sweepstakes on the Consumer Buying Behaviour of Keralites.**

Variable	Occupation status		Test Statistic	Std. Error	Sig
Consumer Buying Behaviour	Unemployed	Labour/Self employed	-53.781	24.701	0.029
	Govt. employee	Unemployed	60.822	28.568	0.033
	Govt. employee	Labour/Self employed	114.603	28.186	0.000
	Govt. employee	Business	-87.746	27.392	0.001
	Private employee	Unemployed	43.768	21.389	0.041
	Private employee	Labour/Self employed	97.549	20.876	0.000
	Private employee	Business	-70.692	19.791	0.000
	Professional	Labour/Self employed	156.641	54.978	0.004
	Professional	Business	129.784	54.576	0.017

Source: Primary Data

From the corresponding  $p$  values, it is clear that the consumer buying behaviour of people who belong to the business and the labour/self-employed category is significantly different from other occupational categories because of the presence of Gambling Related Sales Promotion Tools (sweepstakes). Other occupational categories are not showing any significant difference in influencing the buying behaviour, due to sweepstakes. Because of the existence of sweepstakes in the market, consumer buying behaviour is changing based on the different occupations. Those occupational categories which were more influenced by the sweepstakes are those with unstable income.

### 6.9 Influence of Marital Status on Consumer Buying Behaviour

Hypothesis 7: Marital status has no significant influence on consumer buying behaviour because of the presence of Gambling Related Sales Promotion Tools (sweepstakes)

**Table 6.8 Kruskal - Wallis Test shows the Influence of Marital Status on the Consumer Buying Behaviour of Keralites because of their Participation in Sweepstakes**

Variable	Marital Status	N	Mean Rank	Test statistic	p value
Consumer Buying Behaviour	Unmarried	121	331.36	5.672	0.059
	Married	475	293.38		
	Widow/Widower	4	212.63		

Source: Primary Data

Since  $p$  value (0.059) is greater than 0.05, the hypothesis is accepted for a 5% level of significance. Hence it can be inferred that influence of the marital status of the respondents on the consumer buying behaviour because of the involvement in Gambling Related Sales Promotion Tool (Sweepstakes) is insignificant. The presence of sweepstakes is insignificant on the consumer buying behaviour with respect to marital status. Based on the mean rank unmarried people keep on changing their buying habits in the form of stock piling, brand switching, purchase acceleration/delay because of the influence of sweepstakes. Purchase initiation decision taken by the ‘unmarried’ category is also influenced by the Gambling Related Sales Promotion tools (sweepstakes).

### 6.10 Influence of Religion on Consumer Buying Behaviour

Hypothesis 8: Religion has no significant influence on consumer buying behaviour because of the participation of Keralites in Gambling Related Sales Promotion Tools, (sweepstakes).

**Table: 6.9 Kruskal -Wallis Test Shows the Influence of Religion on the Consumer Buying Behaviour of Keralites because of their Participation in Sweepstakes**

Variable	Religion	N	Mean Rank	Test statistic	p value
Consumer Buying Behaviour	Hindu	254	292.73	1.792	0.408
	Muslim	171	315.17		
	Christian	175	297.44		

Source: Primary Data

Since  $p$  value (0.408) is greater than 0.05, the hypothesis is accepted at a 5% level of significance. Hence it can be inferred that influence of the religion of the respondents on consumer buying behaviour because of the participation of Keralites in Gambling Related Sales Promotion Tool is insignificant. Religion plays no significant role in bringing any change in the buying behaviour of people with the presence of sweepstakes. Based on the mean score, Muslims (315.17) are more influenced by the presence of sweepstakes. It is observed that the existence of sweepstakes does not have a significant influence in the consumer buying behaviour among the three religion.

### **6.11 Addiction Level of Keralites towards Gambling**

In this chapter researcher was discussing the influence of Sweepstakes on the buying behaviour of customers. Various changes in consumer buying behaviour were observed in the form of accumulation of stock, changing purchase timing, changes in purchase initiation, brand or shop switching and purchase repetition only for enjoying sweepstakes. All these factors that were discussed in the previous chapters are changes in the buying behaviour of Keralites, their attraction towards gambling factors, deterioration in the saving habits as well as changes in the spending pattern of disposable income, can be considered as a symptom for gambling addiction. As per the inventories supported the research, that is Gamblers' Beliefs Questionnaire developed by Timothy A Steenbergh, Andrew W Meyers, Ryan K May, and James P Whelan (the American Psychological Association (APA) and Spending and Saving Attitudes and Behaviors Questionnaire, from Psyc Tests, a database of American Psychological Association. Those who are scoring above 90 percent can be considered highly addicted to gambling products selected for the study. So, it is the need of the hour that research needs to be done to analyse at what level addiction is affecting the Kerala population. The presence of all these parameters in the society is an indication of mass addiction level. So, in the next segment of this chapter the researcher is trying to measure the level of penetration of addiction among the Keralites.

### 6.11.1 Parameter Estimates of Addiction Level of Keralites towards Gambling

Table: 6.10 Parameter Estimates of Addiction Level							
			Estimate	Std. Error	Wald	df	Sig.
Threshold	Non-Buyers		5.176	0.865	35.771	1	0
	Occasional Buyer		8.111	0.89	83.103	1	0
	High Buyer		10.451	0.949	121.176	1	0
	Addicted		11.6	0.969	143.378	1	0
Location	Gender	Male	4.431	0.287	237.942	1	0.000
		Female	0 <sup>a</sup>			0	
	Age	18-25	1.293	0.354	13.35	1	0.000
		25-35	0.94	0.301	9.787	1	0.002
		35-45	1.053	0.282	13.98	1	0.000
		45-55	-0.137	0.278	0.243	1	0.622
		Above 55	0 <sup>a</sup>			0	
	Income	< 1 Lakh	3.043	0.663	21.055	1	0.000
		1 - 3 Lakhs	4.086	0.528	59.926	1	0.000
		3-7 Lakhs	3.585	0.468	58.708	1	0.000
		7-12 Lakhs	3.369	0.478	49.605	1	0.000
		12 Lakhs and above	0 <sup>a</sup>			0	
	Education Level	Below 10th	-0.255	0.684	0.139	1	0.71
		10th Pass	0.361	0.387	0.868	1	0.352
		Plus Two	0.71	0.317	5.019	1	0.025
		UG	-0.688	0.256	7.222	1	0.007
		PG	0 <sup>a</sup>			0	
	Occupation Status	Unemployed	3.563	0.776	21.101	1	0.000
		Labour/Self employed	2.447	0.697	12.332	1	0.000
		Private employee	1.437	0.641	5.029	1	0.025
Govt. employee		0.574	0.668	0.739	1	0.39	
Business		2.159	0.664	10.559	1	0.001	
Professional		0 <sup>a</sup>			0		
Link function: Logit.							
<sup>a</sup> This parameter is set to zero because it is redundant							

Source: Primary Data

### 6.11.2 Case Processing Summary of Addiction Level of Keralites towards Gambling

In the Case Processing Summary table, we can see the number and percentage of cases in each level of our response variable.

		N	Marginal Percentage
Addiction	Non buyers	87	14.5%
	Occasional Buyer	214	35.7%
	High Buyer	159	26.5%
	Addicted	61	10.2%
	Highly Addicted	79	13.2%
Total		600	100.0%

Source: Primary Data

### 6.11.3 Model Fitting Information of Addiction Level of Keralites towards Gambling

The model fitting information contains the -2 log likelihood for an intercept only model and the full model (containing all the independent variables). We also have a likelihood ratio chi square test to test whether there is a significant improvement in the fit of the final model relative to the intercept only model. In this case, since the p value is less than 0.05, we can see a significant improvement in the fit of the final model over the intercept only model.

Model	-2 Log Likelihood	Chi-Square	df	Sig.
Intercept Only	1496.629			
Final	992.442	504.187	18	.000
Link function: Logit.				

Source: Primary Data

In the Parameter Estimates table we can see the coefficients, their standard errors, the Wald test and associated p-values (Sig.). Female, above 55, 12 Lakhs and above, PG and Professional are taken as the reference categories of the corresponding independent variables. Other categories are compared with the reference categories. Since the corresponding p value of the category male is less than 0.05, we can conclude

that the addiction level of male is significantly different from that of female. Also, the positive value of the estimate indicate that the addiction level of males are higher than that of females.

Since the p values corresponding to the age categories 18-25, 25-35 and 35-45 are less than 0.05, it is clear that the addiction levels of respondents belonging these categories are significantly different from that of the reference category above 55. Positive values of the corresponding estimates indicate that the people with age less than 45 are more addicted than above 45. Also, it is clear that the addiction level of people belonging to the age category 45-55 is not significantly different from that of above 55 category.

From the corresponding p values of the various categories of income, it can be inferred that the addiction levels of people with income less than 12 lakhs are significantly higher than that of the respondents with annual income above 12 lakhs.

Results corresponding to education level show that the addiction level of respondents with UG is significantly lesser than that of people having a PG degree. On the other hand, the addiction level of respondents with plus two education is significantly higher than that of people having a PG degree. Also, the results show that the addiction levels of the respondents completed 10<sup>th</sup> or below are not significantly different from that of people having a PG degree.

In the case of occupation status, corresponding p values and estimates indicate that the addiction levels of all categories except government employees are significantly higher than the addiction levels of professionals. Addiction levels of government employees are not significantly different from that of professionals as the corresponding p value is greater than 0.05.

#### **6.11.4 Test of Parallel Lines of Addiction Level of Keralites towards Gambling**

<b>Table 6.10.3 Test of Parallel Lines of Addiction Level</b>				
Model	-2 Log Likelihood	Chi-Square	df	Sig.
Null Hypothesis	992.442			
General	937.010	55.432	54	.420
The null hypothesis states that the location parameters (slope coefficients) are the same across response categories.				

Source: Primary Data

From the Test of parallel lines table shows that the test does not reject the hypothesis that the relationship between each pair of outcome groups is the same and it indicates that the proportional odds assumption is not violated.

While involving in gambling initially people use their sense and wisdom. He has the realisation of his own wealth and resources and has control over his own actions, Hodgins, D C. (2001) When continues to gamble, in later stage he behaves like he know every formula to predict the winning number. In this stage he begins to lose his mental ability to realise that gambling especially Kerala State Government Lottery is purely based on probability. Media is playing a major role in this by promoting gambling without any ethics. This begins with leading newspaper organisations arranging Scratch and win (Thambola) contest in newspapers. They use this method to improve their circulation. Most of the daily newspapers repeat the same because of the success of that strategy. This method influences even the children to believe in their element of chance or luck. This has a severe impact on the growth of children and affects productivity as well as the creativity of children. The propaganda given by the leading daily newspapers for the winners of this contest may also influence youngsters and children.

The number of lottery buyers are more than those who benefited by lotteries as an employment opportunity. The majority of buyers are spending their time and money for the winning of a small group of participants. When a small group is victimized for a large group's benefit, then it is a society sponsored loot. When a large group is utilised for a minor group then it is a massive misleading and tricking activity. It is interesting to notice that lottery possess both these features. When the lottery is conducted legally on a massive scale economic strength of a small group is sacrificed legally for the benefit of the whole society's economic drive. This drive can be named as the 'Anesthetic drive of economy'. In this drive some people are heavily affected, some escape, but when time passes this effect will pass to majority and even to the next generation. Even it is organised by the government, it may not be error free. Even a fault is presented in a disguised manner, and no other alternative solution is available, all will show a tendency to believe the fault system as error free, especially if it is promoted by a believable body. It is very difficult to distinguish whether our society's activities are gambling natured or not, because majority of the activities are mixed up with gambling activities. Knowingly or unknowingly we are involving in that. If an



activity became our culture then it will be difficult to distinguish the good or bad in it. Now-a-days media is promoting places leading in liquor consumption. Even though it is an addiction factor, government is promoting this as a good source of income. Similarly, gambling is also dissolved in our society. We cannot escape from its trap immediately, what we have to do is to reduce the impact of gambling by controlling the involvement of society in it and thereby reduce the negative impact upon our society, Hall, G W et.al., (2000)

The overall findings from the Ordinal Logistic Regression Model is approximately 13.2 percent of the population is highly attracted or addicted to gambling products selected for the study, and another 10.2 percent is attracted or addicted to it, and 26.5 percent is reported with high participation, and in a pipeline towards addiction. 35.7 percent is occasional buyers, participating in gambling for entertainment purpose only, and the 14.5 percent of the respondents are non-buyers of gambling products. But even the non-buyers of voluntary gambling are participating in non-voluntary gambling. 80 percent of the respondents reported their participation in non-voluntary gambling. The major revenue from lottery (30 percent) is generated out of 15 percent of the population. This 15 percent is the main contributors towards lottery business in Kerala.

## References

1. Hall, G.W., Carriero NJ, Takushi RY, Montoya ID, Preston KL, Gorelick DA. Pathological gambling among cocaine-dependent outpatients. *Am J Psychiatry.* (2000);157:1127–33
2. Hodgens, DC.,(2001); Processes of changing gambling behavior. *Addict Behaviour.* 26:121–8.
3. Potenza, M N., Steinberg, M A., McLaughlin, S D., Wu R, Rounsaville B,J, O'Malley SS. (2001); “Gender-related differences in the characteristics of problem gamblers using a gambling helpline”. *Am J Psychiatry.* 158:1500–5.