

## **A RESEARCH ON THE EFFECTS OF DEMOGRAPHIC AND SOCIO-ECONOMIC STATUS FACTORS ON CONSUMER PREFERENCES IN FURNITURE PURCHASE (CASE OF BLACK SEA REGION)**

**Ilker Akyüz<sup>1,a</sup>, Nadir Ersen<sup>2</sup>, Kadri Cemil Akyüz<sup>1</sup>, Bahadır Çağrı Bayram<sup>3</sup>**

*iakyuz@ktu.edu.tr, nadirersen20@artvin.edu.tr, akuz@ktu.edu.tr, bcbayram@kastamonu.edu.tr*

<sup>1</sup> Karadeniz Technical University, Department of Forest Industry Engineering, Trabzon, Turkey

<sup>2</sup> Artvin Çoruh University, Department of Forestry, Artvin, Turkey

<sup>3</sup> Kastamonu University, Department of Forest Industry Engineering, Kastamonu, Turkey

### **Abstract**

Consumer behaviour is an issue that must be studied by businesses in terms of marketing. The stages of purchasing any product can be different for each customer. Rapidly developing economic changes lead to strategic decisions such as gain new customers, the customer retention. Home furniture is very important in Forestry Products Industry in terms of both export and domestic consumption. In this study, factors affecting consumers in the Eastern Black Sea region when purchasing furniture (before, during, and after) were investigated. In addition, strategies for acquiring new consumers for furniture businesses were presented. The data were collected by face-to-face survey method and analyzed in SPSS statistics program and the results were explained.

**Keywords:** Furniture, Customer, Socio-economic status, Preference

### **1. Introduction**

In order for a person to be regarded as a consumer in terms of marketing, the following are essential: (1) the need, (2) income and (3) spending request (Akyüz, 2006). The scope of the consumer term is quite broad and people, families, manufacturer and seller (commercial) enterprises, private and public institutions are the major consumption units. Consumer is defined as a real person who buys a marketing mix for personal desires, wants and needs and is in a purchasing capacity (Korkut and Kaval, 2015; Öztürk, 2006). Consumers prefer goods and services that provide the highest benefit and quality at the lowest cost and that suit them best. There are many factors that they pay attention when making this preference (Korkut and Kaval, 2015; Demircioğlu, 2012). For this reason, enterprises must have to take into account consumers' demands and needs, consumer behaviour characteristics while producing goods and services (Korkut and Kaval, 2015).

In accordance with their preferences and desires, consumer behaviour can express a range of processes related to producing and delivering goods or services to consumers (Penpece, 2006). The fact that consumer behaviour is influenced by external factors such as culture, family, advisory group, socio-cultural factors, marketing environment, indicates that it has both a structure that can change and adapt (Akyüz, 2006). Determination of consumer behaviour provides competitive advantages to the enterprises by developing effective market strategies and directing consumers (Gerlevik, 2012). Consumer markets are constantly changing and demographics are one of the most important changes. As the needs and demands of consumers differ, market segmentation according to demographic characteristics will be beneficial for enterprises (Akyüz, 2006). Therefore, marketers should constantly analyze consumer demands and preferences, shopping and purchasing behaviours and build their strategic decisions on this information (Öztürk, 2006).

Furniture, one of the most influential factors in the arrangement of a space, is an important factor in the design and comfort of a house. The function of furniture in our lives has not only been limited to being an object used at home, but it has become goods that establishes and transmits its own meaning structures in every period (Arpacı, 2014). For this reason, buying process of furniture is very important for consumers. The furniture sector includes (Erdinler and Koç, 2015):

- (1) Manufacturers such as seating groups, kitchen, office furniture,
- (2) Industrial enterprises supplying raw materials, machinery and other investment materials to these manufacturers,
- (3) Contract manufacturers.

The socio-cultural, psychological, demographic and situational factors of each consumer are different from each other. These characteristics of consumers who are influential on consumer preferences are socio-demographic (age, gender, family structure, education, occupation etc.), economic (income level, general economic status etc.) and behavioural (culture, social class, motivation, perception, attitude, personality, etc.) (Burdurlu et al., 2004). This is reflected in the purchasing process and shapes the preferences of consumers (Andaç, 2008). The most influential factors for the need for furniture are (Akyüz, 1998):

- (1) It is obsolescence of the existing furniture,
- (2) It is the need for new furniture. Because the children in the family grow up,
- (3) It is other family-related factors,
- (4) It is the increase in income,
- (5) It is influence of friends groups,
- (6) It is outdated furniture.

Reaching the right product that is needed is possible if consumers correctly identify their needs and possibilities. Having knowledge of consumers about furniture types and furniture characteristics will help to make their preferences in the most appropriate way (Arpacı and Obuz, 2013).

### 1.1. Social Class

In general, status is that people are graded according to certain criteria in a social hierarchy. Social class is the process of grading people in the social hierarchy and it has a hierarchical character. Because of this feature, members of the same class have almost the same status, while members of the other classes have more or less status. Because of the similar behaviour of social class members, the social class can be the basis for the market segmentation (Odabaşı, and Barış, 2002).

The most comprehensive study about the social class discrimination in Turkey was done by Zeta-Nielsen Research Company. According to this study, Turkish society is divided into six different classes named as groups A, B, C1, C2, D, and E. When the characteristics of these classes are examined, Turkish society is basically divided into three classes: upper, middle and lower. Groups A and B are the upper class, groups C1 and C2 are the middle class, and groups D and E are the lowest class. Furniture purchasing decisions also differ according to social classes. Social classes are more or less homogenous and socially hierarchical.

Similar values, lifestyles, interests and behaviours are seen in the same social class members. For example; clothing, housing, furniture, entertainment and mass media behaviours of individuals in the same social class are similar. People in different social classes have different desires and consumption values (Kalınkara, 2016).

## 2. Materials and Methods

The universe of our study constitutes 18 provincial centers located in the Black Sea Region. The number of consumers who applied the survey was found by stratified sampling according to the population sizes of 18 provincial centers and a total of 2370 surveys were evaluated.

The decision making behaviours of family members in furniture purchasing were evaluated according to different demographic characteristics. Socio-economic status groups (A, B, C1, C2, D and E) have been examined separately and socio-economic status is shortened in comments as SES.

Crosstab, frequencies, weighted averages and chi-square test were used for the results. Chi-square test results were applied on all demographic variables and significant differences were determined. The null ( $H_0$ ) hypothesis which indicates that there are significant differences between consumer groups, was accepted when the P value is less than 0.05, while the alternative ( $H_1$ ) hypothesis, which indicates that there are no significant differences between the consumer groups, was accepted when the P value is greater than 0.05. Table 1 gives the questions about which subjects consumers evaluate when purchasing furniture.

Table 1. Types of survey questions

Statement 1	Need for furniture and demand to purchase
Statement 2	Studies conducted before purchasing
Statement 3	Assessments regarding price before purchasing
Statement 4	Assessments regarding where to purchase
Statement 5	Assessments regarding the timing of purchasing
Statement 6	Assessments regarding colour, pattern, form, design
Statement 7	Assessments regarding brand and quality
Statement 8	Assessments regarding the final decision on buying
Statement 9	Assessments regarding the usefulness after purchase

### 3. Results

The distribution of demographic characteristics of the consumer groups participating in the survey was given in Table 2. As seen in Table 2, 56.1% of the consumers who participated in the survey are male and 43.9% is female. 33.5% of the respondents are low, 40.1% is in the middle and 26.4% is in the high income groups. The education levels of consumer groups are as follows: 18.9% is primary school, 11.8% is secondary school, 32.1% is high school, 34.5% is bachelor and 2.7% is postgraduate. The majority of the consumer groups participating in the survey are over the age of 31. It is seen that 35.4% of the surveyed families are in elementary family structure (4 people). The ownership status of the houses in which the families live is as follows: 61.8% is homeowner, 33.2% is rent and 4.9% is lodging building.

Table 2. Demographic characteristics of consumers

Demographic characteristics of consumers		Number (N)	Percentage (%)	Cumulative Total
Gender	Male	1330	56.1	56.1
	Female	1040	43.9	100
Income level	Low	794	33.5	33.5
	Middle	949	40.1	73.6
	High	626	26.4	100
Education status	Primary school	449	18.9	18.9
	Secondary school	279	11.8	30.7
	High school	761	32.1	62.8
	Bachelor's degree	818	34.5	97.3
	Postgraduate	63	2.7	100
Age group	18-24	125	5.3	5.3
	25-31	525	22.3	27.6
	32-38	659	28	55.7
	39-45	604	25.7	81.3
	46 and over	439	18.7	100
Number of individuals in the family	1 person	8	0.4	0.4
	2 people	257	11.4	11.7
	3 people	457	20.2	31.9
	4 people	804	35.6	67.5
	5 people	454	20.1	87.6
	6 people	223	9.9	97.4
	7 people	49	2.2	99.6
	8 people	9	0.4	100
Ownership status	Rent	784	33.2	33.2
	Homeowner	1459	61.8	95.1
	Lodging building	116	4.9	100

It was analyzed whether there are any differences between the answers given for “statement 1 (need for furniture and demand to purchase)” and all factors (demographic characteristics, male and female SES groups and total consumer SES groups). In tables, according to demographic characteristics, male and female SES groups and total consumer SES groups, Chi-square ( $X^2$ ) test results of answers given by consumers were given.

The results of the  $X^2$  test related to statement “1” were given in Table 3.

Table 3. The results of the  $X^2$  test related to the need for furniture product and demand to purchase

Factors in Relationship		$\chi^2$	p	df	Results
Need for furniture and demand to purchase	Gender	349.077	0.000	2	Significant
	Education	17.69	0.024	8	Significant
	Income	6.49	0.165	4	Insignificant
	Age	130.19	0.000	8	Significant
	Male SES	42.068	0.000	10	Significant
	Female SES	13.721	0.186	10	Insignificant
	Total SES	69.695	0.000	10	Significant

$p < 0.05$  indicates a significant difference between the variables

Table 3a. Percentage distributions of statement “1” and statement “2”

Needs and demand of purchase					Studies conducted before purchasing					
Demographic and social class variables		Itself	Partner	Wife and husband	Demographic and social class variables		Itself	Partner	Wife, husband and children	Wife and husband
Gender	Male	12.9	35.9	51.2	Gender	Male	28.5	18.9	16.2	35.8
	Female	43	11	46		Female	29.2	19.7	15.9	32.8
Education	Primary school	31.8	25.8	42.4	Education	Primary school	30.8	25	17.2	27
	Secondary school	24.4	24.7	50.9		Secondary school	29.6	20.2	19.9	28.9
	High school	22.4	25.1	52.5		High school	28.6	19.3	15	35.8
	Bachelor's degree	27.2	24	48.7		Bachelor's degree	27.6	16.1	15.3	38.7
	Postgraduate	23.8	30.2	46		Postgraduate	30.2	14.3	12.7	42.9
Income	Low	27.1	22.4	50.6	Income	Low	33.1	17.9	18.1	29.7
	Middle	26.6	24.9	48.5		Middle	28.8	17.5	17	35.2
	High	24.3	28.1	47.6		High	23.4	23.7	12	39.5
Age	18-24	49.6	8.8	41.6	Age	18-24	36.8	8.8	7.2	37.6
	25-31	33	14.1	53		25-31	31.2	15.4	9.3	40.6
	32-38	27.2	24	48.8		32-38	29	17.9	13.7	39.2
	39-45	21	30.2	48.8		39-45	27.4	20.9	22.4	29.4
	46 and over	15.7	36	48.3		46 and over	25.6	26.1	20.6	27.2
Male SES	A class	7.4	51.9	40.7	Male SES	A class	10.2	30.6	13	43.5
	B class	9.3	32.8	57.9		B class	24.7	18.9	14.7	41.7
	C1 class	10.2	33	56.8		C1 class	29.2	17.2	18.8	34.2
	C2 class	17.1	35.9	47		C2 class	32.1	17.2	15.6	34.4
	D class	19.3	38.5	42.2		D class	30.6	21.9	15	32.5
	E class	23.8	28.6	47.6		E class	54.8	9.5	14.3	21.4

Table 3a - Continued

Female SES	A class	37.2	7	55.8	Female SES	A class	33.7	16.3	12.8	37.2
	B class	48.2	8	43.8		B class	29.5	10.7	11.6	45.1
	C1 class	46.3	9.3	44.4		C1 class	35.8	11.6	18.6	31.2
	C2 class	39.4	14.1	46.5		C2 class	36.6	19.7	25.4	16.9
	D class	41.7	12.5	45.8		D class	20.8	18.8	20.8	33.3
	E class	38.7	13.8	47.5		E class	23.3	30.1	15.8	30.1
All Consumer SES	A class	20.6	32	47.4	All Consumer SES	A class	20.6	24.2	12.9	40.7
	B class	27.4	21.4	51.2		B class	27	15.1	13.3	42.9
	C1 class	22.1	25.5	52.5		C1 class	31.1	15.2	18.8	33.3
	C2 class	21.2	31.9	46.9		C2 class	32.9	17.8	17.2	31.3
	D class	25.2	31.9	42.9		D class	29.2	21.1	16.3	32.1
	E class	37.7	15.4	46.9		E class	27	28.6	15.4	28.4

When Table 3a is taken into consideration, both men and women said that the demand to purchase furniture is caused by women. As the level of education in the families increases, it can be said that the ability to act together for "statement 1" increases. It has been seen that as the age increases, the demand for the purchase of furniture in the results of bilateral discussion with family members increases. As the level of income increases, the demand to purchase furniture is caused by women. For male SES groups, the following results were obtained:

- (1) 31.7% of group "A" consumers said that the demand to purchase furniture is caused from their wives, while this rate for group "B" consumers decreased by 20.1%.
- (2) In the middle-class consumer groups, the demand to purchase furniture is the result of bilateral discussion. To furniture purchasing demand, the rate of the shared decision making in the group "C1" is 53.2%, whereas in group "C2" this rate is 44%.
- (3) It has been observed that the rate of shared decision making in lower-class consumers decreases. This rate is found to be 40.8% in group "D".

For all consumer groups, the following results were obtained:

- (1) The rate that the demand to purchase furniture is caused from their partners (wife or husband) in group "D" is 32.5% and this rate is 15.7% in the E group.
- (2) The rate of shared decision making was found to be highest in group "C1" and the rate is 52.8%.

The results of the  $X^2$  test related to studies conducted before furniture purchasing was given in Table 4. There were significant differences between studies conducted before furniture purchasing and all factors.

Table 4. The results of the  $X^2$  test related to studies conducted before furniture purchasing

Factors in Relationship		$\chi^2$	p	df	Results
Studies conducted before purchasing	Gender	15.357	0.000	4	Significant
	Education	45.94	0.000	16	Significant
	Income	39.29	0.000	8	Significant
	Age	188.11	0.000	16	Significant
	Male SES	59.781	0.000	20	Significant
	Female SES	86.058	0.000	20	Significant
	Total SES	69.583	0.000	20	Significant

$p < 0.001$  indicates a significant difference between the variables

When Table 3a is taken into consideration, 35.8% of males and 32.8% of females stated that they made the shared decision on studies conducted before purchasing. As education levels increase in families, the rate of the shared decision making of studies conducted before purchasing also increase. This rate was found as 27.0% in primary school level, 28.9% in secondary school level and 38.7% in bachelor's degree. When income levels are examined, it appears that it is effective in children in families with higher income levels on studies conducted before purchasing. This effect is less in the middle and low income

levels. For male SES groups, the following results were obtained: 43.5% of group "A" said that they made shared decision in studies conducted before purchasing and this ratio is 21.4% in group "E". For female SES groups, the following results were obtained: 45.1% of the consumers in group "B" stated that they made shared decision in studies conducted before purchasing, whereas 36.6% of the consumers in "C2" group stated that they carried out these studies by themselves. For all consumer groups, the following results were obtained: 42.9 % of the consumers in group "B" stated that they made shared decision in studies conducted before purchasing, whereas this rate is the lowest in group "E" consumers with 28.4%.

The results of the  $X^2$  test related to assessments regarding price before purchasing were given in Table 5. There were significant differences between assessments regarding price before furniture purchasing and all factors.

Table 5. The results of the  $X^2$  test related to assessments regarding price before purchasing

Factors in Relationship		$\chi^2$	p	df	Results
Assessments regarding price before purchasing	Gender	232.092	0.000	3	Significant
	Education	79.49	0.000	12	Significant
	Income	44.64	0.000	6	Significant
	Age	29.79	0.000	12	Significant
	Male SES	96.747	0.000	15	Significant
	Female SES	103.387	0.000	15	Significant
	Total SES	308.987	0.000	15	Significant

$p < 0.001$  indicates a significant difference between the variables

Table 5a. Percentage distributions of statement "3" and statement "4"

Assessments regarding the price of furniture products					Assessments regarding where to purchase					
Demographic and social class variables		Itself	Partner	Wife and husband	Demographic and social class variables		Itself	Partner	Wife, husband and children	Wife and husband
Gender	Male	49.2	6.4	43.9	Gender	Male	35.3	13.6	14.6	36.1
	Female	23.1	22.3	52.9		Female	20.9	19.4	14.6	43.1
Education	Primary school	38.7	19.8	41	Education	Primary school	34	21.3	13.9	30.9
	Secondary school	47.3	18.1	32.9		Secondary school	35.8	16.8	16.5	29.7
	High school	39.9	11	48.4		High school	29.7	15.1	15.2	39.2
	Bachelor's degree	32.9	10.8	54.9		Bachelor's degree	23.8	14.2	13.7	46.3
	Postgraduate	23.8	9.5	63.5		Postgraduate	22.6	14.5	14.5	48.4
Income	Low	43.7	11.9	43.5	Income	Low	37.9	14.6	15.7	30.9
	Middle	39	14.9	44.9		Middle	27.7	14.8	15.4	41
	High	28.1	12.9	57.8		High	19.6	20.3	12.1	46.9
Age	18-24	36.8	16.8	45.6	Age	18-24	31.7	9.8	9.8	42.3
	25-31	34.9	11	51.6		25-31	28.4	11.6	9.9	47.2
	32-38	35.7	13.7	49.8		32-38	28.4	15.7	13.1	42.6
	39-45	39.3	16.1	43.8		39-45	28.6	20	19	32.4
	46 and over	42.6	11.1	45.9		46 and over	30.5	19.4	17.8	32.3
Male SES	A class	20.4	10.2	65.7	Male SES	A class	12.2	28	10.3	46.7
	B class	39.2	8.8	51.9		B class	25.8	8.8	14.6	50.8
	C1 class	52.5	3.8	43.2		C1 class	39	13.1	14.9	32.6
	C2 class	58.8	4.2	36.7		C2 class	43.8	10.1	13.3	32.8
	D class	53.4	11.8	34.8		D class	36	19.9	17.4	26.7
	E class	59.5	4.8	33.3		E class	45.2	14.3	19	21.4

Table 5a - Continued

Female SES	A class	19.8	15.1	64	Female SES	A class	12.8	17.4	17.4	52.3
	B class	23.2	13.4	61.2		B class	23.2	12.1	12.5	50.4
	C1 class	33	10.8	54.2		C1 class	25.9	12.7	14.6	43.9
	C2 class	36.6	12.7	47.9		C2 class	28.2	16.9	12.7	42.3
	D class	22.9	22.9	50		D class	18.8	27.1	10.4	37.5
	E class	15.5	37.3	46.6		E class	16.8	27.5	16.6	38.1
All Consumer SES	A class	20.1	12.4	64.9	All Consumer SES	A class	12.4	23.3	13.5	49.2
	B class	32.1	11	55.9		B class	24.6	10.4	13.7	50.5
	C1 class	45.8	6.3	47		C1 class	34.5	13	14.8	36.3
	C2 class	54.9	6.1	38.2		C2 class	41.1	11.1	13.3	34.5
	D class	46.2	14.3	38.1		D class	32.9	21	15.7	29
	E class	20.1	33.8	45.4		E class	20.1	26.7	16.5	35.7

When Table 5a is taken into consideration, 49.2% of male consumers said that they carried out assessments regarding price by themselves, whereas this rate was found to be 23.1% in female consumers. Also, 52.9% of female consumers said that they made shared decision with husband in assessments regarding price. In economic decisions, male consumers seem to dominate in the family. As education level and income level increase, the rate of the shared decision making in the family on assessments regarding price before furniture purchasing increases. The rate of the shared decision making in primary school level is 41%, whereas it is 63.5% in postgraduate level. The rate of the shared decision making was found to be 43.5% at low income level, whereas this rate was found to be 57.8% at high income level. For male SES groups, the following results were obtained: 65.7% of the consumers in group "A" stated that they made shared decision in assessments regarding price before purchasing, whereas in group "C2", this value decreased to 36.7%. For female SES groups, the following results were obtained: 64% of the consumers in group "A" stated that they made shared decision in assessments regarding price before purchasing, whereas in group "D", this value was 50%. For all consumer groups, the following results were obtained: 64.9 % of the consumers in group "A" stated that they made shared decision in assessments regarding price before purchasing, whereas this rate was 38.1% for group "D".

The results of the  $X^2$  test related to assessments regarding where to purchase were given in Table 6. There were significant differences between assessments regarding where to purchase and all factors.

Table 6. The results of the  $X^2$  test related to assessments regarding where to purchase

Factors in Relationship		$\chi^2$	p	df	Results
Assessments regarding where to purchase	Gender	74.147	0.000	4	Significant
	Education	66.37	0.000	16	Significant
	Income	77.93	0.000	8	Significant
	Age	128.46	0.000	16	Significant
	Male SES	111.115	0.000	20	Significant
	Female SES	58.030	0.000	20	Significant
	Total SES	157.611	0.000	20	Significant

$p < 0.001$  indicates a significant difference between the variables

When Table 5a is taken into consideration, regarding gender, 35.3% of male consumers stated that they made assessments regarding where to purchase by themselves, while for female consumers this rate was found to be 20.9%. It can be said that male consumers are more dominant in terms of assessments regarding where to purchase. With the increase of the education level, the rate of shared decision making in the family for assessments regarding where to purchase also increased. I was found that as the income level of consumers increased, they made shared decision in assessments regarding where to purchase. For male SES groups, the following results were obtained: 46.7% of respondents forming group "A" stated that they made shared decision for assessments regarding where to purchase, whereas the rate of consumers in the group "B" (50.8%) was very close to the group "A". For female SES groups, the following results were obtained: the rate of shared decision making in the family on assessments regarding where to

purchase was highest for “B” consumers (52.3%). For all consumer groups, the following results were obtained: the rate of shared decision making of the groups “A and B” is higher levels than other groups.

The results of the  $X^2$  test related to assessments regarding the timing of purchasing were given in Table 7. There were no significant differences between “assessments regarding the timing of purchasing” and “age”, whereas there is a significant difference compared to other factors.

Table 7. The results of the  $X^2$  test related to assessments regarding the timing of purchasing

Factors in Relationship		$\chi^2$	p	df	Results
Assessments regarding the timing of purchasing	Gender	14.027	0.003	3	Significant
	Education	63.79	0.000	12	Significant
	Income	28.47	0.000	6	Significant
	Age	14.25	0.285	12	Insignificant
	Male SES	83.537	0.000	15	Significant
	Female SES	57.793	0.000	15	Significant
	Total SES	115.267	0.000	15	Significant

$p < 0.05$  indicates a significant difference between the variables

Table 7a. Percentage distributions of statement “5” and statement “6”

Assessments regarding the timing of purchasing					Assessments regarding color. pattern. form. design					
Demographic and social class variables		Itself	Partner	Wife and husband	Demographic and social class variables		Itself	Partner	Wife. husband and children	Wife and husband
Gender	Male	32	11.8	55.6	Gender	Male	10.2	29.7	26.7	33.1
	Female	25.6	14.3	59		Female	37.4	7.1	25.2	28.3
Education	Primary school	32.1	18.8	48.7	Education	Primary school	26.2	19.9	31.8	21.9
	Secondary school	29.4	17.2	51.6		Secondary school	22.9	20.8	28	27.2
	High school	31.7	11.2	56.8		High school	20	20.7	26.1	32.4
	Bachelor’s degree	26.2	9.7	63.2		Bachelor’s degree	21.5	18.7	22.8	35.3
	Postgraduate	15.9	14.3	65.1		Postgraduate	23.8	19	17.5	39.7
Income	Low	33.5	13.6	52.2	Income	Low	22.9	19.5	29.4	27.2
	Middle	30.1	13.1	55.7		Middle	21.8	18.7	26.4	31.9
	High	22.3	11.7	65.2		High	21.6	21.8	21.2	34.5
Age	18-24	36	17.6	45.6	Age	18-24	35.2	10.4	12	34.4
	25-31	29.1	12.8	57		25-31	30.2	14.3	11.9	41.3
	32-38	29.5	10.8	59		32-38	21.3	16.3	27.7	34.8
	39-45	27.9	13.8	57.1		39-45	19.9	23.3	32.2	24.4
	46 and over	28.5	14.1	57.2		46 and over	13	29	35.8	21.7
Male SES	A class	12	18.5	65.7	Male SES	A class	1.9	38	20.4	39.8
	B class	24.7	9.7	65.6		B class	8.5	26.4	22.5	42.6
	C1 class	31	10.4	58.6		C1 class	9.1	28.8	29.4	32.5
	C2 class	41.9	10.1	47.4		C2 class	13.6	29.5	27.9	28.2
	D class	38.5	17.4	43.5		D class	14.9	31.7	26.1	26.7
	E class	42.9	14.3	42.9		E class	19	28.6	28.6	23.8



Table 7a - Continued

Female SES	A class	22.1	16.3	60.5	Female SES	A class	44.2	9.3	7	39.5
	B class	29.9	6.7	61.2		B class	37.1	4	19.6	36.6
	C1 class	27.1	8.4	64.5		C1 class	37.9	7	29	23.4
	C2 class	31	8.5	60.6		C2 class	33.8	9.9	28.2	28.2
	D class	37.5	10.4	50		D class	37.5	10.4	25	20.8
	E class	19.2	22.8	57.3		E class	34.9	8.1	30.7	25.5
All Consumer SES	A class	16.5	17.5	63.4	All Consumer SES	A class	20.6	25.3	14.4	39.7
	B class	27.4	8.3	63.3		B class	22.2	16	21	39.5
	C1 class	29.8	9.8	60.4		C1 class	18	22	29.3	29.5
	C2 class	39.5	9.8	50.1		C2 class	17	25.7	28.4	28.4
	D class	38.1	15.7	44.8		D class	20.5	26.2	25.7	25.7
	E class	22.5	22	54.8		E class	34.2	9.7	30.2	25.2

When Table 7a is taken into consideration, 55.6% of males and 59% of females stated that they made the shared decision on assessments regarding the timing of purchasing. İslamoğlu (1990) found that men and women decided together for durable consumer goods in terms of the timing of purchasing. For assessments regarding the timing of purchasing, as the education and income level of consumers increased, the rate of the shared decision making increased. For male SES groups, the following results were obtained: the rate of shared decision making in the family in terms of the timing of purchasing were 65.7% in group "A", 47% in group "C2" and 43.5% in group "D". For all consumer groups, the following results were obtained:

- (1) The highest rate of shared decision making in the family was found 63.4% in group "A", whereas the lowest was found in group "D".
- (2) The highest self-decision-making rate was found group "C2", whereas the lowest was found in group "A". Group "C2" followed by group "D".

The results of the  $X^2$  test related to assessments regarding color, pattern, form, design were given in Table 8. There were significant differences between assessments regarding color, pattern, form, design and all factors.

Table 8. The results of the  $X^2$  test related to assessments regarding color, pattern, form, design

Factors in Relationship		$\chi^2$	p	df	Results
Assessments regarding color, pattern, form, design	Gender	363.851	0.000	4	Significant
	Education	44.41	0.000	16	Significant
	Income	17.87	0.022	8	Significant
	Age	277.73	0.000	16	Significant
	Male SES	44.066	0.001	20	Significant
	Female SES	52.948	0.000	20	Significant
	Total SES	128.845	0.000	20	Significant

$p < 0.05$  indicates a significant difference between the variables

When Table 7a is taken into consideration, 37.4% of female consumers said that they carried out assessments regarding color, pattern, form, design by themselves, whereas this rate was found to be 10.2% in male consumers. It can be said that the female consumers are more dominant in determining the form, the pattern, the color and the design of the furniture in the family. In primary school-level, it was observed that it is effective in children in determining the form, the pattern, the color and the design of the furniture. To determining the form, the pattern, the color and the design of the furniture, as the income level of consumers increased, the rate of the shared decision making increased. As the ages of the consumers have increased, the self-decision-making rates of consumers have decreased. For male SES groups, as the level of social class decreased, the rates of shared decision making of consumers have decreased. For female SES groups, as the level of social class also decreased, the self-decision-making rates

of consumers and the rates of shared decision making of consumers have decreased. For all consumer groups, the following results were obtained:

- (1) The highest rate of shared decision making in the family was found in groups "A" and "B".
- (2) The highest self-decision-making rate was found in group "E".

The results of the  $X^2$  test related to assessments regarding brand and quality were given in Table 9. There were no significant differences between "assessments regarding brand and quality" and "gender", whereas there is a significant difference compared to other factors.

Table 9. The results of the  $X^2$  test related to assessments regarding brand and quality

Factors in Relationship		$\chi^2$	p	df	Results
Assessments regarding brand and quality	Gender	3.352	0.34	3	Insignificant
	Education	34.15	0.001	12	Significant
	Income	29.09	0.000	6	Significant
	Age	21.10	0.049	12	Significant
	Male SES	51.35	0.001	15	Significant
	Female SES	51.424	0.000	15	Significant
	Total SES	68.489	0.000	15	Significant

$p < 0.05$  indicates a significant difference between the variables

Table 9a. Percentage distributions of statement "7" and statement "8"

Assessments regarding brand and quality					Assessments regarding the final decision on buying				
Demographic and social class variables		Itself	Partner	Wife and husband	Demographic and social class variables		Itself	Partner	Wife and husband
Gender	Male	29.6	12.4	56.9	Gender	Male	44.7	7.1	48
	Female	28	14.9	55.9		Female	25	16.5	56.5
Education	Primary school	35.3	17	47.1	Education	Primary school	38.7	18.9	40.9
	Secondary school	29.7	12.9	55.6		Secondary school	38	12.3	48.9
	High school	28.7	13.3	57.5		High school	37.4	11	50.5
	Bachelor's degree	26.4	11.9	60.1		Bachelor's degree	33.8	7	58.3
	Postgraduate	15.9	15.9	66.7		Postgraduate	19.7	9.8	70.5
Income	Low	33.4	13.5	51.7	Income	Low	39.7	13.1	46.2
	Middle	29.7	14.3	55.3		Middle	38	11.5	49.6
	High	22	12.5	64.3		High	28.2	8.5	61.9
Age	18-24	40.8	10.4	47.2	Age	18-24	44	14.4	40.8
	25-31	30.9	12.8	54.7		25-31	32.6	13.8	52.6
	32-38	28.6	12	58.7		32-38	37.4	11.3	50.8
	39-45	28.6	15.8	54.7		39-45	33.3	9.2	56.4
	46 and over	24.9	14.8	59.1		46 and over	40.2	9	48.7
Male SES	A class	12	21.3	63.9	Male SES	A class	27.8	13.9	57.4
	B class	24.5	11.7	63		B class	37	7.5	55.1
	C1 class	31	10.8	57.5		C1 class	45.7	4.9	49.4
	C2 class	32.8	9.1	56.5		C2 class	50.2	5.9	43.3
	D class	36.6	19.3	44.1		D class	54.1	8.8	37.1
	E class	40.5	9.5	47.6		E class	50	14.3	35.7

Table 9a - Continued

Female SES	A class	15.1	16.3	68.6	Female SES	A class	9.3	4.7	84.9
	B class	28.1	8	60.7		B class	28.6	8.9	60.7
	C1 class	33.6	11.2	54.7		C1 class	34.1	6.1	57.9
	C2 class	26.8	15.5	57.7		C2 class	39.4	9.9	46.5
	D class	18.8	22.9	54.2		D class	21.3	34	44.7
	E class	28	19.4	52.6		E class	17.8	28.7	51.2
All Consumer SES	A class	13.4	19.1	66	All Consumer SES	A class	19.6	9.8	69.6
	B class	26.5	10	61.7		B class	33.3	8.2	57.4
	C1 class	31.7	10.9	56.8		C1 class	41.9	5.4	52.2
	C2 class	31.8	10.3	56.5		C2 class	47.9	6.4	44.4
	D class	32.4	20	46.7		D class	46.4	14.5	39.1
	E class	29.6	18.7	51.3		E class	21	27.4	49.5

When Table 9a is taken into consideration, as the ages, income level, and education levels of the consumers have increased, the rates of shared decision making of consumers have increased. In addition, as the ages, income level, and education levels of the consumers have increased, the self-decision-making rates of consumers have decreased. For “male SES groups”, “female SES groups”, and “all consumer groups”, as the level of social class decreased, the rates of shared decision making of consumers have decreased.

The results of the  $X^2$  test related to assessments regarding the final decision on buying were given in Table 10. There were significant differences between assessments regarding the final decision on buying and all factors.

Table 10. The results of the  $X^2$  test related to assessments regarding the final decision on buying

Factors in Relationship		$\chi^2$	p	df	Results
Assessments regarding the final decision on buying	Gender	133.506	0.000	3	Significant
	Education	67.85	0.000	12	Significant
	Income	39.23	0.000	6	Significant
	Age	28.88	0.004	12	Significant
	Male SES	46.443	0.000	15	Significant
	Female SES	126.088	0.000	15	Significant
	Total SES	235.473	0.000	15	Significant

$p < 0.001$  indicates a significant difference between the variables

When Table 9a is taken into consideration, 44.7% of male consumers said that they carried out assessments regarding the final decision on buying by themselves, whereas this rate was 25% in female consumers. It can be said that male consumers are more effective in making the final decision on purchasing furniture in the family. İslamoğlu (1990) emphasized that men play an important role in making final decisions on durable consumer goods. As the ages, income level, and education level of the consumers have increased, the rates of shared decision making of consumers have increased. For “male SES groups”, “female SES groups”, and “all consumer groups”, the highest rates of shared decision making are “A” and “B” groups, respectively. In other words, as the level of social class of consumers increases, the decision making and assess of consumers together is increasing.

The results of the  $X^2$  test related to assessments regarding the usefulness after purchasing were given in Table 11. There were significant differences between assessments regarding the usefulness after purchasing and all factors.

Table 11. The results of the  $\chi^2$  test related to assessments regarding the usefulness after purchasing

Factors in Relationship		$\chi^2$	p	df	Results
Assessments regarding the usefulness after purchasing	Gender	29.409	0.000	4	Significant
	Education	60.84	0.000	16	Significant
	Income	62.98	0.000	8	Significant
	Age	163.73	0.000	16	Significant
	Male SES	54.831	0.000	20	Significant
	Female SES	61.238	0.000	20	Significant
	Total SES	79.744	0.000	20	Significant

$p < 0.001$  indicates a significant difference between the variables

Table 11a. Percentage distribution of statement "9"

Assessments regarding the usefulness after purchasing furniture					
Demographic and social class variables		Itself	Partner	Wife, husband and children	Wife and husband
Gender	Male	21.6	17.6	45.1	14.7
	Female	26.6	11.2	43.3	17
Education	Primary school	26.3	14.5	36.4	22.1
	Secondary school	29.5	15.8	36.7	16.2
	High school	22.8	15.3	43.3	17.4
	Bachelor's degree	21.1	14.2	51.8	10.9
	Postgraduate	27	14.3	49.2	9.5
Income	Low	27.7	14.3	38.2	18.2
	Middle	25.4	15.4	41.3	16.4
	High	16.3	14.4	56.7	11.4
Age	18-24	38.4	9.6	40.8	0.8
	25-31	26.5	14.1	49.3	7.8
	32-38	22.1	15.4	44.4	17.4
	39-45	22.8	16.9	41.2	18.9
	46 and over	20.7	12.8	43.7	22.1
Male SES	A class	10.2	13	63	11.1
	B class	16.7	20.5	51.9	10.9
	C1 class	22.4	19.3	42.4	14.9
	C2 class	22.1	16.2	43.8	17.2
	D class	29.8	14.9	35.4	18.6
	E class	38.1	11.9	33.3	14.3
Female SES	A class	18.6	12.8	60.5	7
	B class	29.5	8	50.9	11.2
	C1 class	26.2	9.3	44.9	15.4
	C2 class	32.4	14.1	38	15.5
	D class	25	8.3	35.4	25
	E class	25.1	13.5	37	23.3
All Consumer SES	A class	13.9	12.9	61.9	9.3
	B class	22.9	14.8	51.1	11
	C1 class	23.5	15.9	42.9	15.4
	C2 class	23.6	15.9	43.2	16.7
	D class	29	13.3	35.2	20
	E class	26.7	13.7	36.6	21.7

When Table 11a is taken into consideration, in all demographic and socio-economic variables, it was observed that it is effective in children on assessments regarding the usefulness after purchasing furniture.

#### 4. Conclusion

It was found that the partners (husband and wife) decide together on factors such as the need to the purchase of furniture, studies conducted before the purchase of furniture, assessments regarding the timing of purchasing, and assessments regarding brand and quality. Although decision-makers are women on assessments such as form, colour, pattern, design in furniture, decision-makers are men on assessments such as price, where to purchase, and the final decision on buying. Moreover, although the partners decide together on the need to purchasing, women are more dominant than men.

It was found that in factors affecting consumers when purchasing furniture, as income level and education level of the consumers increase, the rates of shared decision making of consumers increase in general.

When we examined the factors that influence the consumer's preference in terms of age, the following results were obtained:

- (1) The highest rate of shared decision making in the family on factors such as the need to the purchase of furniture, studies conducted before the purchase of furniture, assessments regarding price, assessments regarding where to purchase, and assessments regarding form, color, pattern, design is in the age range 25-31.
- (2) The highest rate of self-determination on the need to the purchase of furniture is in the age range 18-24.
- (3) The highest rate of shared decision making on assessments such as where to purchase, and the final decision on buying is in the age range 39-45.
- (4) The highest rate of shared decision making on assessments regarding the timing of purchasing is in the age range 32-38.
- (5) The highest rate of shared decision making on assessments regarding brand and quality is the age group of 46 and above.

In terms of social class, the highest rate of shared decision making of consumers on all factors is in groups "A and B". That is, as the class level of consumers decreases, the rate of shared decision making of consumers decreases. One of the remarkable results is that more than 50% of the consumers in group "C2" carried out assessments regarding price on their own.

In all demographic and socio-economic variables, it was observed that it is effective in children on assessments regarding the usefulness after purchasing furniture.

#### 5. Acknowledgments

This study was presented at the "1st International Technology Science and Design Symposium" and published in the full text book.

#### References

- Akyüz İ. (1998). The Study of Consumers' Behavior on Preferences of Furniture in Point of Sex (Trabzon county center model). Master Thesis, Karadeniz Technical University, Graduate School of Natural and Applied Sciences, Trabzon.
- Akyüz İ. (2006). The Effects of Socio-Cultural and Socio-Psychological Factors on Consumer Behavior During Furniture Purchase. PhD Thesis, Karadeniz Technical University, Graduate School of Natural and Applied Sciences, Trabzon.
- Andaç T. (2008). A Research on Furniture Consumer Preference in Kayseri. Master Thesis, Kahramanmaraş Sütçü İmam University, Graduate School of Natural and Applied Sciences, Kahramanmaraş.
- Arpacı F. (2014). Furniture Purchasing, Using Behaviours of Consumers Living in Ankara and Their Problems Regarding Furniture Purchasing. International Refereed Journal of Marketing and Market Researches, 2(1), 1-15.
- Arpacı F. and Obuz K. (2013). Consumers Preferences Related To Furniture. ACADEMIC SIGHT International Refereed Online Journal of Social Sciences, 36, 1-20.

- Burdurlu E., İlçe A.C. and Ciritcioğlu H.H. (2004). The Preference Priorities of the Consumers on Furniture Product Characteristics. *Hacettepe University Journal of Sociological Research*. Retrieved from [http://www.sdergi.hacettepe.edu.tr/burdurlu\\_cerceve.html](http://www.sdergi.hacettepe.edu.tr/burdurlu_cerceve.html).
- Demircioğlu B. (2012). Brand Effect on The Behavior of The Consumer. Master Thesis, Kahramanmaraş Sütçü İmam University, Institute of Social Sciences, Kahramanmaraş.
- Erdinler E.S. and Koç K.H. (2015). Consumer Preferences and Design Demands in Furniture, "in 3rd National Furniture Congress," Konya, Turkey, April 10-12, 2015, pp.1136-1149.
- Gerlevik D. (2012). Via Internet Shopping' Effects on Consumer Behaviour. Master Thesis, Atılım University, Institute of Social Sciences, Ankara.
- İslamoğlu A. H. (1990). A Research on the Roles of Family Members in the Purchasing Decisions of Durable Consumer Goods. *Marketing World*, 4(19), p. 21.
- Kalınkara V. (2016). Consumer Behavior in Purchasing Home furniture. *Turkey Journal of Social Studies*, 20(1), 233-247.
- Odabaşı Y. and Barış G. Consumer Behaviour. Mediacat Publishing, İstanbul (2002).
- Korkut D.S. and Kaval S. (2015). Consumer Preferences in Furniture Selection: The example of Düzce. *Düzce University Journal of Forestry*, 11(1), 42-51.
- Öztürk E. (2006). Effect and Importance of Certificate of Quality on Customer Purchase Behaviour. Master Thesis, Marmara University, Institute of Social Sciences, İstanbul.
- Penpece D. (2006). The Factors Which Determine the Consumer Behaviour: The Effect Of Culture On Consumer Behavior. Kahramanmaraş Sütçü İmam University, Institute of Social Sciences, Kahramanmaraş.