

**Purchase behavior: An analysis of influences on consumers**

*Mark R. Lyberger, Kent State University*

*Larry McCarthy, Seton Hall University*

*John Harris, Kent State University*

*Sangkwon Lee, Kent State University*

*Drayven R. DeLong, Kent State University*

**Marketing  
Abstract 2009-215**

**May 30, 2009  
3:00 PM**

**Poster  
(Lexington/Carolina Prefunction)**

For years, research scholars have noted that purchase intentions may serve as a valid proxy for, or precursor to, purchase behavior (Fishbein & Ajzen (1975); Creyer & Ross (1997). However, researchers such as Morwitz (2001) have noted that actual behavior and stated intentions are not perfectly correlated. A variety of explanations have been put forth ranging from changes in preferences and interpretation, an inability to predict future consumer preferences, to measurement error (Lusk, McLaughlin & Jaeger (2007). Some researchers contest the persuasive view of Fishbein and Ajzen (1975) highlighting intentions are the best predictors of behavior. These researchers contend that further research is needed to clarify the relationship between intent and behavior (Lusk, et al 2005). Purchase intentions are often analyzed without considering the likelihood or truthfulness of consumer's response. Carson, Flores & Meade (2001) argue that people strategically overstate their preferences for goods. Newberry, Klemz, and Boshoff (2003) have cautioned that the generalizations drawn from intention data may be misleading and if management relied solely on these responses they would often be misguided or mislead in their decision making. A common objective of business research is the modeling of the relationship between various segmentation bases, characteristics of individuals and the likelihood of certain behaviors, such as purchase (Young, DeSarbo, and Morowitz 1998). In sport and business countless empirical studies have confirmed a fundamental tenet of modern economics that individuals respond to incentives (Lusk & et al 2007). For these incentives to be valued the exchange relationship must be receptacle in nature. Organizations are often unable to identify the primary linkage between consumer behavior, the incentive and the exchange process. Therefore, sport entities often begin to integrate multiple strategies to create an impact. As Crompton (2004) stated, the trade-off is weighed between what will be gained and what will be given up, an interpretation amicable to both sides. . Lusk et al (2007) have noted, if incentives matter, their effects are not likely regulated to just the marketplace, but permeate to impact behavior in a variety of facets of life. Studies previously conducted by Cornwell and Maignan 1998; Crompton 2004; Harvey 2001; Meenaghan 2001; Pope & Voges 1999, and others have identified image and purchase intentions as recognized outcomes. Sport literature points to intention as a contextual way to view sponsorship effectiveness and indirectly has been linked to behavior (Jalleh, Donovan, Giles-Corti & Homan 2002). However, as research indicates there often are considerable inconsistencies between what people say and what people actually do, highlighting the need to further research to clarify the contextual framework between purchase intention and its relationship to sport and entertainment (Lusk et al (2007). An array of Midwest consumer groups (N=300) were utilized in this study to procure perceptual contexts specific to purchase behavior. Consumer perceptions specific to cost of purchase, consumer needs, consumer wants, consumer income, brand name, and symbol representation were analyzed and compared to interest, viewing and attendance statistics. The authors will report the results of these comparisons as well as describe its relationship to their proposed model of purchase behavior.