

## **Postponable Purchasing of Confused Consumer; The Moderating Role of Perceived Risk And Income Between Consumer Confusion Proneness & Decision Postponement**

**Sajid Iqbal<sup>1</sup>, Naqash Ahmad<sup>2</sup>, Nadeem Iqbal<sup>3</sup>, Naveed Ahmad<sup>4</sup>**

<sup>1,2</sup>MS Scholars Mohammad Ali Jinnah University, Islamabad, Pakistan

<sup>3</sup>Head of Management Sciences, Ghazi University, Dera Ghazi Khan, Pakistan

<sup>4</sup>Head of Management and Social Sciences, Indus International Institute, Dera Ghazi Khan, Pakistan

Corresponding Author: [naveedahmad@indusdgk.edu.pk](mailto:naveedahmad@indusdgk.edu.pk)

### **ABSTRACT**

The major objective of the study was to develop a model and to test consumer confusion in mobile phone industry of Pakistan. The present study mainly attempted to analyze consumer's basic attitudes i.e. consumer confusion in an under-researched country i.e. Pakistan. So the model examines the impact and outcomes of consumer confusion with moderating effect of perceived risk and personal income level. Results have given some novel findings specifically in Pakistani culture and Pakistani mobile phone markets. While all scaled demographics are found insignificant relation and similarity confusion is found insignificantly associated with decision postponement. But overload and ambiguity confusion is found significant. Moreover perceived risk is found fully insignificant but personal income is only found significant with ambiguity confusion.

---

**Key Words: Consumer Confusion, Similarity Confusion, Perceived Risk, Personal Income, Decision Postponement**

### **INTRODUCTION**

Researchers from the last many years have paid attention to consumer confusion and to its antecedents. The important feature of the market is the plethora of options available in market (Walsh et al., 2007). Confusion arises due to various brands choices and overload, which is through put by disturbance of responsiveness that makes consumer agitated and tensed (Mitchell & Papavasiliou, 1999; Walsh, Thuru & Mitchell, 2010). Today consumer markets are perfectly comparative and differentiated, providing plenty of choices to end users. Therefore, three main streams of confusion proneness are found "Similarity proneness, Ambiguity Proneness and

Overload Proneness” (Walsh et al., 2009). However, overload proneness due to choice and information overload, similarity proneness and ambiguity proneness leverages leads to consumer decisions to postponement (Dany, 2007; Memi, 2012; Chen & Chang, 2013; Wang & Shukla, 2013). Moreover, Hills et al. (2013) have found similar results as consumer confusion in their study.

Such factors pinches consumers not to incorporate a rationale decision but to postpone it, while postponement is the choice deferral found in a decision and found significant to e. consumers because of overload and other proneness’s (Lucian & Farias, 2009). Mainly, technological advancements and unawareness of consumers also leads to postponement (Davasenathipati & Saravanan, 2013). Therefore, a limited research has been conducted on the relationship between consumer confusion and decision postponement in Pakistan. Hence these findings will help the consumers regarding to overcome their confusion and decision postponement.

Moreover, postponement is also caused by interplay of sensed risk (Taylor, 2000). Perceived risk is the level of uncertainty during purchase decision, in concern to purchase anxieties that pinches consumer’s mental perception and gravity of risk (Conchar et al., 2004). Later on Zheng et al. (2012) investigated perceived risk in Chinese context and found the similar results of postponement, with marginal differences of rituals to e. shopping. Therefore, perceived risk has been found as moderator among the relationship of consumer confusion and decision postponement (Perez & Garcia, 2012). And most of the end users postpones their decisions on the bases of price and their income level (Brandt and Holz, 2006; Angeli, Valanedis & Bonk, 2003). Because Consumer confusion can leads to product purchase avoidance. According to prospect theory of Kahenamen and Tversky, (1979) stated that “people values gains and losses differently and decisions will be based on perceived gains and perceived losses.”

Consumer confusion has been slighter investigated but recently the theorist have focused to investigate such brand resemblance in every dimension of consumer behavior. However, previous studies have been conducted mostly in western countries and there are no such studies in Asian context (Bhatnagar, 2007). According to Aycaan at al. (2000) Pakistan is under researched country, therefore the relationship between consumer confusion and decision postponement has been limited studied in Asian context. Moreover, it is less investigated as moderators in Pakistan.

However, this paper has important implications for theorists and practitioners. This study will play a significant role in understanding consumer’s perceived risk as a moderator between consumer confusion proneness and its outcomes for theorists will be discussed, that will help marketers to understand the psyche of consumers. This concept is also important for organizations because of the alarming outcomes of consumer confusion proneness like as reduced sales, reduced customer satisfaction, negative word of mouth, difficulty of effectively communicating with customers, reduced brand loyalty, reduced profit and consumer decision

postponement. On the other hand it must be understandable for the manufacturers and retailers that offering huge line extensions might not always be amicable for consumers and brings hurtful outcomes. Moreover, such study provides a clear direction to consumer behavior researchers by presenting new dimension in study. So mainly three questions are focused in this study. Firstly, to what extent the relationship exists between consumer confusion and decision postponement in Pakistan and to what extent consumer confusion is moderated by perceived risk and income level. Hence, the research objectives are categorized to find the extent of consumer confusion on decision postponement and its moderation consequences between consumer confusion and decision postponement.

This paper is distributed into three main segments, beginning with literature review that represents the concept of variables of model and explore the results and explanations of previous studies in this context. In the next segment methodology regarding research design is discussed and analyses are also discussed. The last segment explains the findings, conclusion and managerial implications.

## **LITRATURE REVIEW**

### **Similarity Confusion**

Similarity confusion is originated as branch of consumer confusion, defined as propensity to think as different products in different category are symbolically and functionally homogeneous (Walsh et al., 2007). In other words, similarity confusion emerges due to homogeneous products and brands features (Matzler & Waiguny, 2005). So similarity confusion arises due to similar variety of divisional products that turns consumer behavior to purchase of bogus product (Walsh et al., 2010). While Kapferer, (1995); Kasper, Bloemer & Driessen (2010) explained similarity confusion arises based on these factor that appears (e.g. logo, Symbols, Brand Meaning, labeling, and Trade Mark). Later Matzler et al. (2007) explained that such varieties of options are because of mass-customization. And these options strongly support and originate the legal and ethical issues (Balabanis & Craven, 2010).

However, similarity confusion may alter consumer decision to postponement because they are going to purchase an unplanned product and did not intentionally aimed to purchase, if alternatives are absolutely same, and this happens in low involvements with products that also shuffles the purchase and consumption culture (Holt, 2002; Mitchell and Papavassiliou 1999). And Leek & Chanaswatkit, (2006) have also found that similar brands and technological advancements lead consumer's loyalty and choice behavior to postponement. Therefore, a consumer fell in trap heuristically and purchases low priced & quality product as a substitute that ultimately deceives (Walsh, Thureau & Mitchell, 2007). While Drummond & Rule, (2007) have also supported these findings and explained that such confusion shuffles the gravity of market success and improvements as consumers postpone their purchase decisions. Therefore, Derosia,

Lee & Christensen (2011) comprehensively explained that as brand extension will increase consumer confusion will also increase leading to purchase delays. So this steers to propose that:

*H1: There is significant relationship of similarity confusion with decision postponement.*

### **Overload Confusion**

Information overload is availability of more information to consumer than his need, which creates negative smack on consumer cognitive ability (Paulo, 1999). However, Walsh et al, (2007) has defined comprehensively overload confusion that “A lack of understanding caused by excessive information available in a mature environment, that is not understandable by consumers in available time during purchase.” However, consumers are found less satisfied, spare confused and not so much confident because of information overload (Lee & Lee, 2004; Lucian et al. 2007). Therefore, overload confusion arises due to bulk of information available as unclear information and implied & material frameworks (Lucian & Farias, 2009).

So as the variety of information makes consumers agitated, consumers ultimately reshapes their buying behaviors that have direct impact on purchasing choices, word of mouth and satisfaction (Walsh, Thureau & Mitchell, 2007). So in information overload relevancy is required but technological advancements have played a massive role that has made information and data more complex in nature, ultimately to postpone. (Wood, Patterson & Roth, 2002). Therefore, Angeli, Valanides & Bonk (2003) have found less supported reasoning among students in her study because of communication inference. But Chen, Pedersen & Murphy, (2011) resulted in their study that all students are not affected by information overload because some students are cognitively different and prior learned to manage such overload. But Murray & Thomson, (2011) resulted in their study that senior citizens are found more confused because of overload as compare to young. Though, similar consequences are of information overload to postponement by both roots. Moreover, Cremer, (2007) found postponement in his study in the context of line extension because of overload. Therefore, more information creates more errors and leads to reduction in conscious awareness that influences not to have a rationale purchase decision but mutually coordinates to have a confused decision or postpone the decision (Tunney, 2002; Walsh & Mitchell, 2008). So in the light of above discussion it proposes that,

*H2: There is significant relationship of overload confusion with decision postponement.*

### **Ambiguity Confusion**

Today when consumer enters in the market where the high involvement of complex technologically innovated brands/products exists, they face various kinds of uncertain, misleading and ambiguous information. So this dimension of consumer confusion is, “the

consumer tolerance for processing unclear, misleading or ambiguous product related information or advertisement” (Walsh et al., 2007). As defined by Kapferer, (1995) consumers fathom uncertainty, when they perceives illness from informational lack of clarity and inappropriateness and such ambiguity confusion proves consumers to find it difficult legally also. And it affects to interpreted and to understand product/brand based on conflicting information and pricing strategies (Schweizer, Kotouc, & Wagner 2006; Walsh et al., 2007). Just because it is comparative approach used by consumers and researchers that how consumers co-opt fresh product into known product attributes (Uekermann et al., 2009). And it is matter of choice in consumer hands (Rajgopal and Burnkrant, 2005). Hence, ambiguity as double edge is found most supportive in the context of strategic planning’s (Abdallah and Langley, 2014).

Therefore, when consumers comprehend the comparison between brands/products and they professionalize ambiguity confusion, including income level it could cause decision postponement (Lafgren, Lindquist & Sims, 1997). As Taylor, (2000) explained that ambiguity is caused by behavioral formation and causes uncertainty that pinches the decision process and reasoning from normal course purchase execution. Therefore, individual prefers the lower level of ambiguity for decisions where chance of losses is found including punishment (Loughran et al., 2011). Moreover consumers are at less advantage of experience, skills and information as compared to brokers that also shuffles their cognition to ambiguity (Woodwards and Econometrics, 2003). Hence, such ambiguity pinches the marginal preferences and collaborations and it shuffles the partial advantage i.e. monetary and non monetary (Mauro and Castro, 2011). Therefore, literature states the following hypothesis that

*H3: There is significant impact of consumer confusion with decision postponement.*

### **Moderating role of Perceived Risk**

The most important erect faced by consumers during purchase of brands or products are “Perceived Risk”, while perceived risk is consumer’s judgment to all embryonic counterfeits (Conchar et al., 2004). In other words, perceived risk is the construct of mental insecurity in the mind of end-users that forces to search and show marginal willingness to purchase and consume the rival brands. So scholars are largely agreed to the impact of perceived risk on consumers cognitive and purchase decisions (e.g., Mitchell, 1998; Campbell and Goodstein, 2001; Pereiz and Garcia, 2012).

Therefore, Mitchell, (1998) designed his study to work on conceptualization of perceived risk models and started by identifying the relationship of perceived risk with consumer involvement and trust. Meanwhile, Campbell & Goodstien, (2001) investigated perceived risk with product involvement and found significant nature of outcomes and proposed perceived risk as moderator for paramount factors. Then later Laroche, Bergeron & Goutaland, (2003) investigated product intangibility with the context of perceived risk and accounted highly correlated results that as

much the intangibility will increase the level of perceived risk will automatically increase. Moreover, Martin & Camarero, (2008) found similar findings in the context of web site consumers that consumers perceives more risk and also asses the reputation, word of mouth and service quality of that web site. Similarly Periez & Garcia, (2012) have found similar results in their study and argued perceived risk as moderator on the determinants of online loyalty because it intends to influence the consumer satisfaction and their purchase hell-bent. Meanwhile, Zheng et al. (2012) have founded homogeneous results of perceived risk relation in the domain of e. shopping consumers with some marginal heterogeneous results like Chinese culture to purchase intentions and shopping environment. While, Chen & Chang, (2013) have found similar results but with a quite different ink by using perceived risk as mediator, found positively correlated with green wash but negatively correlated with green trust of consumers. So priorly Koklic, (2009) have argued that consumer mostly postpone their decision because of unfamiliarity with such products and their purchase consequences than has a potential chance to negative outcomes in shape of less satisfaction or lose of money. Therefore, such argument was supported by Periez & Garcia, (2012) that consumers with high involvement of perceived risk will postpone the decision and they feel confused but in the context of consumer low involvement will tend to make decision quickly even in confused situation because of similarity, overload and ambiguity confusion proneness. Hence, literature suggest to hypothesize that,

H4: There is moderating relation of Perceived risk between similarity confusion and decision postponement.

H5: There is moderating relation of Perceived risk between overload confusion and decision postponement.

H6: There is moderating relation of Perceived risk between ambiguity confusion and decision postponement.

### **Moderating role of Personal Income**

A certain portion of value, material custody or currency that is earned through various sources in society and social groups is known as income level (Ordabayeva and Chandon, 2011). And such income level is strongly con integrated with sources of revenue generation but because of inconsistency in wages of workers causes decline in income and it fumbles to income inequality (Piketty, 2003). But some times during formation of analogues society level of incomes changes and mostly declines that ultimately changes the consumption patterns that gives birth to consumption inequality (Cai, Chen and Zhou, 2010). And as priory investigated, such income inequality leads consumers to reshape their decisions regarding consumption on the bases of monthly price movements and such phenomena is found strongly co integrated in retail business (Fox, Montgomery and Lodish, 2004; Gou, Mroz & Popkin 2000). Hence, it affects the people's basic needs to live as their income level curve moves to decline that ultimately changes the

shopping habits of their selves and such consumers then rely on financial support (Mofitt and Scholz, 2010). But due to certain attitudinal factors study resulted that low-income individuals spends more as compare to high-income individuals (Dyanan, Skinner and Zeldes, 2004).


Sometimes decision postponement is found co integrated in the context of retired individuals that shows their changing decisions before and after retirement to consumption habits and makes them more cautious (Smith, 2003; Ostergaard, Sorensen & Yosha, 2004). And their decisions are based on the upper and lower limits of prices including their available funds flow (Ofir, 2004). Oppositely, consumers with a uniform and increasing stream of stream of income always moves with same consumption patterns and maintains their self esteem by enhancing their social status (Becker, Murphy and Werning, 2005; Mu, 2006). But price of the brand or product always matter and each consumer uses mental accounting for value and price comparison before shopping (Brandt and Holz, 2006). Therefore, earning patterns and individuals wealth has sound able concern regarding consumer shopping and shopping life that has dual effect either in shape of heavy earnings or heterogeneous earnings (Sabel, Dorling and Hiscock, 2007). Hence, literature states the hypothesis that,

H7: There is moderating relationship between similarity confusion and decision postponement.

H8: There is moderating relationship between overload confusion and decision postponement.

H9: There is moderating relationship between ambiguity confusion and decision postponement.

### CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK



As conceptual frame work states that three independent variables (Similarity confusion, Overload Confusion & Ambiguity Confusion) are used, two moderators (Perceived Risk & Personal Income) and one dependent variable is used as decision postponement. So this model has generated 09 hypotheses collectively.

## **METHODOLOGY**

### **Instrumentation**

The questionnaires are adopted from the papers of (Alarabi & Gronblad, 2012, Walsh; Thurau & Mitchell, 2010, Laroche; Begeron & Goutaland, 2003). While three items scale of consumer confusion, overload confusion and perceived risk, 5 items scale of ambiguity confusion and 04 items scale of decision postponement were adopted. All the items were measured by five point likert scale with “01” representing strongly agree and “05” representing strongly disagree.

### **Population & Sample**

The population of the research was consumers of using mobile phones. Sample consisted of consumers working in various fields of life. And the data is only collected from the individuals of mobile phone market, who are active consumers of such market. Initially, 300 questionnaires were distributed and 261 were received back. Out of these 11 questionnaires were incomplete and were eliminated. So 250 questionnaires were used in our study that represented response rate of 83%. For confidentiality concern, respondents were not asked to report their name anywhere on questionnaire. In order it is kept un sourced to get honest and reliable information.

### **Sample Characteristics**

The sample constitutes 70.6% males and 20.4% females. The ratio of females in the sample is low because of the cultural norms of the country. In Pakistani culture, willingness of females to fill and respond to questionnaire is not considered a good thing. And in qualification term, 4.4% respondents dominated the degree of Doctorate, 12.6% Master of philosophy, 10.3 degree of master, 45.8% Graduates, Intermediate 18.3% and 03.8% Matriculations. Moreover, our sample belongs to the various groups of ages. 71% were between 18-25 years, 18.7% belongs to 26-33 years age, 3.1% from age of 34-45 years and 0.8% from the age of >50 years.

### **Control Variables**

After performing descriptive analyses, in this study all demographic variables i.e. gender, age, qualification, social status and qualification are controlled. And as explained below no one sociodemographic variable is found significant at any level. And it is because Pakistan is underdeveloped country and still is in developing stage (Huang, & Van De Vliert, 2003).

### **Reliability Analyses**



All measures are strongly correlated with each other excluding similarity confusion and overload confusion. Because their measurement scale has limited strength. So the reliability of all measures is analyzed through Chronbach's alpha and all items are acceptable.

Number of Items	Chronbach's Alpha
03	0.582

*SC = Similarity Confusion*

Number of Items	Chronbach's Alpha
03	0.543

*OC = Overload Confusion*

Number of Items	Chronbach's Alpha
05	0.609

*OC = Overload Confusion*

Number of Items	Chronbach's Alpha
03	0.812

*PR = Perceived Risk*

Number of Items	Chronbach's Alpha
04	0.753

Hence, total alpha reliability is 0.582 that is not much satisfactory due to scale. Because of only three items were available to adopt to measure the similarity confusion. And no one item is deleted because of minimal limitation of the scale.

## RESULTS

**Table. 01**  
**Data Normality**

Variable	N	Skewness	Kurtosis
Similarity Confusion	250	0.143	-1.405
Overload Confusion	250	0.081	-1.399
Ambiguity Confusion	250	-0.075	-1.311

The basic objective of any data analyses is to explore and interpreted the data location and variability of data. So data normality is just the possibility that the basic variables are normally distributed. Data normality is checked by Skewness and Kurtosis. Term “Skewness” referred as that is distorted to one side. And Kurtosis argues that how flat a measurement is of the extent to which observation cluster around a base point (Pearson, 1895).

Data have shown the required statistics to examine the Kurtosis and Skewness of the Data. The required range for Kurtosis are -2 and +2, below and above the data needs to be corrected before applying tests where as Skewness value more than twice its standard error is taken to indicate a departure from symmetry. The Kurtosis value was at the range of -1.408 to - 0.850.

**Table.02**  
**Descriptive Statistics**

Variable	Mean	Standard Deviation
Similarity Confusion	2.28	1.03
Overload Confusion	2.45	0.96
Ambiguity Confusion	2.47	1.19
Perceived Risk	2.46	1.05
Decision Postponement	2.23	0.90

Descriptive statistics were carried out to check the response. The mean value of the similarity confusion was 2.28, overload confusion was 2.45 and ambiguity confusion was 2.47. This is measured on the bases of consumer confusion dimensions in the study with 05 point liker scale value match with 02=Agree. And all variables are measured on 05 point likert scale.

**Table.03**  
**Correlation Analyses**

Variable	1	2	3	4	5
1.Similarity Confusion	1				
2.Overload Confusion	.395**	1			
3.Ambiguity Confusion	.427**	.501**	1		
4.Perceived Risk	.306**	.402**	.415**	1	
5.Decision Postponement	.331**	.450**	.456**	.484**	1

\*. Correlation is significant at 0.05 level (02-tailed)

\*\* . Correlation is significant at 0.01 levels (02-tailed)

The table shows correlation among similarity confusion, overload confusion, ambiguity confusion perceived risk and decision postponement. Correlation analyses revealed that similarity confusion has significant positive relationship with overload confusion (0.0395\*\*,  $p < 0.01$ ) and overload confusion is also positively correlated with ambiguity confusion (0.427\*\*,  $p < 0.01$ ). While ambiguity confusion has positive correlation with perceived risk (0.415\*\*,  $p < 0.01$ ) and perceived risk has positive correlation with (0.306\*\*,  $p < 0.01$ ) and with (0.402\*\*,  $p < 0.01$ ) and also with decision postponement (0.484\*\*,  $p, 0.01$ ). Therefore, decision postponement is also positively correlated with similarity confusion (0.331\*\*,  $p < 0.01$ ), overload confusion (0.450\*\*,  $p, 0.01$ ) and ambiguity confusion (0.456\*\*,  $p < 0.01$ ).

**Table. 04**  
**Results of Moderated Regression**  
**Analyses for Perceived Risk**

Predictor	DP		
	<i>B</i>	$R^2$	$\Delta R^2$
Step 1 Control variables		.008	
Step 2			
SC	.068	.355	.347
OC	.149**		
AC	.189**		
PR	.254***		
Step 3			
SC*PR	.024	.362	.008
OC*PR	.041		
AC*PR	.011		

**Note:** - Control variables: Gender, Age, Qualification, Social status, Occupation.  
 SC= Similarity Confusion, OC= Overload Confusion, AC= Ambiguity Confusion,  
 PR= Perceived Risk, DP= Decision Postponement  
 \*\*\* $p < 0.001$ , \*\* $p < 0.01$ , \* $p < 0.05$

The moderated regression analysis is used to check the role of perceived risk between consumer confusion and decision postponement. In first control variables were entered secondly all three independent variables were entered to predict decision postponement. In third step, three interaction terms were entered. It is observed that similarity confusion (beta 0.68) is found insignificant, overload confusion (beta 0.149\*\*  $p < 0.01$ ), ambiguity confusion (beta 0.189\*\*  $p < 0.01$ ) and perceived risk (beta 0.254\*\*\*,  $p < 0.001$ ) are significantly related with decision postponement. Whereas three interaction terms were generated, it was observed that similarity confusion and perceived risk (beta 0.024) overload confusion and perceived risk (beta 0.041) and ambiguity confusion perceived risk (beta 0.011) has insignificant interaction term with outcome variables.

**Table. 05**  
**Results of Moderated Regression**  
**Analyses for Personal Income**

Predictor	B	DP	
		R <sup>2</sup>	$\Delta R^2$
Step 1			
Control variables		.008	
Step 2			
SC	.067	.355	.347
OC	.149**		
AC	.189**		
PR	.254***		
PI	.007		
Step 3			
SCPI	-.005	.377	.023
OCPI	-.021		

ACPI

.108\*\*

---

**Note:** - Control variables: Gender, Age, Qualification, Social status, Occupation.  
 SC= Similarity Confusion, OC= Overload Confusion, AC= Ambiguity Confusion,  
 PR= Perceived Risk, DP= Decision Postponement, PI= Personal Income  
 \*\*\* $p < 0.001$ , \*\* $p < 0.01$ , \* $p < 0.05$

The personal income moderated regression analyses is conducted between consumer confusion and decision postponement. In first control variables were entered secondly all three independent variables were entered to predict decision postponement. In third step, three interaction terms were entered. It is observed that similarity confusion (beta 0.67) is found insignificant, but overload confusion (beta 0.149\*\*  $p < 0.01$ ) is significantly found, ambiguity confusion (beta 0.189\*\*  $p < 0.01$ ) is significant but perceived risk (beta 0.254) is significantly related with decision postponement. Moreover, personal income is (beta 0.007) is also found insignificant. Whereas three interaction terms were generated, it was observed that similarity confusion and personal income (beta -0.05,  $p < 0.0$ ), overload confusion and personal income (beta -0.021,  $p < 0.0$ ) are found in significant and ambiguity confusion & personal income (beta 0.108\*\*,  $p < 0.01$ ) has significant interaction term with outcome variables.

### Results Summary

To summarize our results in regression table (04) Hypothesis 01 is rejected that similarity has no significant impact on the decision postponement. While hypothesis 02 & 03 are accepted that overload confusion and ambiguity confusion has positive significant impact on decision postponement. But hypothesis 04, 05 & 06 (Moderator hypothesis) is rejected because interaction term has no significant results as shown in the results. In regression table (05) hypothesis 01 is rejected that similarity confusion has no significant impact on consumer confusion. While hypothesis 02 & 03 are accepted. But personal income (moderator) hypothesis 04 & 05 are rejected that similarity confusion and overload confusion has no significant impact on personal income. But hypothesis 06 is accepted that ambiguity confusion has positive significant influence with personal income.

### DISCUSSION

We observed that our 05 hypothesis are accepted out of 09 hypotheses. Similarity confusion hypothesis is rejected as mentioned above. Whereas hypothesis of overload confusion and ambiguity confusion are accepted. But when we studied these specifically in cultural context then our results came opposite. Then as moderational analyses it led new contribution to this study that all three hypotheses (04, 05 & 06) are rejected. Hence, perceived risk has no moderating effect between consumer confusion dimensions and decision postponement because consumers of Pakistan in mobile phone are more fashion oriented, early adopters and rationally

well aware about markets and mobile phone brands. Moreover, in Pakistan mostly mobile phone consumers are young and students and they are monetarily supported by parents. Therefore, such young consumers are not risk averse. Hence, perceived risk has no moderational influence.

But when results of consumer confusion dimensions are observed with personal income as moderator, the results were more surprising. Because hypothesis 01 of similarity confusion is also rejected here and it is due the reason that most consumers of mobile phone markets in Pakistan are well aware of all brands. It is because of consumer attachment with brands that pinches him to explore more and more about brands. Moreover, in Pakistan informational, promotional and advertising activities are sounder that reduces consumer brand identification agitation. But overload and ambiguity confusion hypothesis are accepted because where there is found rich marketing environment and mature markets information overload increase than normal level that cause overload and ambiguity confusion. Hence, same is the case in Pakistani context, consumers postpones their purchases because of these. While hypothesis 04 & 05 are rejected with personal income that shows that similarity confusion and overload confusion has no significant relationship with personal income. It is because in Pakistan consumers have too certain demands and no decision are postponed due to similarity confusion as data sets represented. But oppositely hypothesis 06 is accepted that ambiguity confusion has significant impact with personal income represents that up to theory and real phenomena that where ever ambiguity of brands exists consumers as humans also behaves risk averse and to secure their money refuses to transact. Because money is more vital item no one wants to lose.

As the main aim of the research was to measure the influence of consumer confusion dimensions on decision postponement with moderation impact of perceived risk and personal income. The results are shown above fully supporting hypothesis 02 & 03 that overload confusion and ambiguity has significant positive impact decision postponement. Perceived risk as moderated fully rejected and personal income hypothesis 06 is only accepted that ambiguity confusion has significant positive impact on income level. Hence, it shows that in this study overload confusion and ambiguity confusion has significant positive influence on decision postponement.

### **Practical Implications**

The current study findings have various practical implications for marketer's practices, policy executers and research. And consumer confusion absence has shown it before. Therefore, it has important for consequences of consumer confusions and decision postponement intensity reduction of mobile phone brands in Pakistan. And specifically policies can be made regarding students consumer behavior to exclude the rising unsystematic market risk that can shuffle brand positioning.

### **Conclusion**

In accordance with results, in Pakistan consumer's confusion exists due to overload and ambiguity about any brand of mobile phones. And due to collectivist social culture source of income of various consumers is autocratic and are served by their parents. So consumers enjoy the leisure of risk and adopt new brands for self satisfaction and maintained status quo. Therefore, perceived risk as moderator is found insignificant in results. While, in Pakistani mobile phone market most of the market share is occupied by young individuals and their income is originated from family groups. Therefore, in this moderational analyses such consumers felt confused when they are ambiguous about any brand. But mostly, such consumers are well aware due to cheap and reliable source of information availability. Therefore, role of sales representative regarding informational transmission is reduced.

### **Future research directions**

The present study is done only in Pakistani context and only on mobile phone market. The future research can be conducted on various products including automobiles, detergents, home appliances and laptops markets. And mostly brands in Pakistan are imported that are made at any one location assembled in other and are exported here. So country origin has strong influence leading to consumer confusion, can be used for future research. Moreover, family life style, purchasing patterns and their subculture can show novel results regarding consumer confusion.

### **REFERENCES**

- Abdallah, C. & Langley, A. (2014). The Double Edge of Ambiguity in Strategic Planning. *Journal of Management Studies*, 51, 02.
- Angeli, C., Valanedis, N., & Bonk, J. C. (2003). Communication in a Web based Conferencing System: The Quality of Computer Mediated Interactions. *British Journal of Educational Technology*, 34(01).
- Aycan, et al. (2000). Impact of Culture on Human Resource Management Practice: A 10-Countries Comparison. *Applied Psychology: An International Review*, 49(01), 192-221.
- Balabanis, G. & Craven, S. (2010). Consumer Confusion from Own Brands Lookalikes: An exploratory investigation. *Journal of Marketing Management*, 13, 229-313.
- Becker, S. G., Murphy, M. K., & Werning, I. (2005). The Equilibrium Distribution of Income and Market of Status. *Journal of Political Economy*, 113, (02), 282-310.
- Bhatnagar, J. (2007). Talent Management Strategies of Employee Engagement in Indian IETS Employees: Key to Retention. *Journal of Employee Relation*, 29, 06.

- Brandt, L. & Holz, A. C. (2006). Spatial Price Differences in China: Estimates and Implications. *Economic Development and Cultural Change*, 55, (01), 43-86.
- Campbell, C. M. & Goodstein C. R. (2001). The moderating Effect of Perceived Risk on Consumer Evaluations of Products Incongruity: Preferences for the Norm. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 28, (03), 439-449.
- Cai, H., Chen, Y., & Zhou, L. (2010). Income and Consumption Inequality in Urban China. *Economic Development and Cultural Change*, 58, (03), 385-413.
- Chen, Y. S. & Chang, C. H. (2013), Green wash and Green trust: The Mediation Effect of Green Consumer Confusion and Green Perceived Risk. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 114, 489-500.
- Conchar et al. (2004). An integrated Frame work for the Conceptualization of Consumers' Perceived Risk Processing. *Journal of Academy of Marketing Sciences*, 32, No. 4 Page 418-436.
- Chen, Y. C., Pedersen, S., & Murphy, L. K. (2011). The influence of Perceived Information Overload on Student Participation and Knowledge Construction in Computer-mediated Communication. *Journal of Inter Sciences*, 40, 325-349.
- Cremer, C. (2007). Consumer Confusion in the Context of Line Extension. *Universitiet Maastrich, Master Thesis*.
- Devasenathipathi, T., & Saravanan, s. (2013). A Study on Consumer Confusion among Urban, Semi-Urban and Rural Consumers with Special Reference to Laptop Market – A Post Purchase Recall Survey. *Abhinave National Monthly Refereed Journal of Research in Commerce & Management*, 2(3), ISSN 2277-1166.
- Dany, P. (2007). Consumer Confusion and Confusion Reduction Strategies: A Case of Cambodian Mobile Phone Market. *Consumer Confusion in the Context of Line Extensions. Master-Thesis*.
- Drummond, G. & Rule, G. (2007). Consumer Confusion in UK Wine Industry. *Journal of Wine Research*, 16 (01) 55-64.
- Derosia, E. D., Lee. R. T., & Christensen, L. G. (2011). Sophisticated but Confused: The Impact of Brand Extension and Motivation on Source Confusion. *Journal of Psychology & Marketing*, 28(05), 457-478.
- Dynan, E. K., Sikkner, J., & Zeldes, P. S. (2004). Do the Rich Save More? *Journal of Political Economy*, 112. (02), 397-444.



- Fox, J. E., Montgomery, L. A., & Lodish, M. L. (2004). Consumer Shopping and Spending Across Retail Market. *The Journal of Business*, 77, (52), S25-S60.
- Gou, X., Mroz, A. T., & Popkin, M. B. (2000). Structural Change in the Impact of Income on Food Consumption in China, 1989-1993. *Economic Development and Cultural Change*, 48, (04), 737-760.
- Huang, X., & Van De Vliert, E. (2003). Where intrinsic job satisfaction fails to work: National moderators of intrinsic motivation. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 24, 159-179.
- Hills, T. T., Noguchi, T. Gibbert, M. (2013). Information Overload and Search Amplified Risk? Set Size and Order Effect on Decisions from Experience. *Psychon Bull Rev.* 20, 1023-1031.
- Holt, B. D. (2002). Why do brands Cause Trouble? A Dialectical Theory of Consumer Culture and Branding. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 29 (01), 70-90.
- Kahneman, D. & Tversky. (1979). Prospect Theory: Decision making under Risk. *Econometrica* (pre-1986); Mar 1979; 47, 2.
- Kasper, H., Bloemer, J. & Driessen, H.P. (2010). Coping with Confusion: The Case of the Dutch Mobile Phone Market. *Journal of Managing Servicing Quality*, 20 (02), 140-160
- Kapferer, N. J. (1995). Brand Confusion: Empirical Study of Legal Concept. *Journal of Marketing & Psychology*, 12(06), 551-586.
- Koklic, K. M. (2009). The Strategic Household Purchase: Consumer House Buying Behavior. *Managing Global Transition: International Research Journal*, 07, (01), 75-96.
- Laroche, M., Begeron, J., & Goutaland, C. (2003). How Intangibility Effects Perceived Risk: The Moderating Role of Knowledge and Involvement. *Journal of Service Marketing*, 17, (02), 122-140.
- Lefgren, L., Lindquist, J. M., & Sims, D. (2012). Rich Dad, Smart Dad: Decomposing the Intergenerational Transmission of Income. *Journal of Political Economy*, 120 (02), 286-303.
- Leek, S. & Chansawaskit, S. (2006). Consumer Confusion in Thai Mobile Phone Market. *Journal of Consumer Behavior*, 05, 518-532.

- Lee, K. B. & Lee, N. W. (2004). The Effect of Information Overload on Consumer Choice Quality in an On-Line Environment. *Journal of Psychology & Marketing*, (21)3, 159-183
- Lucian, R. & Farias, A. (2009). Effect of information overload in Brazilian E. Consumers. *American Journal of Economics and Business Administration*, 1 (1) 21-26, 2009.
- Lucian et al. (2007). Information Overload in Ecommerce. *International Federation for Information Processing*, 251, 423-430.
- Loughran et al. (2011). On Ambiguity in Perception of Risk: Implications for Criminal Decisions Making and Deterrence. *Journal of Criminology*, 49 (04).
- Martin, S. S. & Camarero, C. (2008). How Percieved Risk Effects Online Buying. *Online Information Review*, 33, (04), 629-654.
- Matzler et al., (2007). Spoiled for choice: Consumer Confusion in Internet based Mass Customization. *Journal of Innovative Marketing*, 03, (03).
- Matzler, K. & Waiguny, M. (2005). Consequences of Consumer Confusion in Online Hotel Booking. *Journal of Information and Communication Technologies in Tourism*, 306-317.
- Mauro, D. C. & Castro, F. M. (2011). Kindness, Confusion, Or . . . Ambiguity? *Journal of Experimental Econometrics*, 14, 611-633.
- Memi, D. (2012). Information Overload and Virtual Institutions. *AI & Soc*, 29, 75-83.
- Mitchell, V.W., & Papavassiliou, V. (1999). Marketing Causes and Implications of Consumer Confusion. *Journal of Product & Brand Management*, 8(4), 319-339.
- Mitchell, W. V. (1998). Consumer Perceived Risk Conceptualization & Models. *European Journal of Marketing*, 33, (01), 163-195.
- Moffitt, R. & Scholz, K. J. (2010). Trends in the Level and Distribution of Income Support. *Journal of Tax Policy and Economy*, 24, (01), 111-152.
- Murray, J. & Thomson, E. M. (2011). Age related Differences on Cognitive Overload in an Audio Visual Memory. *European Journal of Psychological Education*, 26, 129-141.
- Mu, R. (2006). Income Shocks, Wealth, Consumption and Human Capital: Evidence from Russia. *Economic Development and Cultural Change*, 54 (04), 857-892.

- Ofir, C. (2004). Reexamining Latitude of Price Acceptability and Price Thresholds: Predicting Basic Consumer Reaction to Price. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 30, (04), 612-621.
- Oradabayeva, N. & Chandon, P. (2011). Getting Ahead of the Joneses: When Equality Increases Conspicuous Consumption among Bottom Tier Consumers. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 38, (01), 27-41.
- Ostergaard, C., Sorensen, E. B., Yosha, O. (2004). Consumption and Aggregate Constraints: Evidence From US. States and Canadian Provinces. *Journal of Political Economy*, 110 (03), 634-645.
- Piketty, T. (2003). Income Inequality in France, 19901-1998. *Journal of Political Economy*, 111, (05), 1004-1042.
- Pearson, K. (1895). Contribution to the mathematical theory of evaluation, II: Skew variation in homogenous material. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society of London*, 186, 343-414.
- Perez, C., & Garcia, S. (2012) Satisfaction and Loyalty to a Website: The Moderating Effect of Perceived Risk. *Esicmarket*, 141, pp. 183-207.
- Paulo, H. F. (1999). Information Overload in Computer-Mediated Communication and Educated: In the Really too much Information? Implication for Distance Education. *Journal of T. space Library*.
- Rajgopal, P. & Burnkrant, E. R. (2005). Consumer Categorization and Evaluation of Ambiguous Products. *Advances in Consumer Research*, 32.
- Sabel, E. C., Dorling, D., & Hiscock, R. (2007). Sources of Income, Wealth and Length of Life: An Individual Level Study of Mortality. *Critical Public Health*, 17 (04), 293-310.
- Shweizer, M., Kotouc, J. A., & Wagner, T. (2006). Scale Development for Consumer Confusion. *Advances in Consumer Research*, 33.
- Smith, P. J. (2003). Trends and Projections in Income Replacement during Retirement. *Journal of Labor Economics*, 21, (04), 755-781.
- Taylor, K.A. (2000). Explaining Individual and Task Differences in Consumer Attitudes and Ambiguity. *Marketing Letters*, 11:2 (2000), 117-127.
- Tunney, J. (2002). The Neglected Tension Between Disclosure of Consumer of Information in Consumer and Competition Law Context. *Journal of Consumer Policy*, 25, 329-343.

- Uekermann et al. (2009). The Influence of Stimulus Ambiguity on Category and Attitude Formation. *Review of Managerial Sciences*, 04, 33-52.
- Wang, Q. & Shukla, P. (2013). Linking sources of Consumer Confusion to Decision Satisfaction: The role of Choice Goals. *Journal of Psychology and Marketing*, 30(04), 295-304.
- Walsh, G., Mitchell, V.W. Kilian, T. & Miller, L. (2009). Measuring Consumer Vulnerability to Perceived Product Similarity problems and its Consequences. *Journal of Marketing Management*, 00, No. 00, 1-17.
- Walsh, G., Hennig-Thurau, T., & Mitchell, V. W. (2007). Consumer Confusion Proneness: Scale Development, Validation, and Application. *Journal of Marketing Management*, 22 (forthcoming).
- Walsh, G., Thurau, H.T. & Mitchell, M.V. (2010). Consumer Confusion Proneness: Scale Development, Validation and Application. *Journal of Marketing Management*, 23, (07-08), 697-721
- Walsh, G. & Mitchell, W. V. (2008). The effect of Consumer Confusion Proneness on Word of Mouth, Trust and Customer Satisfaction. *Eupeon Journal of Marketing*, 44(06), 838-859.
- Woods, D. D., Paterson, S. E. & Roth, M. E. (2002). Can We ever Escape from Data Overload? A Cognitive System Diagnosis. *Journal of Cognition, Technology & Work*, 04, 22-36.
- Woodwards, E. S. & Econometrics, H. S. (2003). Consumer Confusion In Mortgage Market. *Sand hill Econometric Research Paper*.
- Zheng, et al., (2012). Chinese Consumer Perceived Risk and Risk Relievers in E-Shopping for Clothing. *Journal of Electronic Commerce Research*, 13(3).

