CHAPTER - IV ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION

# 4.1 INTRODUCTION

The present chapter is based on the analysis and interpretation of data. The data may be reliable and valid, but it does not serve the purpose, unless the data is carefully classified, processed, analyzed, interpreted and concluded. This chapter consists of different parts of analysis, such as Percentage Analysis, Mean, Chi - Square, Correlation, Factor Analysis, Regression and Structural Equation Modeling.

# Analysis

The analysis and interpretation of data have been carried out by comparing the Apparel retail stores in various branches in the following chapter

# TABLE.4.1. Personal Profile of the Respondents

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **S.No** | **Residential Area** | **Frequency** | **Percent** |
| 1 | Rural | 626 | 41.3 |
| 2 | Urban | 567 | 37.5 |
| 3 | Sub Urban | 321 | 21.2 |
|  | **Total** | **1,514** | **100.0** |
| **S.No** | **Age** | **Frequency** | **Percent** |
| 1. | Below 25 years | 710 | 46.9 |
| 2. | From 31 years to 35 years | 304 | 20.1 |
| 3. | From 25 years to 30 years | 242 | 16.0 |
| 4. | From 36 years to 40 years | 161 | 10.6 |
| 5. | above 40 years | 97 | 6.4 |
|  | **Total** | **1,514** | **100.0** |
| **S.No** | **Gender** | **Frequency** | **Percent** |
| 1 | Female | 823 | 54.4 |
| 2 | Male | 691 | 45.6 |
|  | **Total** | **1,514** | **100.0** |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **S.No** | **Educational Qualification** | **Frequency** | **Percent** |
| 1. | Post Graduate | 549 | 36.3 |
| 2. | Graduate | 450 | 29.7 |
| 3. | Professional | 193 | 12.7 |
| 4. | Others | 193 | 12.7 |
| 5. | Technical Education | 129 | 8.5 |
|  | **Total** | **1,514** | **100.0** |
| **S.No** | **Marital Status** | **Frequency** | **Percent** |
| 1. | Married | 936 | 61.8 |
| 2. | Unmarried | 578 | 38.2 |
|  | **Total** | **1,514** | **100.0** |
| **S.No** | **Family Type** | **Frequency** | **Percent** |
| 1. | Nuclear Family | 870 | 57.5 |
| 2. | Joint Family | 644 | 42.5 |
|  | **Total** | **1,514** | **100.0** |
| **S.No** | **Profession** | **Frequency** | **Percent** |
| 1. | Private. Employed | 595 | 39.3 |
| 2. | Un Employed | 563 | 37.2 |
| 3. | Self Employed | 146 | 9.6 |
| 4. | Govt. Employed | 145 | 9.6 |
| 5. | Retired | 65 | 4.3 |
|  | **Total** | **1,514** | **100.0** |
| **S.No** | **Monthly Income** | **Frequency** | **Percent** |
| 1. | From 10001 to 20000 | 532 | 35.1 |
| 2. | Below 10000 | 418 | 27.6 |
| 3. | From 20001 to 30000 | 258 | 17.0 |
| 4. | From 30001 to 40000 | 193 | 12.7 |
|  | above 40000 | 113 | 7.5 |
|  | **Total** | **1,514** | **100.0** |

**Residential Area**

The table about the residential area clearly shows that 41.3 percent of the respondents belong to Rural area, 37.5 percent of the respondents belong to urban area and 21.2 percent of the respondents belong to Sub urban area.

# Age

The table about the age of the respondents shows that the highest number of the

respondents have age group of below 25 years with 46 . 9 percent, the second highest number of the respondents are coming under the age group from 31 years to 35 years with 20.1 percent, then third highest number of the respondents is from 25 years to 30 years with 16.0 percent, then the fourth highest number of the respondents are between 36 years to 40 years with 10.6 percent and the fifth highest number of the respondents are above 40 years with 6.4 percent.

# Gender

The table about the gender of the respondents shows the maximum number of respondents are female with 54.4 percent and 45.6 percent of respondents are male.

# Educational Qualification

The table about the educational qualification of the respondents shows that the highest numbers of respondent have the educational qualification with 36.3 percent are Post Graduate, 28.6 percent have the educational qualification at graduate level, 12.7 percent of the respondents are Professional level and others, and 8.5 percent of the respondents are Technical Education level.

# Marital Status

The table about the marital status of the respondents shows the maximum number of respondents are Married with 61.8 percent and 38.2 percent of respondents are Unmarried.

# Family Type

The table about the family type of the respondents shows the maximum number of respondents with 57.5 percent belongs to Joint family and 42.5 percent of respondents belong to Nuclear family type.

# Profession

The table about the profession of the respondents clearly shows that 39.3 percent of the respondents belong to Private employed, 37.2 percent of the respondents belong to Un employed, 9.6 percent of the respondents belong to Self employed and Govt. Employed, then 4.3 percent of the respondents belong to Retired.

# Monthly Income

The table about the monthly income of the respondent’s shows that the maximum numbers of respondent’s have income of Rs.10001 to 20000 with 3 5 . 1 percent, 27.6 percent of the respondents have an income of below Rs. 10000, 17.0 percent of the respondents have an income of Rs. 20001 to 30000, 12.7 percent of the respondents have an income of Rs. 30001 to to 40000 and 7.5 percent of the respondents have an income of Rs.40000 and above.

# TABLE.4.2. Mean for Atmosphere

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Mean for Atmosphere** | **Mean** | **SD** |
| Fashion ability of store interior | 4.149 | 0.837 |
| Attractiveness of decor in store | 3.754 | 0.908 |
| Suitable finishing materials used in store (e.g wood/stainless steel) | 3.723 | 0.995 |
| Style of decor in store | 3.680 | 0.912 |
| Shopping experience (feeling when shopping in store  e.g. Special/welcome) | 3.657 | 0.929 |
| Colours used in store | 3.594 | 0.844 |
| **Mean Score** | **3.760** | **0.904** |

The respondents are strongly agreed in the following areas of Atmosphere variables with the highest mean score. Fashion ability of store interior with a mean value of 4.149.

The respondents are agreed in the following areas of Atmosphere variables with the mean score. Attractiveness of decor in store with a mean value of 3.754, Suitable finishing materials used in store (e.g wood/stainless steel) with a mean value of 3.723, Style of decor in store with a mean value of 3.680, Shopping experience (feeling when shopping in store e.g. Special/welcome) with a mean value of 3.657and Colours used in store with a mean value of 3.594.

# The overall respective mean score of 3.760 from the table indicates that the respondents from customer are agreed with Atmosphere variables which is a dimension of buying behavior

**TABLE.4.3. Mean for Convenience**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Mean for Convenience** | **Mean** | **Std.**  **Deviation** |
| Amount of walking required within store | 4.117 | 0.743 |
| Ease of finding merchandise items | 3.756 | 0.847 |
| Time it takes to travel to store | 3.639 | 0.933 |
| Store opening hours | 3.606 | 0.958 |
| Accessibility of store (e.g. Location within mall) | 3.604 | 0.867 |
| Proximity of store to variety of other stores (e.g. Grocery store) | 3.572 | 0.973 |
| Flow of people in mall where store is situated (i.e. Ease of movement | 3.551 | 0.941 |
| **Mean Score** | **3.692** | **0.894** |

The respondents are strongly agreed in the following areas of Convenience variables with the highest mean score. Amount of walking required within store with a mean value of 4.117.

The respondents are agreed in the following areas of Convenience variables with the mean score. Ease of finding merchandise items with a mean value of 3.756, Time it takes to travel to store with a mean value of 3.639, Store opening hours with a mean value of 3.606, Accessibility of store (e.g. Location within mall) with a mean value of 3.604, Proximity of store to variety of other stores (e.g. Grocery store) with mean value of 3.572 and Flow of people in mall where store is situated (i.e. Ease of movement) with a mean value of 3.551.

# The overall respective mean score of 3.692 from the table indicates that the respondents from customer are agreed with Convenience variables which is a dimension of buying behavior

**TABLE.4.4. Mean for Facilities**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Mean for Facilities** | **Mean** | **Std.**  **Deviation** |
| Accessibility of store entrance/exit | 3.860 | 0.917 |
| Lighting in fitting rooms | 3.787 | 0.932 |
| Position of aisles in store | 3.669 | 0.927 |
| Width of aisles in store | 3.637 | 0.849 |
| Number of fitting rooms | 3.618 | 0.970 |
| Ease of shopping with family in mall where store is situated | 3.552 | 1.029 |
| Accessibility of merchandise rails | 3.508 | 0.930 |
| **Mean Score** | **3.661** | **0.936** |

The respondents are agreed in the following areas of Facilities variables with the mean score. Accessibility of store entrance/exit with a mean value of 3.860, Lighting in fitting rooms with a mean value of 3.787, Position of aisles in store with a mean value of 3.669, Width of aisles in store with a mean value of 3.637, Number of fitting rooms with mean value of 3.618, Ease of shopping with family in mall where

store is situated with a mean value of 3.552 and Flow of people in mall where store is situated (i.e. Ease of movement) with a mean value of 3.508.

# The overall respective mean score of 3.661 from the table indicates that the respondents from customer are agreed with Facilities variables which is a dimension of buying behavior

**TABLE.4.5. Mean for Institutional**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Mean for Institutional** | **Mean** | **Std.**  **Deviation** |
| Social class appeal of store (e.g. High/low class) | 3.777 | 0.958 |
| Store's appeal to my friends | 3.576 | 0.983 |
| Similarity between store image and self-image | 3.573 | 0.995 |
| Similarity in appearance between sales personnel and customers | 3.543 | 0.918 |
| Store's efforts to build personal relationship with customers (e.g. Personalized letters) | 3.460 | 0.996 |
| Ability to identify with store | 3.437 | 0.870 |
| **Mean Score** | **3.561** | **0.953** |

The respondents are agreed in the following areas of Institutional variables with the mean score. Social class appeal of store (e.g. High/low class)with a mean value of 3.777, Store's appeal to my friends with a mean value of 3.576, Similarity between store image and self image with a mean value of 3.573, Similarity in appearance between sales personnel and customers with a mean value of 3.543, Store's efforts to build personal relationship with customers (e.g. Personalized letters) with mean value of

3.460 and Ability to identify with store with a mean value of 3.437.

# The overall respective mean score of 3.561 from the table indicates that the respondents from customer are agreed with Institutional variables which is a dimension of buying behavior

**TABLE.4.6. Mean for Merchandise**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Mean for Merchandise** | **Mean** | **Std.**  **Deviation** |
| Variety of merchandise categories (e.g. Formalwear/leisurewear/ lingerie/shoes/accessories) | 3.808 | 0.959 |
| Quality of merchandise in store | 3.542 | 1.007 |
| Availability of designer label merchandise (e.g. Calvin klein) | 3.476 | 0.986 |
| Availability fashion merchandise | 3.444 | 0.952 |
| Availability of exclusive merchandise (e.g. Limited number manufactured) | 3.414 | 1.095 |
| Availability of styles suited to my age | 3.412 | 0.970 |
| Availability of unique merchandise (e.g. Only offered by specific store) | 3.383 | 1.000 |
| Availability of imported merchandise | 3.380 | 0.989 |
| **Mean Score** | **3.482** | **0.995** |

The respondents are agreed in the following areas of Merchandise variables with the mean score. Variety of merchandise categories (e.g. Formalwear/leisurewear/ lingerie/shoes/accessories) with a mean value of 3.808, Quality of merchandise in store with a mean value of 3.542, Availability of designer label merchandise (e.g. Calvin klein) with a mean value of 3.476, Availability fashion merchandise with a mean value of 3.444, Availability of exclusive merchandise (e.g. Limited number manufactured) with mean value of 3.414, Availability of styles suited to my age with a mean value of 3.412, Availability of unique merchandise (e.g. Only offered by specific store) with a mean value of 3.383 and Availability of imported merchandise with a mean value of 3.380.

# The overall respective mean score of 3.482 from the table indicates that the respondents from customer are agreed with Merchandise variables which are a dimension of buying behavior.

**TABLE.4.7. Mean for Promotion**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Mean for Promotion** | **Mean** | **Std.**  **Deviation** |
| Sales with marked-down prices | 3.736 | 0.958 |
| Credibility of store advertising | 3.649 | 1.020 |
| Timely announcement of sales | 3.554 | 0.952 |
| Models used in store advertising | 3.487 | 1.031 |
| Inclusion of brochures in mailed store card account | 3.445 | 1.029 |
| Spaciousness of in-store displays | 3.423 | 1.037 |
| Availability of special offers (e.g. Buy one get one free) | 3.415 | 0.937 |
| **Mean Score** | **3.530** | **0.995** |

The respondents are agreed in the following areas of Promotion variables with the mean score. Sales with marked-down prices with a mean value of 3.736, Credibility of store advertising with a mean value of 3.649, Timely announcement of sales with a mean value of 3.554, Models used in store advertising with a mean value of 3.487, Inclusion of brochures in mailed store card account with mean value of 3.445, Spaciousness of in-store displays with a mean value of 3.423 and Availability of special offers (e.g. Buy one get one free) with a mean value of 3.415.

# The overall respective mean score of 3.530 from the table indicates that the respondents from customer are agreed with Promotion variables which is a dimension of buying behavior.

**TABLE.4.8. Mean for Sales Personnel**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Mean for Sales Personnel** | **Mean** | **Std.**  **Deviation** |
| Fashionability of sales personnel | 3.830 | 0.906 |
| Attractiveness of sales personnel | 3.616 | 0.936 |
| Similarity in body type between sales personnel and myself (e.g. Large-size/petite) | 3.651 | 0.907 |
| Similarity in age between sales personnel and myself | 3.489 | 0.847 |
| Similarity in gender between sales personnel and myself | 3.521 | 0.907 |
| **Mean Score** | **3.621** | **0.901** |

The respondents are agreed in the following areas of Sales Personnel variables with the mean score. Fashionability of sales personnel with a mean value of 3.830, Attractiveness of sales personnel with a mean value of 3.616, Similarity in body type between sales personnel and myself (e.g. Large-size/petite) with a mean value of 3.651, Similarity in age between sales personnel and myself with a mean value of 3.489 and Similarity in gender between sales personnel and myself with a mean value of 3.521.

# The overall respective mean score of 3.621 from the table indicates that the respondents from customer are agreed with Sales Personnel variables which are a dimension of buying behavior.

**TABLE.4.9 Mean for Service**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Mean for Service** | **Mean** | **Std.**  **Deviation** |
| Expertise of sales personnel | 3.757 | 0.997 |
| Number of sales personnel | 3.583 | 0.803 |
| Courteousness of sales personnel | 3.562 | 0.894 |
| Availability of gift vouchers | 3.384 | 0.957 |
| Availability of gift registry | 3.213 | 1.119 |
| Availability of alteration service | 3.192 | 1.238 |
| Availability of mail-order service | 3.151 | 1.167 |
| Availability of inter-store transfer facilities (e.g. Find items from other stores) | 3.054 | 1.177 |
| **Mean Score** | **3.362** | **1.044** |

The respondents are agreed in the following areas of Service variables with the mean score. Expertise of sales personnel with a mean value of 3.757, Number of sales personnel with a mean value of 3.583, Courteousness of sales personnel with a mean value of 3.562, Availability of gift vouchers with a mean value of 3.384, Availability of gift registry with mean value of 3.213, Availability of alteration service with a mean value of 3.192, Availability of mail-order service with a mean value of 3.151 and Availability of inter-store transfer facilities (e.g. Find items from other stores)with a mean value of 3.054.

# The overall respective mean score of 3.362 from the table indicates that the respondents from customer are agreed with Service a variable which is a dimension of buying behavior.

**TABLE.4.10 Mean for Store Image**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Mean for Store Image** | **Mean** | **Std.**  **Deviation** |
| Atmosphere (e.g. Store interior/store atmosphere) | 3.693 | 1.021 |
| Convenience (e.g. Transportation/location) | 3.659 | 0.994 |
| Facilities (e.g. Fixtures/fitting rooms) | 3.628 | 0.862 |
| Sales personnel (e.g. Appearance/promotion) | 3.563 | 0.894 |
| Merchandise (e.g. Assortment/style) | 3.542 | 0.975 |
| Institutional (e.g. Clientele/store reputation) | 3.531 | 0.953 |
| Promotion (e.g. Advertising/displays) | 3.520 | 0.908 |
| Service (e.g. Payment options/delivery options) | 3.501 | 0.920 |
| **Mean Score** | **3.580** | **0.941** |

The respondents are agreed in the following areas of Store Image variables with the mean score. Atmosphere (e.g. Store interior/store atmosphere) with a mean value of 3.693, Convenience (e.g. Transportation/location) with a mean value of 3.659, Facilities (e.g. Fixtures/fitting rooms) with a mean value of 3.628, Sales personnel (e.g. Appearance/promotion) with a mean value of 3.563, Merchandise (e.g. Assortment/style) with mean value of 3.542, Institutional (e.g. Clientele/store reputation) with a mean value of 3.531, Promotion (e.g. Advertising/displays) with a mean value (3.520) and Service (e.g. Payment options/delivery options) with a mean value of 3.501.

# The overall respective mean score of 3.580 from the table indicates that the respondents from customer are agreed with Store Image a variable which is a dimension of buying behavior.

**TABLE.4.11. Mean for Customer Satisfaction**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Mean for Customer Satisfaction** | **Mean** | **Std.**  **Deviation** |
| Satisfied with the private label brands whose prices are competitive | 3.875 | 0.924 |
| Satisfied with the private label brand that always meets all the shopping requirements | 3.701 | 0.909 |
| Extremely happy with the quality of the private label brands in the stores | 3.670 | 0.803 |
| Satisfied with the Private label brands, which has variety of assortment for me to choose | 3.607 | 0.971 |
| Pleased with the customer service offered by the store and is of high standard | 3.550 | 0.858 |
| Satisfied with shopping experience, which allows me to form a positive opinion of the supermarket and its private labels | 3.446 | 0.908 |
| **Mean Score** | **3.642** | **0.895** |

The respondents are agreed in the following areas of Customer Satisfaction variables with the mean score. Satisfied with the private label brands in the stores whose prices are competitive with a mean value of 3.875, Satisfied with the private label brand that always meets all the shopping requirements with a mean value of 3.701, Extremely happy with the quality of the private label brands in the stores with a mean value of 3.670, Satisfied with the Private label brands, which has variety of assortment for me to choose with a mean value of 3.607, Pleased with the customer service offered by the store and is of high standard with mean value of 3.550 and Satisfied with shopping experience, which allows me to form a positive opinion of the supermarket and its private labels with a mean value of 3.446.

# The overall respective mean score of 3.642 from the table indicates that the respondents from customer are agreed with Customer Satisfaction a variable which is a dimension of buying behavior.

**TABLE.4.12. Mean for Customer Loyalty**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Mean for Customer Loyalty** | **Mean** | **Std.**  **Deviation** |
| Satisfied with the shopping experience; I intend to continue shopping at this supermarket for a long time | 3.960 | 0.932 |
| Even if another store private label price is lower, I will go on buying at private label brand in this store | 3.637 | 0.910 |
| Continue to buy private label brands in other product categories also | 3.575 | 0.963 |
| Buy these private label brands the next time I shop in the store | 3.565 | 0.893 |
| Recommend to friends and relatives to purchase private label brands from the store that I purchase | 3.522 | 0.942 |
| Willing to say positive things about private label brands to other people | 3.520 | 0.988 |
| **Mean Score** | **3.630** | **0.938** |

The respondents are agreed in the following areas of Customer Loyalty variables with the mean score. Satisfied with the shopping experience; I intend to continue shopping at this supermarket for a long time with a mean value of 3.960, Even if another store private label price is lower, I will go on buying at private label brand in this store with a mean value of 3.637, Continue to buy private label brands in other product categories also with a mean value of 3.575, Buy these private label brands the next time I shop in the store with a mean value of 3.565, Recommend to friends and relatives to purchase private label brands from the store that I purchase with mean value of 3.522 and Willing to say positive things about private label brands to other people with a mean value of 3.520.

# The overall respective mean score of 3.630 from the table indicates that the respondents from customer are agreed with Customer Loyalty variables which are a dimension of buying behavior.

**TABLE.4.13. Consolidated Mean Score for Buying Behavior variables**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **S.No** | **Variables** | **Mean** | **SD** |
| 1 | Atmosphere | 3.819 | 0.785 |
| 2 | Institutional | 3.672 | 0.804 |
| 3 | Sales Personnel | 3.661 | 0.780 |
| 4 | Store image | 3.650 | 0.795 |
| 5 | Convenience | 3.649 | 0.695 |
| 6 | Facilities | 3.627 | 0.786 |
| 7 | Merchandise | 3.550 | 0.820 |
| 8 | Promotion | 3.521 | 0.769 |
| 9 | Service | 3.458 | 0.807 |

The respondents from Buying behavior variables are agreed in all the nine

factors.

# CHI-SQUARE TEST

**TABLE.4.14. Association between Residential area and Buying Behavior Dimension**

**Hypothesis**

There is no Significant association between the Residential area and overall Buying behavior dimension

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **S.No** | **Dimensions** | **Chi-Square Value** | **df** | **Sig.** |
| 1. | Atmosphere | 123.069 | 6 | 0.000\* |
| 2. | Convenience | 121.974 | 6 | 0.000\* |
| 3. | Facilities | 104.412 | 6 | 0.000\* |
| 4. | Institutional | 165.167 | 6 | 0.000\* |
| 5. | Merchandise | 142.730 | 6 | 0.000\* |
| 6. | Promotion | 205.677 | 8 | 0.000\* |
| 7. | Sales Personnel | 172.735 | 6 | 0.000\* |
| 8. | Service | 229.292 | 6 | 0.000\* |
| 9. | Store image | 216.342 | 6 | 0.000\* |
| ***\*significant at 0.05 % level*** | | | | |

Among the 9 dependent factors relating to Buying behavior dimension, all the factors show a significant association with the Residential area of the respondents, since their significance value is less than **‘P’ value (0.05%).** Hence the null hypothesis is rejected, which means that there is an association between mentioned dimensions and Residential area of the respondents.

# TABLE.4.15. Association between Gender and Buying Behavior Dimension Hypothesis

There is no Significant association between the Gender and overall Buying behavior dimension

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **S.No** | **Dimensions** | **Chi-Square Value** | **df** | **Sig.** |
| 1. | Atmosphere | 57.621 | 3 | 0.000\* |
| 2. | Convenience | 53.694 | 3 | 0.000\* |
| 3. | Facilities | 11.713 | 3 | 0.008\* |
| 4. | Institutional | 40.599 | 3 | 0.000\* |
| 5. | Merchandise | 20.128 | 3 | 0.000\* |
| 6. | Promotion | 100.908 | 4 | 0.000\* |
| 7. | Sales Personnel | 77.360 | 3 | 0.000\* |
| 8. | Service | 130.135 | 3 | 0.000\* |
| 9. | Store image | 77.832 | 3 | 0.000\* |
| ***\*significant at 0.05 % level*** | | | | |

Among the 9 dependent factors relating to Buying behavior dimension, all the factors show a significant association with the gender of the respondents, since their significance value is less than **‘P’ value (0.05%).** Hence the null hypothesis is rejected, which means that there is an association between mentioned dimensions and gender of the respondents.

# TABLE.4.16. Association between Age and Buying Behavior Dimension Hypothesis

There is no Significant association between the Age and overall Buying behavior dimension

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **S.No** | **Dimensions** | **Chi-Square Value** | **df** | **Sig.** |
| 1. | Atmosphere | 280.891 | 12 | 0.000\* |
| 2. | Convenience | 131.352 | 12 | 0.000\* |
| 3. | Facilities | 310.770 | 12 | 0.000\* |
| 4. | Institutional | 210.502 | 12 | 0.000\* |
| 5. | Merchandise | 274.036 | 12 | 0.000\* |
| 6. | Promotion | 266.983 | 16 | 0.000\* |
| 7. | Sales Personnel | 320.043 | 12 | 0.000\* |
| 8. | Service | 370.902 | 12 | 0.000\* |
| 9. | Store image | 286.134 | 12 | 0.000\* |
| ***\*significant at 0.05 % level*** | | | | |

Among the 9 dependent factors relating to Buying behavior dimension, all the factors show a significant association with the age of the respondents, since their significance value is less than **‘P’ value (0.05%).** Hence the null hypothesis is rejected, which means that there is an association between mentioned dimensions and age of the respondents.

# TABLE.4.17. Association between Marital status and Buying Behavior Dimension

**Hypothesis**

There is no Significant association between the Marital status and overall Buying behavior dimension

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **S.No** | **Dimensions** | **Chi-Square**  **Value** | **df** | **Sig.** |
| 1. | Atmosphere | 24.770 | 6 | 0.000\* |
| 2. | Convenience | 52.282 | 6 | 0.000\* |
| 3. | Facilities | 52.965 | 6 | 0.000\* |
| 4. | Institutional | 22.814 | 6 | 0.000\* |
| 5. | Merchandise | 119.920 | 6 | 0.000\* |
| 6. | Promotion | 140.356 | 8 | 0.000\* |
| 7. | Sales Personnel | 106.234 | 6 | 0.000\* |
| 8. | Service | 85.750 | 6 | 0.000\* |
| 9. | Store image | 70.438 | 6 | 0.000\* |
| ***\*significant at 0.05 % level*** | | | | |

Among the 9 dependent factors relating to Buying behavior dimension, all the factors show a significant association with the marital status of the respondents, since their significance value is less than **‘P’ value (0.05%).** Hence the null hypothesis is rejected, which means that there is an association between mentioned dimensions and marital status of the respondents.

# TABLE.4.18. Association between Qualification and Buying Behavior Dimension Hypothesis

There is no Significant association between the Qualification and overall Buying behavior dimension

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **S.No** | **Dimensions** | **Chi-Square Value** | **df** | **Sig.** |
| 1. | Atmosphere | 344.318 | 12 | 0.000\* |
| 2. | Convenience | 331.565 | 12 | 0.000\* |
| 3. | Facilities | 217.225 | 12 | 0.000\* |
| 4. | Institutional | 233.235 | 12 | 0.000\* |
| 5. | Merchandise | 166.331 | 12 | 0.000\* |
| 6. | Promotion | 269.649 | 16 | 0.000\* |
| 7. | Sales Personnel | 286.705 | 12 | 0.000\* |
| 8. | Service | 340.826 | 12 | 0.000\* |
| 9. | Store image | 192.991 | 12 | 0.000\* |
| ***\*significant at 0.05 % level*** | | | | |

Among the 9 dependent factors relating to Buying behavior dimension, all the factors show a significant association with the Qualification of the respondents, since their significance value is less than **‘P’ value (0.05%).** Hence the null hypothesis is rejected, which means that there is an association between mentioned dimensions and Qualification of the respondents.

# TABLE.4.19. Association between Profession and Buying Behavior Dimension Hypothesis

There is no Significant association between the Profession and overall Buying behavior dimension

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **S.No** | **Dimensions** | **Chi-Square Value** | **df** | **Sig.** |
| 1. | Atmosphere | 179.199 | 12 | 0.000\* |
| 2. | Convenience | 205.933 | 12 | 0.000\* |
| 3. | Facilities | 303.575 | 12 | 0.000\* |
| 4. | Institutional | 221.752 | 12 | 0.000\* |
| 5. | Merchandise | 294.486 | 12 | 0.000\* |
| 6. | Promotion | 221.860 | 16 | 0.000\* |
| 7. | Sales Personnel | 316.816 | 12 | 0.000\* |
| 8. | Service | 406.660 | 12 | 0.000\* |
| 9. | Store image | 287.436 | 12 | 0.000\* |
| ***\*significant at 0.05 % level*** | | | | |

Among the 9 dependent factors relating to Buying behavior dimension, all the factors show a significant association with the Profession of the respondents, since their significance value is less than **‘P’ value (0.05%).** Hence the null hypothesis is rejected, which means that there is an association between mentioned dimensions and Profession of the respondents.

# TABLE.4.20. Association between Income and Buying Behavior Dimension Hypothesis

There is no Significant association between the Income and overall Buying behavior dimension

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **S.No** | **Dimensions** | **Chi-Square Value** | **df** | **Sig.** |
| 1. | Atmosphere | 109.429 | 12 | 0.000\* |
| 2. | Convenience | 132.875 | 12 | 0.000\* |
| 3. | Facilities | 183.336 | 12 | 0.000\* |
| 4. | Institutional | 244.653 | 12 | 0.000\* |
| 5. | Merchandise | 207.698 | 12 | 0.000\* |
| 6. | Promotion | 257.031 | 16 | 0.000\* |
| 7. | Sales Personnel | 160.916 | 12 | 0.000\* |
| 8. | Service | 149.203 | 12 | 0.000\* |
| 9. | Store image | 189.256 | 12 | 0.000\* |
| ***\*significant at 0.05 % level*** | | | | |

Among the 9 dependent factors relating to Buying behavior dimension, all the factors show a significant association with the income of the respondents, since their significance value is less than **‘P’ value (0.05%).** Hence the null hypothesis is rejected, which means that there is an association between mentioned dimensions and income of the respondents.

# TABLE.4.21. Association between Family status and Buying Behavior Dimension Hypothesis

There is no Significant association between the Family status and overall Buying behavior dimension

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **S.No** | **Dimensions** | **Chi-Square Value** | **df** | **Sig.** |
| 1. | Atmosphere | 74.100 | 9 | 0.000\* |
| 2. | Convenience | 69.348 | 9 | 0.000\* |
| 3. | Facilities | 103.989 | 9 | 0.000\* |
| 4. | Institutional | 121.960 | 9 | 0.000\* |
| 5. | Merchandise | 88.848 | 9 | 0.000\* |
| 6. | Promotion | 109.040 | 12 | 0.000\* |
| 7. | Sales Personnel | 128.846 | 9 | 0.000\* |
| 8. | Service | 105.500 | 9 | 0.000\* |
| 9. | Store image | 126.500 | 9 | 0.000\* |
| ***\*significant at 0.05 % level*** | | | | |

Among the 9 dependent factors relating to Buying behavior dimension, all the factors show a significant association with the family status of the respondents, since their significance value is less than **‘P’ value (0.05%).** Hence the null hypothesis is rejected, which means that there is an association between mentioned dimensions and family status of the respondents.

# ANOVA

**TABLE.4.22. ANOVA for Residential area and Buying Behavior Dimension Hypothesis**

There is no significant relationship between Residential Area and buying behavior dimension.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | | **Sum of Squares** | **Df** | **Mean Square** | **F** | **Sig.** |
| Atmosphere | Between Groups | 65.820 | 2 | 32.910 | 57.382 | 0.000\* |
| Within Groups | 866.592 | 1,511 | 0.574 |
| **Total** | **932.412** | **1,513** |  |
| Convenience | Between Groups | 30.802 | 2 | 15.401 | 33.246 | 0.000\* |
| Within Groups | 699.962 | 1,511 | 0.463 |
| **Total** | **730.764** | **1,513** |  |
| Facilities | Between Groups | 47.828 | 2 | 23.914 | 40.780 | 0.000\* |
| Within Groups | 886.069 | 1,511 | 0.586 |
| **Total** | **933.897** | **1,513** |  |
| Institutional | Between Groups | 68.646 | 2 | 34.323 | 57.041 | 0.000\* |
| Within Groups | 909.204 | 1,511 | 0.602 |
| **Total** | **977.850** | **1,513** |  |
| Merchandise | Between Groups | 43.641 | 2 | 21.821 | 33.885 | 0.000\* |
| Within Groups | 973.043 | 1,511 | 0.644 |
| **Total** | **1,016.685** | **1,513** |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Promotion | Between Groups | 56.001 | 2 | 28.001 | 50.499 | 0.000\* |
| Within Groups | 837.823 | 1,511 | 0.554 |
| **Total** | **893.824** | **1,513** |  |
| Sales Personnel | Between Groups | 69.358 | 2 | 34.679 | 61.637 | 0.000\* |
| Within Groups | 850.140 | 1,511 | 0.563 |
| **Total** | **919.498** | **1,513** |  |
| Service | Between Groups | 105.547 | 2 | 52.774 | 90.589 | 0.000\* |
| Within Groups | 880.247 | 1,511 | 0.583 |
| **Total** | **985.795** | **1,513** |  |
| Store image | Between Groups | 54.950 | 2 | 27.475 | 46.050 | 0.000\* |
| Within Groups | 901.515 | 1,511 | 0.597 |
| **Total** | **956.465** | **1,513** |  |

To analysis the factors relating to the Buying behavior dimension, out of 9 factors all the factors show a significant relationship with the Residential area of the respondents, since the significance value is less than the ‘P’ value (0.05%). Hence the null hypothesis is rejected, which means that there is an relationship between mentioned dimensions and Residential area of the respondents.

# TABLE.4.23. ANOVA for Gender and Buying Behavior Dimension Hypothesis

There is no significant relationship between Gender and Buying Behavior dimension.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | | **Sum of Squares** | **Df** | **Mean Square** | **F** | **Sig.** |
| Atmosphere | Between Groups | 0.454 | 1 | 0.454 | 0.736 | 0.391 |
| Within Groups | 931.958 | 1,512 | 0.616 |
| **Total** | **932.412** | **1,513** |  |
| Convenience | Between Groups | 0.005 | 1 | 0.005 | 0.010 | 0.920 |
| Within Groups | 730.759 | 1,512 | 0.483 |
| **Total** | **730.764** | **1,513** |  |
| Facilities | Between Groups | 2.797 | 1 | 2.797 | 4.542 | 0.033\* |
| Within Groups | 931.100 | 1,512 | 0.616 |
| **Total** | **933.897** | **1,513** |  |
| Institutional | Between Groups | 1.047 | 1 | 1.047 | 1.621 | 0.203 |
| Within Groups | 976.803 | 1,512 | 0.646 |
| **Total** | **977.850** | **1,513** |  |
| Merchandise | Between Groups | 3.608 | 1 | 3.608 | 5.385 | 0.020\* |
| Within Groups | 1,013.077 | 1,512 | 0.670 |
| **Total** | **1,016.685** | **1,513** |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Promotion | Between Groups | 13.841 | 1 | 13.841 | 23.782 | 0.000\* |
| Within Groups | 879.982 | 1,512 | 0.582 |
| **Total** | **893.824** | **1,513** |  |
| Sales Personnel | Between Groups | 0.299 | 1 | 0.299 | 0.491 | 0.483 |
| Within Groups | 919.199 | 1,512 | 0.608 |
| **Total** | **919.498** | **1,513** |  |
| Service | Between Groups | 7.397 | 1 | 7.397 | 11.431 | 0.001\* |
| Within Groups | 978.398 | 1,512 | 0.647 |
| **Total** | **985.795** | **1,513** |  |
| Store image | Between Groups | 0.002 | 1 | 0.002 | 0.003 | 0.954 |
| Within Groups | 956.463 | 1,512 | 0.633 |
| **Total** | **956.465** | **1,513** |  |

To analysis the factors relating to the Buying behavior dimension, out of 9 factors Facilities, Merchandise, Promotion, Sales Personnel and Service show a significant relationship with the Gender of the respondents, since the significance value is less than the ‘P’ value (0.05%). Hence the null hypothesis is rejected, which means that there is an relationship between mentioned dimensions and Gender of the respondents.

The Atmosphere, Convenience, Institutional, Sales Personnel and Store image shows no significant relationship with the gender of the respondents. Hence null hypothesis is accepted, which means that there is a relationship between mentioned dimensions and Gender of the respondents.

# TABLE.4.24. ANOVA for Age and Buying Behavior Dimension Hypothesis

There is no significant relationship between age and Buying behavior dimension.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | | **Sum of Squares** | **Df** | **Mean Square** | **F** | **Sig.** |
| Atmosphere | Between Groups | 84.353 | 4 | 21.088 | 37.523 | 0.000\* |
| Within Groups | 848.060 | 1,509 | 0.562 |
| **Total** | **932.412** | **1,513** |  |
| Convenience | Between Groups | 23.125 | 4 | 5.781 | 12.328 | 0.000\* |
| Within Groups | 707.639 | 1,509 | 0.469 |
| **Total** | **730.764** | **1,513** |  |
| Facilities | Between Groups | 123.787 | 4 | 30.947 | 57.645 | 0.000\* |
| Within Groups | 810.110 | 1,509 | 0.537 |
| **Total** | **933.897** | **1,513** |  |
| Institutional | Between Groups | 88.636 | 4 | 22.159 | 37.604 | 0.000\* |
| Within Groups | 889.214 | 1,509 | 0.589 |
| **Total** | **977.850** | **1,513** |  |
| Merchandise | Between Groups | 95.439 | 4 | 23.860 | 39.082 | 0.000\* |
| Within Groups | 921.246 | 1,509 | 0.611 |
| **Total** | **1,016.685** | **1,513** |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Promotion | Between Groups | 20.640 | 4 | 5.160 | 8.917 | 0.000\* |
| Within Groups | 873.184 | 1,509 | 0.579 |
| **Total** | **893.824** | **1,513** |  |
| Sales Personnel | Between Groups | 120.809 | 4 | 30.202 | 57.063 | 0.000\* |
| Within Groups | 798.689 | 1,509 | 0.529 |
| **Total** | **919.498** | **1,513** |  |
| Service | Between Groups | 138.494 | 4 | 34.623 | 61.663 | 0.000\* |
| Within Groups | 847.301 | 1,509 | 0.561 |
| **Total** | **985.795** | **1,513** |  |
| Store image | Between Groups | 111.230 | 4 | 27.807 | 49.645 | 0.000\* |
| Within Groups | 845.235 | 1,509 | 0.560 |
| **Total** | **956.465** | **1,513** |  |

To analysis the factors relating to the Buying behavior dimension, out of 9 factors all the factors show a significant relationship with the Age of the respondents, since the significance value is less than the ‘P’ value (0.05%). Hence the null hypothesis is rejected, which means that there is a relationship between mentioned dimensions and Age of the respondents.

# TABLE.4.25. ANOVA for Marital status and Buying Behavior Dimension Hypothesis

There is no significant relationship between Marital status and Buying behavior dimension.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | | **Sum of Squares** | **Df** | **Mean Square** | **F** | **Sig.** |
| Atmosphere | Between Groups | 2.485 | 2 | 1.243 | 2.019 | 0.133 |
| Within Groups | 929.927 | 1,511 | 0.615 |
| **Total** | **932.412** | **1,513** |  |
| Convenience | Between Groups | 2.099 | 2 | 1.050 | 2.176 | 0.114 |
| Within Groups | 728.665 | 1,511 | 0.482 |
| **Total** | **730.764** | **1,513** |  |
| Facilities | Between Groups | 12.982 | 2 | 6.491 | 10.650 | 0.000\* |
| Within Groups | 920.915 | 1,511 | 0.609 |
| **Total** | **933.897** | **1,513** |  |
| Institutional | Between Groups | 1.864 | 2 | 0.932 | 1.443 | 0.236 |
| Within Groups | 975.986 | 1,511 | 0.646 |
| **Total** | **977.850** | **1,513** |  |
| Merchandise | Between Groups | 36.304 | 2 | 18.152 | 27.977 | 0.000\* |
| Within Groups | 980.380 | 1,511 | 0.649 |
| **Total** | **1,016.685** | **1,513** |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Promotion | Between Groups | 4.349 | 2 | 2.174 | 3.694 | 0.025\* |
| Within Groups | 889.475 | 1,511 | 0.589 |
| **Total** | **893.824** | **1,513** |  |
| Sales Personnel | Between Groups | 20.624 | 2 | 10.312 | 17.334 | 0.000\* |
| Within Groups | 898.874 | 1,511 | 0.595 |
| **Total** | **919.498** | **1,513** |  |
| Service | Between Groups | 10.778 | 2 | 5.389 | 8.351 | 0.000\* |
| Within Groups | 975.017 | 1,511 | 0.645 |
| **Total** | **985.795** | **1,513** |  |
| Store image | Between Groups | 7.044 | 2 | 3.522 | 5.605 | 0.004\* |
| Within Groups | 949.421 | 1,511 | 0.628 |
| **Total** | **956.465** | **1,513** |  |

To analysis the factors relating to the Buying behavior dimension, out of 9 factors Facilities, Merchandise, Promotion, Sales Personnel, Service and Store image show a significant relationship with the marital status of the respondents, since the significance value is less than the ‘P’ value (0.05%). Hence the null hypothesis is rejected, which means that there is an relationship between mentioned dimensions and Marital status of the respondents.

The Atmosphere, Convenience and Institutional show no significant relationship with the marital status of the respondents. Hence null hypothesis is accepted, which means that there is an relationship between mentioned dimensions and Marital status of the respondents.

# TABLE.4.26. ANOVA for Qualification and Buying Behavior Dimension Hypothesis

There is no significant relationship between Qualification and Buying behavior dimension.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | | **Sum of Squares** | **df** | **Mean Square** | **F** | **Sig.** |
| Atmosphere | Between Groups | 101.524 | 4 | 25.381 | 46.095 | 0.000\* |
| Within Groups | 830.888 | 1,509 | 0.551 |
| **Total** | **932.412** | **1,513** |  |
| Convenience | Between Groups | 85.965 | 4 | 21.491 | 50.295 | 0.000\* |
| Within Groups | 644.799 | 1,509 | 0.427 |
| **Total** | **730.764** | **1,513** |  |
| Facilities | Between Groups | 77.365 | 4 | 19.341 | 34.074 | 0.000\* |
| Within Groups | 856.532 | 1,509 | 0.568 |
| **Total** | **933.897** | **1,513** |  |
| Institutional | Between Groups | 98.891 | 4 | 24.723 | 42.444 | 0.000\* |
| Within Groups | 878.959 | 1,509 | 0.582 |
| **Total** | **977.850** | **1,513** |  |
| Merchandise | Between Groups | 67.811 | 4 | 16.953 | 26.960 | 0.000\* |
| Within Groups | 948.874 | 1,509 | 0.629 |
| **Total** | **1,016.685** | **1,513** |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Promotion | Between Groups | 58.523 | 4 | 14.631 | 26.431 | 0.000\* |
| Within Groups | 835.301 | 1,509 | 0.554 |
| **Total** | **893.824** | **1,513** |  |
| Sales Personnel | Between Groups | 45.665 | 4 | 11.416 | 19.714 | 0.000\* |
| Within Groups | 873.833 | 1,509 | 0.579 |
| **Total** | **919.498** | **1,513** |  |
| Service | Between Groups | 59.442 | 4 | 14.861 | 24.207 | 0.000\* |
| Within Groups | 926.352 | 1,509 | 0.614 |
| **Total** | **985.795** | **1,513** |  |
| Store image | Between Groups | 67.993 | 4 | 16.998 | 28.870 | 0.000\* |
| Within Groups | 888.472 | 1,509 | 0.589 |
| **Total** | **956.465** | **1,513** |  |

To analysis the factors relating to the Buying behavior dimension, out of 9 factors all the factors show a significant relationship with the Qualification of the respondents, since the significance value is less than the ‘P’ value (0.05%). Hence the null hypothesis is rejected, which means that there is an relationship between mentioned dimensions and Qualification of the respondents.

# TABLE.4.27. ANOVA for Profession and Buying Behavior Dimension Hypothesis

There is no significant relationship between Profession and Buying behavior dimension.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | | **Sum of Squares** | **df** | **Mean Square** | **F** | **Sig.** |
| Atmosphere | Between Groups | 63.464 | 4 | 15.866 | 27.553 | 0.000\* |
| Within Groups | 868.948 | 1,509 | 0.576 |
| **Total** | **932.412** | **1,513** |  |
| Convenience | Between Groups | 37.925 | 4 | 9.481 | 20.650 | 0.000\* |
| Within Groups | 692.839 | 1,509 | 0.459 |
| **Total** | **730.764** | **1,513** |  |
| Facilities | Between Groups | 68.539 | 4 | 17.135 | 29.879 | 0.000\* |
| Within Groups | 865.358 | 1,509 | 0.573 |
| **Total** | **933.897** | **1,513** |  |
| Institutional | Between Groups | 46.425 | 4 | 11.606 | 18.803 | 0.000\* |
| Within Groups | 931.425 | 1,509 | 0.617 |
| **Total** | **977.850** | **1,513** |  |
| Merchandise | Between Groups | 98.649 | 4 | 24.662 | 40.538 | 0.000\* |
| Within Groups | 918.036 | 1,509 | 0.608 |
| **Total** | **1,016.685** | **1,513** |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Promotion | Between Groups | 28.407 | 4 | 7.102 | 12.383 | 0.000\* |
| Within Groups | 865.416 | 1,509 | 0.574 |
| **Total** | **893.824** | **1,513** |  |
| Sales Personnel | Between Groups | 54.621 | 4 | 13.655 | 23.825 | 0.000\* |
| Within Groups | 864.877 | 1,509 | 0.573 |
| **Total** | **919.498** | **1,513** |  |
| Service | Between Groups | 84.028 | 4 | 21.007 | 35.153 | 0.000\* |
| Within Groups | 901.767 | 1,509 | 0.598 |
| **Total** | **985.795** | **1,513** |  |
| Store image | Between Groups | 46.299 | 4 | 11.575 | 19.190 | 0.000\* |
| Within Groups | 910.166 | 1,509 | 0.603 |
| **Total** | **956.465** | **1,513** |  |

To analysis the factors relating to the Buying behavior dimension, out of 9 factors all the factors show a significant relationship with the Profession of the respondents, since the significance value is less than the ‘P’ value (0.05%). Hence the null hypothesis is rejected, which means that there is an relationship between mentioned dimensions and Profession of the respondents.

# TABLE.4.28. ANOVA for Income and Buying Behavior Dimension

**Hypothesis :** There is no significant relationship between Income and Buying behavior dimension.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | | **Sum of Squares** | **df** | **Mean Square** | **F** | **Sig.** |
| Atmosphere | Between Groups | 39.720 | 4 | 9.930 | 17.055 | 0.000\* |
| Within Groups | 868.713 | 1,492 | 0.582 |
| **Total** | **908.433** | **1,496** |  |
| Convenience | Between Groups | 44.465 | 4 | 11.116 | 25.324 | 0.000\* |
| Within Groups | 654.931 | 1,492 | 0.439 |
| **Total** | **699.396** | **1,496** |  |
| Facilities | Between Groups | 68.651 | 4 | 17.163 | 30.746 | 0.000\* |
| Within Groups | 832.857 | 1,492 | 0.558 |
| **Total** | **901.508** | **1,496** |  |
| Institutional | Between Groups | 100.690 | 4 | 25.172 | 44.351 | 0.000\* |
| Within Groups | 846.826 | 1,492 | 0.568 |
| **Total** | **947.516** | **1,496** |  |
| Merchandise | Between Groups | 84.981 | 4 | 21.245 | 34.149 | 0.000\* |
| Within Groups | 928.225 | 1,492 | 0.622 |
| **Total** | **1,013.206** | **1,496** |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Promotion | Between Groups | 33.452 | 4 | 8.363 | 15.166 | 0.000\* |
| Within Groups | 822.769 | 1,492 | 0.551 |
| **Total** | **856.222** | **1,496** |  |
| Sales Personnel | Between Groups | 46.830 | 4 | 11.707 | 20.750 | 0.000\* |
| Within Groups | 841.819 | 1,492 | 0.564 |
| **Total** | **888.649** | **1,496** |  |
| Service | Between Groups | 14.096 | 4 | 3.524 | 5.649 | 0.000\* |
| Within Groups | 930.803 | 1,492 | 0.624 |
| **Total** | **944.899** | **1,496** |  |
| Store image | Between Groups | 63.501 | 4 | 15.875 | 27.490 | 0.000\* |
| Within Groups | 861.627 | 1,492 | 0.577 |
| **Total** | **925.128** | **1,496** |  |

To analysis the factors relating to the Buying behavior dimension, out of 9 factors all the factors show a significant relationship with the Income of the respondents, since the significance value is less than the ‘P’ value (0.05%). Hence the null hypothesis is rejected, which means that there is an relationship between mentioned dimensions and Income of the respondents.

# TABLE.4.29. ANOVA for Family status and Buying Behavior Dimension

**Hypothesis:** There is no significant relationship between Family status and Buying behavior dimension.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | | **Sum of Squares** | **df** | **Mean Square** | **F** | **Sig.** |
| Atmosphere | Between Groups | 25.640 | 3 | 8.547 | 14.232 | 0.000\* |
| Within Groups | 906.773 | 1,510 | 0.601 |
| **Total** | **932.412** | **1,513** |  |
| Convenience | Between Groups | 12.165 | 3 | 4.055 | 8.521 | 0.000\* |
| Within Groups | 718.600 | 1,510 | 0.476 |
| **Total** | **730.764** | **1,513** |  |
| Facilities | Between Groups | 18.553 | 3 | 6.184 | 10.202 | 0.000\* |
| Within Groups | 915.343 | 1,510 | 0.606 |
| **Total** | **933.897** | **1,513** |  |
| Institutional | Between Groups | 25.945 | 3 | 8.648 | 13.719 | 0.000\* |
| Within Groups | 951.905 | 1,510 | 0.630 |
| **Total** | **977.850** | **1,513** |  |
| Merchandise | Between Groups | 34.156 | 3 | 11.385 | 17.497 | 0.000\* |
| Within Groups | 982.529 | 1,510 | 0.651 |
| **Total** | **1,016.685** | **1,513** |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Promotion | Between Groups | 33.447 | 3 | 11.149 | 19.567 | 0.000\* |
| Within Groups | 860.376 | 1,510 | 0.570 |
| **Total** | **893.824** | **1,513** |  |
| Sales Personnel | Between Groups | 38.644 | 3 | 12.881 | 22.082 | 0.000\* |
| Within Groups | 880.854 | 1,510 | 0.583 |
| **Total** | **919.498** | **1,513** |  |
| Service | Between Groups | 15.536 | 3 | 5.179 | 8.060 | 0.000\* |
| Within Groups | 970.258 | 1,510 | 0.643 |
| **Total** | **985.795** | **1,513** |  |
| Store image | Between Groups | 15.264 | 3 | 5.088 | 8.163 | 0.000\* |
| Within Groups | 941.201 | 1,510 | 0.623 |
| **Total** | **956.465** | **1,513** |  |

To analysis the factors relating to the Buying behavior dimension, out of 9 factors all the factors show a significant relationship with the Family status of the respondents, since the significance value is less than the ‘P’ value (0.05%). Hence the null hypothesis is rejected, which means that there is an relationship between mentioned dimensions and Family status of the respondents.

# TABLE.4.30. Correlation between Dimensions Related to the Buying Behavior

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | | **Atmosphere** | **Convenience** | **Facilities** | **Institutional** | **Merchandise** | **Promotion** | **Sales Personnel** | **Service** | **Store image** |
| Atmosphere | PC  Value | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Sig. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| N | 1514 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Convenience | Pc Value | .781(\*\*) | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Sig. | .000 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| N | 1514 | 1514 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Facilities | PC  Value | .737(\*\*) | .756(\*\*) | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Sig. | .000 | .000 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| N | 1514 | 1514 | 1514 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Institutional | PC  Value | .681(\*\*) | .707(\*\*) | .732(\*\*) | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Sig. | .000 | .000 | .000 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| N | 1514 | 1514 | 1514 | 1514 |  |  |  |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Merchandise | PC  Value | .618(\*\*) | .583(\*\*) | .732(\*\*) | .581(\*\*) | 1 |  |  |  |  |
| Sig. | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 |  |  |  |  |  |
| N | 1514 | 1514 | 1514 | 1514 | 1514 |  |  |  |  |
| Promotion | PC  Value | .650(\*\*) | .602(\*\*) | .622(\*\*) | .518(\*\*) | .656(\*\*) | 1 |  |  |  |
| Sig. | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 |  |  |  |  |
| N | 1514 | 1514 | 1514 | 1514 | 1514 | 1514 |  |  |  |
| Sales Personnel | PC  Value | .578(\*\*) | .566(\*\*) | .679(\*\*) | .586(\*\*) | .675(\*\*) | .580(\*\*) | 1 |  |  |
| Sig. | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 |  |  |  |
| N | 1514 | 1514 | 1514 | 1514 | 1514 | 1514 | 1514 |  |  |
| Service | PC  Value | .685(\*\*) | .609(\*\*) | .638(\*\*) | .609(\*\*) | .661(\*\*) | .662(\*\*) | .603(\*\*) | 1 |  |
| Sig. | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 |  |  |
| N | 1514 | 1514 | 1514 | 1514 | 1514 | 1514 | 1514 | 1514 |  |
| Store image | PC  Value | .615(\*\*) | .626(\*\*) | .627(\*\*) | .602(\*\*) | .671(\*\*) | .683(\*\*) | .684(\*\*) | .714(\*\*) | 1 |
| Sig. | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 |  |
| N | 1514 | 1514 | 1514 | 1514 | 1514 | 1514 | 1514 | 1514 | 1514 |

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

# Correlation Interpretation

The above correlation table shows the inter correlation between the dimensions Atmosphere, Convenience, Facilities, Institutional, Merchandise, Promotion, Sales Personnel, Service and Store image

# Factors Having Positive Correlation at 1% Level of Significance

Comparatively high level positive correlation at 1% level of significance among the variables exists between Atmosphere and Convenience with a Pearson value of 0.781, then between Convenience and Facilities with a Pearson value of 0.756, then between Atmosphere and Facilities with a Pearson value of 0.737, then between Institutional and Facilities with a Pearson value of 0.732, then between Merchandise and Facilities with a Pearson value of 0.732, then between Service and Store image with a Pearson value of 0.714, then between Convenience and Institutional with a Pearson value of 0.707.

Further next high level positive correlation at 1% level of significance among the variables exists between Atmosphere and Service with a Pearson value of 0.685, then between Atmosphere and Institutional with a Pearson value of 0.681, then between Store image and Sales Personnel with a Pearson value of 0.684, then between Store image and Promotion with a Pearson value of 0.683, then between Facilities and Sales Personnel with a Pearson value of 0.679, then between Merchandise and Sales Personnel with a Pearson value of 0.675, then between Merchandise and Store image with a Pearson value of 0.671, then between Service and Promotion with a Pearson value of 0.662, then between Service and Merchandise with a Pearson value of 0.661, then between Merchandise and Promotion with a Pearson value of 0.656.

Further next high level positive correlation at 1% level of significance among the variables exists between Atmosphere and Sales Personnel with a Pearson value of 0.650, then between Facilities and Service with a Pearson value of 0.638, then between Facilities and Store image with a Pearson value of 0.627, then between Store image and Convenience with a Pearson value of 0.626, then between Facilities and Promotion with a Pearson value of 0.622, then between Merchandise and Atmosphere with a Pearson value of 0.618, then between Atmosphere and Store image with a Pearson value of 0.615, then between Service and Convenience with a Pearson value

of 0.609, then between Service and Institutional with a Pearson value of 0.609, then between Service and Sales Personnel with a Pearson value of 0.603, then between Institutional and Store image with a Pearson value of 0.602, then between Convenience and Promotion with a Pearson value of 0.602.

Further next high level positive correlation at 1% level of significance among the variables exists between Institutional and Sales Personnel with a Pearson value of 0.586, then between Convenience and Merchandise with a Pearson value of 0.583, then between Institutional and Merchandise with a Pearson value of 0.581, then between Promotion and Sales Personnel with a Pearson value of 0.580, then between Sales Personnel and Atmosphere with a Pearson value of 0.578, then between Sales Personnel and Convenience with a Pearson value of 0.566, then between Promotion and Institutional with a Pearson value of 0.518.

# Multiple regressions

**Table.4.31.1. Impact of Buying Behavior on Customer Satisfaction Model Summary**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Model** | **R** | **R Square** | **Adjusted R Square** | **Std. Error of the Estimate** |
| Buying Behavior | .815(a) | .664 | .663 | .391 |
| a Predictors: (Constant), Satisfied with shopping experience, which allows me to form a positive opinion of the supermarket and its private labels., Satisfied with the private label brands in the stores whose prices are competitive, Pleased with the customer service offered by the store and is of high standard, Extremely happy with the quality of the private label brands in the stores, Satisfied with the private label brand that always meets all the shopping requirements., Satisfied with the Private label brands, which has variety  of assortment for me to choose | | | | |

The multiple regressions are shown in the above table. The model summary table shows R-Square for this model is .664. This means that 66.4 percent of the variation in buying behavior (dependent variable) can be explained from the 6

independent variables. The table also shows the adjusted R-square for the model as

.663.

Any time another independent variable is added to a multiple regression model, the R-square will increase (even if only slightly). Consequently, it becomes difficult to determine which models do the best job of explaining variation in the same dependent variable. The adjusted R-Square does just what its name implies. It adjusts the R- square by the number of predictor variables in the model. This adjustment allows the easy comparison of the explanatory power of models with different numbers of predictor’s variable. It also helps us decide how many variables to include in our regression model.

# Table.4.31.2. Association between impact of Buying Behavior on Customer Satisfaction

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Model** | | **Sum of**  **Squares** | **df** | **Mean**  **Square** | **F** | **Sig.** |
| Buying Behavior | Regression | 455.934 | 6 | 75.989 | 496.842 | .000(a) |
| Residual | 230.487 | 1507 | .153 |
| Total | 686.421 | 1513 |  |
| 1. Predictors: (Constant), Satisfied with shopping experience, which allows me to form a positive opinion of the supermarket and its private labels., Satisfied with the private label brands in the stores whose prices are competitive, Pleased with the customer service offered by the store and is of high standard, Extremely happy with the quality of the private label brands in the stores, Satisfied with the private label brand that always meets all the shopping requirements., Satisfied with the Private label brands, which has variety of assortment for me to choose 2. Dependent Variable: Buying Behavior | | | | | | |

The ANOVA table, as displayed in the above table shows the F ratio for the regression model that indicates the statistical significance of the overall regression model. The F ratio is calculated the same way for regression analysis as it was for the ANOVA technique. The variance Independent variable that is associated with dependent variable (Buying behavior) is referred to as explained variance. The remainder of the total variance in Independent variable that is not associated with dependent variable is referred as unexplained variance.

The larger the F ratio the more will be the variance in the dependent variable that is associated with the independent variable. The F ratio = 496.842. The statistical significance is .000 - the “Sig”. So we can reject the null hypothesis that no relationship exists between the two variables. There is relationship between independent and dependent variables.

# Table.4.31.3. Coefficient of impact of Buying Behavior on Customer Satisfaction

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Unstandardized Coefficients** | | **Standardized Coefficients** | **t** | **Sig.** |
| **B** | **Std. Error** | **Beta** |
| (Constant) | .543 | .059 |  | 9.185 | .000 |
| Satisfied with the private label brands in the stores whose prices are competitive | .181 | .013 | .249 | 13.638 | .000 |
| Extremely happy with the quality of the private label brands in the stores | .192 | .016 | .229 | 12.054 | .000 |
| Pleased with the customer service offered by the store and is of high standard | .106 | .014 | .134 | 7.681 | .000 |
| Satisfied with the private label brand that always meets all the shopping requirements | .187 | .015 | .252 | 12.208 | .000 |
| Satisfied with the Private label brands, which has variety of assortment for me to choose | .113 | .015 | .162 | 7.688 | .000 |
| Satisfied with shopping experience, which allows me to form a positive opinion of the supermarket and its private labels | .050 | .014 | .068 | 3.577 | .000 |

Dependent Variable: Buying behavior

To determine if one or more of the independent variables are significant predictors of Buying behavior, we examine the information provided in the coefficient table. Out of Six independent statements all the statements are statistically significant.

Satisfied with the private label brands in the stores whose prices are competitive has a beta coefficient (0.249), which is significant (0.000). Extremely happy with the quality of the private label brands in the stores has a beta coefficient (0.229), which is significant (0.000). Pleased with the customer service offered by the store and is of high standard has a beta coefficient (0.134), which is significant (0.004). Satisfied with the private label brand that always meets all the shopping requirements has a beta coefficient (0.252), which is significant (0.000). Satisfied with the Private label brands, which has variety of assortment for me to choose has a beta coefficient (0.162), which is significant (0.000). Satisfied with shopping experience, which allows me to form a positive opinion of the supermarket and its private labels has a beta coefficient (0.068), which is significant (0.000).

# Table.4.32.1. Impact of Buying Behavior on Customer Loyalty Model Summary

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Model** | **R** | **R Square** | **Adjusted R Square** | **Std. Error of the Estimate** |
| Buying Behavior | .808(a) | .653 | .652 | .398 |
| brands to other people., Satisfied with the shopping experience; I intend to continue shopping at this supermarket for a long time., Buy these private label brands the next time I shop in the store, Recommend to friends and relatives to purchase private label brands from the store that I purchase, Continue to buy private label brands in other product categories also, Even if another store private label price is lower, I will go on  buying at private label brand in this store | | | | |

The multiple regressions are shown in the above table. The model summary table shows R-Square for this model is .653. This means that 65.3 percent of the variation in buying behavior (dependent variable) can be explained from the 6

independent variables. The table also shows the adjusted R-square for the model as

.652.

Any time another independent variable is added to a multiple regression model, the R-square will increase (even if only slightly). Consequently, it becomes difficult to determine which models do the best job of explaining variation in the same dependent variable. The adjusted R-Square does just what its name implies. It adjusts the R- square by the number of predictor variables in the model. This adjustment allows the easy comparison of the explanatory power of models with different numbers of predictor’s variable. It also helps us decide how many variables to include in our regression model.

# Table.4.32.2. Association between impacts of Buying Behavior on Customer Loyalty

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Model** | | **Sum of**  **Squares** | **df** | **Mean**  **Square** | **F** | **Sig.** |
| Buying Behavior | Regression | 448.219 | 6 | 74.703 | 472.614 | .000(a) |
| Residual | 238.202 | 1507 | .158 |
| Total | 686.421 | 1513 |  |
| 1. Predictors: (Constant), Willing to say positive things about private label brands to other people., Satisfied with the shopping experience; I intend to continue shopping at this supermarket for a long time., Buy these private label brands the next time I shop in the store, Recommend to friends and relatives to purchase private label brands from the store that I purchase, Continue to buy private label brands in other product categories also, Even if another store private label price is lower, I will go on buying at private label brand in this store 2. Dependent Variable: Buying Behavior | | | | | | |

The ANOVA table, as displayed in the above table shows the F ratio for the regression model that indicates the statistical significance of the overall regression model. The F ratio is calculated the same way for regression analysis as it was for the ANOVA technique. The variance Independent variable that is associated with dependent variable (Buying behavior) is referred to as explained variance. The remainder of the total variance in Independent variable that is not associated with dependent variable is referred as unexplained variance.

The larger the F ratio the more will be the variance in the dependent variable that is associated with the independent variable. The F ratio = 472.614. The statistical significance is .000 - the “Sig”. So we can reject the null hypothesis that no relationship exists between the two variables. There is relationship between independent and dependent variables.

# Table.4.32.3. Coefficient of impact of Buying Behavior on Customer Loyalty

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Unstandardized Coefficients** | | **Standardized Coefficients** | **t** | **Sig.** |
| **B** | **Std. Error** | **Beta** |
| (Constant) | .703 | .056 |  | 12.506 | .000 |
| Satisfied with the shopping experience; I intend to continue shopping at this supermarket for a long time | .159 | .016 | .220 | 10.130 | .000 |
| Buy these private label brands the next time I shop in the store | .058 | .015 | .077 | 3.939 | .000 |
| Even if another store private label price is lower, I will go on buying at private label brand in this store | .122 | .015 | .165 | 8.305 | .000 |
| Continue to buy private label brands in other product categories also | .086 | .014 | .123 | 6.265 | .000 |
| Recommend to friends and relatives to purchase private label brands from the store that I purchase | .122 | .014 | .170 | 8.864 | .000 |
| Willing to say positive things about private label brands to other people | .249 | .012 | .365 | 20.766 | .000 |

Dependent Variable: Buying behavior

To determine if one or more of the independent variables are significant predictors of Buying behavior, we examine the information provided in the coefficient table. Out of Six independent statements all the statements are statistically significant.

Satisfied with the shopping experience; I intend to continue shopping at this supermarket for a long time has a beta coefficient (0.220), which is significant (0.000). Buy these private label brands the next time I shop in the store has a beta coefficient (0.077), which is significant (0.000). Even if another store private label price is lower, I will go on buying at private label brand in this store has a beta coefficient (0.165), which is significant (0.004). Continue to buy private label brands in other product categories also has a beta coefficient (0.123), which is significant (0.000). Recommend to friends and relatives to purchase private label brands from the store that I purchase have a beta coefficient (0.170), which is significant (0.000). Willing to say positive things about private label brands to other people has a beta coefficient (0.365), which is significant (0.000).

# TABLE.4.33.1 KMO and Bartlett's Test

The individual statements on buyer behaviour was examined using factor analysis based on 62 individual statements and the reliability of the samples collected was tested for internal consistency of the grouping of the items

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy.** | | **0.830** |
| Bartlett's Test of Sphericity | Approx. Chi-Square | 110571.2 |
| df | 1891 |
| Sig. | .000 |

KMO measure of sampling adequacy is an index to examine the appropriateness of factor analysis. High values between 0.5 and 1.0 indicate factor analysis is appropriate. Values below 0.5 imply that factor analysis may not be appropriate. From the above table it is seen that Kaiser – Meyer – Olkin measure of sampling adequacy index is 0.830 and hence the factor analysis is appropriate for the given data set. Bartlett’s Test of Sphericity is used to examine the hypothesis that the variables are uncorrelated. It is based on chi- Square transformation of the determinant of correlation matrix. A large value of the test statistic will favor the rejection of the null hypothesis. In turn this would indicate that factor analysis is appropriate. Bartlett’s test of Sphericity

Chi-square statistics is 110571.2, that shows the 13 statements are correlated and hence as inferred in KMO, factor analysis is appropriate for the given data set.

# Table 4.33.2 Total Variance Explained

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Component** | **Initial Eigenvalues** | | | **Extraction Sums of Squared Loadings** | | |
| **Total** | **% of Variance** | **Cumulative**  **%** | **Total** | **% of Variance** | **Cumulative**  **%** |
| 1 | 26.888 | 43.368 | 43.368 | 26.888 | 43.368 | 43.368 |
| 2 | 3.076 | 4.961 | 48.329 | 3.076 | 4.961 | 48.329 |
| 3 | 2.487 | 4.011 | 52.340 | 2.487 | 4.011 | 52.340 |
| 4 | 2.085 | 3.362 | 55.703 | 2.085 | 3.362 | 55.703 |
| 5 | 1.980 | 3.194 | 58.896 | 1.980 | 3.194 | 58.896 |
| 6 | 1.906 | 3.074 | 61.970 | 1.906 | 3.074 | 61.970 |
| 7 | 1.536 | 2.477 | 64.447 | 1.536 | 2.477 | 64.447 |
| 8 | 1.460 | 2.355 | 66.802 | 1.460 | 2.355 | 66.802 |
| 9 | 1.405 | 2.267 | 69.068 | 1.405 | 2.267 | 69.068 |
| 10 | 1.197 | 1.931 | 70.999 | 1.197 | 1.931 | 70.999 |
| 11 | 1.177 | 1.898 | 72.897 | 1.177 | 1.898 | 72.897 |
| 12 | 1.041 | 1.680 | 74.577 | 1.041 | 1.680 | 74.577 |
| 13 | 1.034 | 1.667 | 76.243 | 1.034 | 1.667 | 76.243 |
| 14 | .959 | 1.547 | 77.790 |  |  |  |
| 15 | .909 | 1.465 | 79.255 |  |  |  |
| 16 | .879 | 1.419 | 80.674 |  |  |  |
| 17 | .780 | 1.258 | 81.932 |  |  |  |
| 18 | .753 | 1.214 | 83.146 |  |  |  |
| 19 | .699 | 1.128 | 84.274 |  |  |  |
| 20 | .626 | 1.010 | 85.284 |  |  |  |
| 21 | .603 | .972 | 86.256 |  |  |  |
| 22 | .578 | .932 | 87.188 |  |  |  |
| 23 | .560 | .904 | 88.092 |  |  |  |
| 24 | .496 | .799 | 88.891 |  |  |  |
| 25 | .481 | .776 | 89.667 |  |  |  |
| 26 | .446 | .719 | 90.386 |  |  |  |
| 27 | .442 | .713 | 91.099 |  |  |  |
| 28 | .390 | .630 | 91.729 |  |  |  |
| 29 | .381 | .614 | 92.343 |  |  |  |
| 30 | .364 | .587 | 92.930 |  |  |  |
| 31 | .333 | .537 | 93.467 |  |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 32 | .325 | .525 | 93.992 |  |  |  |
| 33 | .301 | .485 | 94.477 |  |  |  |
| 34 | .275 | .444 | 94.921 |  |  |  |
| 35 | .263 | .424 | 95.345 |  |  |  |
| 36 | .263 | .424 | 95.769 |  |  |  |
| 37 | .237 | .383 | 96.152 |  |  |  |
| 38 | .223 | .360 | 96.511 |  |  |  |
| 39 | .202 | .327 | 96.838 |  |  |  |
| 40 | .184 | .297 | 97.134 |  |  |  |
| 41 | .173 | .279 | 97.414 |  |  |  |
| 42 | .165 | .266 | 97.680 |  |  |  |
| 43 | .147 | .237 | 97.917 |  |  |  |
| 44 | .139 | .224 | 98.140 |  |  |  |
| 45 | .133 | .214 | 98.354 |  |  |  |
| 46 | .121 | .195 | 98.549 |  |  |  |
| 47 | .108 | .175 | 98.724 |  |  |  |
| 48 | .100 | .161 | 98.886 |  |  |  |
| 49 | .098 | .157 | 99.043 |  |  |  |
| 50 | .078 | .126 | 99.169 |  |  |  |
| 51 | .068 | .109 | 99.278 |  |  |  |
| 52 | .065 | .104 | 99.383 |  |  |  |
| 53 | .064 | .103 | 99.486 |  |  |  |
| 54 | .059 | .095 | 99.581 |  |  |  |
| 55 | .051 | .082 | 99.663 |  |  |  |
| 56 | .048 | .077 | 99.740 |  |  |  |
| 57 | .044 | .072 | 99.812 |  |  |  |
| 58 | .034 | .054 | 99.866 |  |  |  |
| 59 | .031 | .049 | 99.915 |  |  |  |
| 60 | .024 | .038 | 99.954 |  |  |  |
| 61 | .016 | .025 | 99.979 |  |  |  |
| 62 | .013 | .021 | 100.000 |  |  |  |

Eigen Value represents the total variance explained by each factor. Percentage of the total variance attributed to each factor. One of the popular methods used in Exploratory Factor Analysis is Principal Component Analysis, Where the total variance in the data is considered to determine the minimum number of factors that will account for maximum variance of data.

# Table 4.33.3 Component Matrix (a)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Component | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 |
| Fashion ability of store interior | 0.559 | -0.01 | 0.01 | 0.259 | -0.086 | -0.231 | -0.321 | 0.368 | 0.069 | -0.063 | 0.05 | 0.002 | 0.229 |
| Style of decor in store | 0.694 | 0.22 | 0.092 | 0.152 | -0.067 | -0.113 | -0.093 | -0.046 | 0.136 | -0.04 | 0.295 | 0.178 | 0.161 |
| Attractiveness of decor in store | 0.693 | 0.045 | -0.161 | 0.155 | 0.083 | -0.29 | 0.127 | -0.171 | 0.156 | -0.029 | 0.229 | 0.021 | 0.123 |
| Colours used in store | 0.603 | 0.383 | -0.068 | 0.263 | 0.03 | 0.131 | -0.063 | 0.159 | 0.039 | 0.284 | -0.178 | 0.055 | 0.074 |
| Suitable finishing materials used in store  (e.g wood/stainless steel) | 0.688 | 0.241 | -0.059 | -0.046 | 0.157 | -0.044 | -0.246 | -0.157 | 0.139 | 0.01 | 0.28 | 0.123 | -0.202 |
| Shopping experience (feeling when  shopping in store e.g. Special/welcome) | 0.639 | 0.351 | 0.124 | 0.133 | 0.226 | -0.054 | -0.243 | -0.214 | 0.078 | 0.076 | -0.201 | -0.006 | 0.047 |
| **Time it takes to travel to store** | 0.575 | 0.072 | 0.022 | -0.142 | 0.177 | -0.071 | -0.285 | **0.378** | -0.155 | 0.059 | 0.111 | -0.346 | 0.072 |
| Proximity of store to variety of other  stores (e.g. Grocery store | 0.643 | 0.397 | -0.103 | 0.22 | -0.103 | 0.001 | -0.06 | -0.011 | -0.157 | 0.015 | 0.213 | -0.006 | -0.123 |
| **Accessibility of store (e.g. Location within mall)** | 0.596 | 0.192 | -0.166 | **0.38** | -0.114 | 0.206 | -0.107 | -0.204 | -0.178 | -0.2 | -0.013 | -0.072 | 0.262 |
| Flow of people in mall where store is  situated (i.e. Ease of movement | 0.674 | 0.26 | -0.23 | 0.174 | 0.169 | -0.203 | -0.169 | 0.057 | -0.163 | -0.071 | 0.029 | -0.083 | -0.313 |
| Amount of walking required within store | 0.631 | 0.227 | 0.343 | -0.333 | -0.013 | -0.153 | 0.128 | 0.081 | 0.095 | 0.013 | 0.021 | -0.18 | 0.042 |
| Ease of finding merchandise items | 0.706 | 0.231 | -0.075 | -0.155 | 0.101 | 0.146 | 0.05 | -0.124 | 0.019 | 0.05 | 0.138 | -0.185 | -0.013 |
| Store opening hours | 0.583 | 0.259 | -0.161 | -0.256 | 0.213 | 0.272 | 0.053 | -0.022 | 0.162 | -0.263 | 0.104 | -0.08 | -0.084 |
| Accessibility of store entrance/exit | 0.59 | -0.012 | -0.353 | 0.07 | 0.234 | -0.088 | 0.222 | -0.094 | -0.197 | 0.043 | 0.129 | 0.124 | -0.008 |
| Position of aisles in store | 0.712 | -0.123 | -0.149 | -0.16 | 0.05 | -0.227 | -0.036 | -0.23 | 0.14 | 0.06 | -0.021 | 0.116 | -0.004 |
| **Width of aisles in store** | 0.635 | 0.288 | -0.059 | 0.032 | 0.006 | -0.029 | 0.001 | -0.369 | -0.079 | -0.062 | 0.005 | -0.021 | **0.236** |
| Accessibility of merchandise rails | 0.661 | 0.413 | -0.199 | 0.06 | 0.003 | 0.13 | 0.041 | -0.004 | -0.049 | 0.093 | -0.055 | 0.033 | -0.195 |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Number of fitting rooms | 0.704 | 0.343 | 0.126 | -0.136 | -0.012 | -0.194 | 0.064 | -0.023 | 0.053 | -0.154 | -0.111 | -0.063 | -0.188 |
| Lighting in fitting rooms | 0.73 | 0.209 | 0.176 | 0.098 | -0.162 | -0.217 | 0.132 | -0.046 | -0.101 | -0.069 | -0.089 | -0.071 | 0.147 |
| Ease of shopping with family in mall  where store is situated | 0.691 | 0.183 | -0.195 | -0.012 | -0.136 | -0.056 | 0.21 | 0.183 | 0.054 | -0.128 | 0.07 | -0.04 | 0.001 |
| Social class appeal of store (e.g.  High/low class) | 0.664 | 0.091 | -0.193 | -0.243 | 0.198 | -0.061 | -0.105 | 0.324 | -0.053 | -0.115 | -0.1 | 0.136 | 0.123 |
| **Store's appeal to my friends** | **0.797** | 0.127 | -0.103 | -0.153 | -0.035 | -0.015 | 0.012 | -0.017 | -0.011 | -0.134 | -0.069 | 0.174 | 0.02 |
| Similarity in appearance between sales  personnel and customers | 0.675 | 0.147 | -0.192 | -0.158 | -0.106 | -0.379 | 0.04 | -0.001 | 0.198 | 0.01 | -0.194 | 0.014 | 0.134 |
| Ability to identify with store | 0.559 | 0.289 | -0.144 | -0.142 | -0.196 | 0.343 | 0.13 | 0.032 | 0 | 0.173 | -0.194 | 0.127 | 0.144 |
| **Similarity between store image and self image** | 0.591 | **0.476** | -0.125 | -0.076 | -0.314 | -0.063 | 0.12 | 0.116 | 0.16 | 0.054 | -0.2 | -0.09 | -0.029 |
| Store's efforts to build personal  relationship with customers (e.g. Personalized letters) | 0.624 | 0.047 | -0.046 | -0.452 | 0.031 | 0.141 | -0.069 | 0.207 | 0.069 | 0.003 | 0.306 | 0.096 | 0.237 |
| Variety of merchandise categories (e.g. Formalwear/leisurewear/  lingerie/shoes/accessories) | 0.724 | 0.119 | 0.033 | 0.064 | 0.185 | 0.251 | -0.012 | -0.138 | -0.022 | -0.157 | -0.123 | 0.036 | -0.304 |
| Availability of imported merchandise | 0.66 | -0.134 | 0.01 | 0.237 | 0.185 | -0.01 | 0.343 | -0.137 | -0.078 | 0.018 | -0.07 | -0.12 | 0.001 |
| Availability of unique merchandise (e.g.  Only offered by specific store) | 0.612 | -0.239 | -0.153 | -0.267 | 0.21 | 0.008 | 0.094 | 0.199 | -0.278 | 0.113 | -0.062 | -0.028 | -0.065 |
| Availability of exclusive merchandise  (e.g .Limited number manufactured) | 0.679 | -0.22 | -0.122 | -0.042 | 0.302 | 0.081 | 0.015 | 0.001 | -0.121 | 0.039 | -0.14 | 0.094 | 0.035 |
| Availability of designer label  merchandise (e.g.Calvin) | 0.657 | -0.009 | 0.043 | 0.191 | 0.128 | 0.107 | 0.201 | -0.035 | -0.382 | 0.256 | -0.006 | -0.11 | 0.202 |
| Availability fashion merchandise | 0.61 | 0.155 | 0.038 | 0.159 | -0.238 | 0.221 | 0.203 | 0.287 | -0.07 | 0.215 | 0.137 | -0.126 | -0.001 |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Availability of styles suited to my age** | 0.687 | -0.077 | -0.13 | 0.06 | -0.096 | -0.168 | **0.383** | 0.2 | -0.171 | 0.007 | 0.024 | 0.115 | -0.015 |
| Quality of merchandise in store | 0.69 | -0.124 | -0.112 | 0.058 | -0.291 | 0.306 | -0.058 | -0.128 | 0.053 | -0.003 | -0.021 | -0.085 | -0.121 |
| Credibility of store advertising | 0.75 | -0.163 | 0.096 | 0.155 | 0.139 | 0.066 | -0.394 | 0.107 | -0.002 | 0.174 | -0.077 | -0.009 | -0.082 |
| Models used in store advertising | 0.71 | -0.162 | 0.111 | 0.006 | -0.071 | -0.26 | -0.288 | 0.01 | 0.002 | 0.219 | -0.092 | -0.073 | -0.096 |
| Inclusion of brochures in mailed store  card account | 0.664 | -0.28 | -0.012 | 0.356 | 0.043 | 0.14 | -0.156 | 0.037 | 0.087 | 0.095 | 0.194 | -0.118 | -0.077 |
| Spaciousness of in-store displays | 0.782 | -0.299 | 0.022 | 0.106 | 0.067 | -0.136 | 0.017 | 0.131 | 0.047 | 0.078 | 0.042 | 0.151 | -0.179 |
| **Sales with marked-down prices** | 0.461 | 0.011 | 0.482 | 0.105 | 0.366 | 0.006 | 0.244 | 0.177 | **0.329** | -0.07 | -0.227 | -0.075 | 0.061 |
| **Timely announcement of sales** | 0.543 | -0.158 | **0.53** | 0.139 | 0.044 | -0.266 | 0.128 | -0.103 | 0.215 | 0.19 | -0.072 | 0.069 | -0.011 |
| Availability of special offers (e.g. Buy  one get one free) | 0.485 | -0.085 | 0.257 | 0.355 | 0.394 | 0.132 | 0.141 | 0.086 | 0.163 | -0.167 | 0.185 | 0.178 | 0.133 |
| Fashionability of sales personnel | 0.696 | -0.296 | -0.053 | 0.213 | -0.21 | 0.159 | 0.114 | 0.092 | 0.037 | -0.096 | -0.03 | -0.094 | -0.132 |
| Attractiveness of sales personnel | 0.654 | -0.299 | -0.003 | 0.117 | -0.101 | -0.199 | 0.252 | 0.166 | -0.064 | -0.226 | 0.028 | -0.151 | -0.138 |
| Similarity in body type between sales  personnel and myself (e.g. Large- size/petite) | 0.663 | -0.346 | -0.106 | -0.261 | -0.236 | 0.013 | -0.043 | 0.001 | 0.144 | -0.255 | 0.044 | -0.131 | 0.002 |
| Similarity in age between sales personnel  and myself | 0.656 | -0.37 | -0.293 | -0.206 | -0.037 | -0.086 | 0.026 | -0.19 | -0.107 | 0.118 | -0.133 | -0.003 | -0.052 |
| **Similarity in gender between sales personnel and myself** | 0.61 | -0.096 | -0.132 | -0.109 | -0.111 | 0.066 | 0.077 | 0.085 | 0.241 | **0.441** | 0.021 | 0.226 | -0.169 |
| **Expertise of sales personnel** | 0.695 | -0.078 | -0.082 | -0.002 | 0.125 | 0.212 | -0.024 | 0.209 | 0.155 | -0.099 | -0.091 | **0.327** | 0.057 |
| Courteousness of sales personnel | 0.747 | -0.206 | -0.14 | -0.061 | -0.028 | -0.216 | -0.027 | -0.204 | 0.028 | 0.043 | -0.058 | 0.181 | 0.026 |
| Number of sales personnel | 0.735 | -0.103 | -0.028 | 0.116 | -0.118 | -0.158 | 0.065 | -0.14 | 0.139 | 0.097 | 0.129 | -0.182 | -0.015 |
| Availability of gift vouchers | 0.632 | -0.187 | 0.175 | -0.104 | -0.255 | -0.186 | -0.135 | -0.017 | -0.285 | -0.008 | 0.132 | 0.131 | 0.016 |
| Availability of gift registry | 0.65 | -0.055 | 0.318 | 0.171 | -0.308 | 0.175 | -0.085 | 0.127 | -0.068 | -0.12 | -0.099 | 0.141 | 0 |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Availability of inter-store transfer  facilities (e.g. Find items from other stores) | 0.599 | 0.099 | 0.346 | -0.016 | -0.249 | -0.025 | -0.133 | -0.066 | -0.313 | -0.217 | -0.17 | 0.271 | -0.037 |
| Availability of mail-order service | 0.644 | 0.057 | 0.527 | -0.218 | -0.07 | 0.182 | -0.071 | -0.06 | -0.195 | -0.019 | -0.155 | -0.014 | -0.063 |
| **Availability of alteration service** | 0.51 | 0.065 | 0.505 | -0.313 | -0.136 | -0.008 | 0.04 | -0.072 | -0.214 | 0.104 | **0.373** | 0.074 | -0.055 |
| **Atmosphere (e.g. Store interior/store atmosphere)** | 0.576 | 0.053 | 0.185 | -0.227 | **0.476** | 0.164 | -0.041 | -0.046 | -0.051 | -0.043 | -0.005 | -0.097 | -0.089 |
| Convenience (e.g.  Transportation/location) | 0.714 | -0.163 | 0.265 | -0.035 | 0.131 | -0.044 | 0.135 | -0.088 | -0.127 | -0.076 | 0.061 | 0 | -0.022 |
| Facilities (e.g. Fixtures/fitting rooms) | 0.714 | -0.048 | 0.027 | -0.004 | -0.254 | 0.006 | -0.078 | -0.016 | 0.285 | -0.124 | -0.041 | -0.187 | -0.113 |
| Institutional (e.g. Clientele/store  reputation) | 0.761 | -0.283 | -0.171 | -0.037 | 0.098 | -0.15 | -0.048 | 0.001 | -0.123 | -0.147 | -0.146 | -0.079 | 0.102 |
| **Merchandise (e.g. Assortment/style)** | 0.646 | -0.345 | -0.065 | 0.119 | -0.171 | **0.355** | -0.024 | -0.007 | 0.104 | -0.168 | 0.05 | 0.121 | -0.049 |
| Promotion (e.g. Advertising/displays) | 0.701 | -0.356 | -0.191 | -0.059 | 0.074 | 0.071 | -0.214 | -0.036 | -0.003 | -0.055 | -0.12 | -0.135 | 0.205 |
| Sales personnel (e.g.  Appearance/promotion) | 0.701 | -0.204 | 0.058 | -0.027 | -0.051 | 0.167 | -0.148 | -0.211 | 0.083 | 0.152 | -0.023 | -0.17 | 0.156 |
| Service (e.g. Payment options/delivery  options) | 0.679 | -0.207 | 0.098 | -0.248 | -0.08 | 0.344 | 0.13 | -0.157 | 0.141 | 0.13 | 0.068 | -0.063 | 0.154 |

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis. Rotation Method: Varimax with Kaiser Normalization.

1. Rotation converged in 19 iterations.
2. Interpretation of factors is facilitated by identifying the statements that have large loadings in the same factor. The factor can be interpreted in terms of the statement that loads high on it.

The factors of a study on factors influencing the perceived quality variable comprises of 62 individual statements. Out of 62 statements, 13 individual statements contribute more towards the study (76.243%).

The statements are:

* 1. Time it takes to travel to store
  2. Accessibility of store (e.g. Location within mall)
  3. Width of aisles in store
  4. Store's appeal to my friends
  5. Similarity between store image and self image
  6. Availability of styles suited to my age
  7. Sales with marked-down prices
  8. Timely announcement of sales
  9. Similarity in gender between sales personnel and myself
  10. Expertise of sales personnel
  11. Availability of alteration service
  12. Atmosphere (e.g. Store interior/store atmosphere)
  13. Merchandise (e.g. Assortment/style)