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ABSTRACT

The substitution of small retail stores by the large stores has been a topic of debate among academics, practitioners, retailers and general public, especially in the context of foreign firms entering emerging markets such as China and India. The purpose of this research is to find out the determinants of consumer satisfaction in departmental stores, with a sample from Tirupur district.

As satisfied customer is a valuable asset to any organization, especially, for the ones dealing with ultimate consumers Data were collected using a 19-item structured questionnaire developed by the authors. The sample consists of 400 consumers who shop at departmental stores in Tirupur District.

Exploratory factor analysis grouped the 19 variables into 6 factors. Further, ANOVA and f-test revealed that six of the factors (Employees’ behavior, Leisure & refreshment, Ambience, Price & Quality, Location and Exclusive Products) were major predictors of consumer satisfaction as they were found to be significant at 1% or 5% level. The factor analysis, ANOVA and f-test results reveal that customer satisfaction is influenced by the six factors resulted from factor analysis test and further, socio-economic variables have a good voice-over the customer satisfaction while buying in the departmental stores in Tirupur district. The research can be extended in other areas of the State and comparative study can be undertaken by taking other organized retail formats.
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INTRODUCTION:

Customer satisfaction plays a vital role in the formation of consumers’ future purchase intentions. Satisfied customers are treated as an asset of any business concern in the present competitive era. Consumers are likely to express others of their favorable experiences and engage in positive word of mouth advertising. Customer satisfaction, not only is the leading indication to measure customer loyalty, identify unhappy customers, reduce churn and increase revenue, it is also a key point of differentiation that helps to attract new customers in competitive business environments. In a turbulent commercial environment, in order to sustain the growth and increase their market share, departmental stores need to understand how to satisfy customers, as customer satisfaction is crucial for establishing long term customer relationships. It is evident by the fact that over the last five years customer satisfaction surveys have become common in many business outlets. Thus, a fundamental understanding of factors impacting customer satisfaction is of great importance to business, particularly the business of departmental stores.

REVIEW OF LITERATURE:

Satnam Kour Ubeja and D.D. Bedia (2011), quoted that Customer satisfaction is a complex phenomenon for marketers as well as researchers. The objectives of the present study were to analyze the customer satisfaction
in shopping malls with respect to product, price, place and promotion in Indore city and to study the variations in customer satisfaction due to different demographic variables. The factors were product consciousness, comfort with entertainment seeker, extra service conscious, store and hygiene consciousness, price consciousness, billing flexibility and facility, sales people consciousness, choice of store, employee consciousness and taste consciousness.

Saini Neelam (2012), indicate that variety of products, branded products and availability of necessary goods under same roof, reasonable price and fixed price and location of organized retail outlets at close to residence or work place play a significant role in motivating the customers to visit organized retail outlet. There is a significant relationship between customer satisfaction and 5 dimensions of service quality of organized retail outlets. Those five dimensions were Product Characteristics, Price factor, Physical aspects, Promotional schemes and Personnel interaction. Since the results of the study show that customers’ satisfaction is related with service quality of retail stores in terms above said 5 dimensions, therefore, retailers need to stress on these related aspects in providing their services.

U.Dinesh kumar and P.Vikkraman (2012), found that 64% of respondents were purchasing from convenience store before moving to organised retail stores. They also found that consumers were highly satisfied with quality of services provided in organised retail stores and highly dissatisfied with variety of mode of payment and parking facility. The study suggested increasing the services like parking facility, convenient payment methods and special attention to avoid long standing queue for billing and payment will make the business flourish.

K.Narayanan, Samal and Rao (2013), found that 36% customers were satisfied with the goods and services of organised retail stores, 38% customers were not satisfied due to inconvenient parking facility, long standing queue for billing and delivery, poor home delivery services and the like and remaining 26% customers were sure about their satisfaction level. This fact is a word of caution for organised retailers to take care of services to win over the customers’ satisfaction.

R.Gomathi, S.Kishore, R.Deepika (2013), spells out that there is relationship between the gender of the respondents and various offers and discounts offered by the departmental stores. The customers are dissatisfied with the parking facilities, price of products like fancy items, children’s toys, door delivery, billing procedure, long waiting time the departmental stores should address these issues quickly to make their customers satisfy and happy.

Sushmana (2014) have proved that 40% of the customers prefer unorganised retail shopping while 34% of the customers prefer organised retail stores and 26% of the customers prefer both. Further, 58% of the customers are satisfied with pricing strategy, 42% of the customers are not satisfied.

Hameed (2015), highlighted that store layout must be favourable for high level of satisfaction, for high level of brand loyalty. It is also found that factors like less queue and welcoming staff, services, quality and accuracy of bills, price and price discount positively affects the customers’ reliability. The researcher suggested that if additional facilities are provided to customers they are attracted towards stores.

Sameera.P (2015), found that majority of customers are satisfied with the product variety and price range, physical facilities, adaption of modern equipment and fixtures, operating hours, quality of services etc., They are also satisfied with self service, product price, visual merchandising, home delivery and fast checkouts. They feel that the store layout is easily accessible to find the products. But at the same time the study points out some difficulties are associated with organized retail outlets like improper, insufficient parking facility and in this era of technological advancement the customers are likely to have variety mode of payment in the shops as their convenience. But majority of shops are lacking these facilities.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY:

The study is descriptive in nature. Among the different districts Tirupur districts has been purposively selected for the present study. The respondents have been selected by adopting multi-stage sampling technique through pre-tested, structured questionnaire and analyzed using the statistical tools factor analysis, ANOVA and f-test. The period of study is June 2017 – August 2017. Both primary as well as secondary data was used for the study. Likert Scale has been incorporated to gather information on 19 statements related to satisfaction of customers. Necessary changes have been made in the questionnaire after the pilot study with 50 respondents.

Quantification and Scoring Procedure:

To measure the level of satisfaction of the sample customers towards departmental stores, Likert’s summated scaling technique has been adopted. Nineteen statements relating to the satisfaction of customers have been constructed. The respondents have been asked to indicate their satisfaction regarding each satisfaction statement in the Likert’s five point scale. The scale values 5,4,3,2 and 1 have been used to measure the satisfaction level of the respondent.
For the purpose of analysis based on the satisfaction score, the customers have been grouped into three viz., low, medium and high. The respondents who have scored 47 or less are classified as ‘Low’ (that is, if his or her response for 10 or more statements is dissatisfied or highly dissatisfied and for 9 statements is neutral). The respondents who have scored 67 and above are classified as ‘High’ (that is, if his or her response for 10 or more statements is highly satisfied or satisfied and for 9 or less statements is neutral). The respondents who have scored between 48 to 66 are classified as ‘Medium’.

**Table 1: Distribution of respondents based on the level of satisfaction**

| Level of satisfaction | No.  | Percent |
|-----------------------|------|---------|
| Low(47 or less)       | 116  | 29.0    |
| Medium (48-66)        | 152  | 38.0    |
| High(67 and above)    | 132  | 33.0    |
| **Total**             | **400** | **100.0** |

Table 1 shows that among 400 customers, 116 (26%) are having low level of satisfaction, 152 (38%) are having medium level of satisfaction and 132 (33%) are having high level of satisfaction towards departmental stores.

**Relationship Between the Overall Satisfaction Level and Socio-Economic Characteristics of the Customers:**

From the fresh look of the past literatures, it is understood that the socio-economic characteristics influence to some extent the satisfaction of respondents towards departmental stores. Hence, an attempt has been made to examine the relationship between the socio-economic characteristics of the respondents and their level of satisfaction, for which the following hypothesis has been framed and tested. The result of the analysis is presented below.

**Table 2: Relationship between Socio-economic factors and Overall satisfaction of the customers**

| Variables                      | Groups             | Mean  | S.D  | No. | F-Value | T-Value | Table value | SIG  |
|--------------------------------|--------------------|-------|------|-----|---------|---------|-------------|------|
| Age                            | 15-25 yrs          | 71.34 | 8.63 | 62  | 6.632   | -------- | 3.831 **   |      |
|                                | 26-35 yrs          | 70.12 | 8.15 | 125 |         |         |             |      |
|                                | 36-45 yrs          | 66.57 | 7.79 | 144 |         |         |             |      |
|                                | 46-55 yrs          | 67.65 | 9.84 | 69  |         |         |             |      |
| Gender                         | Male               | 67.47 | 8.66 | 116 |         |         |             |      |
|                                | Female             | 69.07 | 8.54 | 284 |         |         |             |      |
| Marital status                 | Married            | 68.10 | 8.58 | 326 |         |         |             |      |
|                                | Single             | 70.85 | 8.36 | 74  |         |         |             |      |
| Educational qualification      | Illiterate         | 63.43 | 9.68 | 7   |         |         |             |      |
|                                | School level       | 66.92 | 8.57 | 177 |         |         |             |      |
|                                | Diploma/ITI        | 68.27 | 6.65 | 11  |         |         |             |      |
|                                | Graduate           | 69.67 | 8.24 | 151 |         |         |             |      |
|                                | Post graduate      | 72.24 | 7.93 | 38  |         |         |             |      |
|                                | Professional       | 71.06 | 10.26| 16  |         |         |             |      |
| Occupational status            | Govt. employee     | 67.00 | 15.22| 7   |         |         |             |      |
|                                | Pvt. employee      | 70.13 | 7.67 | 136 |         |         |             |      |
|                                | Professional       | 71.25 | 9.87 | 8   |         |         |             |      |
|                                | Businessman        | 69.88 | 10.30| 52  |         |         |             |      |
|                                | Agriculturalists   | 60.40 | .89  | 5   |         |         |             |      |
|                                | House wife         | 67.07 | 8.03 | 167 |         |         |             |      |
|                                | Others             | 69.20 | 9.40 | 25  |         |         |             |      |
| Monthly income of the family   | Below Rs.25000     | 67.06 | 8.59 | 143 |         |         |             |      |
|                                | Rs.25001-50000     | 68.84 | 8.23 | 200 |         |         |             |      |
|                                | Rs.50001-75000     | 71.44 | 9.23 | 36  |         |         |             |      |
|                                | Above Rs.75000     | 72.05 | 9.04 | 21  |         |         |             |      |
The post graduate, single, female, young (15-25 years) age group of respondents is found to be highly satisfied towards departmental stores. Professionals, with the monthly income of the family more than Rs.75, 000, travelling from the distance of 11-15 km, spending more than Rs.5, 000 and those who prefer impulsive purchase are highly satisfied towards departmental stores.

In order to find whether the overall satisfaction of customers towards departmental stores differs significantly among the groups of selected socio-economic variables the following hypothesis is framed and tested.

**Null Hypothesis (H₀):**
There is no significant difference in the overall satisfaction scores among groups of age, gender, marital status, educational qualification, occupational status, monthly income of the family, duration of shopping, distance travelled, amount spent and impulsive purchase.

The calculated f-value and t-value comparing the mean scores of age, marital status, educational qualification, occupational status, monthly income of the family and duration of shopping are significantly higher than the respective table values at either 5% or 1% level. Thus, it is inferred that these factors significantly differ with the satisfaction level of customers towards departmental stores. Hence, the hypothesis is rejected with respect to age, marital status, educational qualification, occupational status, monthly income of the family and duration of shopping and overall satisfaction of customers towards departmental stores.

For gender, distance travelled, amount spent and impulsive purchase no significant differences are found between the satisfaction level and the above said factors as the calculated test values are less than the table values. Hence, the hypothesis is accepted with respect to gender, distance travelled and amount spent and impulsive purchases and satisfaction of customer towards departmental stores.

The table of descriptive statistics for all the variables under investigation is given below. Typically, the mean, standard deviation and number of respondents (N) who participated in the survey are given. Looking at the mean scores it can be concluded which variable contributes more for the satisfaction of customers. Higher the mean rating more will be the level of satisfaction.

**Table 3: Descriptive Statistics / Mean ratings of items of customer satisfaction**

| Variables                  | Groups                          | N   | Minimum | Maximum | Mean   | S.D    |
|----------------------------|---------------------------------|-----|---------|---------|--------|--------|
| Modern appearance          |                                 | 400 | 1.00    | 5.00    | 3.7950 | .88879 |
| Spaces are clean and fresh |                                 | 400 | 1.00    | 5.00    | 3.8350 | .87446 |
| Customer friendly layout   |                                 | 400 | 1.00    | 5.00    | 3.8800 | .92072 |
| Adequate number of resting seats |                           | 400 | 1.00    | 5.00    | 2.6350 | 1.12692 |
| Well designed and adequate number of entrances |           | 400 | 1.00    | 5.00    | 2.9800 | 1.13261 |
| Convenient opening hours/working days |                   | 400 | 1.00    | 5.00    | 4.3825 | .81107 |
| Adequate number of clean rest rooms/toilets |      | 400 | 1.00    | 5.00    | 2.0500 | 1.22116 |
The table shows that, the ratings vary between a minimum of 1 to a maximum of 5 for all the items. The highest mean rating is 4.3825 for the variable “Convenient working hours/ working days”. That is, on an average the level of satisfaction for this item falls between satisfied and strongly satisfied. Lowest mean rating is 1.8475 for the item “Safety children play area”, which falls between strongly dissatisfied and dissatisfied.

Step 1:

**Table 4: KMO and Bartlett’s Test**

| Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy | .774 |
|---|---|
| Bartlett’s Test of Sphericity | 2481.877 |
| Approx. Chi-Square | 171 |
| df | ** |
| Sig. | 1%

The Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) measure of sampling adequacy is an index used to measure the appropriateness of the data collected for factor analysis. The Bartlett’s test of sphericity is a test statistic used to examine the hypothesis that the variables are uncorrelated in the population. The KMO measure being 0.774 it can be concluded that the data are adequate to proceed with factor analysis. The Bartlett’s test of sphericity, indication of the strength of the relationship among variables, is significant at 1% level which indicates that the data are more appropriate for factor analysis.

Step 2:

The Table 5 gives the Component Matrix or Factor Matrix, for the factors extracted from PCA. These are all coefficients used to express a standardized variable in terms of the factors. These coefficients are called factor loadings, as they indicate how much weight are closely related to that variable.

**Table 5: Component Matrix of the variables of customer satisfaction**

| Easy availability of staff to provide necessary help when required | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| N | Minimum | Maximum | Mean | S.D | .683 | .031 | -.217 | .246 | -.139 | .200 |
| Staff are friendly during check out stage | 400 | 1.00 | 5.00 | 3.6800 | .90257 |
| Staff has knowledge about storage of products | 400 | 1.00 | 5.00 | 3.8500 | .92175 |
| Staff are generally very friendly | 400 | 1.00 | 5.00 | 3.7450 | .93924 |
| Located at convenient location | 400 | 1.00 | 5.00 | 4.1600 | .82225 |
| Located near other shopping area | 400 | 1.00 | 5.00 | 3.9075 | .96502 |
| Reasonable price | 400 | 1.00 | 5.00 | 4.1925 | .75953 |
| Exclusive for particular products | 400 | 1.00 | 5.00 | 3.0775 | 1.25516 |
| Variety of products | 400 | 1.00 | 5.00 | 4.2450 | .80099 |
| Best quality | 400 | 1.00 | 5.00 | 4.3275 | .80739 |
| Excellent food court | 400 | 1.00 | 5.00 | 3.5000 | 1.18892 |
| Safety children play area | 400 | 1.00 | 5.00 | 1.8475 | 1.06399 |
| Convenient parking facilities | 400 | 1.00 | 5.00 | 2.6200 | 1.23872 |
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Step 3:
The rotated component matrix is the key output of Principal Components Analysis. The Component Matrix obtained in the extraction phase indicates the relationship between the factors and the individual variables. Further, to identify meaningful factors based on this matrix, the rotation phase of the factor analysis is used which attempts to transfer initial matrix into one that is easier to interpret. It is called the rotation of the factor matrix. The Rotated Factor Matrix with varimax rotation is given below where each factor identifies itself with a few set of variables. The variables which identify with each of the factors were sorted in the decreasing order and are highlighted against each column and row.

| Component | 1   | 2   | 3   | 4   | 5   | 6   |
|-----------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| Staff has knowledge about storage of products | .550 | -.034 | -.543 | .250 | .263 | .087 |
| Located at convenient location | .523 | -.153 | .357 | -.188 | .005 | .351 |
| Variety of products | .517 | -.284 | .339 | -.056 | .429 | -.053 |
| Located near other shopping area | .511 | -.180 | .277 | .095 | -.421 | .410 |
| Convenient opening hours/working days | .399 | -.271 | .369 | .352 | -.196 | .181 |
| Well designed and adequate number of entrances | .156 | .716 | .180 | .056 | .102 | .064 |
| Convenient parking facilities | .261 | .680 | .334 | -.122 | -.057 | -.082 |
| Adequate number of resting seats | .261 | .656 | .183 | .093 | .163 | .114 |
| Safety children play area | .137 | .585 | -.020 | -.199 | -.121 | .292 |
| Excellent food court | .206 | .510 | .196 | .332 | .055 | -.430 |
| Exclusive for particular products | .210 | .210 | -.293 | -.301 | .587 | .310 |

Table 6: Rotated Component Matrix of the variables of customer satisfaction

Step 4:
Principal Component Analysis is recommended when the primary concern is to determine the minimum number of factors that will account for maximum variance in the data for use in subsequent multivariate analysis. The
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factors are called Principal Components. In other words, the goal of PCA is to explain the maximum amount of variance with the fewest number of principal components. Table 7 gives the analyzed result of Principal Component Analysis in the table called Total Variance Explained.

Table 7: Total Variance Explained for Factors of Customer Satisfaction

| Component | Initial Eigen values | Extraction Sums of Squared Loadings (Rotated) |
|-----------|----------------------|----------------------------------------------|
|           | Total % of Variance  | Cumulative %                                  | Total % of Variance  | Cumulative %                                  |
| 1         | 4.703                | 24.753                                        | 2.648               | 13.936                                        |
| 2         | 2.482                | 13.063                                        | 2.454               | 12.917                                        |
| 3         | 1.695                | 8.922                                         | 2.289               | 12.050                                        |
| 4         | 1.323                | 6.962                                         | 2.116               | 11.138                                        |
| 5         | 1.236                | 6.508                                         | 1.694               | 8.916                                         |
| 6         | 1.019                | 5.365                                         | 1.257               | 6.615                                         |
| 7         | .848                 | 4.463                                         | 1.115               | 5.728                                         |
| 8         | .793                 | 4.173                                         | 1.115               | 5.728                                         |
| 9         | .708                 | 3.727                                         | 1.115               | 5.728                                         |
| 10        | .647                 | 3.407                                         | 1.115               | 5.728                                         |
| 11        | .544                 | 2.865                                         | 1.115               | 5.728                                         |
| 12        | .510                 | 2.686                                         | 1.115               | 5.728                                         |
| 13        | .457                 | 2.405                                         | 1.115               | 5.728                                         |
| 14        | .420                 | 2.209                                         | 1.115               | 5.728                                         |
| 15        | .402                 | 2.115                                         | 1.115               | 5.728                                         |
| 16        | .358                 | 1.883                                         | 1.115               | 5.728                                         |
| 17        | .320                 | 1.687                                         | 1.115               | 5.728                                         |
| 18        | .272                 | 1.431                                         | 1.115               | 5.728                                         |
| 19        | .262                 | 1.376                                         | 1.115               | 5.728                                         |

**Factor 1:**
This factor explains a maximum variance (13.936%) and comprised of four variables namely staff are generally very friendly, staff has knowledge about storage of products, staff are friendly during check out stage and easy availability of staff to provide necessary help when required. All these variables contribute to the valid aspects of satisfaction of customers towards the behaviour of the employees in the departmental stores. The second look at the writings from the past reveals that the previous studies labelled similar package of variables as “Employees’ behaviour” as confirmatory actions of these variables improve the customers’ level of satisfaction. The maximum variance is 13.936% indicating that consumers did consider employees’ behaviour as significant for their satisfaction towards departmental stores.

**Factor 2:**
Leisure and refreshment factor extracted in this study explains 12.917% of variance. It comprised of variables such as convenient parking facilities, well designed and adequate number of entrances, adequate number of resting seats, discuss with other before shopping, excellent food court, and safety children play area. These variables add to the leisure and refreshment services offered by the departmental stores to make shopping a pleasant experience. Thus, this factor is labelled as “Leisure and Refreshment”. Factor loadings for all the four variables are significant ranging from 0.796 to 0.489. The percentage of variance is 12.917% making it one of the highest factors requiring attention of the store managers to offer enhanced services.

**Factor 3:**
Third factor explains 12.050% of variance. Three variables comprising of it are variety of products, best quality and reasonable price. These variables represent the price and quality factor, a sensitive part of shopping. Factor loadings for these variables ranged from 0.776 to 0.743. Being the third highest score among all the factors, the score indicates that the price and quality is the sensitive and decisive factor that customers consider while shopping.

**Factor 4:**
Ambience factor extracted in this study explains 11.138% of variance. It contained variables like customer
friendly layout, spaces are clean and fresh and modern appearance. These variables seemingly relate to layout and appearance of the departmental stores which the consumers value as most important aspect. However, these variables underline a common aspect, an attempt to attract consumers to the departmental stores using the psychological aspect “look out of the stores”. Consumers are easily attracted towards the friendly atmosphere of the store. So, it is apt to label these variables under “Ambience”. It indicates that customers are more drawn towards modern look and appearance of the stores.

**Factor 5:**
Location factor explains 8.916% of variance associated with the location of the store. It consists of factors namely located near other shopping area, convenient opening hours/working days and located at convenient location. The variables point towards position of the departmental store in compared with other shopping zones and hence, labeled “Location”. It turned out to be the fifth important factor contributing towards the satisfaction level of customers shopping in the departmental stores.

**Factor 6:**
The last factor explains 6.615% of the variance associated with the availability of exclusive products in the departmental stores. The percentage of variance indicates that consumers consider this factor as least significant factor in shopping in the departmental stores. This may be due to the fact that the customers lack knowledge about the availability of variety and designs of products in other stores and e-stores. Results of factor analysis together with percentage of total variance is shown in Table 8. Thus, the 19 variables in the data are reduced to 6 factor model and each factor may be identified with the corresponding variables as follows:

| Statements                                                                 | Factors Identified |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------|
| Staff are generally very friendly                                          | Employees behavior |
| Staff has knowledge about storage of products                              | 13.936             |
| Staff are friendly during check out stage                                  |                    |
| Easy availability of staff to provide necessary help when required         |                    |
| Convenient parking facilities                                             | Leisure and refreshment |
| Well designed and adequate number of entrances                             | 12.917             |
| Adequate number of resting seats                                           |                    |
| Excellent food court                                                       |                    |
| Safety children play area                                                  |                    |
| Variety of products                                                       | Price and Quality   |
| Best quality                                                               | 12.050             |
| Reasonable price                                                          |                    |
| Customer friendly layout                                                   | Ambience           |
| Spaces are clean and fresh                                                 | 11.138             |
| Modern appearance                                                         |                    |
| Located near other shopping area                                           | Location           |
| Convenient opening hours/working days                                     | 8.916              |
| Located at convenient location                                             |                    |
| Exclusive for particular products                                          | Exclusive products 6.615 |

**Relationship Between Satisfaction Level and Socio-Economic Characteristics of the Customers:**
It is recognised that analysis of the customers’ satisfaction is a mandatory step for the decision makers of the retail business. Thus, the six factors derived from the set of statements related to the satisfaction scale, are further analyzed based on the socio-economic factors and its significant association with the factors of customers’ satisfaction.
Customers’ Satisfaction towards Employees’ Behaviour:
The following table describes the mean scores of satisfaction level for different socio-economic characteristics and results of f-test and t-test on the hypothesis framed.

Table 9: Satisfaction towards employees’ behaviour and Socio-economic factors

| Variables                  | Groups          | Mean  | S.D  | No. | F-Value | T-Value | Table value | SIG. |
|----------------------------|-----------------|-------|------|-----|---------|---------|-------------|------|
| Age                        | 15-25 yrs       | 15.58 | 3.04 | 62  | 1.309   | --------| 2.627       | NS   |
|                            | 26-35 yrs       | 15.51 | 2.83 | 125 |         | --------| 2.627       |      |
|                            | 36-45 yrs       | 14.96 | 3.14 | 144 |         | --------| 2.627       |      |
|                            | 46-55 yrs       | 14.91 | 2.90 | 69  |         | --------| 2.627       |      |
| Gender                     | Male            | 14.92 | 3.05 | 116 |         | 1.272   | 1.966       | NS   |
|                            | Female          | 15.34 | 2.96 | 284 |         | --------| 1.966       |      |
| Marital status             | Married         | 15.12 | 2.97 | 326 |         | 1.410   | 1.966       | NS   |
|                            | Single          | 15.66 | 3.05 | 74  |         | --------| 1.966       |      |
| Educational qualification  | Illiterate      | 15.00 | 2.16 | 7   | 1.588   | --------| 2.237       | NS   |
|                            | School level    | 14.85 | 3.04 | 177 |         | --------| 2.237       |      |
|                            | Diploma/ITI     | 15.55 | 2.73 | 11  |         | --------| 2.237       |      |
|                            | Graduate        | 15.39 | 3.02 | 151 |         | --------| 2.237       |      |
|                            | Post graduate   | 15.61 | 3.12 | 38  |         | --------| 2.237       |      |
|                            | Professional    | 16.69 | 1.82 | 16  |         | --------| 2.237       |      |
| Occupational status        | Govt. employee  | 17.00 | 2.71 | 7   | 1.168   | --------| 2.122       | NS   |
|                            | Pvt. employee   | 15.54 | 2.76 | 136 |         | --------| 2.122       |      |
|                            | Professional    | 14.75 | 3.54 | 8   |         | --------| 2.122       |      |
|                            | Businessman     | 15.23 | 3.53 | 52  |         | --------| 2.122       |      |
|                            | Agriculturalists| 15.20 | 1.79 | 5   |         | --------| 2.122       |      |
|                            | House wife      | 14.86 | 2.95 | 167 |         | --------| 2.122       |      |
|                            | Others          | 15.52 | 3.23 | 25  |         | --------| 2.122       |      |
| Monthly income of the family| Below Rs.25000  | 14.75 | 2.93 | 143 | 2.720   | --------| 2.627       | *    |
|                            | Rs.25001-50000  | 15.33 | 2.96 | 200 |         | --------| 2.627       |      |
|                            | Rs.50001-75000  | 16.08 | 3.14 | 36  |         | --------| 2.627       |      |
|                            | Above Rs.75000  | 15.95 | 3.04 | 21  |         | --------| 2.627       |      |
| Duration of Shopping       | Less than 1 year| 15.65 | 2.80 | 80  | 9.619   | --------| 3.831       | **   |
|                            | 1-5 years       | 14.50 | 2.74 | 195 |         | --------| 3.831       |      |
|                            | 6-10 years      | 15.73 | 3.36 | 88  |         | --------| 3.831       |      |
|                            | More than 10 years| 16.89 | 2.72 | 37  |         | --------| 3.831       |      |
| Distance travelled         | Up to 5 km      | 15.54 | 3.08 | 243 | 3.987   | --------| 4.659       | *    |
|                            | 6-10 km         | 14.80 | 2.85 | 134 |         | --------| 4.659       |      |
|                            | 11-15 km        | 14.26 | 2.34 | 23  |         | --------| 4.659       |      |
| Amount spent               | Rs.1000         | 14.70 | 2.98 | 30  | 2.823   | --------| 2.627       | *    |
|                            | Rs.2000         | 15.56 | 3.36 | 90  |         | --------| 2.627       |      |
|                            | Rs.3000         | 14.71 | 2.74 | 119 |         | --------| 2.627       |      |
|                            | Rs.4000         | 15.17 | 3.45 | 82  |         | --------| 2.627       |      |
|                            | Rs.5000         | 15.72 | 2.28 | 64  |         | 2.627   | 2.627       | **   |
|                            | More than Rs.5000 | 16.47 | 1.81 | 15  |         | 2.627   | 2.627       |      |
| Impulsive purchase         | Yes             | 15.19 | 3.10 | 302 | 0.327   | 0.327   | 1.966       | NS   |
|                            | No              | 15.31 | 2.66 | 98  |         | --------| 1.966       |      |

Note: *- 5% level of significance, ** - 1% level of significance, NS- not significance

From the inferences of the above analysis, it is concluded that the single, female, young age groups (15-25 yrs) of respondents are found to be more satisfied with the employees’ behavior. Professionals, in government jobs with the family income of Rs.50, 001 – Rs.75, 000 are highly satisfied with the employees’ behavior. Respondents with the spending capacity of more than Rs.5,000, shopping for more than 10 years in the...
departmental stores travelling within 5 km and who do not favour impulsive purchases are highly satisfied and fulfilled with employees’ behavior.

In order to find whether the satisfaction scores with respect to employees’ behaviour differs significantly among the groups of selected socio-economic variables, the following hypothesis is framed and tested.

**Null Hypothesis (H₀):**

There is no significant difference in the employees’ behaviour satisfaction scores among groups of age, gender, marital status, educational qualification, occupational status, monthly income of the family, duration of shopping, distance travelled, amount spent and impulsive purchases.

The calculated f-value and t-value comparing the mean scores of monthly income of the family, duration of shopping, distance travelled and amount spent and satisfaction towards employees’ behaviour are significantly higher than the respective table values at either 5% or 1% level. Thus, there exists significant difference between these socio-economic factors and the satisfaction towards employees’ behaviour and hence, hypothesis is rejected in case of these factors and satisfaction towards employees’ behaviour.

For age, gender, marital status, educational qualification, occupational status and impulsive purchase no significant differences are found with the satisfaction towards employees’ behaviour as the calculated test values are less than the table values. Hence, the hypothesis is accepted with respect to these factors and satisfaction towards employees’ behaviour.

**Customers’ Satisfaction towards Leisure and Refreshment:**

The following table describes the mean scores of satisfaction level for different socio-economic characteristics and results of f-test and t-test on the hypothesis framed.

| Variables                        | Groups          | Mean | S.D | No. | F-Value | T-Value | Table Value | SIG |
|----------------------------------|-----------------|------|-----|-----|---------|---------|-------------|-----|
| **Age**                          |                 |      |     |     |         |         |             |     |
|                                  | 15-25 yrs       | 15.44| 3.38| 62  | 10.323  | --------| 3.831 **  |     |
|                                  | 26-35 yrs       | 13.95| 3.88| 125 |         |         |             |     |
|                                  | 36-45 yrs       | 12.33| 4.14| 144 |         |         |             |     |
|                                  | 46-55 yrs       | 13.87| 3.64| 69  |         |         |             |     |
| **Gender**                       |                 |      |     |     |         |         |             |     |
|                                  | Male            | 13.41| 3.89| 116 | --------| 0.539   | 1.966 NS    |     |
|                                  | Female          | 13.65| 4.05| 284 |         |         |             |     |
| **Marital status**               |                 |      |     |     |         |         |             |     |
|                                  | Married         | 13.31| 4.00| 326 | --------| 2.855   | 2.588 **    |     |
|                                  | Single          | 14.77| 3.78| 74  |         |         |             |     |
| **Educational qualification**    |                 |      |     |     |         |         |             |     |
|                                  | Illiterate      | 11.14| 4.45| 7   | 4.645   | --------| 3.064 **    |     |
|                                  | School level    | 12.80| 4.14| 177 |         |         |             |     |
|                                  | Diploma/ITI     | 12.45| 3.53| 11  |         |         |             |     |
|                                  | Graduate        | 14.19| 3.51| 151 |         |         |             |     |
|                                  | Post graduate   | 15.45| 3.45| 38  |         |         |             |     |
|                                  | Professional    | 13.94| 5.66| 16  |         |         |             |     |
| **Occupational status**          |                 |      |     |     |         |         |             |     |
|                                  | Govt. employee  | 11.86| 6.64| 7   | 3.777   | --------| 2.848 **    |     |
|                                  | Pvt. employee   | 14.42| 3.51| 136 |         |         |             |     |
|                                  | Professional    | 16.63| 1.60| 8   |         |         |             |     |
|                                  | Businessman     | 13.37| 4.96| 52  |         |         |             |     |
|                                  | Agriculturalists| 16.40| .89 | 5   |         |         |             |     |
|                                  | House wife      | 12.76| 3.82| 167 |         |         |             |     |
|                                  | Others          | 13.92| 4.10| 25  |         |         |             |     |
| **Monthly income of the family**|                 |      |     |     |         |         |             |     |
|                                  | Below Rs.25000  | 13.22| 3.70| 143 | 2.066   | --------| 2.627 NS    |     |
|                                  | Rs.25001-50000  | 13.56| 4.08| 200 |         |         |             |     |
|                                  | Rs.50001-75000  | 14.14| 4.16| 36  |         |         |             |     |
|                                  | Above           | 15.38| 4.59| 21  |         |         |             |     |
### Variables Groups Mean S.D No. F-Value T-Value Table value SIG

**Duration of Shopping**

| Groups | Mean | S.D | No. | F-Value | T-Value | Table value | SIG |
|--------|------|-----|-----|---------|---------|-------------|-----|
| Less than 1 year | 15.38 | 3.59 | 80 | 8.187 | -------- | 3.831 | ** |
| 1-5 years | 13.14 | 3.67 | 195 | | | | |
| 6-10 years | 12.70 | 4.05 | 88 | | | | |
| More than 10 years | 14.11 | 5.13 | 37 | | | | |

**Distance travelled**

| Groups | Mean | S.D | No. | F-Value | T-Value | Table value |
|--------|------|-----|-----|---------|---------|-------------|
| Up to 5 km | 13.25 | 4.19 | 243 | 3.398 | -------- | 3.018 |
| 6-10 km | 13.89 | 3.70 | 134 | | | |
| 11-15 km | 15.30 | 2.98 | 23 | | | |

**Amount spent**

| Groups | Mean | S.D | No. | F-Value | T-Value | Table value | SIG |
|--------|------|-----|-----|---------|---------|-------------|-----|
| Rs.1000 | 13.57 | 4.38 | 30 | 1.707 | -------- | 2.627 | NS |
| Rs.2000 | 13.30 | 4.14 | 90 | | | |
| Rs.3000 | 14.04 | 3.70 | 119 | | | |
| Rs.4000 | 12.72 | 3.76 | 82 | | | |
| Rs.5000 | 13.77 | 4.47 | 64 | | | |
| More than Rs.5000 | 15.60 | 2.90 | 15 | | | |

**Impulsive purchase**

| Groups | Mean | S.D | No. | F-Value | T-Value | Table value | SIG |
|--------|------|-----|-----|---------|---------|-------------|-----|
| Yes | 13.44 | 3.86 | 302 | | | 1.277 | 1.966 | NS |
| No | 14.03 | 4.38 | 98 | | | |

**Note:** *- 5% level of significance, ** - 1% level of significance, NS- not significance

Regarding the satisfaction of customers towards leisure and refreshment, it is found that the post graduate, single, female, young age group (15-25 yrs) of respondents is more found to be happy with the leisure and refreshment services provided by the departmental stores. Professionals with the monthly income of the family more than Rs.75, 000, shopping for less than one year are highly satisfied towards leisure and refreshment. The respondents who travel a distance of 11-15 km, spending more than Rs. 5,000 and not making any impulsive purchase are more satisfied and gratified towards leisure and refreshment.

In order to find whether the satisfaction scores with respect to leisure and refreshment differs significantly among the groups of selected socio-economic variables, the following hypothesis is framed and tested.

**Null Hypothesis (H₀):**

There is no significant difference in the leisure and refreshment satisfaction scores among groups of age, gender, marital status, educational qualification, occupational status, monthly income of the family, duration of shopping, distance travelled, amount spent and impulsive purchase.

The calculated f-value and t-value comparing the mean scores of age, marital status, educational qualification, occupational status, duration of shopping and distance travelled and satisfaction towards leisure and refreshment are significantly higher than the respective table values at either 5% or 1% level. Hence, the hypothesis is rejected with respect to age, marital status, educational qualification, occupational status, duration of shopping and distance travelled and satisfaction towards leisure and refreshment.

Gender, monthly income of the family, amount spent and impulsive purchase are significantly differ with the satisfaction towards leisure and refreshment as the calculated test values are less than the table values. Thus, the hypothesis is accepted in case of gender, monthly income of the family, amount spent and impulsive purchase and satisfaction towards leisure and refreshment.

**Customers’ Satisfaction towards Price and Quality:**

The following table describes the mean scores of satisfaction level for different socio-economic characteristics and results of f-test and t-test on the hypothesis framed.

**Table 11: Satisfaction towards price and quality and Socio-economic factors**

| Variables | Groups | Mean | S.D | No. | F-Value | T-Value | Table value | SIG |
|-----------|--------|------|-----|-----|---------|---------|-------------|-----|
| Age       | 15-25 yrs | 13.02 | 1.56 | 62 | 2.539 | -------- | 2.627 | NS |
| 26-35 yrs | 12.96 | 2.02 | 125 | | | |
| 36-45 yrs | 12.74 | 1.64 | 144 | | | |
| 46-55 yrs | 12.23 | 2.53 | 69 | | | |
### Table 1: Mean Scores and Statistical Analysis

| Variables                      | Groups         | Mean | S.D | No.  | F-Value | T-Value | Table value | SIG. |
|--------------------------------|----------------|------|-----|------|---------|---------|-------------|------|
| **Gender**                     | Male           | 12.71| 1.90| 116  | --------| 0.382  | 1.966       | NS   |
|                                | Female         | 12.79| 1.96| 284  | --------|         |             |      |
| **Marital status**             | Married        | 12.71| 2.01| 326  | --------| 1.288  | 1.966       | NS   |
|                                | Single         | 13.03| 1.58| 74   | --------|         |             |      |
| **Educational qualification**  | Illiterate     | 11.86| 1.95| 7    | --------|         |             |      |
|                                | School level   | 12.53| 1.95| 177  | 1.572   | 2.237  | NS          |      |
|                                | Diploma/ITI    | 13.00| 1.79| 11   |         |         |             |      |
|                                | Graduate       | 13.04| 2.02| 151  | 4.815   | 2.848  | **          |      |
|                                | Post graduate  | 12.95| 1.80| 38   |         |         |             |      |
|                                | Professional   | 12.56| 1.15| 16   | 1.546   | 2.627  | NS          |      |
| **Occupational status**        | Govt. employee| 12.86| 1.46| 7    | 0.998   | 2.627  | NS          |      |
|                                | Pvt. employee  | 12.98| 1.78| 136  |         |         |             |      |
|                                | Professional   | 12.00| 1.93| 8    | 4.815   | 2.848  | **          |      |
|                                | Businessman    | 13.27| 1.63| 52   |         |         |             |      |
|                                | Agriculturalists| 9.00 | 2.24| 5    |         |         |             |      |
|                                | House wife     | 12.56| 2.07| 167  |         |         |             |      |
|                                | Others         | 12.92| 1.66| 25   | 0.213   | 3.018  | NS          |      |
| **Monthly income of the family**| Below Rs.25000 | 12.64| 1.80| 143  | 1.546   | 2.627  | NS          |      |
|                                | Rs.25001-50000 | 12.83| 2.04| 200  |         |         |             |      |
|                                | Rs.50001-75000 | 13.25| 1.87| 36   |         |         |             |      |
|                                | Above Rs.75000 | 12.24| 1.87| 21   |         |         |             |      |
| **Duration of shopping**       | Less than 1 year| 12.89| 1.44| 80   | 0.998   | 2.627  | NS          |      |
|                                | 1-5 years      | 12.59| 2.04| 195  |         |         |             |      |
|                                | 6-10 years     | 12.97| 1.96| 88   |         |         |             |      |
|                                | More than 10 years| 12.92| 2.28| 37   |         |         |             |      |
| **Distance travelled**         | Up to 5 km     | 12.81| 2.02| 243  | 0.213   | 3.018  | NS          |      |
|                                | 6-10 km        | 12.68| 1.92| 134  |         |         |             |      |
|                                | 11-15 km       | 12.74| 1.10| 23   |         |         |             |      |
| **Amount spent**               | Rs.1000        | 12.73| 1.68| 30   | 0.164   | 2.627  | NS          |      |
|                                | Rs.2000        | 12.91| 1.95| 90   |         |         |             |      |
|                                | Rs.3000        | 12.49| 2.14| 119  |         |         |             |      |
|                                | Rs.4000        | 12.87| 1.82| 82   |         |         |             |      |
|                                | Rs.5000        | 13.03| 1.92| 64   |         |         |             |      |
|                                | More than Rs.5000| 12.27| 1.10| 15   |         |         |             |      |
| **Impulsive purchase**         | Yes            | 12.94| 1.81| 302  | 3.211   | 2.588  | **          |      |
|                                | No             | 12.22| 2.21| 98   |         |         |             |      |

**Note:** *- 5% level of significance, ** - 1% level of significance, NS- not significance

Concerning the price and quality the fact derived is that the graduate, single, female young age groups (15-25 yrs) are found to be more satisfied with the price and quality. The sample customers travelling within 11-15 km with the monthly income of the family of Rs.50,001- Rs.75,000, shopping for 6-10 years with the spending capacity of around Rs.5,000 making impulsive purchases are highly satisfied with the price and quality of products available in the departmental stores in Tirupur district.

In order to find whether the satisfaction scores with respect to price and quality differs significantly among the groups of selected socio-economic variables, the following hypothesis is framed and tested.

**Null Hypothesis (H₀):**
There is no significant difference in the price and quality satisfaction scores among groups of age, gender, marital status, educational qualification, occupational status, monthly income of the family, duration of shopping, distance travelled, amount spent and impulsive purchase.

The calculated f-value and t-value comparing the mean scores of occupational status and impulsive purchase...
and satisfaction towards price and quality are significantly higher than the respective table values at either 5% or 1% level. Thus, there exists significant difference between occupational status and impulsive purchase and satisfaction towards price and quality and hence, hypothesis is rejected. For age, gender, marital status, educational qualification, monthly income of the family, duration of shopping, distance travelled and amount spent no significant differences are found with satisfaction towards price and quality as the calculated test values are less than the table values. Hence, the hypothesis is accepted in these cases of socio-economic factors and satisfaction towards price and quality.

Customers’ Satisfaction towards Ambience:
The following table describes the mean scores of satisfaction level for different socio-economic characteristics and results of f-test and t-test on the hypothesis framed.

| Variables                      | Groups             | Mean  | S.D  | No. | F-Value | T-Value | Table value | SIG. |
|-------------------------------|--------------------|-------|------|-----|---------|---------|-------------|------|
| Age                           | 15-25 yrs          | 11.81 | 2.41 | 62  | 4.691   | ------- | 3.831       | **   |
|                               | 26-35 yrs          | 12.01 | 2.18 | 125 |         |         |             |      |
|                               | 36-45 yrs          | 11.16 | 2.11 | 144 |         |         |             |      |
|                               | 46-55 yrs          | 11.07 | 2.13 | 69  |         |         |             |      |
| Gender                        | Male               | 11.01 | 2.43 | 116 |         | 2.917   | 2.588       | **   |
|                               | Female             | 11.71 | 2.09 | 284 |         |         |             |      |
| Marital status                | Married            | 11.46 | 2.17 | 326 |         | 0.944   | 1.966       | NS   |
|                               | Single             | 11.73 | 2.40 | 74  |         |         |             |      |
| Educational qualification     | Illiterate         | 11.71 | 1.70 | 7   | 1.929   | ------- | 2.237       | NS   |
|                               | School level       | 11.23 | 2.14 | 177 |         |         |             |      |
|                               | Diploma/ITI        | 11.82 | 2.44 | 11  |         |         |             |      |
|                               | Graduate           | 11.68 | 2.28 | 151 |         |         |             |      |
|                               | Post graduate      | 12.26 | 1.84 | 38  |         |         |             |      |
|                               | Professional       | 10.94 | 2.91 | 16  |         |         |             |      |
| Occupational status           | Govt. employee    | 10.14 | 3.34 | 7   | 3.569   | ------- | 2.848       | **   |
|                               | Pvt. employee      | 11.56 | 2.24 | 136 |         |         |             |      |
|                               | Professional       | 12.63 | 1.60 | 8   |         |         |             |      |
|                               | Businessman        | 11.50 | 2.49 | 52  |         |         |             |      |
|                               | Agriculturalists   | 7.80  | .45  | 5   |         |         |             |      |
|                               | House wife         | 11.66 | 2.05 | 167 |         |         |             |      |
|                               | Others             | 11.04 | 1.90 | 25  |         |         |             |      |
| Monthly income of the family  | Below Rs.25000     | 11.08 | 1.99 | 143 | 7.579   | ------- | 3.831       | **   |
|                               | Rs.25001-50000     | 11.49 | 2.36 | 200 |         |         |             |      |
|                               | Rs.50001-75000     | 12.58 | 1.92 | 36  |         |         |             |      |
|                               | Above Rs.75000     | 12.86 | 1.68 | 21  |         |         |             |      |
| Duration of Shopping          | Less than 1 year   | 11.81 | 2.14 | 80  | 1.229   | ------- | 2.627       | NS   |
|                               | 1-5 years          | 11.32 | 2.13 | 195 |         |         |             |      |
|                               | 6-10 years         | 11.70 | 2.36 | 88  |         |         |             |      |
|                               | More than 10 years | 11.38 | 2.46 | 37  |         |         |             |      |
| Distance travelled            | Up to 5 km         | 11.75 | 2.20 | 243 | 3.776   | ------- | 3.018       | *    |
|                               | 6-10 km            | 11.13 | 2.23 | 134 |         |         |             |      |
|                               | 11-15 km           | 11.17 | 2.06 | 23  |         |         |             |      |
| Amount spent                  | Rs.1000            | 12.33 | 1.30 | 30  | 0.633   | ------- | 2.627       | NS   |
|                               | Rs.2000            | 11.58 | 2.12 | 90  |         |         |             |      |
|                               | Rs.3000            | 11.36 | 2.32 | 119 |         |         |             |      |
|                               | Rs.4000            | 11.34 | 2.25 | 82  |         |         |             |      |
|                               | Rs.5000            | 11.41 | 2.53 | 64  |         |         |             |      |
|                               | More than Rs.5000  | 12.00 | 1.65 | 15  |         |         |             |      |
| Impulsive purchase            | Yes                | 11.52 | 2.26 | 302 |         | 0.207   | 1.966       | NS   |
|                               | No                 | 11.47 | 2.10 | 98  |         |         |             |      |
The analysis of ambience of the store with the socio-economic factors reveal that the single, female professional with post graduation under the age group of 26-35 years are found to be more satisfied towards ambience of the stores they are purchasing. The respondents with the family income of above Rs.75,000, shopping for less than 1 year, travelling within 5 km, spending around Rs.1000 and making impulsive purchase are found to be highly satisfied with the ambience of the stores.

In order to find whether the satisfaction scores with respect to ambience differs significantly among the groups of selected socio-economic variables, the following hypothesis is framed and tested.

Null Hypothesis (H₀):
There is no significant difference in the satisfaction scores towards ambience among groups of age, gender, marital status, educational qualification, occupational status, monthly income of the family, duration of shopping, distance travelled, amount spent and impulsive purchase.

The calculated f-value and t-value comparing the mean scores of age, gender, occupational status, monthly income of the family and distance travelled and satisfaction towards ambience are significantly higher than the respective table values at either 5% or 1% level. Hence, the hypothesis is rejected with respect these factors and satisfaction towards ambience.

For marital status, educational qualification, duration of shopping, amount spent and impulsive purchase no significant differences are found with satisfaction towards ambience as the calculated test values are less than the table values. Hence, the hypothesis is accepted in case of these factors and satisfaction towards ambience.

Customers’ Satisfaction towards Location:
The following table describes the mean scores of satisfaction level for different socio-economic characteristics and results of f-test and t-test on the hypothesis framed.

| Variables               | Groups                      | Mean | S.D | No. | F-Value | T-Value | Table value | SIG. |
|-------------------------|-----------------------------|------|-----|-----|---------|---------|-------------|------|
| Age                     | 15-25 yrs                   | 12.55| 2.00| 62  | 1.095   | -------  | 2.627       | NS   |
|                         | 26-35 yrs                   | 12.66| 1.76| 125 |         |         |             |      |
|                         | 36-45 yrs                   | 12.37| 1.96| 144 |         |         |             |      |
|                         | 46-55 yrs                   | 12.16| 2.29| 69  |         |         |             |      |
| Gender                  | Male                        | 12.34| 2.09| 116 |         | 0.739   | 1.966       | NS   |
|                         | Female                      | 12.50| 1.91| 284 |         |         |             |      |
| Marital status          | Married                     | 12.39| 1.98| 326 |         | 1.357   | 1.966       | NS   |
|                         | Single                      | 12.73| 1.90| 74  |         |         |             |      |
| Educational qualification| Illiterate                  | 11.00| 3.00| 7   |         |         |             |      |
|                         | School level                | 12.19| 2.09| 177 |         |         |             |      |
|                         | Diploma/ITI                 | 12.55| 2.30| 11  | 2.338   | -------  | 2.237       | *    |
|                         | Graduate                    | 12.71| 1.71| 151 |         |         |             |      |
|                         | Post graduate               | 12.63| 1.94| 38  |         |         |             |      |
|                         | Professional                | 13.06| 1.73| 16  |         |         |             |      |
| Occupational status     | Govt. employee              | 12.71| 1.80| 7   |         |         |             |      |
|                         | Pvt. employee               | 12.67| 1.97| 136 |         |         |             |      |
|                         | Professional                | 11.75| 2.66| 8   | 3.163   | -------  | 2.848       | **   |
|                         | Businessman                 | 13.06| 2.11| 52  |         |         |             |      |
|                         | Agriculturalists            | 10.20| .45 | 5   |         |         |             |      |
|                         | House wife                  | 12.15| 1.85| 167 |         |         |             |      |
|                         | Others                      | 12.60| 1.87| 25  |         |         |             |      |
| Monthly income of the family | Below Rs.25000     | 12.11| 1.82| 143 | 3.665   | -------  | 2.627       | *    |
|                         | Rs.25001-50000              | 12.76| 2.03| 200 |         |         |             |      |
|                         | Rs.50001-75000              | 12.03| 1.81| 36  |         |         |             |      |
|                         | Above Rs.75000              | 12.57| 2.20| 21  |         |         |             |      |
| Duration of             | Less than 1 year            | 12.78| 1.79| 80  | 6.508   | -------  | 3.831       | **   |
Location of the stores attracts single female customers of age group of 26–35 years and they are found to be more satisfied. Professional degree holders doing business with the family income of Rs.25,001 – Rs.50,000, shopping for more than 10 years are highly satisfied with the location of the store. The respondents travelling from 11-15 km, spending more than Rs.5,000 and those who are making impulsive purchases are more satisfied with the location of the store.

In order to find whether the satisfaction scores with respect to location differs significantly among the groups of selected socio-economic variables, the following hypothesis is framed and tested.

**Null Hypothesis (H₀):**
There is no significant difference in the satisfaction scores towards location among groups of age, gender, marital status, educational qualification, occupational status, monthly income of the family, duration of shopping, distance travelled, amount spent and impulsive purchase.

The calculated f-value and t-value comparing the mean scores of educational qualification, occupational status, monthly income of the family, duration of shopping and impulsive purchases and satisfaction towards location are significantly higher than the respective table values at either 5% or 1% level. Thus, the hypothesis is rejected in case of these factors and satisfaction towards location. For age, gender, marital status, distance travelled and amount spent no significant differences are found with the satisfaction towards location as the calculated test values are less than the table values. Hence, the hypothesis is accepted with respect to age, gender, marital status, distance travelled and amount spent and satisfaction towards location.

**Customers’ Satisfaction towards Exclusive Products:**
The following table describes the mean scores of satisfaction level for different socio-economic factors and results of f-test and t-test on the hypothesis framed.

**Table 14: Satisfaction towards exclusive products and Socio-economic factors**

| Variables            | Groups        | Mean  | S.D   | No. | F-Value | T-Value | Table value | SIG. |
|----------------------|---------------|-------|-------|-----|---------|---------|-------------|------|
| Age                  | 15-25 yrs     | 2.95  | 1.22  | 62  | 1.974   | -----   | 2.627       | NS   |
|                      | 26-35 yrs     | 3.03  | 1.30  | 125 |         |         |             |      |
|                      | 36-45 yrs     | 3.01  | 1.23  | 144 |         |         |             |      |
|                      | 46-55 yrs     | 3.41  | 1.23  | 69  |         |         |             |      |
| Gender               | Male          | 3.08  | 1.38  | 116 |         | 0.001   | 1.966       | NS   |
|                      | Female        | 3.08  | 1.20  | 284 |         |         |             |      |
| Marital status       | Married       | 3.11  | 1.25  | 326 |         | 1.102   | 1.966       | NS   |
|                      | Single        | 2.93  | 1.27  | 74  |         |         |             |      |
### Table

| Variables | Groups                  | Mean  | S.D  | No.  | F-Value | T-Value | Table value | SIG. |
|-----------|-------------------------|-------|------|------|---------|---------|-------------|------|
| Educational qualification | Illiterate              | 2.71  | .95  | 7    |         |         | 3.064       | **   |
|           | School level            | 3.33  | 1.14 | 177  | 7.186   | --------|             |      |
|           | Diploma/ITI             | 2.91  | 1.51 | 11   |         |         | 3.064       | **   |
|           | Graduate                | 2.66  | 1.25 | 151  |         |         |             |      |
|           | Post graduate           | 3.34  | 1.21 | 38   |         |         | 3.064       | **   |
|           | Professional            | 3.88  | 1.41 | 16   |         |         |             |      |
| Occupational status  | Govt. employee          | 2.43  | 1.51 | 7    | 2.443   | --------| 12.592      | *    |
|           | Pvt. employee           | 2.96  | 1.31 | 136  |         |         |             |      |
|           | Professional            | 3.50  | .93  | 8    |         |         |             |      |
|           | Businessman             | 3.46  | 1.31 | 52   |         |         |             |      |
|           | Agriculturalists        | 1.80  | .45  | 5    |         |         |             |      |
|           | House wife              | 3.08  | 1.15 | 167  |         |         |             |      |
|           | Others                  | 3.20  | 1.38 | 25   |         |         |             |      |
| Monthly income of the family | Below Rs.25000           | 3.27  | 1.25 | 143  | 3.314   | --------| 2.627       | *    |
|           | Rs.25001-50000           | 2.89  | 1.28 | 200  |         |         |             |      |
|           | Rs.50001-75000           | 3.36  | 1.15 | 36   |         |         |             |      |
|           | Above Rs.75000           | 3.05  | 1.02 | 21   |         |         |             |      |
| Duration of Shopping | Less than 1 year         | 3.18  | 1.20 | 80   | 6.306   | --------| 3.831       | **   |
|           | 1-5 years               | 3.03  | 1.24 | 195  |         |         |             |      |
|           | 6-10 years              | 2.78  | 1.25 | 88   |         |         |             |      |
|           | More than 10 years      | 3.81  | 1.20 | 37   |         |         |             |      |
| Distance travelled  | Up to 5 km              | 3.11  | 1.27 | 243  | 0.536   | --------| 3.018       | NS   |
|           | 6-10 km                 | 2.99  | 1.27 | 134  |         |         |             |      |
|           | 11-15 km                | 3.22  | 1.00 | 23   |         |         |             |      |
| Amount spent | Rs.1000                 | 3.73  | 1.26 | 30   |         |         |             |      |
|           | Rs.2000                 | 3.08  | 1.31 | 90   | 2.036   | --------| 2.627       | NS   |
|           | Rs.3000                 | 2.87  | 1.28 | 119  |         |         |             |      |
|           | Rs.4000                 | 2.96  | 1.22 | 82   |         |         |             |      |
|           | Rs.5000                 | 3.33  | 1.11 | 64   |         |         |             |      |
|           | More than Rs.5000       | 3.00  | 1.00 | 15   |         |         |             |      |
| Impulsive purchase | Yes                     | 3.06  | 1.31 | 302  |         | 0.592   | 1.966       | NS   |
|           | No                      | 3.14  | 1.06 | 98   |         |         |             |      |

**Note:** *- 5% level of significance, ** - 1% level of significance, NS- not significance

Availability of exclusive products satisfies more elder group (46-55 yrs) of married professionals with the monthly family income of Rs.50,001 – Rs.75,000, shopping for more than 10 years are pleased and satisfied with this factor. The respondents shopping in the departmental stores within 5 km, spending around Rs.1,000 without making any impulsive purchase are found to be highly satisfied with the availability of exclusive products.

In order to find whether the satisfaction scores with respect to exclusive products differs significantly among the groups of selected socio-economic variables the following hypothesis is framed and tested.

**Null Hypothesis (H0):**
There is no significant difference in the scores of satisfaction towards exclusive products among groups of age, gender, marital status, educational qualification, occupational status, monthly income of the family, duration of shopping, distance travelled, amount spent and impulsive purchase.

The calculated f-value and t-value comparing the mean scores of educational qualification, occupational status, monthly income of the family and duration of shopping and satisfaction towards exclusive products are significantly higher than the respective table values at either 5% or 1% level. Thus, it is concluded that there exists significant difference between these socio-economic factors and satisfaction towards exclusive products.

For age, gender, marital status, distance travelled, amount spent and impulsive purchase no significant differences are found with the satisfaction towards exclusive products as the calculated test values are less than the table...
values. Hence, the hypothesis is accepted with respect to these factors and satisfaction towards exclusive products.

CONCLUSION:
Customer satisfaction is the key area to be focused by the retail sector, particularly the departmental stores. As these stores are facing cut throat competition from multiple angles the study on customer satisfaction is the need of the hour.
The study reveals that, if not all the factors, at least the factors derived out of factors analysis are to be enhanced immediately to satisfy the customers shopping in the stores .From the inferences, of the results of analysis, it is concluded that satisfaction level of the customers towards the six factors extracted through factor analysis is significantly influenced by the socio-economic factors.
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