

Chapter IV

Customers Characteristic Factors and Purchase Pattern Considered by Men before Preferring Branded Raiment

CHAPTER IV

**CUSTOMERS CHARACTERISTIC FACTORS AND PURCHASE
PATTERN CONSIDERED BY MEN BEFORE PREFERRING
BRANDED RAIMENT.**

4.1 INTRODUCTION

Nicholas Eberstadt reported that, Asia Pacific including India is undergoing a major demographic change not only in terms of number of humans, but also in human profiles and these changes have an impact on international economics. This reflects that India will have a relatively positive outlook in demographics (Ritu Jain, 2015). Thus, it is necessary to understand the demographic profile of Indian consumers.

Consumer behaviour is the study of individuals, groups, or organizations and the processes they use to select, secure, and dispose of products, services, experiences, or ideas to satisfy needs and the impacts that these processes have on the consumer and society (Kotler).

Consumers prefer the stores according to their perception and requirement. It is necessary to understand the perception of consumers and their purchasing pattern in order to satisfy their needs and wants. One of the best ways to enhance the level of service is to understand the consumers' purchasing pattern.

4.2. ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION

The analysis and interpretation of the study on “Impulsive Buying Behaviour and Customer Satisfaction on Select Branded Raiment” is based on a sample of 400 respondents selected for the study. The collected data were classified and tabulated. To derive the results from data collected a detailed analysis has been carried out and suitable statistical tools were also employed in fulfilling the objectives of the study.

Statistical tools applied are namely,

- ❖ Simple Percentage Analysis
- ❖ Descriptive Statistics

- ❖ Kendall’s Coefficient of Concordance
- ❖ t-test
- ❖ ANOVA
- ❖ Factor analysis

PERCENTAGE ANALYSIS

The percentage analysis has been applied to all the questions given in the questionnaire. This analysis describes the classification of the respondents falling under each category.

$$\text{Percentage analysis} = \frac{\text{Number of respondents}}{\text{Total percentage analysis}} \times 100$$

4.3 DEMOGRAPHIC PROFILE OF THE RESPONDENTS

The Demographic Variables such as age, gender, marital status, education qualification, and occupation, area of residence, family structure, family size, family monthly income and number of earning members in the family have been considered for the analysis.

Table – 4.3.1 Demographic Variables

| Demographic Variables | | No. of Respondents | Per cent |
|-----------------------|------------------|--------------------|-------------|
| Age | Below 20 yrs | 22 | 5.5 |
| | 21-30 yrs | 216 | 54.0 |
| | 31-40 yrs | 76 | 19.0 |
| | 41- 50 yrs | 45 | 11.3 |
| | Above 50 yrs | 41 | 10.3 |
| | Total | 400 | 100 |

| Demographic Variables | | No. of Respondents | Per cent |
|--------------------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|-----------------|
| Education qualification | No formal education | 12 | 3.0 |
| | School level | 45 | 11.3 |
| | Graduation | 186 | 46.5 |
| | Post graduation | 89 | 22.3 |
| | Professional | 68 | 17.0 |
| | Total | 400 | 100 |
| Marital status | Married | 222 | 55.5 |
| | Unmarried | 178 | 44.5 |
| | Total | 400 | 100 |
| Occupation | Students | 35 | 8.8 |
| | Govt employee | 24 | 6.0 |
| | Private employee | 179 | 44.8 |
| | Businessman | 88 | 22.0 |
| | Professional | 37 | 9.3 |
| | Others | 37 | 9.3 |
| | Total | 400 | 100 |
| Location of residency | Urban | 131 | 32.8 |
| | Semi- urban | 129 | 32.3 |
| | Rural | 140 | 35.0 |
| | Total | 400 | 100 |
| Family monthly income | Below Rs.25000 | 86 | 21.5 |
| | Rs.25001- Rs.50000 | 136 | 34.0 |
| | Rs.50001- Rs.75000 | 88 | 22.0 |
| | Above Rs.75000 | 90 | 22.5 |
| | Total | 400 | 100 |

(Source: Primary Data)

Age

Age influences the purchase decision of the respondents and it plays an important role in the selection of branded raiment. The table 4.3.1 reveals that, out of 400 respondents, 54 percent of the respondents are between the age category of 21 – 30 years, 19 percent of the respondents belong to the age category of 31 – 40 years, 11.3 percent of the respondents belong to the age category of 41 – 50 years, 10.3 percent of the respondents belong to the age category of above 50 years and only above 5.5 percent of the respondents are below 20 years. Hence, most of the respondents are in the age group of below 21 – 30 years.

Marital Status

The married person is more responsibility to purchase according to their taste and preference. The table 4.3.1 shows that 55.5 percent of the respondents are married and 44.5 percent of the respondents are unmarried. Thus 55.5 percent of the respondents are married.

Education Qualification

Education qualification is the important factor to identify the learning level of the respondents and their level of satisfaction about impulsive buying. It is clear from the table 4.3.1 that 46.5 percent of the respondents have completed their graduation, 22.3 percent of the respondents have completed their post-graduation, 17 percent of the respondents have completed professional educations, 11.3 percent of the respondents have completed their school level and 3 per cent of the respondents have no formal education. Thus most of the respondents are educated at graduation level.

Occupation

Out of 400 respondents, 44.8 percent of the respondents are private employee, 22 percent of the respondents are business people, 3 percent of the respondents are professionals and others category, 8.8 percent of the respondents are students and 6 per cent of the respondents are government employee. Thus most of the respondents are private employees.

Family Monthly Income

The income level determines their purchasing power of the respondents. 34 percent of the respondents family monthly income is between Rs.25,000 – Rs50,000, 22.5 percent of the respondents family monthly income is above Rs.75,000, 22 percent of the respondents family monthly income is between Rs.50,001 – Rs.75,000 and 21.5 percent of the respondents family monthly income is below Rs.25,000. Hence, most of the respondents' monthly income is between Rs.25, 000 – Rs.50, 000.

Location of the Residency

Respondents make their purchase according to their convenient location of the shop, so that customers save their time. 35 percent of the respondents are located in rural area, 32.8 per cent of the respondents are located in urban area and 32.3 per cent of the respondents are located in semi-urban areas. Thus most of the respondents of rural area are also very specific in impulsive buying behaviour.

4.4 PURCHASE PATTERN AND DEMOGRAPHIC PROFILE OF THE RESPONDENTS

The purchase pattern of the respondents decides the type of raiment and the brand of the raiment preferred. This attitude views according to their demographic profile while making impulsive buying.

4.4.1 Frequency of Purchase

The frequency of purchase is the number of times that a respondent makes a purchase in a given period of time. The frequency of purchase has been described in the following table.

Table 4.4.1 – Frequency of Purchase

| Frequency of purchase | No. of Respondents | Percentage |
|-------------------------------|---------------------------|-------------------|
| Once a month | 67 | 16.8 |
| Once in every 3 months | 78 | 19.5 |
| Once in every 6 months | 165 | 41.3 |
| Once in a year | 90 | 22.5 |
| Total | 400 | 100 |

(Source: Primary Data)

It is inferred from the table 4.4.1 that, 41.3 percent of the respondents make their purchase only once in every 6 months, 22.5 percent of the respondents make their purchase only once in a year, 19.5 percent of the respondents make their purchase only once in every 3 months and 16.8 per cent of the respondents make their purchase once in a month. Thus it is evident that the respondents prefer for branded raiment make purchase only once in 6 months.

4.4.2 Source of Information

Source of information provides information to the respondents about the brands, new collection of brands and the leading brands. It plays an important role in taking up the consumer towards trending design.

Table 4.4.2 – Source of Information

| Source of information | No. of respondents | Per cent |
|------------------------------|---------------------------|-----------------|
| Friends and Relatives | 120 | 30.0 |
| Advertisement | 112 | 28.0 |
| Hoarding/Banners | 143 | 35.8 |
| Television/Radio | 25 | 6.3 |
| Total | 400 | 100 |

(Source: Primary Data)

It is observed from the table 4.4.2 that, 35.8 per cent of the respondents have known about the brand through hoardings and banners, 30 per cent of the respondents have known about the brand through their friends and relatives, 28 per cent of the respondents have received information through advertisements and 6.3 per cent of the respondents received information by listening television and radio. Hence most of the respondents are aware about the brand through hoarding and banners. This may happen while they are going for purchase.

4.4.3 Time of Purchase

The time of purchase reflects on loyalty towards the brand. The table 4.4.3 describes the time of purchase.

Table 4.4.3 - Time of Purchase

| Time of Purchase | No. of Respondents | Percent |
|-------------------------|---------------------------|----------------|
| Festival | 108 | 27.0 |
| Discount | 90 | 22.5 |
| Function | 86 | 21.5 |
| Regularly | 93 | 23.3 |
| Others | 23 | 5.8 |
| Total | 400 | 100 |

(Source: Primary Data)

The above table shows that 27 percent of the respondents make purchase during festival time, 23.3 percent of the respondents make their purchase regularly, 21.5 percent of the respondents make purchase only during function time and 5.8 percent of the respondents belongs to others category like family shopping, etc. Thus most of the respondents make they purchase during festival time.

4.4.4 Persons Finalizing the Selection of Branded Raiment

The person finalizing the branded raiment is more important because they are particular on the brand image and brand value.

Table 4.4.4 – Persons Finalizing Selection of Branded Raiment

| Persons finalizing selection of brand | No. of respondents | Per cent |
|--|---------------------------|-----------------|
| Themselves | 139 | 34.8 |
| Friends | 84 | 21.0 |
| Family members | 132 | 33.0 |
| Salesman in showroom | 45 | 11.3 |
| Total | 400 | 100 |

(Source: Primary Data)

It is noted that 34.8 per cent of the respondents finalizes the selection of brand by self, 33 per cent of the respondents make selection of brand with their family members, 21 per cent of the respondents buy the brand which is selected by their friends and 11.3 percent of the respondents select the brand when salesman finalizes the brand. Thus it is evident that the decision taken by the respondents towards brands stands the final and this shows about their brand selection.

4.4.5 Place of Purchase

Customers are more conscious about place of purchase where they get satisfied with all their needs and wants. The following table shows the place of purchase while making impulsive buying.

Table 4.4.5 - Place of Purchase

| Place of Purchase | No. of Respondents | Percent |
|--------------------------|---------------------------|----------------|
| Showroom | 159 | 39.8 |
| Shopping malls | 147 | 7.0 |
| Wholesale shop | 39 | 36.8 |
| Retail shop | 27 | 9.8 |
| Factory outlet | 28 | 6.8 |
| Total | 400 | 100 |

(Source: Primary Data)

It is clear from the table 4.4.5 that, 39.8 percent of the respondents choose their place of purchase at showroom, 36.8 percent of the respondents choose their place of purchase at wholesale shop, 9.8 percent of the respondents choose their place of purchase at retail shop, 7 percent of the respondents choose their place of purchase at shopping malls and 6.8 per cent of the respondents make their place of purchase at factory outlet. Thus most of the respondents choose their place of purchase at showroom.

4.4.6 Mean Ranking

The respondents were asked to rank the different type of raiment based on the preference. The most preferred type of raiment is given a rank of 1 and the least preferred raiment is given a rank of 5. Mean rating were found out for each type which are given below.

Table 4.4.6 - Mean rank-Type of Raiment Preferred

| Type of Raiment Preferred | Mean rank | Rank |
|---------------------------|-----------|------|
| Casual wear | 2.19 | 1 |
| Formal wear | 2.27 | 2 |
| Ethnic wear | 3.05 | 3 |
| Occasional/party wear | 3.57 | 4 |
| Sports wear | 3.92 | 5 |

(Source: Computed)

It is seen from the above table 4.7 that, casual wear has a lowest mean rank of 2.19 which means, which is the most preferred type of raiment compared to others followed by sportswear, has the highest mean rank of 3.92 which is the least preferred type of raiment.

Table 4.4.6(a) - Kendall's Coefficient of concordance for the type of raiment preferred

| | |
|-------------|------|
| Kendall's W | .237 |
|-------------|------|

Kendall's co-efficient of concordance (W) is used to find the extent of similarity among the respondents in their ranking order. The Kendall's (w) value range between 0 and 1. Higher the value of W more will be the similarity among the respondents in their ranking order. The Kendall's W found for the 5 types is 0.237 which shows that there is less similarity in their ranking order.

4.4.7 Factors Considered before Buying Branded Raiment

Percentage analysis is applied to know the preference level of factors that are considered by customers before preferring branded raiment. The table 4.4.7 depicts factors considered by customers before buying branded raiment.

Table: 4.4.7 - Factors Considered before Buying Branded Raiment

| Factors | | Never | Sometimes | Always | Total |
|-------------------------|-----|--------------|------------------|---------------|--------------|
| Colour combination | No. | 23 | 108 | 269 | 400 |
| | % | 5.8 | 27.0 | 67.3 | 100.0 |
| Comfort | No. | 11 | 130 | 259 | 400 |
| | % | 2.8 | 32.5 | 64.8 | 100.0 |
| Design/print | No. | 81 | 142 | 177 | 400 |
| | % | 20.3 | 35.5 | 44.3 | 100.0 |
| Easy of care | No. | 48 | 176 | 176 | 400 |
| | % | 12.0 | 44.0 | 44.0 | 100.0 |
| Fibre content | No. | 60 | 187 | 153 | 400 |
| | % | 15.0 | 46.8 | 38.3 | 100.0 |
| Low price | No. | 63 | 181 | 156 | 400 |
| | % | 15.8 | 45.3 | 39.0 | 100.0 |
| Popular/trend | No. | 75 | 141 | 184 | 400 |
| | % | 18.8 | 35.3 | 46.0 | 100.0 |
| Quality | No. | 21 | 80 | 299 | 400 |
| | % | 5.3 | 20.0 | 74.8 | 100.0 |
| Readily available | No. | 31 | 129 | 240 | 400 |
| | % | 7.8 | 32.3 | 60.0 | 100.0 |
| Wide range of varieties | No. | 56 | 176 | 168 | 400 |
| | % | 14.0 | 44.0 | 42.0 | 100.0 |

(Source: Primary Data)

It is seen from the table 4.4.7 that, 67.3 percent of the respondents have rated that colour combination is always considered before buying branded raiment followed by

27 percent of the respondents rated that colour combination is considered sometimes before buying branded raiment and 5.8 percent of the respondents rated that colour combination is never considered before buying branded raiment. Thus, it is marked that most of the respondents always consider colour combination is the factor considered before buying branded raiment.

64.8 percent of the respondents have rated that comfort is always considered before buying branded raiment followed by 32.5 percent of the respondents rated comfort is considered sometimes before buying branded raiment and 2.8 percent of the respondents rated that comfort is never considered before buying branded raiment. Hence it is noticed that most of the respondents always highly consider comfort.

44.3 percent of the respondents have rated that design/print is always considered before buying branded raiment followed by 35.5 percent of the respondents rated design/print is considered sometimes before buying branded raiment and 20.3 percent of the respondents rated that design/print is never considered before buying branded raiment. Hence it is noticed that most of the respondents always highly consider design/print.

It is found that 44 percent of the respondents have rated that easy of care is always considered before buying branded raiment and same 44 percent of the respondents rated easy of care is considered sometimes before buying branded raiment and 12 percent of the respondents rated that easy of care is never considered before buying branded raiment. Hence it is market that most of the respondents always highly and sometimes consider easy of care.

46.8 percent of the respondents have rated that fibre content is considered sometime before buying branded raiment followed by 38.3 percent of the respondents rated fibre content is always considered before buying branded raiment and 15 percent of the respondents rated that fibre content is never considered before buying branded raiment. Hence it is noticed that most of the respondents highly consider fibre content at sometimes.

45.3 percent of the respondents have rated that low price is considered sometime before buying branded raiment followed by 39 percent of the respondents rated low price

is always considered before buying branded raiment and 15.8 percent of the respondents rated that low price is never considered before buying branded raiment. Hence it is noticed that most of the respondents highly consider the factor low price at sometimes.

. It is found that 46 percent of the respondents have rated that popular/trend is always considered before buying branded raiment followed by 35.3 percent of the respondents rated popular/trend is considered sometimes before buying branded raiment and 18.8 percent of the respondents rated that popular/trend is never considered before buying branded raiment. Hence it is noticed that most of the respondents always highly consider factor like easy of care.

74.8 percent of the respondents have rated that quality is always considered before buying branded raiment followed by 20 percent of the respondents rated quality is considered sometimes before buying branded raiment and 5.3 percent of the respondents rated that quality is never considered before buying branded raiment. Hence it is noticed that most of the respondents always highly consider quality.

It is found that 60 percent of the respondents have rated that readily available of raiment is always considered before buying branded raiment followed by 32.3 percent of the respondents rated readily available of raiment is considered sometimes before buying branded raiment and 7.8 percent of the respondents rated that readily available of raiment is never considered before buying branded raiment. Hence it is noticed that respondents highly always consider readily available of raiment.

4.5 FACTOR ANALYSIS FOR THE SELECTION OF BRANDED OUTLETS

The factor analysis has been applied to summarize the information contained in a number of original variables into a smaller set of new composite dimensions (Factors) with minimum loss of information. (i.e.) The factor analysis identifies and defines the underlying dimensions in the original variables. The factor analysis technique has been applied to identify the underlying dimensions in the set of statements relating to the selection of branded outlet to make impulsive buying.

Factor analysis has been performed in four steps

1. First, the correlation matrix for all the variables is computed. Variables that do not appear to be related to other variables can be identified from the matrix and the correctness of the factor model can also be calculated.
2. Factor extraction has been the second step. Number of factors necessary to represent the data and the method of calculating them has been determined. Also, how well the chosen model fits the data has been ascertained.
3. The factors chosen have been transformed to make them more interpretable through a process of rotation.
4. Scores for each factor has been computed for each case. These scores have been used for further analysis.

The branded outlet has a set of 15 statements (items) which are factor analyzed and the 5 point rating scale has been used to find the underlying factors.

Step 1

Table 4.5.1 Correlations

| | Affordability | Cordial Atmosphere | Availability | Accessibility |
|--------------------|----------------------|---------------------------|---------------------|----------------------|
| Affordability | 1 | .363** | .198** | .184** |
| Cordial Atmosphere | | 1 | .397** | .329** |
| Availability | | | 1 | .261** |
| Accessibility | | | | 1 |

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

Factors influenced to choose branded outlet when factor analysed resulted in four distinct factors namely Affordability, Cordial Atmosphere, Availability and Accessibility. However, before proceeding with further analysis comparing these factors among the groups of selected independent socio-economic variables, the correlation analysis is done

to find out the extent of relationship between these factors. The results of correlation are presented above. It is seen that all the four factors characterizing the branded outlet are having lesser degree of correlations. The maximum correlations are 0.397 between Cordial atmosphere and Availability. The next highest correlation is 0.363 between Affordability and Cordial Atmosphere. These sets of variables are only moderately correlated. The lowest correlation is 0.184 between Affordability and Accessibility. The correlation results justify the performance of Factor Analysis that these factors are almost unrelated with lesser degree of correlations even the they are found to be significant. The correlation results indicate that further analysis can be conducted by taking up each individual factor separately.

Table 4.5.2 - KMO and Bartlett's Test for branded outlet

| KMO and Bartlett's Test | | |
|--|--------------------|----------|
| Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy. | | .660 |
| Bartlett's Test of Sphericity | Approx. Chi-Square | 1712.182 |
| | Df | 105 |
| | Sig. | ** |

Significant at 1% level (P<0.01)

Bartlett's test of sphericity has been used to test whether the correlation matrix has been an identity matrix. i.e., all the diagonal terms in the matrix has been 1 and the off-diagonal terms in the matrix has been 0. In short, it has been used to test whether the correlations between all the variables has been 0. The test value (1712.182) and the associated significance level (P<.01) given in the table 6.4 has enunciated that the correlation matrix has not been an identity matrix, i.e., there exist correlations between the variables. Hence, the factor analysis has been valid and consistent.

Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) test has been used to measure the sampling adequacy. This test has been based on the correlations and partial correlations of the variables. If the test value, or KMO measure has been closer to 1, then it has been considered appropriate to employ factor analysis whereas, if the KMO has been closer to

0, then it has been considered to be inappropriate to use factor analysis for the variables. It has been noted that the value of test statistic has been 0.660 which means the factor analysis for the variables has been found to be appropriate.

Step 2

Principal Components Analysis (PCA) has been used to extract the factors. It is a method used to transform a set of correlated variables into a set of uncorrelated variables (here factors) so that the factors are unrelated and the variables selected for each factor have been related. Next PCA has been used to extract the number of factors required to represent the data. In order to determine the number of factors to be extracted, it has been noted that with more number of consecutive factors extracted, there exists less variability. Extraction of factors has been stopped while there has been very little ‘random’ variability identified. In the correlation matrix, the analysis has been started from where the variances of all variables have been equal to 1. Therefore, the total variance in that matrix has been equal to the number of variables. There have been 15 variables (items), each with a variance of 1, and then the total variability that can potentially be extracted has been equal to 15 times 1. The variances accounted for by successive factors have been summarized in the following table.

Table 4.5.3 - Total Variance Explained for Branded Outlet

| Component | Initial Eigenvalues | | | Extraction Sums of Squared Loadings(rotated) | | |
|-----------|---------------------|---------------|--------------|--|---------------|--------------|
| | Total | % of Variance | Cumulative % | Total | % of Variance | Cumulative % |
| 1 | 3.628 | 24.187 | 24.187 | 2.516 | 16.771 | 16.771 |
| 2 | 2.039 | 13.596 | 37.784 | 2.226 | 14.838 | 31.608 |
| 3 | 1.528 | 10.186 | 47.969 | 2.100 | 14.000 | 45.609 |
| 4 | 1.460 | 9.734 | 57.703 | 1.814 | 12.094 | 57.703 |
| 5 | .998 | 6.651 | 64.354 | | | |
| 6 | .939 | 6.263 | 70.617 | | | |

| Component | Initial Eigenvalues | | | Extraction Sums of Squared Loadings(rotated) | | |
|-----------|---------------------|---------------|--------------|--|---------------|--------------|
| | Total | % of Variance | Cumulative % | Total | % of Variance | Cumulative % |
| 7 | .790 | 5.269 | 75.886 | | | |
| 8 | .766 | 5.106 | 80.992 | | | |
| 9 | .637 | 4.250 | 85.242 | | | |
| 10 | .512 | 3.412 | 88.654 | | | |
| 11 | .445 | 2.966 | 91.620 | | | |
| 12 | .372 | 2.481 | 94.101 | | | |
| 13 | .324 | 2.161 | 96.262 | | | |
| 14 | .297 | 1.979 | 98.241 | | | |
| 15 | .264 | 1.759 | 100.000 | | | |

Total Variance Explained

In the column titled ‘% of variance’ under *Initial Eigen Values* in the table 6.5, the variance on the new factors that have been successively extracted and these values have been expressed as a percent of the total variance. It has been noticed that factor 1 account for 24 per cent of the total variance, factor 2 about 13 per cent, factor 3 about 10 per cent and so on. As expected, the sum of the Eigen values has been equal to the number of variables. The third column has the cumulative variance extracted. The variances extracted by the factors have been called the Eigen values.

The factors with Eigen values greater than 1 have been retained for analysis. Four factors have been retained for the study. The total variance explained (57.703 per cent) by the four factor model in the original set of variables has been given in the last column of the table.

Table 4.5.4 – Component Matrix for Branded Outlets

| Statements | Component | | | |
|--|-----------|-------|-------|-------|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| Prompt service | .666 | -.092 | -.255 | -.196 |
| Availability of multiple size | .640 | -.166 | .322 | -.229 |
| Salesman approach | .571 | .459 | -.240 | .061 |
| Offers and Discount | .562 | -.252 | -.067 | .233 |
| Developed ambience of store | .545 | -.181 | -.160 | -.300 |
| Wide range of varieties | .537 | -.202 | .287 | -.315 |
| Guaranteed quality of raiment | .459 | .237 | .378 | .430 |
| Reasonable price | .456 | -.435 | .278 | .291 |
| Availability of exchange facilities | .400 | .563 | .014 | -.459 |
| Family purchase from that shop | .406 | -.552 | -.213 | -.040 |
| Advantages of membership cards | .445 | .532 | -.233 | .295 |
| Extension of credit | .399 | -.452 | .130 | .253 |
| Established relation with sales person | .474 | .062 | -.727 | .043 |
| Availability of raiment | .399 | .458 | .560 | -.259 |
| Nearer to home | .252 | .295 | .099 | .647 |

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis. Four components has extracted.

The Component Matrix or Factor Matrix where PCA extracted four factors has been depicted in the table. These coefficients have been used to express a standardized variable in the terms of the factors called factor loadings, since they have indicated the quantum of weight assigned to each factor. Factors with large coefficients (in absolute value) for a variable have been closely related to that variable. For example, Factor 1 has the factor with largest loading (0.666) for the item, “**Prompt service**”. These have been the correlations between the factors and the variables, Hence the correlation between the

first statement in the component matrix and Factor 1 has been 0.666. Thus the factor matrix in the table has been obtained with the initially obtained estimates of factors.

Step 3

Although the factor matrix (Table titled **Component Matrix**) has been obtained in the extraction phase has indicated the relationship between the factors and an individual variables, it has been usually, difficult to identify meaningful factors based on this matrix. The rotation phase of the factor analysis has been attempted to transfer initial matrix into one that has been easier to interpret. It has been called the rotation of the factor matrix. Varimax Rotation has been employed to minimize the number of variables that have high loadings on a factor and has enhanced the interpretability of the factors.

The Rotated Factor Matrix using varimax rotation (Table titled Rotated Component Matrix) has been given in Table 6.7 where each factor has identified itself with a few set of variables. The variables which have been identified with each of the factors have been sorted in the decreasing order and have been highlighted against each column and row.

Table 4.5.5 – Rotated Component Matrix for branded outlets

| Rotated Component Matrix^a | | | | |
|---|------------------|----------|----------|----------|
| Statements | Component | | | |
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| Reasonable price | .714 | -.086 | .072 | .194 |
| Extension of credit | .658 | .000 | -.023 | .106 |
| Family purchase from that shop | .605 | .294 | -.072 | -.244 |
| Offers and Discount | .559 | .290 | .029 | .201 |
| Established relation with sales person | .104 | .848 | -.164 | .051 |
| Salesman approach | -.049 | .597 | .274 | .405 |
| Prompt service | .360 | .587 | .279 | -.055 |

| Rotated Component Matrix^a | | | | |
|---|------------------|----------|----------|----------|
| Statements | Component | | | |
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| Developed ambiance of store | .350 | .440 | .300 | -.197 |
| Availability of raiment | -.079 | -.087 | .811 | .279 |
| Availability of exchange facilities | -.305 | .391 | .662 | .063 |
| Availability of multiple size | .498 | .108 | .578 | -.002 |
| Wide range of varieties | .439 | .082 | .544 | -.125 |
| Nearer to home | .095 | .037 | -.092 | .749 |
| Guaranteed quality of raiment | .256 | -.047 | .271 | .673 |
| Advantages of membership cards | -.119 | .503 | .104 | .587 |

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

Rotation Method: Varimax with Kaiser Normalization. Rotation converged in 15 iterations.

Step 4

Normally, from the factor results arrived, factor score coefficients can be calculated for all variables (since each factor is a linear combination of all variables) which have been used to calculate the factor scores for each statement separately. Since PCA has been used in extraction of initial factors and other methods have also resulted in estimating the same factor score coefficients. However, for the study, original values of the variables have been retained for further analysis.

Some of the factors have been regrouped to have more meaningful approach to the study. The following table has shown the rearranged items from the resultant factor matrix. Here the item for factor 6 have been combined with factor 1 item and has been held as a single factor called “**affordability**”. The items under factor 2 have been grouped under the item called “**cordial atmosphere**”. The items under factor 3 and 4 have been grouped under the dimension “**availability**” and “**accessibility**”. However the original values of the variables ave been retained. Thus, the 15 variables in the data

have been reduced to 4 factor model and each factor has been identified with the corresponding variables in table given below.

Factors score were found out for each factor by adding the rating given by the respondents which are coming under each factor. These factor scores show the level of agreement in choosing the particular outlet. Respondents with higher score have higher level of agreement on each factor. These factor score were future analyzed by comparing among the groups of selected demographic variables and selected buying behavior variables.

Table 4.5.6 – Factors Identified against the Statement related to the Brand Outlets

| Statements | Factors Identified |
|--|---------------------------|
| Reasonable price | Affordability |
| Extension of credit | |
| Family purchase from that shop | |
| Offers and Discount | |
| Established relation with sales person | Cordial atmosphere |
| Salesman approach | |
| Prompt service | |
| Developed ambiance of store | |
| Availability of raiment | Availability |
| Availability of exchange facilities | |
| Availability of multiple size | |
| Wide range of varieties | |
| Nearer to home | Accessibility |
| Guaranteed quality of raiment | |
| Advantages of membership cards | |

It is observed from the table 4.5.6 that, 15 variables have been reduced to 4 factor models and each factor is identified with the corresponding variables viz., affordability, cordial atmosphere, availability and accessibility.

4.6 DEMOGRAPHIC VARIABLES Vs AFFORDABILITY

ANOVA/ t-Test has been used to test whether the scores obtained for ‘affordability’ has differed significantly among the respondents classified based on ‘Demographic Variables’ with the following null hypothesis.

H₀: The mean affordability score do not differ significantly based the group of demographic variables namely age, education, occupation, marital status, family monthly income, location of residency, frequency of purchase, time of purchase and place of purchase.

The null hypothesis has been tested for each of the selected Demographic Variables separately and the results are exhibited in the following table.

Table 4.6 – Demographic variables Vs Affordability

| Demographic variables | | Affordability | | | T value | F-value | Table value | Sig |
|--------------------------------|---------------------|---------------|-------------|------------|---------|---------|-------------|-----|
| | | Mean | S.D | No | | | | |
| Age | Below 20 years | 16.09 | 2.29 | 22 | - | 9.015 | 3.367 | ** |
| | 21 – 30years | 15.80 | 2.86 | 216 | | | | |
| | 31 – 40 years | 14.25 | 2.68 | 76 | | | | |
| | 41 - 50 years | 14.51 | 3.80 | 45 | | | | |
| | 51 years and above | 17.15 | 2.52 | 41 | | | | |
| | Total | 15.51 | 3.00 | 400 | | | | |
| Education qualification | No formal education | 18.92 | 1.16 | 12 | - | 11.312 | 3.367 | ** |
| | School level | 16.76 | 2.15 | 45 | | | | |
| | Graduation | 15.36 | 2.72 | 186 | | | | |
| | Post Graduation | 14.29 | 3.26 | 89 | | | | |
| | Professional | 16.10 | 3.24 | 68 | | | | |
| | Total | 15.51 | 3.00 | 400 | | | | |

| Demographic variables | | Affordability | | | T value | F-value | Table value | Sig |
|------------------------------|------------------------|---------------|-------------|------------|---------|---------|-------------|-----|
| | | Mean | S.D | No | | | | |
| Occupation | Students | 16.03 | 2.77 | 35 | - | 3.333 | 3.367 | ** |
| | Govt employee | 16.58 | 2.30 | 24 | | | | |
| | Private employee | 15.81 | 2.56 | 179 | | | | |
| | Businessman | 14.77 | 3.31 | 88 | | | | |
| | Professional | 15.73 | 3.43 | 37 | | | | |
| | Others | 14.43 | 3.80 | 37 | | | | |
| | Total | 15.51 | 3.00 | 400 | | | | |
| Marital status | Married | 15.36 | 3.19 | 222 | 1.167 | - | 1.167 | NS |
| | Unmarried | 15.71 | 2.74 | 178 | | | | |
| | Total | 15.51 | 3.00 | 400 | | | | |
| Family monthly income | Below Rs.25000 | 14.78 | 2.03 | 88 | - | 7.948 | 3.831 | ** |
| | 25000 – 50000 | 15.68 | 2.57 | 136 | | | | |
| | 50000 – 75000 | 16.67 | 2.69 | 86 | | | | |
| | Above 75000 | 14.87 | 4.14 | 90 | | | | |
| | Total | 15.51 | 3.00 | 400 | | | | |
| Location of residency | Urban | 14.60 | 3.52 | 131 | - | 10.070 | 3.018 | ** |
| | Semi-urban | 16.18 | 2.55 | 129 | | | | |
| | Rural | 15.75 | 2.64 | 140 | | | | |
| | Total | 15.51 | 3.00 | 400 | | | | |
| Frequency of purchase | Once a month | 13.36 | 3.94 | 67 | - | 16.527 | 3.831 | ** |
| | Once in every 3 months | 15.86 | 3.40 | 78 | | | | |
| | Once in every 6 months | 15.74 | 2.18 | 165 | | | | |
| | Once in an year | 16.40 | 2.36 | 90 | | | | |
| | Total | 15.51 | 3.00 | 400 | | | | |
| Time of purchase | Festival | 16.32 | 2.31 | 108 | - | 6.747 | 3.367 | ** |
| | Discount | 15.10 | 2.50 | 90 | | | | |
| | Function | 16.19 | 2.29 | 86 | | | | |
| | Regular | 14.66 | 4.03 | 93 | | | | |
| | Others | 14.26 | 3.67 | 23 | | | | |
| | Total | 15.51 | 3.00 | 400 | | | | |

| Demographic variables | | Affordability | | | T value | F-value | Table value | Sig |
|-----------------------|----------------|---------------|-------------|------------|---------|---------|-------------|-----|
| | | Mean | S.D | No | | | | |
| Place of purchase | Showroom | 14.42 | 3.25 | 159 | - | 18.485 | 3.367 | ** |
| | Factory outlet | 14.96 | 1.67 | 28 | | | | |
| | Shopping malls | 15.96 | 2.37 | 147 | | | | |
| | Wholesale shop | 18.44 | 2.26 | 39 | | | | |
| | Retail shop | 15.89 | 3.23 | 27 | | | | |
| | Total | 15.51 | 3.00 | 400 | | | | |

(Source: computed Ns- Not significant, *- Significant at 5% level, **-Significant at 1 % level)

Age

The respondents whose age group is 51 years and above has the mean score of 17.15 is found to be high than others followed by the age group of below 20 years are with the mean score of 20.15. The respondents in the age group of 21 - 30 years have the mean score of 15.80, respondents in the age group of 41-50 years have the mean score of 14.51 and the lowest mean score of 14.25 has been found among the age group of 31- 40 years. The F-ratio value (9.015) shows that the affordability has a significant difference with respect to age groups of 50 years and above. Hence, the null hypothesis has been rejected at 1 percent.

Education Qualification

The respondents with no formal education have the highest mean score of 18.92 followed by school level respondents have the mean score of 16.76. Professional respondents have the mean score of 16.10, graduate respondents have the mean score of 15.36 and the respondents of post graduate have the lowest mean score of 14.29. However, with the F- value (11.312) it is understood that there is a significant difference in the respondents' affordability with respect to the education qualification, thereby; the null hypothesis has been rejected at 1 percent level of significance.

Occupation

Occupation wise, the government employee respondents have the highest mean score of 16.58 followed by student have the mean score of 16.03, private employee respondents have the mean score of 15.81, professional respondents have the mean score of 15.73,

businessman have the mean score of 14.77 and the respondents belong to other category has the lowest mean score of 14.43. The F- value (3.333) reveals that there is a significant difference in the affordability of the respondents with respect to occupation. Hence, the null hypothesis has been rejected at 1 per cent level of significance with respect to occupational status.

Marital Status

The unmarried respondents have the highest mean score of 15.71. Married respondents are with the mean score of 15.36. The t-value (1.167) shows that there is no significance between affordability with respect to marital status. Hence, the null hypothesis has been accepted.

Family Monthly Income

The respondents with family monthly income of below Rs.25,000 has the highest mean score of 16.67, the respondents with family monthly income of Rs.25, 000 – Rs.30, 000 have the mean score of 15.68, the respondents with family monthly income of above Rs.75,000 have the mean score of 14.87 and the respondents with family monthly income of Rs.50, 000 – Rs.75, 000 has the lowest mean score of 14.78. The F-value (7.948) reveals that there is a significant difference in the affordability with respect to family monthly income. Hence, the null hypothesis has been rejected at 1 per cent level of significance.

Location of Residency

The respondents who are living in semi-urban area with the mean score of 16.18, the respondents living in rural area are with the mean score of 15.75 and the urban area respondent has the lowest mean score of 14.60. The F-value (10.070) reveals that there is a significant difference in the scores which shows that the respondents' affordability varied with the area they are living. Hence, the null hypothesis has been rejected at 1 percent with respect to 'residual area'.

Frequency of Purchase

Respondents who make frequency of purchases for once in a year has the highest mean score of 16.40, respondents who make frequency of purchases for once in every 3 month has the mean score of 15.86. Respondents who make frequency of purchases for

once in every 6 month are with the mean score of 15.74 and respondents who make frequency of purchase for once in a month is low with the mean score of 13.36. Thus, with the significant F- ratio (16.527), the null hypothesis has been rejected at 1 per cent level of significance with respect to frequency of purchase of the respondents.

Time of Purchase

Respondents time of purchase during festival has the highest mean score of 16.32, followed by respondents who purchase during function are with the mean score of 16.19. Respondents time of purchases during discount are with the mean score of 15.10. Respondents time of purchase is regular are with the mean score of 14.66 and the respondents who make purchase during other time has the lowest mean score of 14.26. Thus, with the F- value 6.747, the null hypothesis has been rejected at 1 per cent level of significance with respect to time of purchase of the respondents.

Place of Purchase

Respondents who make purchases at wholesale shop has the highest mean score of 18.44, the next mean score is for shopping mall with the mean score of 15.96. Respondents who make purchases at retail shop are with the mean score of 15.89. Respondents who make purchase at factory outlet are with the mean score of 14.92 and the respondents make their purchases at showroom has the lowest mean score of 14.42. However, with the F-value (18.485) it is understood that there is a significant difference in the affordability with respect to place of purchase, thereby, the null hypothesis has been rejected at 1 per cent level of significance.

4.7 DEMOGRAPHIC VARIABLES Vs CORDIAL ATMOSPHERE

The following ANOVA table reveals that whether any significant difference exists between the groups of selected demographic variables and cordial atmosphere are given in the table. The following null hypothesis is framed.

H₀: The mean cordial atmosphere score do not differ significantly based on the group of demographic variables namely age, education, occupation, marital status, family monthly income and location of residency.

The null hypothesis has been tested for each of the selected Demographic Variables separately and the results are exhibited in the following table.

Table 4.7 - Demographic variables Vs Cordial Atmosphere

| Demographic variables | | Cordial Atmosphere | | | T value | F-value | Table value | Sig |
|--------------------------------|---------------------|--------------------|-------------|------------|---------|---------|-------------|-----|
| | | Mean | S.D | No. | | | | |
| Age | Below 20 years | 14.14 | 3.11 | 22 | | 5.977 | 3.367 | ** |
| | 21 – 30years | 14.97 | 2.85 | 216 | | | | |
| | 31 – 40 years | 14.62 | 3.21 | 76 | | | | |
| | 41 - 50 years | 12.89 | 3.52 | 45 | | | | |
| | 51 years and above | 15.76 | 2.78 | 41 | | | | |
| | Total | 14.71 | 3.09 | 400 | | | | |
| Education qualification | No formal education | 14.25 | 2.49 | 12 | - | 8.289 | 3.367 | ** |
| | School level | 14.13 | 3.20 | 45 | | | | |
| | Graduation | 15.38 | 2.97 | 186 | | | | |
| | Post Graduate | 13.29 | 3.18 | 89 | | | | |
| | Professional | 15.16 | 2.64 | 68 | | | | |
| | Total | 14.71 | 3.09 | 400 | | | | |
| Occupation | Students | 13.49 | 2.66 | 35 | - | 3.160 | 3.064 | ** |
| | Govt employee | 15.88 | 2.38 | 24 | | | | |
| | Private employee | 15.08 | 2.89 | 179 | | | | |
| | Businessman | 14.31 | 3.75 | 88 | | | | |
| | Professional | 14.95 | 2.79 | 37 | | | | |
| | Others | 13.97 | 2.86 | 37 | | | | |
| | Total | 14.71 | 3.09 | 400 | | | | |
| Marital status | Married | 14.68 | 3.14 | 222 | 0.212 | - | 1.966 | NS |
| | Unmarried | 14.74 | 3.03 | 178 | | | | |
| | Total | 14.71 | 3.09 | 400 | | | | |
| Family monthly income | Below Rs.25000 | 14.70 | 3.12 | 86 | - | .797 | 2.627 | NS |
| | 25000 – 50000 | 14.65 | 3.07 | 136 | | | | |
| | 50000 – 75000 | 14.40 | 1.75 | 88 | | | | |
| | Above 75000 | 15.10 | 3.98 | 90 | | | | |
| | Total | 14.71 | 3.09 | 400 | | | | |

| Demographic variables | | Cordial Atmosphere | | | T value | F-value | Table value | Sig |
|-----------------------|------------------------|--------------------|------|-----|---------|---------|-------------|-----|
| | | Mean | S.D | No. | | | | |
| Location of residency | Urban | 14.29 | 3.57 | 131 | - | 1.864 | 3.018 | NS |
| | Semi-urban | 14.82 | 2.81 | 129 | | | | |
| | Rural | 14.99 | 2.81 | 140 | | | | |
| | Total | 14.71 | 3.09 | 400 | | | | |
| Frequency of purchase | Once a month | 14.06 | 4.59 | 67 | - | 3.949 | 3.831 | ** |
| | Once in every 3 months | 15.62 | 2.59 | 78 | | | | |
| | Once in every 6 months | 14.42 | 2.50 | 165 | | | | |
| | Once in an year | 14.92 | 2.92 | 90 | | | | |
| | Total | 14.71 | 3.09 | 400 | | | | |
| Time of purchase | Festival | 14.50 | 2.47 | 108 | - | .882 | 2.395 | NS |
| | Discount | 14.71 | 2.75 | 90 | | | | |
| | Function | 14.45 | 2.78 | 86 | | | | |
| | Regular | 15.20 | 3.95 | 93 | | | | |
| | Others | 14.57 | 3.98 | 23 | | | | |
| | Total | 14.71 | 3.09 | 400 | | | | |
| Place of purchase | Showroom | 14.23 | 3.54 | 159 | - | 5.693 | 3.367 | ** |
| | Factory outlet | 13.61 | 1.99 | 28 | | | | |
| | Shopping malls | 14.78 | 2.70 | 147 | | | | |
| | Wholesale shop | 16.00 | 2.45 | 39 | | | | |
| | Retail shop | 16.33 | 2.91 | 27 | | | | |
| | Total | 14.71 | 3.09 | 400 | | | | |

(Source: computed Ns- Not significant, *- Significant at 5% level, **-Significant at 1 % level)

Age

The respondents whose age group is above 51 years have highest mean cordial atmosphere score (15.76) followed by respondents age group between 21 - 30 years (14.97). Respondents whose age group is between 31- 40 years are with the mean score of 14.62. Respondents whose age group is below 20 years are with the mean score of 14.14 and respondents whose age group is between 41 - 50 years have the lowest mean cordial atmosphere score (12.89). This shows that the respondents in the age group of

above 51 years have high satisfaction on cordial atmosphere. The calculated F value is 5.977. Since the calculated value is higher than the table value it is inferred that the cordial atmosphere score have significant difference with the age group. ANOVA result shows that there is a significant between age and cordial atmosphere. Hence the hypothesis has been rejected.

Education qualification

The respondents who have completed their graduation have been found to have the highest mean score of 15.38, followed by professional qualification respondents are with the mean score of 15.16, no formal education respondents are with the mean score of 14.25, school level respondents are with the mean score of 14.13 and respondents who have completed post graduate have found to have the lowest mean cordial atmosphere score (13.29). Thus, it is shows that respondents who have completed their graduation have high satisfaction in cordial atmosphere. The calculated value is 8.289. Since the calculated value is higher than the table value it is inferred that the cordial atmosphere score vary with the levels of education. ANOVA result shows that there is a significant difference between level of education and cordial atmosphere. Hence the hypothesis has been rejected.

Occupation

Occupation wise, government employee respondents have the highest mean score of 15.88 followed by private employee have the mean score of 15.08, professional respondents have the mean score of 14.95, businessman respondents have the mean score of 14.31, other occupational respondents have the mean score of 13.97 and the students respondents have the lowest mean score of 13.49. The F-ratio (3.160) value reveals that there is a significant difference in the cordial atmosphere with respect to occupation. Hence, the null hypothesis has been rejected at 1 per cent level of significance with respect to occupational status.

Marital status

The unmarried respondents have higher level of cordial atmosphere with the mean score of 14.74 with that of married respondents with the value of 14.68. The t-value (0.212) shows that there is no significant difference in the levels of cordial atmosphere with respect to marital status. Hence, the null hypothesis has been accepted.

Family monthly income

The respondents with family monthly income of above Rs.75,000 has the highest mean cordial atmosphere score (15.10), followed by family monthly income of below Rs.25,000 (14.70), family monthly income between Rs.25,000 to Rs.50,000 are with the mean score (14.65), family monthly income between Rs. 50,000 to Rs.75,000 has the least mean cordial atmosphere score (14.40). Thus it shows that the respondents whose monthly income is above Rs.75,000 have high perception on cordial atmosphere. The calculated value is .797. Since the calculated value is lesser than the table value it is inferred that the cordial atmosphere score do not vary according to the monthly income of the family. ANOVA result shows that there no significant difference between family monthly income and cordial atmosphere. Hence the hypothesis has been accepted.

Location of residency

The respondents living in rural areas have the highest mean cordial atmosphere score (14.99) followed by semi - urban areas (14.82) and respondents living in urban areas have the lowest mean cordial atmosphere score (14.29). Thus it shows that the rural areas respondents have high satisfaction on cordial atmosphere. The calculated F value is 1.864. Since the calculated value is lesser than the table value it is inferred that the cordial atmosphere score do not vary with residential locations. ANOVA result shows that there is no significance among residential location with respect to cordial atmosphere. Hence the hypothesis has been accepted.

Frequency of Purchase

Respondents who make their frequency of purchase for once in every 3 months have the highest mean score of 15.62, respondents who make their frequency of purchase for once in a year have the mean score of 14.92, respondents who make their frequency of purchase for once in every 6 months are with the mean score of 14.42 and respondents who make frequency of purchase for once in a month are low with the mean score of (14.06). Thus, with the calculated F- ratio (3.949) is higher than the table value it is inferred that the cordial atmosphere score varies with the frequencies of purchase. ANOVA result shows that there is significance among frequency of purchase with respect to cordial atmosphere. Hence the hypothesis has been rejected.

Time of Purchase

Respondents time of purchases are regular have the highest mean score of 15.20, followed by respondents who purchase during discount are with the mean score of 14.71. Respondents other time of purchase are with the mean score of 14.57, respondents who's time of purchase for festival are with the mean score of 14.50 and the respondents who make purchase during function have the lowest mean score of 14.45. Thus, the significant F- ratio (.882) is lesser than the table value it is inferred that the cordial atmosphere score do not vary with frequencies of purchase. ANOVA result shows that there is no significant among frequency of purchase with respect to cordial atmosphere. Hence the hypothesis has been accepted.

Place of Purchase

Respondents who makes their purchases at retail shop has the highest mean score of 16.33, followed by Respondents who makes their purchases wholesale shop are with the mean score of 16.0. Respondents who make their purchases are with the mean score of 14.78. Respondents who make their purchases at shopping malls. Respondents who make their purchases at showroom are with the mean score of 14.23 and the respondents make their purchases at factory outlet have the lowest mean score of 13.61. However, with the F-value (5.693) it is understood that there is no significant difference in the respondents' cordial atmosphere when respondents are classified based on their place of purchase. Thereby, the null hypothesis has been rejected at 1 per cent level of significance.

4.8 DEMOGRAPHIC VARIABLES Vs AVAILABILITY

The following ANOVA/ t-test table reveals that whether any significant difference exists between the groups of selected demographic variables and availability are given in the table. The following null hypothesis is framed.

H₀: The mean availability score do not differ significantly among the group of demographic variables namely age, education, occupation, marital status, family monthly income and location of residency.

The null hypothesis has been tested for each of the selected Demographic Variables separately and the results are exhibited in the following table.

Table 4.8 – Demographic Variables Vs Availability

| Demographic Variables | | Availability | | | T value | F-value | Table value | Sig |
|--------------------------------|---------------------|--------------|------|-----|---------|---------|-------------|-----|
| | | Mean | S.D | No | | | | |
| Age | Below 20 years | 16.36 | 2.24 | 22 | | 7.941 | 3.367 | ** |
| | 21 - 30years | 14.39 | 2.75 | 216 | | | | |
| | 31 - 40 years | 14.49 | 2.61 | 76 | | | | |
| | 41 - 50 years | 12.64 | 2.77 | 45 | | | | |
| | 51 years and above | 15.22 | 3.72 | 41 | | | | |
| | Total | 14.41 | 2.91 | 400 | | | | |
| Education qualification | No formal education | 18.92 | 1.16 | 12 | - | 10.135 | 3.367 | ** |
| | School level | 13.76 | 3.65 | 45 | | | | |
| | Graduation | 14.59 | 2.88 | 186 | | | | |
| | Post Graduation | 13.70 | 2.24 | 89 | | | | |
| | Professional | 14.47 | 2.70 | 68 | | | | |
| | Total | 14.41 | 2.91 | 400 | | | | |
| Occupation | Students | 14.71 | 2.60 | 35 | - | 1.388 | 2.237 | NS |
| | Govt employee | 14.38 | 3.10 | 24 | | | | |
| | Private employee | 14.73 | 3.03 | 179 | | | | |
| | Businessman | 13.98 | 2.57 | 88 | | | | |
| | Professional | 14.32 | 2.65 | 37 | | | | |
| | Others | 13.68 | 3.40 | 37 | | | | |
| | Total | 14.41 | 2.91 | 400 | | | | |
| Marital status | Married | 14.05 | 2.97 | 222 | 2.734 | - | 2.588 | ** |
| | Unmarried | 14.85 | 2.77 | 178 | | | | |
| | Total | 14.41 | 2.91 | 400 | | | | |
| Family monthly income | Below Rs.25000 | 13.85 | 3.31 | 86 | - | 8.950 | 3.831 | ** |
| | 25000 – 50000 | 14.83 | 2.77 | 136 | | | | |
| | 50000 – 75000 | 13.39 | 1.99 | 88 | | | | |
| | Above 75000 | 15.30 | 3.10 | 90 | | | | |
| | Total | 14.41 | 2.91 | 400 | | | | |

| Demographic Variables | | Availability | | | T value | F-value | Table value | Sig |
|-----------------------|------------------------|--------------|------|-----|---------|---------|-------------|-----|
| | | Mean | S.D | No | | | | |
| Location of residency | Urban | 15.54 | 2.53 | 131 | - | 17.742 | 4.659 | ** |
| | Semi-urban | 13.53 | 2.94 | 129 | | | | |
| | Rural | 14.16 | 2.90 | 140 | | | | |
| | Total | 14.41 | 2.91 | 400 | | | | |
| Frequency of purchase | Once a month | 14.15 | 2.96 | 67 | - | 7.226 | 3.831 | ** |
| | Once in every 3 months | 14.86 | 2.47 | 78 | | | | |
| | Once in every 6 months | 13.76 | 2.82 | 165 | | | | |
| | Once in an year | 15.39 | 3.10 | 90 | | | | |
| | Total | 14.41 | 2.91 | 400 | | | | |
| Time of purchase | Festival | 14.94 | 2.68 | 108 | - | 7.355 | 3.367 | ** |
| | Discount | 14.53 | 2.69 | 90 | | | | |
| | Function | 12.98 | 2.92 | 86 | | | | |
| | Regular | 14.92 | 2.97 | 93 | | | | |
| | Others | 14.70 | 3.01 | 23 | | | | |
| | Total | 14.41 | 2.91 | 400 | | | | |
| Place of purchase | Showroom | 14.41 | 2.91 | 159 | - | 1.383 | 2.395 | NS |
| | Factory outlet | 13.75 | 2.27 | 28 | | | | |
| | Shopping malls | 14.23 | 2.48 | 147 | | | | |
| | Wholesale shop | 15.00 | 3.97 | 39 | | | | |
| | Retail shop | 15.19 | 3.70 | 27 | | | | |
| | Total | 14.41 | 2.91 | 400 | | | | |

(Source: computed Ns- Not significant, *- Significant at 5% level, **-Significant at 1 % level)

Age

The respondents whose age group is below 20 years have highest mean availability score (16.36) followed by respondents whose age group of 50 years and above are with the mean score of 15.22. The respondents whose age group is between 31- 40 years are with the mean score of 14.49. The respondents whose age group is between 21 - 30 years are with the

mean score of 14.39 and respondents whose age group is between 41 - 50 years have the lowest mean availability score of 12.64. This shows that the respondents in the age group of below 20 years have satisfaction on availability. The calculated F value is 7.941. Since the calculated value is higher than the table value it is inferred that the availability score have difference with the age group. ANOVA result shows that there is a significant difference between age and availability. Hence the hypothesis has been rejected.

Education qualification

The respondents who are illiterate have the highest mean score of 18.92, followed by the respondents who are graduate are with the mean score of 14.59. The respondents who have completed professionals level are with the mean score of 14.47, respondents who have completed school level education are with the mean score of 13.76 and respondents who have completed post graduate have the lowest mean availability score of 13.70. Thus, it shows that respondents who are illiterate have the highest mean score of availability. The calculated value is 10.135. Since the calculated value is higher than the table value it is inferred that the availability score vary with the levels of education qualification. ANOVA result shows that there is a significant difference between level of education qualification and availability. Hence the hypothesis has been rejected.

Occupation

In occupation wise, private employee respondents have the highest mean score of 14.73 followed by students have the mean score of 14.71, government employee respondents have the mean score of 14.38, professional respondents have the mean score of 14.32, businessman respondents have the mean score of 13.98 and other occupational respondents have the lowest mean score of 13.68. The F-ratio value (1.388) reveals that there is no significant difference in the availability of the respondents with respect to occupation. Hence, the null hypothesis has been accepted.

Marital status

The unmarried respondents have higher level of availability with the mean score of 14.85. The married respondents are with the mean score of 14.05. The t-value (2.734) shows that there is a significant difference between availability with respect to marital status. Hence, the null hypothesis has been rejected.

Family monthly income

The respondents with family monthly income of above Rs.75,000 has the highest mean availability score of 15.30, followed by respondents family monthly income is between Rs.25,000 – Rs.50,000 are with the mean score of 14.83. Respondents family monthly income of below Rs.25,000 are with the mean score of 13.85. Respondents Family monthly income of between Rs. 50,000 - Rs.75,000 has the least mean availability score of 13.39. The calculated value is 8.950. Since the calculated value is greater than the table value it is inferred that the availability score vary according to the monthly income of the family. ANOVA result shows that there a significant difference between family monthly income and availability. Hence the hypothesis has been rejected.

Location of residency

The respondents who were living in urban area have the highest mean availability score of 15.54, followed by respondents living in rural area are with the mean score of 14.16. Respondents who were living in semi -urban area have the lowest mean availability score of 13.53. The calculated F value is 17.742. Since the calculated value is higher than the table value it inferred that the availability score varies between residential locations. ANOVA result shows that there is a significant difference between residential location with respect to availability. Hence the hypothesis has been rejected.

Frequency of Purchase

Respondents make their frequency of purchase for once in a year have the highest mean score of 15.39. Respondents make their frequency of purchase for once in every 3 months have the mean score of 14.86. Respondents make their frequency of purchase for once a months are with the mean score of 14.15 and respondents who make frequency of purchase for once in every 6 month are low with the mean score of 13.76. Thus, with the calculated F- ratio (7.226) is higher than the table value it inferred that the availability score varies with frequencies of purchase. ANOVA result shows that there is a significant difference between frequency of purchase with respect to availability. Hence the hypothesis has been rejected.

Time of Purchase

Respondents time of purchases during festival have the highest mean score of 14.94. Respondent's time of purchases regularly are with the mean score of 14.92, respondents other time of purchases are with the mean score of 14.70. Respondent's time of purchases during discount are with the mean score of 14.53 and the respondents who make purchase during function have the lowest mean score of 12.98. Thus, the significant F- ratio (7.355) is higher than the table value it is inferred that the availability score varies with frequencies of purchase. ANOVA result shows that there is a significant difference between frequency of purchase with respect to availability. Hence the hypothesis has been rejected.

Place of Purchase

Respondents who make purchases at retail shop has the highest mean score of 15.19, followed by wholesale shop with the mean score of 15.00. Respondents who make purchases at showroom are with the mean score of 14.41. Respondents who make purchases at shopping malls are with the mean score of 14.23 and the respondents make their purchases at factory outlet have the lowest mean score of 13.75. However, with the F-value (1.383) it is understood that there is no significant difference in the respondents' availability when respondents are classified based on their place of purchase, thereby, the null hypothesis has been rejected at 1 per cent level of significance.

4.9 DEMOGRAPHIC VARIABLES Vs ACCESSIBILITY

The following ANOVA table reveals that whether any significant difference exists between the groups of selected demographic variables and accessibility are given in the table. The following null hypothesis is framed.

H₀: The mean accessibility score do not differ significantly among the group of demographic variables namely age, education, occupation, marital status, family monthly income and location of residency.

The null hypothesis has been tested for each of the selected Demographic Variables separately and the results are exhibited in the following table.

Table 4.9- Demographic Variables Vs Accessibility

| Demographic Variables | | Accessibility | | | T value | F-value | Table value | Sig |
|--------------------------------|---------------------|---------------|------|-----|---------|---------|-------------|-----|
| | | Mean | S.D | No | | | | |
| Age | Below 20 years | 11.59 | 2.50 | 22 | | 1.076 | 3.367 | ** |
| | 21 - 30years | 11.37 | 2.33 | 216 | | | | |
| | 31 - 40 years | 11.37 | 2.29 | 76 | | | | |
| | 41 - 50 years | 10.64 | 2.37 | 45 | | | | |
| | 51 years and above | 11.44 | 2.28 | 41 | | | | |
| | Total | 11.31 | 2.33 | 400 | | | | |
| Education qualification | No formal education | 10.92 | 3.06 | 12 | - | 6.214 | 3.367 | ** |
| | School level | 11.13 | 2.11 | 45 | | | | |
| | Graduation | 11.60 | 2.41 | 186 | | | | |
| | Post Graduate | 10.35 | 2.18 | 89 | | | | |
| | Professional | 11.94 | 1.95 | 68 | | | | |
| | Total | 11.31 | 2.33 | 400 | | | | |
| Occupation | Students | 11.43 | 2.17 | 35 | - | 6.407 | 3.064 | ** |
| | Govt employee | 11.75 | 1.48 | 24 | | | | |
| | Private employee | 11.44 | 2.36 | 179 | | | | |
| | Businessman | 11.83 | 2.27 | 88 | | | | |
| | Professional | 10.84 | 2.87 | 37 | | | | |
| | Others | 9.49 | 1.33 | 37 | | | | |
| | Total | 11.31 | 2.33 | 400 | | | | |
| Marital status | Married | 11.33 | 2.24 | 222 | 0.204 | - | 1.966 | NS |
| | Unmarried | 11.28 | 2.45 | 178 | | | | |
| | Total | 11.31 | 2.33 | 400 | | | | |
| Family monthly income | Below Rs.25000 | 10.62 | 2.75 | 86 | - | 16.551 | 3.831 | ** |
| | 25000 – 50000 | 11.22 | 2.21 | 136 | | | | |
| | 50000 – 75000 | 10.72 | 1.55 | 88 | | | | |
| | Above 75000 | 12.68 | 2.17 | 90 | | | | |
| | Total | 11.31 | 2.33 | 400 | | | | |

| Demographic Variables | | Accessibility | | | T value | F-value | Table value | Sig |
|-----------------------|------------------------|---------------|------|-----|---------|---------|-------------|-----|
| | | Mean | S.D | No | | | | |
| Location of residency | Urban | 11.67 | 2.41 | 131 | - | 3.323 | 3.018 | * |
| | Semi-urban | 10.93 | 1.93 | 129 | | | | |
| | Rural | 11.31 | 2.55 | 140 | | | | |
| | Total | 11.31 | 2.33 | 400 | | | | |
| Frequency of purchase | Once a month | 11.48 | 2.81 | 67 | - | 2.083 | 2.627 | NS |
| | Once in every 3 months | 11.44 | 2.09 | 78 | | | | |
| | Once in every 6 months | 10.98 | 2.28 | 165 | | | | |
| | Once in an year | 11.68 | 2.19 | 90 | | | | |
| | Total | 11.31 | 2.33 | 400 | | | | |
| Time of purchase | Festival | 11.47 | 2.25 | 108 | - | 7.472 | 3.367 | ** |
| | Discount | 10.70 | 2.10 | 90 | | | | |
| | Function | 10.98 | 2.43 | 86 | | | | |
| | Regular | 12.26 | 2.44 | 93 | | | | |
| | Others | 10.30 | 1.26 | 23 | | | | |
| | Total | 11.31 | 2.33 | 400 | | | | |
| Place of purchase | Showroom | 11.03 | 2.58 | 159 | - | 4.616 | 3.367 | ** |
| | Factory outlet | 11.04 | 1.00 | 28 | | | | |
| | Shopping malls | 11.41 | 2.20 | 147 | | | | |
| | Wholesale shop | 12.67 | 2.56 | 39 | | | | |
| | Retail shop | 10.74 | 1.32 | 27 | | | | |
| | Total | 11.31 | 2.33 | 400 | | | | |

(Source: computed Ns- Not significant, *- Significant at 5% level, **-Significant at 1 % level)

Age

The respondents whose age group is below 20 years have the highest mean score of 11.59, followed by respondents age group is above 50 years are with the mean score of 11.44. The respondents belong to age group of 21 – 30 and 31- 40 years have the same mean score of 11.37. Respondents whose age group is 41 - 50 years have the lowest mean score of 10.64. The calculated F value is 1.076. Since the calculated value is higher than

the table value it is inferred that the availability score have difference with the age group. ANOVA result shows that there is a significant difference between age and availability. Hence the hypothesis has been rejected.

Education qualification

The respondents who have completed professional qualification have the highest mean score of 11.94, followed by illiterate respondents have the mean score of 11.92, graduates respondents have the mean score of 11.60. School level education respondents have the mean score of 11.13 and respondents who have completed post graduate have the lowest mean score of 10.35. The calculated value is 6.214. Since the calculated value is higher than the table value it is inferred that the availability score vary with the education qualification. ANOVA result shows that there is significant between education qualification and availability. Hence the hypothesis has been rejected.

Occupation

Occupation wise, respondents of businessman have the highest mean score of 11.83, followed by government employee have the mean score of 11.75. Private employee respondents have the mean score of 11.44. Respondents of students have the mean score of 11.43, professional respondents have the mean score of 10.84 and the respondents of other occupational have the lowest mean score of 9.49. The F-ratio value (6.407) reveals that there is significance different between the availability and occupation of the respondents. Hence, the null hypothesis has been rejected at 1 per cent level of significance with respect to occupational status.

Marital status

The married respondents have highest mean score of 11.33 while the unmarried respondents with the value of 11.28. The t-value (0.204) shows that there is no significant difference with accessibility and marital status. Hence, the null hypothesis has been accepted.

Family monthly income

The respondents with family monthly income of above Rs.75,000 has the highest mean score of 12.68, followed by family monthly income of between Rs.25,000 –

Rs.50,000 are with the mean score of 11.22. Family monthly income of between Rs.50,000 - Rs.75,000 are with the mean score of 10.72. Family monthly income of below Rs.25,000 has the least mean score of 10.62. It shows that the respondents whose monthly income is above Rs.75,000 have high satisfaction on accessibility. The calculated value is 16.551. Since the calculated value is higher than the table value it is inferred that the accessibility score varies according to the monthly income of the family. ANOVA result shows that there is significant difference between family monthly income and accessibility. Hence the hypothesis has been rejected.

Location of residency

The respondents who were living in urban areas have the highest mean score of 11.67, followed by respondents living in rural areas are with the mean score of 11.31. Respondents who are living in semi-urban area have lowest mean score of 10.93. The calculated F value is 3.323. Since the calculated value is higher than the table value it is inferred that the accessibility score varies with residential locations. ANOVA result shows that there is significance among residential location with respect to accessibility. Hence the hypothesis has been rejected.

Frequency of Purchase

Respondents make their frequency of purchase for once in a year have the highest mean score of 11.68, respondents make their frequency of purchase for once a month have the mean score of 11.48, respondents make their frequency of purchase for once in every 3 months are with the mean score of 11.44 and respondents who make frequency of purchase for once in every 6 month are low with the mean score of 10.98. Thus, with the calculated F- ratio (2.083) is lesser than the table value it is inferred that the accessibility score do not vary between frequencies of purchase. ANOVA result shows that there is no significant difference among frequency of purchase with respect to accessibility. Hence the hypothesis has been accepted.

Time of Purchase

Respondents who's time of purchase during regular have the highest mean score of 12.26, followed by respondents who purchase during festival time are with the mean

score of 11.47, respondents time of purchase during function are with the mean score of 10.98, respondents who's time of purchase during discount are with the mean score of 10.70 and the respondents who make purchase during other times have the lowest mean score of 10.30. Thus, with the significant F- ratio (7.472) is higher than the table value it is inferred that the accessibility score varies with time of purchase. ANOVA result shows that there is significant difference between time of purchase with respect to accessibility. Hence the hypothesis has been rejected.

Place of Purchase

Respondents who make their purchases at wholesale shop has the highest mean score of 12.67, followed by shopping malls with the mean score of 11.41. The mean score of 14.04 of the respondents who makes purchase at factory outlet, the mean score of 14.03 respondents who make purchase at showroom and the respondents make their purchases at retail shop have the lowest mean score of 10.74. However, with the F-value (4.616) it is understood that there is a significant difference between accessibility when respondents are classified based on their place of purchase, thereby, the null hypothesis has been rejected at 1 per cent level of significance.

4.10 CONCLUSION

This chapter depicts the demographic profiles and purchase pattern that has been analyzed using percentage analysis. The study results indicates that most of the respondents are under the age group of 21 - 30 years, most of the respondents are married, majority of the respondents resides in rural area, most of the respondents education level are graduation, most of the respondents are private employee and majority of the respondents family monthly income is between Rs.25,000 to 50,000.

Purchase pattern results indicate that most of the respondents make frequency of purchase at once in every 6 months, majority of the respondents are aware about source of information about brand through hoardings and banners, most of the respondents make purchase during festival times, majority of the respondents finalize the raiment by themselves, most of the respondents make their place of purchase at showrooms.

This chapter indicates the analysis on factors considered by men before preferring branded raiment. Kendall Coefficient, percentage analysis, Descriptive, ANOVA, t-test are applied to analyzing the data. The result of the Kendall's W found for the 5 types of branded raiment is 0.237 which shows that there is less similarity in their ranking order, that most of the respondents have been preferred casual type of raiment while making impulsive buying. The results of percentage analysis are the factors namely quality, Comfort, colour combination, design/print, easy of care, popular and trend, readily available, wide range of varieties are always considered by men before preferring branded raiment. fiber content and low price are sometimes considered before preferring branded raiment.

The factor analysis has been applied to find the factors considered by men before preferring branded outlets. Respondents with higher score have higher level of preference on factor such as affordability, cordial atmosphere, availability and accessibility.

ANOVA result shows that the affordability score differ significantly with respect to age, education, occupation, family monthly income and location of residency, with respect to cordial atmosphere, the ANOVA result shows that the cordial atmosphere score differ significantly with respect to age, education, occupation, frequency of purchase and place of purchase. The ANOVA result depicts that there is a significant difference among age, education, marital status, family monthly income, frequency of purchase, time of purchase and location of residency with respect to availability. With reference to accessibility, the ANOVA result shows that there is a significant difference among age, education, occupation, family monthly income and location of residency.

The results of demographic variables, the t-test result shows that there is no significant difference between marital status and affordability. With respect to cordial atmosphere of the branded raiment, t-test shows that there is no significant difference between marital status and cordial atmosphere. The t-test result shows that there is a significant difference between marital status and availability. With respect to the accessibility of branded raiment, there is no significant difference between marital status and accessibility.