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Chapter - 4

ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION

This chapter covers the statistical analysis on consumers’ perspective for emerging organized and unorganized retail formats in Bangalore city. It includes consumers’ shopping Perception, Preference, and Attitude towards organized and unorganized retail formats. Analysis based on consumer’s information is segregated into various sections: Section A includes demographic profile of consumers; perception, preference and attitude towards organized and unorganized retail formats. Section B covers the analysis of factors influence on consumers to visit and buy from organized and unorganized retail formats. Section C covers the type of merchandise (shopping and convenience goods) consumers buy from different retail formats and finally section D focuses on additional factors influence on buying preference and service offered by the organized and unorganized retail formats in Bangalore city. For the proper analysis of the data, statistical analysis like, ANOVA, ‘t’ test, chi square, regression analysis, correlation and path diagrams are used.

SECTION - A

Demographic Profile and Respondents’ perception on Retail Formats

Table 1. Age Groups and Shopping Perception

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Organized Retail Outlets</th>
<th>Unorganized Retail Outlets</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 25 years</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>39.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-35 Years</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>42.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above 35 years</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>41.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>41.57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field Survey
Table 2. Age Groups of Respondents’ and Shopping Perception

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ANOVA</th>
<th>Organized Retail Outlets</th>
<th>Unorganized Retail Outlets</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sum of squares</td>
<td>Mean Square</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>206.49</td>
<td>103.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>5612.20</td>
<td>38.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5818.69</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: *Primary Data*

The above tables 1 and 2 reveals that there is no difference in shopping perception among age group of respondents on organized and unorganized retail formats. It is evident from the statistics that, the obtained ‘F’ value is 2.70 and 0.87 with d.f (2, 147), which is less than the table value 3.0 at 0.05 level of significance. Therefore, all the respondents’ have common perception on organized and unorganized retail outlets.

Table 3. Age and Shopping Preference

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Organized Retail Outlets</th>
<th>Unorganized Retail Outlets</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 25 years</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>25.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-35 Years</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>24.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above 35 years</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>23.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>24.59</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: *Field Survey*
Table 4. Age Groups of Respondents and Shopping Preference

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organized Retail Outlets</th>
<th>Unorganized Retail Outlets</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ANOVA</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sum of squares</td>
<td>Mean Square</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>76.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>2176.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2252.19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Primary data.

The above tables 3 and 4 reveals that there is no difference in shopping preference among the age groups of respondents towards organized and unorganized retail outlets. It is evident from the statistics that, the obtained F value is 2.57 and 0.001 with d.f (2, 147), which is less than the table value 3.0 at 0.05 level of significance. Therefore, all the age groups preference on organized and unorganized retail format is also same.

Table 5. Age Groups and Shopping Attitude

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organized Retail Outlets</th>
<th>Unorganized Retail Outlets</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 25 years</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-35 Years</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above 35 years</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field Survey
Table 6. Age Groups of Respondents’ and Attitude

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organized Retail Outlets</th>
<th>Unorganized Retail Outlets</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ANOVA</strong></td>
<td><strong>ANOVA</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sum of squares</td>
<td>Sum of squares</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>239.42</td>
<td>523.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Square</td>
<td>Mean Square</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119.71</td>
<td>261.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>2.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d.f</td>
<td>d.f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>147</td>
<td>147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>149</td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4693.39</td>
<td>16215.74</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Field Survey*

The above tables 5 and 6 reveals that there is a significant difference in shopping attitude among age groups of respondents on organized retail outlets. It is evident from the statistics that, the obtained ‘F’ value is 3.95 with d.f (2, 147), which is higher than the table value 3.0 at 0.05 level of significance. Hence, the null hypothesis is rejected. Therefore, less than 25 years age group respondent’s shopping attitude is positive towards organized retail outlets. Though, perception is same, there is an attitudinal difference among respondents.
The above table also reveals that, there is no significant difference in shopping attitude among age group of respondents on unorganized retail outlets. The obtained ‘F’ value is 2.45 with d.f (2, 147), which is less than the table value 3.0 at 0.05 level of significance. Therefore, shopping attitude of all age groups on unorganized retail outlet is same.

**Table 7. Occupation of Respondents’ and Buying Perception**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Organized Retail Outlets</th>
<th>Unorganized Retail Outlets</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>40.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>44.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House wife</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>40.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>40.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>42.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>41.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>41.57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field Survey

**Table 8. ANOVA of Occupation of Respondents’ and Buying Perception**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ANOVA</th>
<th>Organized Retail Outlets</th>
<th>Unorganized Retail Outlets</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sum of squares</td>
<td>Mean Square</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>240.25</td>
<td>48.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>5578.43</td>
<td>38.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5818.69</td>
<td>38.73</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field Survey
The above tables 7 and 8 reveals that there is no significant difference in buying perception among different occupation of respondent towards organized and unorganized retail outlets. It is evident from the statistics that, the obtained ‘F’ value is 1.24 and 1.08 with d.f (5, 144), which is less than the table value 3.0 at 0.05 level of significance. Across all the occupation, respondent’s perception on organized and unorganized retail outlet is same.

Table 9. Occupation of Respondents’ and Buying Preference

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Organized Retail Outlets</th>
<th>Unorganized Retail Outlets</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>23.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>25.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House wife</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>25.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>25.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>24.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>24.59</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field Survey

Table 10. ANOVA of Occupation of Respondents’ and Buying Preference

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Organized Retail Outlets</th>
<th>Unorganized Retail Outlets</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sum of squares</td>
<td>Mean Square</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>102.18</td>
<td>20.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>2150.00</td>
<td>14.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2252.19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field Survey
The above tables 9 and 10 reveals that there is no significant difference in shopping preference among occupational groups of respondents on organized and unorganized retail outlets. The obtained ‘F’ value is 1.36 and 1.44 with d.f (5, 144), which is less than the table value 3.0 at 0.05 level of significance. Therefore, respondents’ belonging to different occupation show the same buying preference on organized and unorganized retail outlets.

Table 11. Occupation of Respondents and Shopping Attitude

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Organized Retail Outlets</th>
<th>Unorganized Retail Outlets</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>108.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>104.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House wife</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>102.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>109.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>109.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>99.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>105.09</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field Survey

Table 12. ANOVA of Occupation of Respondents’ and Shopping Attitude

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ANOVA</th>
<th>Organized Retail Outlets</th>
<th>Unorganized Retail Outlets</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sum of squares</td>
<td>Mean Square</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>2433.53</td>
<td>486.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>64457.15</td>
<td>447.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>66890.69</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field Survey
The above tables 11 and 12 reveals that there is no significant difference in shopping attitude among occupation of respondent towards organized retail outlets. The obtained ‘F’ value is 1.08 with d.f (5, 144), which is less than the table value 3.0 at 0.05 level of significance. Therefore, all the occupational groups’ attitude on organized and unorganized retail outlet is same.

But, according to the tables there is a significant difference in shopping attitude among different occupational groups of respondents on unorganized retail outlets. It is evident from the statistics that, the obtained ‘F’ value is 3.86 with d.f (5, 144), which is higher than the table value 3.0 at 0.05 level of significance. Hence, the null hypothesis rejected. Among the occupational attitude of the students on shopping is different with a mean value 102.51, which is higher than the other occupational groups of attitude. Therefore, buying attitude of students on unorganized retail outlet is positive.
Table 13. Qualification of Respondents and Shopping Perception

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Qualification</th>
<th>Organized Retail Outlets</th>
<th>Unorganized Retail Outlets</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than SSLC</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>40.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PUC</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>41.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>44.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PG</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>39.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>41.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field Survey

Table 14. ANOVA of Qualification of Respondents’ and Shopping Perception

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ANOVA</th>
<th>Organized Retail Outlets</th>
<th>Unorganized Retail Outlets</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sum of squares</td>
<td>Mean Square</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>600.96</td>
<td>200.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>4790.53</td>
<td>32.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5391.49</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field Survey

The above tables 13 and 14 reveals that there is a significant difference in buying perception among qualification of respondents on organized retail outlets. It is evident from the statistics that, the obtained ‘F’ value is 6.10 with d.f (3, 146), which is higher than the table value 3.0 at 0.05 level of significance. Hence, the null hypothesis is rejected and also above table reveals that buying perception of graduates is different mean value is 44.07, which is higher than other qualification groups buying perception. Therefore, shopping perception of graduates on unorganized retail outlet is positive.
The above table also reveals that there is no significant difference in buying perception among different qualification groups of respondent towards unorganized retail outlets, as the obtained ‘F’ value is 0.59 with d.f (3, 146), which is less than the table value 3.0 at 0.05 level of significance. Therefore, all the different qualification groups of respondents perception on unorganized retail outlet is same.

![Qualification of Respondents and Shopping Perception](image)

**Fig. 3. Qualification of Respondents and Shopping Perception**

**Table 15. Qualification of Respondents and Shopping Preference**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Qualification</th>
<th>Organized Retail Outlets</th>
<th>Unorganized Retail Outlets</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than SSLC</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>24.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PUC</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>23.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>25.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PG</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>24.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>24.55</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Field Survey*
Table 16. ANOVA of Qualification of Respondents’ and Buying Preference

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organized Retail Outlets</th>
<th>Unorganized Retail Outlets</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ANOVA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sum of squares</td>
<td>32.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Square</td>
<td>10.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>0.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d.f</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sum of squares</td>
<td>326.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Square</td>
<td>108.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>1.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sum of squares</td>
<td>2238.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Square</td>
<td>15.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2271.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source: Field Survey</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Above tables 15 and 16 reveals that there is no difference in buying preference among different level of qualification of respondents on organized and unorganized retail formats. It can be seen from the statistics that, the obtained ‘F’ value is 0.69 and 1.83 with d.f (2, 147), which is less than the table value 3.0 at 0.05 level of significance. Therefore, there is no preferential difference among the different qualification of respondent’s on organized and unorganized retail outlets.

Table 17. Qualification of Respondents and Shopping Attitude

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organized Retail Outlets</th>
<th>Unorganized Retail Outlets</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Qualification</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than SSLC</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PUC</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PG</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field Survey
### Table 18. ANOVA of Respondents’ Qualification and Shopping Attitude

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Organized Retail Outlets</th>
<th>Unorganized Retail Outlets</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ANOVA</strong></td>
<td>Sum of squares</td>
<td>Mean Square</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>d.f</td>
<td>Sum of squares</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>778.58</td>
<td>259.52</td>
<td>5.85</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>424.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>6476.46</td>
<td>44.35</td>
<td></td>
<td>146</td>
<td>58168.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>7255.04</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.85</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>58593.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field Survey

### Fig. 4. Qualification of Respondents and Shopping Attitude

Above tables 17 and 18 reveal that there is a significant difference in shopping attitude among different level of qualification of respondent on organized retail outlets. It is evident from the statistics that, the obtained ‘F’ value is 5.85 with d.f (3, 146), which is higher than the table value 3.0 at 0.05 level of significance. Hence, the null hypothesis rejected. Graduates shopping attitude mean value is 85.33, which is higher than other groups of respondents shopping attitude. Therefore, shopping attitude of graduates on organized retail outlet is positive.
But, the above table also reveals that there is no significant difference in shopping attitude among different qualification groups towards unorganized retail outlets. The obtained ‘F’ value is 0.35 with d.f (3, 146), which is less than the table value 3.0 at 0.05 level of significance. Therefore, all educational qualification groups shopping attitude on unorganized retail outlet is same.

Table 19. Income Groups of Respondents and Shopping Perception

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income</th>
<th>Organized Retail Outlets</th>
<th>Unorganized Retail Outlets</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 5000</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>39.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5000-10,000</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>40.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000-15,000</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>39.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15,000-20,000</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>41.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20,000-25,000</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>44.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above 25,000</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>44.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>41.57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field Survey

Table 20. ANOVA of Income Groups of Respondents’ and Shopping Perception

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ANOVA</th>
<th>Organized Retail Outlets</th>
<th>Unorganized Retail Outlets</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sum of squares</td>
<td>Mean Square</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>629.26</td>
<td>125.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>5189.43</td>
<td>36.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5818.69</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field Survey
The above tables 19 and 20 reveals that there is a difference in shopping perception among income group of respondents on organized retail outlets. The statistics reveals that the obtained F value is 3.49 with d.f (5, 144), which is higher than the table value 3.0 at 0.05 level of significance. Hence, the null hypothesis is rejected. The table also shows that shopping perception of above Rs.25, 000 income group of respondents mean value is 44.41. Therefore, this income group of respondents shopping perception is positive on organized retail outlets.

But there is no difference in shopping perception among the income group of respondents on unorganized retail outlets. The obtained F value is 1.47 with d.f (5, 144), which is less than the table value 3.0 at 0.05 level of significance. Therefore, there is no difference in the shopping perception on unorganized retail outlets.
Table 21. Income Groups of Respondents and Shopping Preference

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 5000</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>23.70</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>35.57</td>
<td>8.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5000-10,000</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>25.08</td>
<td>3.34</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>36.33</td>
<td>6.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000-15,000</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>25.11</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>35.18</td>
<td>8.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15,000-20,000</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>25.10</td>
<td>4.40</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>35.13</td>
<td>8.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20,000-25,000</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>24.70</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>32.70</td>
<td>7.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above 25,000</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>24.08</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>31.96</td>
<td>7.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>24.59</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>34.31</td>
<td>7.77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field Survey

Table 22. ANOVA of Income Groups of Respondents' and Shopping Preference

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ANOVA</th>
<th>Sum of squares</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>d.f</th>
<th>Sum of squares</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>50.55</td>
<td>10.11</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>372.79</td>
<td>74.55</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>2201.64</td>
<td>15.28</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>8625.48</td>
<td>59.89</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2252.19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>149</td>
<td>8998.27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field Survey

The above tables 21 and 22 reveals that there is no difference in shopping preference among income groups of respondents towards organized and unorganized retail outlets. It is evident from the statistics that, obtained F value is 0.66 and 1.24 with d.f (5, 144), which is less than the table value 3.0 at 0.05 level of significance. Therefore, all the different income group of respondent’s preference on organized and unorganized retail outlets is same.
Table 23. Income Groups of Respondents and Shopping Attitude

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 5000</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>105.33</td>
<td>23.76</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>79.714</td>
<td>9.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5000-10,000</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>90.33</td>
<td>26.40</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>105.56</td>
<td>21.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000-15,000</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>105.03</td>
<td>20.082</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>84.68</td>
<td>13.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15,000-20,000</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>108.62</td>
<td>19.89</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>83.13</td>
<td>11.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20,000-25,000</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>106.70</td>
<td>18.32</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>104.87</td>
<td>24.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above 25,000</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>111.88</td>
<td>12.04</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>81.47</td>
<td>12.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>105.09</td>
<td>21.18</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>91.10</td>
<td>19.83</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field Survey

Table 24. ANOVA of Income Groups of Respondents and Shopping Attitude

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ANOVA</th>
<th>Organized Retail Outlets</th>
<th>Unorganized Retail Outlets</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sum of squares</td>
<td>Mean Square</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>7183.94</td>
<td>1436.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>59706.75</td>
<td>414.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>66890.69</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field Survey
The above tables 23 and 24 reveals that there is a difference in shopping attitude among the different income group of respondents on organized retail outlets. It is evident from the statistics that, the obtained F value is 3.46 with d.f (5, 144), which is higher than the table value 3.0 at 0.05 level of significance. Hence, there is sufficient evidence to reject the null hypothesis. The above table also shows that shopping perception of above Rs.25,000 income group of respondents mean value is 111.88. Therefore, this income group of respondents shopping attitude on organized retail outlet is positive.

But the above table also there is a difference in shopping attitude among different income group’s respondents on unorganized retail outlets. It is evident from the statistics that, the obtained F value is 11.92 with d.f (5, 144), which is higher than the table value 3.0 at 0.05 level of significance. Hence, accept the null hypothesis. Shopping attitude of above Rs.25,000 income group respondents mean value is 105.56. Therefore, their shopping attitude on unorganized retail outlet is positive.
SECTION - B

Factors Influencing Customer Buying Preferences

Table 25. Factors Influencing on Customer Shopping Perception

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Organized Retail Outlets</th>
<th>Unorganized Retail Outlets</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>0.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Price</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment</td>
<td></td>
<td>8.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative Change</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.94</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant at 0.5 level

The above table 25 reveals that there is a significant difference in the perception of respondents towards organized and unorganized retail outlets on offer and promotion. It is evident from the statistics that, the obtained t value is 12.42 which is higher than table value 1.96 with degrees of freedom 298 at 0.05 level of significance.

The above table also shows that perception of respondents on retail promotion by organized and unorganized retail outlets with mean value is 10.84. Therefore, perception of respondents on organized retail outlets shows that offer more promotion for shopping.

According to table there is a significant difference in perception of respondents towards price in organized and unorganized retail outlets. It is evident from the statistics that, the obtained t value is 7.52 which is higher than table value 1.96 with degrees of freedom 298 at 0.05 level of significance. The above table also reveals that perception of respondents on the unorganized retail outlet price with mean value is 14.02. Therefore, perception of respondents on unorganized retail outlets is it offers reasonable price.
But the above table reveals that there is a significant difference in perception of respondents towards commitment of purchase in organized and unorganized retail outlets. It is evident from the statistics that, the obtained t value is 5.00 which is higher than table value 1.96 with degrees of freedom 298 at 0.05 level of significance. The above table also reveals that perception of respondents on the unorganized retail outlet commitment with mean value is 10.19. Therefore, perception of respondents more commitment to purchase in unorganized retail outlets.

Perception of respondents towards alternative change for organized and unorganized retail outlets shows t value 5.39 which is higher than table value 1.96 with degrees of freedom 298 at 0.05 level of significance.

The above table shows that perception of respondents towards alternative change of outlets for shopping of merchandise. The mean value of the perception is 7.07 on unorganized retail outlet. Therefore, perception of respondents alternative change towards unorganized retail outlets.

Table 26. Perception, Preference and Attitude of Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organized Retail Outlets</th>
<th>Unorganized Retail Outlets</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overall Perception</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>41.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std. Deviation</td>
<td>6.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overall Preference</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>24.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std. Deviation</td>
<td>3.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overall Attitude</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>102.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std. Deviation</td>
<td>23.27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*tSignificant at 0.05 level
The above table 26 reveals the overall perception, preference and attitude of the respondents on organized and unorganized retail formats. Accordingly, respondents' perception is high on unorganized retail outlets with a mean value 52.90 and t value 10.98 which is higher than table value 1.96 with degrees of freedom 298 at 0.05 level of significance. Overall preference shows the mean value 34.31 with t value 13.70 which is higher than the table value 1.96 with degrees of freedom 298 at 0.05 level of significance. But, the mean value of the attitude of the respondents is high (102.61) with t value 4.61 which is higher than table value 1.96 with degrees of freedom 298 at 0.05 level of significance on organized retail outlets.

Table 27. Factors Influencing on Respondents and Shopping Attitudes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Organized Retail Outlets</th>
<th>Unorganized Retail Outlets</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shopping Enjoyment</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>11.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>10.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>16.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee Behavior</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>19.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Store Features</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>36.88</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant at 0.5 level.

The above table 27 reveals the factors influencing the shopping attitude of the respondents. According to the table, there is a significant influence of shopping enjoyment on attitude of respondents in organized retail outlets is more than the
unorganized outlets with mean value 11.11 and t value 2.97 which is higher than table value 1.96 with degrees of freedom 298 at 0.05 level of significance.

According to table there is a significant influence of environment in shopping in organized retail outlet than unorganized retail outlets. It is evident from the statistics that, the obtained t value is 7.07 which is higher than table value 1.96 with degrees of freedom 298 at 0.05 level of significance.

There is a significant difference in the respondent’s opinion on quality of merchandise in organized and unorganized retail outlets. From the above table, it can be seen that the mean value of quality is 16.20 with t value 11.93 which is higher than table value 1.96 (with d.f 298) at 0.05 level of significance. Hence, quality of merchandise in organized retail outlets is the influencer for shopping attitude of respondents.

The table also reveals that there is a significant difference in respondents opinion towards employee behavior in organized and unorganized retail outlets. It is evident from the statistics that, the mean value of the employee behavior is 19.20 with t value 4.39 which is higher than table value 1.96 with degrees of freedom 298 at 0.05 level of significance.

The store features influence on respondents behavior is also find significantly different in organized and unorganized retail outlets. It is evident from the statistics that, the mean value of the store features is 36.88 with t values 5.28 which is higher than table value 1.96 with degrees of freedom 298 at 0.05 level of significance. Therefore, respondent’s attitude towards organized outlets features is positive than unorganized.
SECTION - C

Information collected from the respondents on various features of organized and unorganized retail outlets is classified and presented below.

Table 28. Merchandise Purchase Behavior of the Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Merchandise Category</th>
<th>Unorganized Retail outlets (%)</th>
<th>Organized Retail Outlets (%)</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Food and Groceries</td>
<td>292(97.3%)</td>
<td>8(2.7%)</td>
<td>300(100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apparels, accessories</td>
<td>238(79.3%)</td>
<td>62(20.7%)</td>
<td>300(100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Furniture (cot, sofa etc)</td>
<td>226(75.3%)</td>
<td>74(24.7%)</td>
<td>300(100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home décor (curtained, bed spread, wall hanging etc)</td>
<td>224(74.7%)</td>
<td>76(25.3%)</td>
<td>300(100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major appliances /electronic items</td>
<td>129(43.0%)</td>
<td>171(57.0%)</td>
<td>300(100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewelers</td>
<td>124(41.3%)</td>
<td>176(58.7%)</td>
<td>300(100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clothes, and footwear</td>
<td>161(53.7%)</td>
<td>139(46.3%)</td>
<td>300(100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fruits and vegetables, milk and eggs, snacks</td>
<td>272(90.7%)</td>
<td>28(9.3%)</td>
<td>300(100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical and health care</td>
<td>174(58.0%)</td>
<td>126(42.0%)</td>
<td>300(100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consumables goods</td>
<td>214(71.3%)</td>
<td>86(28.7%)</td>
<td>300(100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Durable products</td>
<td>204(68.0%)</td>
<td>96(32.0%)</td>
<td>300(100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotels and Restaurants</td>
<td>227(75.7%)</td>
<td>73(24.3%)</td>
<td>300(100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bakery Items</td>
<td>243(81.0%)</td>
<td>57(19.0%)</td>
<td>300(100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House Hold items</td>
<td>254(84.7%)</td>
<td>46(15.3%)</td>
<td>300(100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entertainment</td>
<td>247(82.3%)</td>
<td>53(17.7%)</td>
<td>300(100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDs DVDs and Gifts</td>
<td>243(81.0%)</td>
<td>57(19.0%)</td>
<td>300(100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>188(62.7%)</td>
<td>112(37.3%)</td>
<td>300(100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field survey.
The above table 28 reveals that all the 300 respondents prefer to purchase various category of merchandise in unorganized and organized retail outlets. 97.3 and 2.7 percent of respondents purchase food and groceries in unorganized and organized retail outlets respectively. 79.3 and 20.7 percent of respondents prefer to purchase apparels, accessories in unorganized and organized retail outlets respectively. 75.3 and 24.7 percent of respondents prefer to purchase furniture (sofa, cot, etc) in unorganized and organized retail outlets respectively. 74.7 and 25.3 percent of respondents prefer to purchase home décor (curtained, bed spread, wall hanging etc) in unorganized and organized retail outlets respectively. 43.0 and 57.0 percent of respondents prefer to purchase major appliance/electronics items in unorganized and organized retail outlets respectively. 41.3 and 58.7 percent of respondents prefer to purchase jewelry items in unorganized and organized retail outlets respectively. 53.7 and 46.3 percent of respondents prefer to purchase clothes and footwear's in unorganized and organized retail outlets respectively. 90.7 and 9.3 percent of respondents prefer to purchase Fruits, vegetables, milk, eggs and snacks in unorganized and organized retail outlets respectively. 58.0 and 42.0 percent of respondents prefer to purchase Medical and health care items in unorganized and organized retail outlets respectively. 71.3 and 28.7 percent of respondents prefer to purchase Consumables goods in unorganized and organized retail outlets respectively. 68.0 and 32.0 percent of respondents prefer to purchase durable products in unorganized and organized retail outlets respectively. 75.7 and 24.3 percent of respondents prefer to shop consume food items and soft drinks in organized and unorganized hotels and restaurants respectively. 81.0 and 19.0 percent of respondents prefer to purchase bakery items in unorganized and organized retail outlets respectively. 84.7 and 15.3 percent of respondents prefer to purchase house hold items in unorganized and organized retail outlets respectively. 82.3 and 17.7 percent of respondents prefer to enjoy entertainment in unorganized and organized retail outlets respectively. 81.0 and
19.0 percent of respondents prefer to purchase CDs, DVDs and Gifts in unorganized and organized retail outlets respectively. 62.7 and 37.3 percent of respondents prefer to purchase others items in unorganized and organized retail outlets respectively.

Table 29. Frequency of Purchase at Unorganized and Organized Retail Outlets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sl. No.</th>
<th>Frequency of Purchase</th>
<th>Unorganized Retail Outlets (Frequency)</th>
<th>Organized Retail Outlets (Frequency)</th>
<th>Total Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Daily</td>
<td>10 (6.7%)</td>
<td>17 (11.3%)</td>
<td>27 (9.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Once in a week</td>
<td>26 (17.3%)</td>
<td>25 (16.7%)</td>
<td>51 (17.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Twice in a week</td>
<td>15 (10.0%)</td>
<td>16 (10.7%)</td>
<td>31 (10.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Once in a Fortnight</td>
<td>11 (7.3%)</td>
<td>10 (6.7%)</td>
<td>21 (7.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Once in a Month</td>
<td>33 (22.0%)</td>
<td>31 (20.7%)</td>
<td>64 (21.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Need Based</td>
<td>37 (24.7%)</td>
<td>36 (24.0%)</td>
<td>73 (24.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Special Occasions</td>
<td>18 (12.0%)</td>
<td>15 (10.0%)</td>
<td>33 (11.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>150 (100%)</td>
<td>150 (100%)</td>
<td>300 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Primary Data

The above table 29 reveals the opinion of respondents towards frequency of purchase at unorganized and organized retail outlets. 24.7 and 24 percent of respondents opined that purchase of merchandise and their shopping is need based. 22.0 and 20.7 percent of respondents purchase merchandise once in a month at unorganized and organized retail outlets respectively. 17.3 and 16.7 percent of respondents purchase merchandise once in week at unorganized and organized retail outlets respectively. 12.0 and 10.0 percent of respondents purchase merchandise only on special occasions. 10.0 and 10.7 percent of respondents purchase twice in a week at unorganized and organized retail outlets respectively. 7.3 and 6.7 percent of respondents purchase once in a fortnight
at unorganized and organized retail outlets respectively. 6.7 and 11.3 percent of respondents purchase daily at unorganized retail outlets. It can be inferred that 24.7 percent of respondents prefer to shop whenever need arises and purchase merchandise in unorganized retail outlets.

Section – D

Services Offered by Retail Formats

Table 30. Mode of Payment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sl.No.</th>
<th>Mode of payment</th>
<th>Unorganized Retail Outlets (Frequency)</th>
<th>Organized Retail Outlets (Frequency)</th>
<th>Total Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Cash</td>
<td>120 (80.0%)</td>
<td>95 (63.3%)</td>
<td>215 (71.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Credit</td>
<td>20 (13.3%)</td>
<td>15 (10.0%)</td>
<td>35 (11.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Pay through Debit/ Credit Cards</td>
<td>10 (6.7%)</td>
<td>40 (26.7%)</td>
<td>50 (16.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>150 (100%)</strong></td>
<td><strong>150 (100%)</strong></td>
<td><strong>300 (100.0%)</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field survey

![Fig. 7. Mode of Payment and Shopping of Merchandise](image_url)
The above table 30 reveals that opinion of respondents on mode of payment for purchase in unorganized and organized retail outlets. 80.0 percent of respondents use mode of payment is cash in unorganized retail outlets and 63.3 percent of respondents use mode of payment in cash purchase at organized retail outlets. 13.3 percent of respondents mode of payment is through credit at unorganized retail outlets and 10.0 percent of respondents use mode of payment is credit for purchase in organized retail outlets. 26.7 percent of respondents mode of payment is to pay through debit/credit cards for purchase products at organized retail outlets. 6.7 percent of respondent’s use mode of payment through debit/credit cards to purchase at unorganized retail outlets. It can be inferred that 80.0 percent of respondents use mode of payment is cash for purchase of merchandise in unorganized retail outlets.

Table 31. Products Varieties in Unorganized and Organized Retail Outlets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sl. No.</th>
<th>Products Varieties</th>
<th>Unorganized Retail Outlets (Frequency)</th>
<th>Organized Retail Outlets (Frequency)</th>
<th>Total Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Very narrow</td>
<td>6(4.0%)</td>
<td>6(4.0 %)</td>
<td>12( 4.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>83(55.3%)</td>
<td>43(28.7 %)</td>
<td>126(42.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Wide Range</td>
<td>61(40.7%)</td>
<td>101(67.3 %)</td>
<td>162(54.0 %)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>150(100%)</td>
<td>150(100% )</td>
<td>300(100.0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field survey
The above table reveals that opinion of respondents on variety of products available in unorganized and organized retail outlets. 67.3 percent of respondent's opined that wide range variety of product available in the organized retail outlet. 40.7 percent of respondent's opined that average range and variety of product available in unorganized retail outlets. 55.3 percent of respondent's opined that average range variety of products available in unorganized retail outlets. 28.7 percent of respondent's opined that average range variety of products available in organized retail outlets. 4.0 percent of respondent's opined that very narrow range variety of products available in organized retail formats. 4.0 percent of respondents opined that narrow range products available in organized retail outlets. It can be inferred that 67.3 percent wide variety of products available at organized retail outlets.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Products Varieties</th>
<th>Unorganized Retail Outlets</th>
<th>Organized Retail Outlets</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very narrow</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>28.7</td>
<td>55.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wide Range</td>
<td>40.7</td>
<td>67.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig. 8. Products Varieties in Unorganized and Organized Retail Outlets
Table 32. Merchandise Management in Unorganized and Organized Retail Outlets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sl.No.</th>
<th>Merchandise Management</th>
<th>Unorganized Retail Outlets (Frequency)</th>
<th>Organized Retail Outlets (Frequency)</th>
<th>Total Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>80(53.3%)</td>
<td>10(6.7%)</td>
<td>90(30.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>60(40.0%)</td>
<td>60(40.0%)</td>
<td>120(40%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>10(6.7%)</td>
<td>80(53.3%)</td>
<td>90(30%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>150(100%)</td>
<td>150(100%)</td>
<td>300(100.0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field survey

Fig. 9. Merchandise Management in Unorganized and Organized Retail Outlets

The above table 32 reveals that the opinion of respondents on merchandise management in terms of stock management and display in unorganized and organized retail outlets. 53.3 percent of respondents opined that the organized retail outlets merchandise management is good and 6.7 percent of respondents opined that the unorganized retail outlets merchandise management is good. 40 percent of respondents opined that the organized retail outlets merchandise management is moderate and 40 percent of respondents opined that the unorganized retail outlets merchandise management is moderate. 53.3 percent of respondents opined that the unorganized retail
outlets merchandise management is low and 6.7 percent of respondents opined that the organized retail formats merchandise management is low. It can be inferred that 53.3 % of respondents opined that organized retail outlets merchandise management is good compare to unorganized retail outlets merchandise management.

Table 33. Location of Unorganized and Organized Retail Outlets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sl.No.</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Unorganized Retail Outlets (Frequency)</th>
<th>Organized Retail Outlets (Frequency)</th>
<th>Total Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>18(12.0%)</td>
<td>14(9.3%)</td>
<td>32(10.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>46(30.7%)</td>
<td>66(44.0%)</td>
<td>112(37.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>66(32.3%)</td>
<td>90(60.0%)</td>
<td>156(52.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>150(100%)</td>
<td>150(100%)</td>
<td>300(100.0)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field survey

Fig. 10. Location of Unorganized and Organized Retail Outlets
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The above table 33 reveals that the opinion of respondents on location to purchase merchandise in unorganized and organized retail outlets. 60.0 percent of respondent’s opined that organized retail outlets location is good for purchase. 32.3 percent respondents opined that the unorganized retail outlets location is good. 44.0 percent of respondents opined that the organized retail outlets location is moderate for purchase merchandise. 30.7 percent of respondents opined that the unorganized retail outlets location is moderate for purchase. 12.0 percent of respondents opined that the unorganized retail outlets location is poor. 9.3 percent of respondents opined that the organized retail outlets location is poor. It can be inferred that 60.0 percent of respondents opined that organized retail outlets location is good for purchase.

Table 34. Replacement and Exchange of Products

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sl.No.</th>
<th>Replacement and Exchange of Products</th>
<th>Unorganized Retail Outlets (Frequency)</th>
<th>Organized Retail Outlets (Frequency)</th>
<th>Total Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Not available</td>
<td>45 (30.0%)</td>
<td>30 (20.0%)</td>
<td>75 (25.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Less Available</td>
<td>67 (44.7%)</td>
<td>62 (41.3%)</td>
<td>129 (43.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Available</td>
<td>38 (25.3%)</td>
<td>58 (38.7%)</td>
<td>96 (32.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>150 (100%)</td>
<td>150 (100%)</td>
<td>300 (100.0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field survey
The above table 34 reveals that opinion of respondents on replacement and exchange of products service available in unorganized and organized retail outlets. 44.7 percent of respondent’s opined that replacement and exchange of products service less available at unorganized retail outlets and 41.3 percent of respondent’s opined that replacement and exchange of products service less available at organized retail outlets. 38.7 percent of respondent’s opined that replacement and exchange of products service available in organized retail outlets and 25.3 percent of respondent’s opined that replacement and exchange of products service available in unorganized retail outlets. 30.0 percent of respondent’s opined that replacement and exchange of products service not available at unorganized retail outlets and 20.0 percent of respondent’s opined that replacement and exchange of products service not available at organized retail outlets. It can be inferred that 44.7 percent of respondent’s opined that replacement and exchange of products service available in unorganized retail outlets.
Table 35. Credit Facility

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sl.No.</th>
<th>Credit Facility</th>
<th>Unorganized Retail Outlets (Frequency)</th>
<th>Organized Retail Outlets (Frequency)</th>
<th>Total Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Not Available</td>
<td>54(36.0%)</td>
<td>36(24.0%)</td>
<td>90(30.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Less Available</td>
<td>65(43.3%)</td>
<td>58(38.7%)</td>
<td>123(41.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Available</td>
<td>31(20.7%)</td>
<td>56(37.3%)</td>
<td>87(29.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>150(100%)</td>
<td>150(100%)</td>
<td>300(100.0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field survey

Fig. 12. Credit Facility in Unorganized and Organized Retail Formats

The above table 35 reveals that opinion of respondents towards credit facility available in unorganized and organized retail formats for purchase. 43.3 percent of respondent’s opined that credit facility less available at unorganized retail outlets and 38.7 percent of respondent’s opined that credit facility less available at organized retail outlets. 37.3 percent of respondent’s opined that credit facility available in organized retail outlets and 20.7 percent of respondent’s opined that credit facility available in
unorganized retail outlets. 36.0 percent of respondent’s opined that credit facility not available in unorganized retail outlets and 24.0 percent of respondent’s opined that credit facility not available in organized retail outlets. It can be inferred that 37.3% of respondent’s opined that organized retail outlets provide credit facility for shop.

Table 36. Availability of Attractive Brands

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SL.No.</th>
<th>Availability of attractive Brands</th>
<th>Unorganized Retail Outlets (Frequency)</th>
<th>Organized Retail Outlets (Frequency)</th>
<th>Total Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Less attractive</td>
<td>26(17.3%)</td>
<td>10(6.7%)</td>
<td>36(12.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Attractive</td>
<td>86(57.3%)</td>
<td>89(59.3%)</td>
<td>175(58.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Highly attractive</td>
<td>35(23.3%)</td>
<td>54(36.0%)</td>
<td>89(29.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>150(100%)</td>
<td>150(100%)</td>
<td>300(100.0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field survey

Fig. 13. Availability of Attractive Brands

The above table 36 reveals that opinion of respondents on availability of attractive brands of products in unorganized and organized retail formats. 59.3 percent of
respondents opined that the organized retail outlets brands are attractive and 57.3 percent of respondents opined that the unorganized retail outlets brands are attractive. 36.0 percent of respondents opined that the organized retail outlets attractive brands are highly attractive and 23.3 percent of respondents opined that the unorganized retail outlets brands are highly attractive. 17.3 percent of respondent’s opined that the unorganized retail outlets products brands are less attractive and 6.7 percent of respondents opined that the organized retail outlets brands are less attractive. It can be inferred that 59.3 percent of respondent’s opined that the organized retail outlets products brands are highly attractive in nature.

Table 37. Offers and Discount Schemes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sl.No.</th>
<th>Offers and Discount Schemes</th>
<th>Unorganized Retail Outlets (frequency)</th>
<th>Organized Retail Outlets (frequency)</th>
<th>Total percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Less Attractive</td>
<td>30 (20.0%)</td>
<td>15 (10.0%)</td>
<td>45 (15.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Attractive</td>
<td>70 (46.7%)</td>
<td>80 (53.3%)</td>
<td>150 (50.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Highly Attractive</td>
<td>50 (33.3%)</td>
<td>55 (36.7%)</td>
<td>105 (35.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>150 (100%)</td>
<td>150 (100%)</td>
<td>300 (100.0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field survey

Fig. 14. Offers and Discount Schemes
The above table 37 reveals that opinion of respondents towards offers and discount schemes and offers for purchase by unorganized and organized retail formats. 53.3 percent of respondents opined that the organized retail outlets offered attractive discounts and offers for shop in organized retail formats and 46.7 percent of respondents opined that the unorganized retail outlets offered attractive discount schemes and offers for purchase. 36.7 percent of respondents opined that the organized retail outlets offered highly attractive discount schemes and offers for shop. 33.3 percent of respondent’s opined that the unorganized retail outlets offered highly attractive offers and discount schemes for shop. 20.0 percent of respondent’s opined that the unorganized retail outlets offered less attractive discount schemes and offers for purchase. 10.0 percent of respondent’s opined that the organized retail outlets offered less attractive discount schemes and offers for purchase. It can be inferred that 53.3 percent of respondent’s opined that the organized retail outlets offered attractive offers and discount schemes for purchase merchandise.

Table 38. Customer Relationship Management

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sl.No.</th>
<th>Customer Relationship Management</th>
<th>Unorganized Retail outlets (Frequency)</th>
<th>Organized Retail outlets (Frequency)</th>
<th>Total percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>10 (6.6%)</td>
<td>12 (8.0%)</td>
<td>22 (7.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Better</td>
<td>76 (50.7%)</td>
<td>98 (65.3%)</td>
<td>174 (58.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td>42 (28.0%)</td>
<td>62 (41.3%)</td>
<td>104 (43.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>150 (100%)</td>
<td>150 (100%)</td>
<td>300 (100.0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field survey
The above table reveals that opinion of respondents towards customer relationships management of unorganized and organized retail outlets. 65.3 percent of respondents opined that the organized retail outlets maintain better customer relationship management. 50.7 percent of respondent's opined that the unorganized retail outlets maintain better customer relationship management. 41.3 percent of respondent's opined that the organized retail outlets maintain satisfactory customer relationship management. 28.3 percent of respondents opined that the unorganized retail outlets maintain satisfactory customer relationship management. 8.0 percent of respondent's opined that the organized retail outlets maintain poor customer relationship management and 6.6 percent of respondents opined that the unorganized retail outlets maintain poor customer relationship management. It can be inferred that 65.3 percent of respondents opined that the organized retail outlets maintain better customer relationship management.
Table 39. Overall Services of Unorganized and Organized Retail Formats

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sl.No.</th>
<th>Overall Service</th>
<th>Unorganized Retail Outlets (Frequency)</th>
<th>Organized Retail Outlets (Frequency)</th>
<th>Total Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>14(9.3 %)</td>
<td>24(16.0 %)</td>
<td>38(12.6 %)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td>64(42.7 %)</td>
<td>68(45.3 %)</td>
<td>130(43.3 %)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>62(41.3 %)</td>
<td>68(45.3 %)</td>
<td>132(44.0 %)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>150(100 %)</td>
<td>150(100 %)</td>
<td>300(100.0 %)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field survey

Fig. 16. Overall Services of Unorganized and Organized Retail Formats

The above table 39 reveals that opinion of respondents on overall service of unorganized and organized retail formats. 45.3 percent of respondents opined that the organized retailers provide good service and 42.7 percent of respondents opined that the unorganized retail outlets provide satisfactory service. 45.3 percent of respondents opined that the organized retail outlets provide satisfactory service and 41.3 percent of
respondents opined that unorganized retail outlets provide good service. 16.3 percent of respondents opined that the unorganized retail outlets provide poor service and 9.3 percent of respondents opined that the organized retail outlets provide poor service. It can be inferred that 45.3 percent of respondents’ opinions that the organized retailers provide good service.

**Table 40. Opinion of Respondents on Overall Service offer by the Organized and Unorganized Retail Outlets**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sl. No.</th>
<th>Types of Retail outlets</th>
<th>Mode Rate</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Very Good</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Unorganized Retail Outlets overall service</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Organized Retail outlets overall service</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 41. Respondents Opinion on Overall Service offer by unorganized and organized retail outlets**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pearson Chi-Square</th>
<th>d.f</th>
<th>Chi-Square Value</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8.34*</td>
<td>0.05 level of Significance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The above tables 40 and 41 reveals that the opinion of respondents towards overall service of unorganized and organized retail outlets. It is evident from the statistics that, the obtained chi-square value is 8.34 and the table value 5.99 at 0.05 level of significance. The calculated value is higher than the table value. Hence, is sufficient evidence to reject the null hypothesis. Therefore, organized retail outlets overall service is very good compared to unorganized retail outlets service.
Table 42. Nature of the Advertising and Sales Promotion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sl.No.</th>
<th>Nature of the Advertising and Sales Promotion</th>
<th>Unorganized Retail Outlets (Frequency)</th>
<th>Organized Retail Outlets (Frequency)</th>
<th>Total Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Less Attractive</td>
<td>35(23.3%)</td>
<td>14(9.3%)</td>
<td>49(16.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Attractive</td>
<td>72(48.0%)</td>
<td>88(58.7%)</td>
<td>160(53.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Highly Attractive</td>
<td>43(28.7%)</td>
<td>48(32.0%)</td>
<td>91(30.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>150(100%)</td>
<td>150(100%)</td>
<td>300(100.0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field survey.

Fig. 17. Nature of the Advertising and Sales Promotion

The above table 42 reveals that opinion of respondents towards nature of the advertising and sales promotion for merchandise purchase in unorganized and organized retail formats 58.7 percent of respondent’s opined that the organized retail outlets offer attractive advertising and sales promotion for shop. 48.0 percent of respondent’s opined
that the unorganized retail outlets offer attractive advertising and sales promotion for product purchase. 32.0 percent of respondent’s opined that the organized retail outlets offer highly attractive advertising and sales promotion for product shop. 28.7 percent of respondents opined that the organized retail outlets offer highly attractive advertising and sales promotion for merchandise shop. 23.3 percent of respondents opined that the unorganized retail outlets offered less attractive advertising and sales promotion for product purchase. 9.3 percent of respondent’s opined that the organized retail outlets offer less attractive advertising and sales promotion for product purchase. It can be inferred that 58.7 percent of respondents opined that the organized retail outlets offer attractive advertising and sales promotion for merchandise shop.

Table 43. Employees Behavior in Unorganized and Organized Retail Formats

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sl.No.</th>
<th>Employees Behavior</th>
<th>Unorganized Retail Outlets (Frequency)</th>
<th>Organized Retail Outlets (Frequency)</th>
<th>Total Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>24(16.0%)</td>
<td>6(4.0%)</td>
<td>30(10.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>78(52.0%)</td>
<td>80(53.3%)</td>
<td>158(52.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Very Good</td>
<td>48(32.0%)</td>
<td>64(42.7%)</td>
<td>112(37.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>150(100%)</td>
<td>150(100%)</td>
<td>300(100.0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: *Field survey.*
Fig. 18. Employees Behavior in Unorganized and Organized Retail Formats

The above table reveals that opinion of respondents towards employee behavior in unorganized and organized retail formats. 53.3 percent of respondent’s opined that the organized retail outlets employee’s behavior is good. 52.0 percent of respondent’s opined that the unorganized retail outlets employee’s behavior is good. 42.7 percent of respondents organized retail outlet employee’s behavior is very good. 32.0 percent of respondent’s opined that the unorganized retail outlet employee’s behavior is very good. 16.0 percent of respondent’s opined that the unorganized retail outlet employee’s behavior is moderate. 4.0 percent of respondents opined that the unorganized retail employee’s behavior is moderate. It can be inferred that 53.3% of respondents opined that organized retail outlets employee’s behavior is good.
Table 44. Overall Image of Unorganized and Organized Retail Formats

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sl.No.</th>
<th>Overall Image</th>
<th>Unorganized Retail Outlets (Frequency)</th>
<th>Organized Retail Outlets (Frequency)</th>
<th>Total Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Less Attractive</td>
<td>26 (17.3)</td>
<td>20 (13.3)</td>
<td>46 (15.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Attractive</td>
<td>76 (50.7)</td>
<td>92 (61.3)</td>
<td>168 (56.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Highly Attractive</td>
<td>32 (21.3)</td>
<td>54 (36.0)</td>
<td>86 (28.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>150 (100)</td>
<td>150 (100)</td>
<td>300 (100.0)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field survey.

Fig. 19. Overall Image of Unorganized and Organized Retail Formats
The above table 44 reveals that opinion of respondents towards overall image of unorganized and organized retail formats. 61.3 percent of respondents opined that the image of organized retail format is attractive. 50.7 percent of respondents opined that image of unorganized retail format is attractive. 36.0 percent of respondent’s opined that the image of organized retail format is highly attractive. 21.3 percent of respondent’s opined that the image of unorganized retail format is highly attractive. 17.3 percent of respondent’s opined that the image of unorganized retail outlet is less attractive. 13.3 percent of respondent’s opined that the image of organized retail outlet is less attractive. It can be inferred that 61.3 percent of respondent’s opined that the overall image of organized retail outlet is attractive.

**Table 45. Respondents Time Spend for purchase**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sl.No.</th>
<th>Time Spend for purchase</th>
<th>Unorganized Retail Outlets (Frequency)</th>
<th>Organized Retail Outlets (Frequency)</th>
<th>Total Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Less than 1 Hour</td>
<td>97 (64.7%)</td>
<td>88 (58.7%)</td>
<td>185 (61.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1-2 Hours</td>
<td>29 (19.3%)</td>
<td>31 (20.7%)</td>
<td>60 (20.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>More than 2 Hour</td>
<td>24 (16.0%)</td>
<td>31 (20.6%)</td>
<td>55 (18.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>150 (100%)</td>
<td>150 (100%)</td>
<td>300 (100.0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** *Field survey*
The above table 45 reveals that opinion of respondents towards time spend for purchase in unorganized and organized retail outlets. 64.7 percent of respondents spend less than 1 hour time for purchase in unorganized retail outlets. 58.7 percent of respondents spend less than 1 hour time for purchase in organized retail outlets. 20.7 percent of respondents spend 1-2 hour time for purchase in organized retail outlets and 19.3 percent of respondents spend 1-2 hour time for purchase in unorganized retail outlets. 20.6 percent of respondents spend more than 2 hour time for purchase in organized retail outlets and 16.0 percent of respondents spend more than 2 hour time for purchase in unorganized retail outlets. It can be inferred that 64.7 percent of respondents spend less than 1 hour time for purchase in unorganized retail outlets.
Table 46. Factors Affecting Respondents preference towards Organized and Unorganized Retail Formats (PR= Preference)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Range</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Skewness</th>
<th>Kurtosis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Preference (PR)</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>12.00</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>22.00</td>
<td>17.1867</td>
<td>3.17260</td>
<td>-0.643</td>
<td>.141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place (X1)</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>22.00</td>
<td>19.3133</td>
<td>2.09199</td>
<td>-0.673</td>
<td>.141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion (X2)</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>18.00</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td>43.00</td>
<td>36.5000</td>
<td>4.53563</td>
<td>-1.040</td>
<td>.141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Price (X3)</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>13.00</td>
<td>11.4000</td>
<td>0.99497</td>
<td>-0.541</td>
<td>.141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment (X4)</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>12.00</td>
<td>16.00</td>
<td>28.00</td>
<td>22.9867</td>
<td>3.25091</td>
<td>-0.520</td>
<td>.141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative Change (X5)</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>14.00</td>
<td>19.00</td>
<td>16.7533</td>
<td>1.48543</td>
<td>-0.137</td>
<td>.141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enjoyment (X6)</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>14.00</td>
<td>12.9533</td>
<td>1.01715</td>
<td>-1.135</td>
<td>.141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality (X7)</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>14.00</td>
<td>11.9867</td>
<td>1.63567</td>
<td>-0.856</td>
<td>.141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment (X8)</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>66.00</td>
<td>86.00</td>
<td>76.0800</td>
<td>5.66220</td>
<td>-0.309</td>
<td>.141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convenient/Complement (X9)</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>13.00</td>
<td>11.7800</td>
<td>0.90978</td>
<td>-0.409</td>
<td>.141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complaint Handling (X10)</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>14.00</td>
<td>11.7667</td>
<td>1.39955</td>
<td>-0.403</td>
<td>.141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee Behaviour (X11)</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>14.00</td>
<td>12.4467</td>
<td>1.28556</td>
<td>-0.404</td>
<td>.141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Store Features (X12)</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>19.00</td>
<td>15.1000</td>
<td>2.65962</td>
<td>-0.310</td>
<td>.141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valid N</td>
<td>300</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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The descriptive statistics in the above table 46 reveals that the data exhibits adequate variance to carry out further statistical analysis. It also reveals that the range, minima and maxima, mean, Std. Deviation values are within the scale range. And also reveals that all the values of kurtosis are between +3 and -3 and all the values of Skewness are between +2 and -2. Hence all the variables meet the multivariate normality requirement. Besides Skewness and kurtosis, specific statistical tests are also recommended by Heir et al. (2006) and Gujarati (1995).

**Regression Analysis of Unorganized Retail Outlets**

**Analysis and interpretation of objective-1:** To assess place, promotion, price, commitment, enjoyment, alternative change, quality, environment, convenient/complement, complaint handling, employee behavior, store features are not significant predictors of respondents buying preference towards unorganized retail outlets.

**Hypothesis:** Place, promotion, price, commitment, alternative change enjoyment, quality, environment, convenient/complement, complaint handling, employee behavior, store features are not significant predictors of buying preference of consumers towards unorganized retail formats.

To achieve this hypothesis, the multiple linear regression procedure was applied and the results are presented in the following table.

Results of multiple linear regression procedure of the effect of place, promotion, price, commitment, enjoyment, quality, alternative change, environment, convenient/complement, complaint handling, employee behavior, store features are not significant predictors of buying preference of consumers towards unorganized retail outlets are presented below:
### Table 47. Results of Multiple Linear Regression (Unorganized Retailing)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent variable</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Significant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std.Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>25.002</td>
<td>7.075</td>
<td>3.534</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place (X1)</td>
<td>0.853</td>
<td>0.319</td>
<td>0.193</td>
<td>2.678</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion (X2)</td>
<td>-0.432</td>
<td>0.150</td>
<td>-0.330</td>
<td>-2.873</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Price (X3)</td>
<td>0.690</td>
<td>0.148</td>
<td>0.535</td>
<td>4.668</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment (X4)</td>
<td>0.006</td>
<td>0.313</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.985</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative Change (X5)</td>
<td>1.628</td>
<td>0.323</td>
<td>0.714</td>
<td>5.045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enjoyment (X6)</td>
<td>0.074</td>
<td>0.207</td>
<td>0.024</td>
<td>0.358</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality (X7)</td>
<td>-2.875</td>
<td>0.333</td>
<td>-1.051</td>
<td>-8.625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment (X8)</td>
<td>0.365</td>
<td>0.393</td>
<td>0.122</td>
<td>0.930</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convenient/Complement (X9)</td>
<td>0.151</td>
<td>0.136</td>
<td>0.100</td>
<td>1.105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complaint Handling (X10)</td>
<td>-1.174</td>
<td>0.384</td>
<td>-0.362</td>
<td>-3.061</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee Behavior (X11)</td>
<td>1.203</td>
<td>0.224</td>
<td>0.448</td>
<td>5.361</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Store Features (12)</td>
<td>-0.005</td>
<td>0.073</td>
<td>-0.005</td>
<td>-0.065</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dependent variable: Preference.
R=0.726; R²= 0.526; Adjusted R²= 0.485; F=12.690; P<0.05; Std. Error of Estimate=2.80500
Result of the above table clearly indicate that,

1. The effect of place (X1) was found to be significant on buying preference of consumers towards unorganized retail outlets (Regression Coefficient=0.193, P<0.05) at 0.05 level of significance. Hence, null hypothesis is rejected. It means that, the place (X1) is a significant predictor of buying preference of consumers towards unorganized retail outlets.

2. The effect of promotion (X2) was found to be significant on buying preference of consumers towards unorganized retail outlets (Regression Coefficient=-0.330, P<0.05) at 0.05 level of significance. Hence, null hypothesis is rejected. It means that, the promotion (X2) is a significant predictor of buying preference of consumers towards unorganized retail outlets.

3. The effect of price (X3) was found to be significant on buying preference of consumers toward unorganized retail outlets (Regression Coefficient=0.535, P<0.05) at 0.05 level of significance. Hence, null hypothesis is rejected and alternative hypothesis is accepted. It means that, the price (X3) is a significant predictor of buying preference of consumers towards unorganized retail outlets.

4. The effect of commitment (X4) was found to be not significant on buying preference of consumers towards unorganized retail outlets (Regression Coefficient=0.001, P<0.05) at 0.05 level of significance. Hence, null hypothesis is accepted. It means that, commitment (X4) is not significant predictor of buying preference of consumers towards unorganized retail outlets.

5. The effect of alternative change (X5) was found to be significant on buying preference of consumers towards unorganized retail outlets (Regression Coefficient=0.714, P<0.05) at 0.05 level of significance. Hence, null hypothesis is
rejected and alternative hypothesis is accepted. It means that, alternative change (X5) is a significant predictor of buying preference of consumers towards unorganized retail outlets.

6. The effect of enjoyment (X6) was found to be not significant on buying preference of consumers towards unorganized retail outlets (Regression Coefficient=0.024, P<0.05) at 0.05 level of significance. Hence, null hypothesis is accepted. It means that, enjoyment (X6) is not significant predictor of buying preference of consumers towards unorganized retail outlets.

7. The effect of quality (X7) was found to be significant on buying preference of consumers towards unorganized retail outlets (Regression Coefficient=1.051, P<0.05) at 0.05 level of significance. Hence, null hypothesis is rejected and alternative hypothesis is accepted. It means that, quality (X7) is a significant predictor of buying preference of consumers towards unorganized retail outlets.

8. The effect of environment (X8) was found to be not significant on buying preference of consumers towards unorganized retail outlets (Regression Coefficient=0.122, P<0.05) at 0.05 level of significance. Hence, null hypothesis is accepted. It means that, environment (X8) is not significant predictor of buying preference of consumers towards unorganized retail outlets.

9. The effect of convenient/complement (X9) was found to be significant on buying preference of consumers towards unorganized retail outlets (Regression Coefficient=0.100, P<0.05) at 0.05 level of significance. Hence, null hypothesis is accepted. It means that, convenient/complement (X9) is a not significant predictor of buying preference of consumers towards unorganized retail outlets.

10. The effect of complaint handling (X10) was found to be significant on buying preference of consumers towards unorganized retail outlets (Regression
Coefficient = -0.362, \( P<0.05 \) at 0.05 level of significance. Hence, null hypothesis is rejected and alternative hypothesis is accepted. It means that, complaint handling (X10) is a significant predictor of buying preference of consumers towards unorganized retail outlets.

11. The effect of employee behavior (X11) was found to be significant on buying preference of consumers towards unorganized retail outlets (Regression Coefficient = 0.448, \( P<0.05 \)) at 0.05 level of significance. Hence, null hypothesis is rejected and alternative hypothesis is accepted. It means that, employee behavior (X11) is a significant predictor of buying preference of consumers towards unorganized retail outlets.

12. The effect of store features (X12) was found to be not significant on buying preference of consumers towards unorganized retail outlets (Regression Coefficient = -0.005, \( P<0.05 \)) at 0.05 level of significance. Hence, null hypothesis is accepted. It means that, store features (X12) is not significant predictor of buying preference of consumers towards unorganized retail outlets.

13. The effect of commitment (X4), enjoyment (X6), and environment (X8), convenient/complement (X9), store features (X12) are found to be not significant on buying preference of consumers towards unorganized retail outlets at 0.05 level of significance. Hence, null hypothesis is accepted. It means that, commitment, enjoyment and environment, complaint handling, store features are not the significant predictors of buying preference of consumers towards unorganized retail outlets.

* The relative contribution of place, promotion, price, commitment, alternative change, enjoyment, quality, environment, convenient/complement, complaint handling, employee behavior, store features, on buying preference of consumers are also presented in the following table.
Table 48. Relative Contribution of Independent Variables on Buying Preference

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variable</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>Beta x r</th>
<th>% Contribution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>25.002</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place (X1)</td>
<td>0.193</td>
<td>0.331</td>
<td>0.063883</td>
<td>6.3883</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion (X2)</td>
<td>-0.330</td>
<td>0.289</td>
<td>-0.09537</td>
<td>-9.537</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Price (X3)</td>
<td>0.535</td>
<td>0.318</td>
<td>0.17013</td>
<td>17.013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment (X4)</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.146</td>
<td>0.000146</td>
<td>0.0146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative Change (X5)</td>
<td>0.714</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.07854</td>
<td>7.854</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enjoyment (X6)</td>
<td>0.024</td>
<td>0.024</td>
<td>0.000576</td>
<td>0.0576</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality (X7)</td>
<td>-1.051</td>
<td>-0.142</td>
<td>0.149242</td>
<td>14.9242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment (X8)</td>
<td>0.122</td>
<td>0.145</td>
<td>0.01769</td>
<td>1.769</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convenient/Complement (X9)</td>
<td>0.100</td>
<td>0.053</td>
<td>0.0053</td>
<td>0.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complaint Handling (X10)</td>
<td>-0.362</td>
<td>-0.104</td>
<td>0.037648</td>
<td>3.7648</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee Behavior (X11)</td>
<td>0.448</td>
<td>0.221</td>
<td>0.099008</td>
<td>9.9008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Store Features (X12)</td>
<td>-0.005</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>-0.00085</td>
<td>-0.085</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The total contribution of all the independent variables on buying preference of customers was found to be 52.6793% in which, the contribution of place (X1) is 6.3883, promotion (X2) is -9.537%, price (X3) is 17.013%, commitment (X4) is 0.0146%, alternative change (X5) is 7.854%, enjoyment (X6) is 0.0576%, quality (X7) is 14.9242%, environment (X8) is 1.769%, convenient/complement (X9) is 0.53%, complaint handling (X10) is 3.7648, employ behavior (X11) is 9.9008%, store features (X12) is -0.085%. Therefore, we conclude that, the price (X3) is the first contributor/predictor followed by quality (X7), promotion (X2), employee behavior (X11), place (X1), alternative change (X5), complaint handling (X10), convenient/complement (X9), environment (X8), commitment (X4), and enjoyment (X6), store features (X12) contributors/predictors on buying preference of consumers towards unorganized retail outlets.
The equation developed for urban respondents sample (N=300) to predict buying preference of consumers with the help of place, promotion, price, commitment, alternative change, enjoyment, quality, environment, convenient/complement, complaint handling, employee behavior, store features score are:

\[ Y = 25.002 + 0.193X_1 + (-0.330X_2) + 0.535X_3 + 0.001X_4 + 0.714X_5 + 0.024X_6 + (-1.051X_7) + 0.122X_8 + 0.100X_9 + (-0.362X_{10}) + (0.448X_{11}) + (-0.005X_{12}). \]

Analysis and interpretation of objective - 2: To assess place, promotion, price, commitment, alternative change, enjoyment, quality, environment, convenient/complement, complaint handling, employee behavior, store features are not significant predictors of respondents buying preference towards organized retail outlets.

Hypothesis: place, promotion, price, commitment, alternative change, enjoyment, quality, environment, convenient/complement, complaint handling, employee behavior, store features are not significant predictors of buying preference of consumers on organized retail formats.

To achieve this hypothesis, the multiple linear regression procedure was applied and the results on procedure of the effect of place, promotion, price, commitment, alternative change, enjoyment, quality, environment, convenient/complement, complaint handling, employee behavior, store features are not significant predictors of buying preference of consumers towards organized retail formats is analyzed.
Table 49. Results of Multiple Linear Regression (Organized Retailing)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variable</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Significant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std.Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>47.663</td>
<td>10.425</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.572</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place(X1)</td>
<td>0.626</td>
<td>0.333</td>
<td>0.137</td>
<td>1.878</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion(X2)</td>
<td>-0.717</td>
<td>0.174</td>
<td>-0.514</td>
<td>-4.113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Price(X3)</td>
<td>1.895</td>
<td>0.205</td>
<td>0.621</td>
<td>9.245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment(X4)</td>
<td>0.091</td>
<td>0.307</td>
<td>0.020</td>
<td>0.295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative Change(X5)</td>
<td>1.793</td>
<td>0.329</td>
<td>0.647</td>
<td>5.456</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enjoyment(X6)</td>
<td>-0.098</td>
<td>0.474</td>
<td>-0.020</td>
<td>-0.208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality(X7)</td>
<td>-3.814</td>
<td>0.383</td>
<td>-1.177</td>
<td>-9.964</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment(X8)</td>
<td>0.520</td>
<td>0.373</td>
<td>0.147</td>
<td>1.394</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convenient/Complement(X9)</td>
<td>0.510</td>
<td>0.165</td>
<td>0.299</td>
<td>3.086</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complaint Handling (X10)</td>
<td>-1.268</td>
<td>0.487</td>
<td>-0.326</td>
<td>-2.603</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee Behavior(X11)</td>
<td>-0.881</td>
<td>0.135</td>
<td>-0.478</td>
<td>-6.551</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Store Features(12)</td>
<td>1.368</td>
<td>0.133</td>
<td>0.950</td>
<td>10.251</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dependent variable: Preference.

R=0.881; R²=0.776; Adjusted R²=0.756; F=39.439; P<0.05; Std. Error of Estimate=2.24490

Result of the above table clearly indicate that,

1. The effect of promotion (x2) was found to be significant on buying preference of consumers (Regression Co-efficient=-0.514, P<0.05) at 0.05 level of significance. Hence, null hypothesis is rejected. It means that, the promotion (X2) is a significant predictor of buying preference of consumers towards organized retail outlets.
2. The effect of price (X3) was found to be significant on buying preference of consumers (Regression Co-efficient= 0.621, $P<0.05$) at 0.05 level of significance. Hence, null hypothesis is rejected and alternative hypothesis is accepted. It means that, the price (X3) is a significant predictor of buying preference of consumers towards organized retail outlets.

3. The effect of alternative change (X5) was found to be significant on buying preference of consumers (Regression Co-efficient= 0.647, $P<0.05$) at 0.05 level of significance. Hence, null hypothesis is rejected and alternative hypothesis is accepted. It means that, alternative change (X5) is a significant predictor of buying preference of consumers towards organized retail outlets.

4. The effect of quality (X7) was found to be significant on buying preference of consumers (Regression Co-efficient=-1.177, $P<0.05$) at 0.05 level of significance. Hence, null hypothesis is rejected and alternative hypothesis is accepted. It means that, quality (X7) is a significant predictor of buying preference of consumers towards organized retail outlets.

5. The effect of convenient/complement (X9) was found to be significant on buying preference of consumers (Regression Co-efficient= 0.299, $P<0.05$) at 0.05 level of significance. Hence, null hypothesis is rejected and alternative hypothesis is accepted. It means that, convenient/complement (X9) is a significant predictor of buying preference of consumers towards organized retail outlets.

6. The effect of complaint handling (X10) was found to be significant on buying preference of consumers (Regression Co-efficient= -0.326, $P<0.05$) at 0.05 level of significance. Hence, null hypothesis is rejected and alternative hypothesis is accepted. It means that, complaint handling (X10) is a significant predictor of buying preference of consumers towards organized retail outlets.
7. The effect of employee behavior (X11) was found to be significant on buying preference of consumers (Regression Co-efficient=-0.478, P<0.05) at 0.05 level of significance. Hence, null hypothesis is rejected and alternative hypothesis is accepted. It means that, employee behavior (X11) is a significant predictor of buying preference of consumers towards organized retail outlets.

8. The effect of store features (X12) was found to be significant on buying preference of consumers (Regression Co-efficient=0.950, P<0.05) at 0.05 level of significance. Hence, null hypothesis is rejected and alternative hypothesis is accepted. It means that, store features (X12) is a significant predictor of buying preference of consumers towards organized retail outlets.

9. The effect of place (X1), commitment (X4), enjoyment (X6) and environment (X8) are found to be not significant on buying preference of consumers towards organized retail outlets at 0.05 level of significance. Hence, null hypothesis is accepted. It means that, place, commitment, enjoy and environment are not the significant predictors of buying preference of consumers towards organized retail outlets.

* The relative contribution of place, promotion, price, commitment, alternative change, enjoyment, quality, environment convenient/complement, complaint handling, employee behavior, store features, on buying preference of consumers are also presented in the following table.
Table 50. Relative Contribution of Independent Variables on Consumer Buying Preference

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variable</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>Beta x r</th>
<th>% Contribution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Place (X1)</td>
<td>0.137</td>
<td>0.277</td>
<td>0.037949</td>
<td>3.7949</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion (X2)</td>
<td>-0.514</td>
<td>0.361</td>
<td>-0.18555</td>
<td>-18.5554</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Price (X3)</td>
<td>0.621</td>
<td>0.213</td>
<td>0.132273</td>
<td>13.2273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment (X4)</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.128</td>
<td>0.00256</td>
<td>0.256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative Change (X5)</td>
<td>0.647</td>
<td>0.071</td>
<td>0.045937</td>
<td>4.5937</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enjoyment (X6)</td>
<td>-0.020</td>
<td>0.066</td>
<td>-0.00132</td>
<td>0.132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality (X7)</td>
<td>-1.177</td>
<td>-0.208</td>
<td>0.244816</td>
<td>24.4816</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment (X8)</td>
<td>0.147</td>
<td>0.159</td>
<td>0.023373</td>
<td>2.3373</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convenient/Complement (X9)</td>
<td>0.299</td>
<td>-0.033</td>
<td>-0.00987</td>
<td>-0.9867</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complaint handling (X10)</td>
<td>-0.326</td>
<td>-0.148</td>
<td>0.048248</td>
<td>4.8248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee behavior (X11)</td>
<td>-0.478</td>
<td>-0.103</td>
<td>0.049234</td>
<td>4.9234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Store Features (X12)</td>
<td>0.950</td>
<td>0.408</td>
<td>0.3876</td>
<td>38.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.775249</td>
<td>77.5249</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The total contribution of all the independent variables on buying preference of customers was found to be 77.5249% in which, the contribution of place (X1) is 3.79, promotion (X2) is -18.55%, price (X3) is 13.22%, commitment (X4) is 0.25%, alternative change (X5) is 4.59%, enjoyment (X6) is 0.13%, quality (X7) is 24.48%, environment (X8) is 2.33%, convenient/complement (X9) is 0.98%, complaint handling (X10) is 4.82. Employee behavior (X11) is 4.92%. Store features (X12) is 38.76%. Therefore, we conclude that, the store features(X12) is the first contributor/predictor followed by quality (X7), promotion (X2), price (X3), store features (X12), complaint handling (X10), alternative change (X5), place (X1), environment (X8), commitment (X4), and enjoyment (X6) contributors/ predictors on buying preference of consumers towards organized retail outlets.
The equation developed for urban respondents sample (N=300) to predict buying preference of consumers with the help of place, promotion, price, commitment, alternative change, enjoyment, quality, environment, convenient/complement, complaint handling, employee behavior, store features score are:

\[ Y = 47.663 + 0.137X_1 + (-0.514X_2) + 0.621X_3 + 0.020X_4 + 0.647X_5 + (-0.020X_6) + (-1.177X_7) + 0.147X_8 + 0.299X_9 + (-0.326X_10) + (-0.478X_11) + 0.950X_{12}. \]

\( Y \) = Buying Preference. \( X_1 \) = Place, \( X_2 \) = Promotion, \( X_3 \) = Price \( X_4 \) = commitment \( X_5 \) = Alternative change, \( X_6 \) = Enjoyment, \( X_7 \) = Quality, \( X_8 \) = Environment, \( X_9 \) = Convenient/complement, \( X_{10} \) = Complaint handling, \( X_{11} \) = Employee behavior, \( X_{12} \) = Store Features.

Analysis and interpretation of objective - 3: To study the direct and indirect effect of place, promotion, price, commitment, alternative change, enjoyment of shopping, quality, convenient/complement, complaint handling, employee behavior and store features are not significant predictors of respondents buying preference towards organized retail outlets.

In order to test this objective a null hypothesis was formulated and path diagram technique has been applied.

**Hypothesis:** There is no significant direct and indirect effect of place, promotion, price, commitment, alternative change, enjoyment, quality, and environment, convenient/complement, complaint handling, employee behavior, store features which are not significant predictors of buying preference of consumers towards organized retail outlets.

To achieve this hypothesis, the path technique has been applied and the results are presented in the following table:
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Table 51. Results of the Path Analysis of Independent Variables on Consumers Buying Preference (Unorganized Retailing)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent Variable</th>
<th>Independent Variables</th>
<th>Direct effect</th>
<th>Indirect Effects Through</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X1</td>
<td>X2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preference</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PR</td>
<td>Place (X1)</td>
<td>.331**</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Promotion (X2)</td>
<td>.289**</td>
<td>.288**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Price (X3)</td>
<td>.318**</td>
<td>.306**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Commitment (X4)</td>
<td>.146</td>
<td>.149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alternative Change (X5)</td>
<td>.110</td>
<td>.184*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Enjoyment (X6)</td>
<td>.024</td>
<td>-.037</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Environment (X7)</td>
<td>-.142</td>
<td>.161*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Quality (X8)</td>
<td>.145</td>
<td>.258**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Convenient/complement(X9)</td>
<td>.053</td>
<td>.421**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Complaint Handling (X10)</td>
<td>-.104</td>
<td>.078</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Employee Behavior (X11)</td>
<td>.221**</td>
<td>.141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Store Features (X12)</td>
<td>.170*</td>
<td>.253**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
From the results of the above table, the following inferences are made:

1. The direct effect of place (X1), promotion (X2), price (X3), employee behavior (X11), store features (X12) are found to be statistically significant on buying preference of consumers towards unorganized retail outlets at 0.05% level of significance.

2. The indirect effect of place (X1) through promotion (X2), price (X3), alternative change (X5), quality (X7), environment (X8), convenient/complement (X9), store features (X12) are found to be statistically significant on buying preference of consumers towards unorganized retail outlets at 0.05% level of significance.

3. The indirect effect of place (X1) through commitment (X4), enjoyment (X6), complaint handling (X10), employee behavior are found to be statistically not significant on buying preference of consumers towards unorganized retail outlets at 0.05% level of significance.

4. The indirect effect of promotion (X2) through place (X1), price (X3), commitment (X4), alternative change (X5), enjoyment (X6), quality (X7), environment (X8), convenient/complement (X9), employee behavior (X11), store features (X12) are found to be statistically significant on buying preference of consumers at 0.05% level of significance.

5. The indirect effect of promotion (X2) through complaint handling (X10), is found to be statistically not significant on buying preference of consumers towards unorganized retail outlets at 0.05% level of significance.

6. The indirect effect of price (X3) through place (X1), promotion (X2), commitment (X4), alternative change (X5), quality (X7), environment (X8), convenient/complement (X9), complaint handling (X10), employee behavior (X11), store features (X12) are found to be statistically significant on buying preference of consumers at 0.05% level of significance.
7. The indirect effect of enjoyment (X6) is found to be statistically not significant on buying preference of consumers towards unorganized retail outlets at 0.05% level of significance.

8. The indirect effect of commitment (X4), through promotion (X2), environment (X8), convenient/complement (X9) are found to be statistically significant on buying preference of consumers at 0.05% level of significance.

9. The indirect effect of commitment (X4), through place (X1), price (X3) alternative change (X5), enjoyment (X6), quality (X7), complaint handling (X10), employee behavior (X11), store features (X12) are found to be statistically not significant on buying preference of consumers towards unorganized retail outlets at 0.05% level of significance.

10. The indirect effect of alternative change (X5), through place (X1), promotion (X2), price (X3), quality (X7), environment (X8), convenient/complement (X9), complaint handling (X10), employee behavior (X11), store features (X12) are found to be statistically significant on buying preference of consumers towards unorganized retail outlets at 0.05% level of significance.

11. The indirect effect of alternative change (X5), through commitment (X4), enjoyment (X6), is found to be statistically not significant on buying preference of consumers towards unorganized retail outlets at 0.05% level of significance.

12. The indirect effect of enjoyment (X6), through promotion (X2), quality (X7), are found to be statistically significant on buying preference of consumers towards unorganized retail outlets at 0.05% level of significance.

13. The indirect effect of enjoyment (X6), through place (X1), price (X3), commitment (X4), alternative change (X5), environment (X8), convenient/complement (X9), complaint handling (X10), employee behavior (X11), store features (X12) is found to be statistically not significant on buying preference of consumers towards unorganized retail outlets at 0.05% level of significance.
14. The indirect effect of quality (X7), through place (X1), promotion (X2), price (X3), alternative change (X5), enjoyment (X6), environment (X8), convenient/complement (X9), complaint handling (X10), employee behavior (X11), store features (X12) are found to be statistically significant on buying preference of consumers towards unorganized retail outlets at 0.05% level of significance.

15. The indirect effect of quality (X7) through commitment (X4) are found to be statistically not significant on buying preference of consumers towards unorganized retail outlets at 0.05% level of significance.

16. The indirect effect of Environment (X8), through place (X1), promotion (X2), price (X3), commitment (X4), alternative change (X5), quality (X7), convenient/complement (X9), complaint handling (X10), employee behavior (X11), store features (X12) are found to be statistically significant on buying preference of consumers towards unorganized retail outlets at 0.05% level of significance.

17. The indirect effect of environment (X8), through enjoyment (X6), is found to be statistically not significant on buying preference of consumers towards unorganized retail outlets at 0.05% level of significance.

18. The indirect effect of convenient/complement (X9), through place (X1), promotion (X2), price (X3), commitment (X4), alternative change (X5), quality (X7), environment (X8), complaint handling (X10), employee behavior (X11), store features (X12) are found to be statistically significant on buying preference of consumers towards unorganized retail outlets at 0.05% level of significance.

19. The indirect effect of convenient/complement (X9), through enjoyment (X6) is found to be statistically not significant on buying preference of consumers towards unorganized retail outlets at 0.05% level of significance.
20. The indirect effect of complaint handling (X10), through price (X3), alternative change (X5), quality (X7), environment (X8), convenient/complement (X9), employee behavior (X11), are found to be statistically significant on buying preference of consumers towards unorganized retail outlets at 0.05% level of significance.

21. The indirect effect of complaint handling (X10), through place (X1), promotion (X2), commitment (X4), enjoyment (X6), store features (X12) are found to be statistically not significant on buying preference of consumers towards unorganized retail outlets at 0.05% level of significance.

22. The indirect effect of employee behavior (X11), through promotion (X2), price (X3), alternative change (X5), quality (X7), environment (X8), convenient/complement (X9), complaint handling (X10), store features (X12) are found to be statistically significant on buying preference of consumers towards unorganized retail outlets at 0.05% level of significance.

23. The indirect effect of employee behavior (X11), through place (X1), commitment (X4), enjoyment (X6) is found to be statistically not significant on buying preference of consumers towards unorganized retail outlets at 0.05% level of significance.

24. The indirect effect of store features (X12) through place (X1), promotion (X2), price (X3), alternative change (X5), quality (X7), environment (X8), convenient/complement (X9), employee behavior (X11), are found to be statistically significant on buying preference of consumers towards unorganized retail outlets at 0.05% level of significance.

25. The indirect effect of store features (X12) through commitment (X4), enjoyment (X6), complaint handling (X10), are found to be statistically not significant on buying preference of consumers towards unorganized retail outlets at 0.05% level of significance.
1. Summary of the Path Model Output

Pictorial representation of Intra correlation among the Exogenous and endogenous variables

Exogenous (Independent) latent variables.

Endogenous (dependent) Latent variable(Y)

Y= Buying Preference. X1=Place, X2=Promotion, X3=Price X4=Commitment X5=Alternative Change, X6=Enjoyment, X7=Quality, X8=Environment, X9= Convenient/ Complement, X10= complaint handling, X11=Employee behavior, X12=Store Features
0.288** = Correlation co-efficient between X1 and X2,
0.306** = Correlation co-efficient between X1 and X3
0.149 = Correlation co-efficient between X1 and X4
0.184* = Correlation co-efficient between X1 and X5
0.037 = Correlation co-efficient between X1 and X6
0.161* = Correlation co-efficient between X1 and X7,
0.258** = Correlation co-efficient between X1 and X8
0.421** = Correlation co-efficient between X1 and X9
0.078 = Correlation co-efficient between X1 and X10
0.306** = Correlation co-efficient between X1 and X11
0.253** = Correlation co-efficient between X1 and X12
0.722** = Correlation co-efficient between X2 and X3
-0.223** = Correlation co-efficient between X2 and X4
0.415** = Correlation co-efficient between X2 and X5
0.176* = Correlation co-efficient between X2 and X6
0.360** = Correlation co-efficient between X2 and X7
0.574** = Correlation co-efficient between X2 and X8
0.278** = Correlation co-efficient between X2 and X9
-0.014 = Correlation co-efficient between X2 and X10
0.346** = Correlation co-efficient between X2 and X11
0.396** = Correlation co-efficient between X2 and X12
0.255** = Correlation co-efficient between X3 and X4
0.398** = Correlation co-efficient between X3 and X5
0.136 = Correlation co-efficient between X3 and X6
0.538** = Correlation co-efficient between X3 and X7
0.690** = Correlation co-efficient between X3 and X8
0.334** = Correlation co-efficient between X3 and X9
0.222** = Correlation co-efficient between X3 and X10
0.459** = Correlation co-efficient between X3 and X11
0.336** = Correlation co-efficient between X3 and X12
0.100 = Correlation co-efficient between X4 and X5
-0.094 = Correlation co-efficient between X4 and X6
-0.098 = Correlation co-efficient between X4 and X7
-0.304** = Correlation co-efficient between X4 and X8
-0.178** = Correlation co-efficient between X4 and X9
0.028 = Correlation co-efficient between X4 and X10
0.160 = Correlation co-efficient between X4 and X11
-0.051 = Correlation co-efficient between X4 and X12
0.125 = Correlation co-efficient between X5 and X6
0.728** = Correlation co-efficient between X5 and X7
0.663** = Correlation co-efficient between X5 and X8
0.336** = Correlation co-efficient between X5 and X9
0.720** = Correlation co-efficient between X5 and X10
0.434** = Correlation co-efficient between X5 and X11
0.212** = Correlation co-efficient between X5 and X12
0.194** = Correlation co-efficient between X6 and X7
0.120 = Correlation co-efficient between X6 and X8
-0.068 = Correlation co-efficient between X6 and X9
-0.123 = Correlation co-efficient between X6 and X10
0.122 = Correlation co-efficient between X6 and X11
0.135 = Correlation co-efficient between X6 and X12
0.708** = Correlation co-efficient between X7 and X8
0.509** = Correlation co-efficient between X7 and X9
0.615** = Correlation co-efficient between X7 and X10
0.606** = Correlation co-efficient between X7 and X11
0.349** = Correlation co-efficient between X7 and X12
0.617** = Correlation co-efficient between X8 and X9
0.505** = Correlation co-efficient between X8 and X10
0.409** = Correlation co-efficient between X8 and X11
0.413** = Correlation co-efficient between X8 and X12
0.276** = Correlation co-efficient between X9 and X10
0.240** = Correlation co-efficient between X9 and X11
0.282** = Correlation co-efficient between X9 and X12
0.370** = Correlation co-efficient between X10 and X11
0.123 = Correlation co-efficient between X10 and X12
0.336** = Correlation co-efficient between X11 and X12

0.331** = Standard regression of coefficient of X1 in the multiple regression of Y.
0.289** = Standard regression of coefficient of X2 in the multiple regression of Y.
0.318* = Standard regression of coefficient of X3 in the multiple regression of Y.
0.146 = Standard regression of coefficient of X4 in the multiple regression of Y.
0.110 = Standard regression of coefficient of X5 in the multiple regression of Y.
0.024 = Standard regression of coefficient of X6 in the multiple regression of Y.
-0.142* = Standard regression of coefficient of X7 in the multiple regression of Y.
0.145, = Standard regression of coefficient of X8 in the multiple regression of Y.
0.053, = Standard regression of coefficient of X9 in the multiple regression of Y.
-0.104, = Standard regression of coefficient of X10 in the multiple regression of Y.
0.221** = Standard regression of coefficient of X11 in the multiple regression of Y.
0.170** = Standard regression of coefficient of X12 in the multiple regression of Y.
The path diagram indicates that place (X1) with standard regression co-efficient 0.331 has emerged as first major contributor of consumer preference (Y) while shopping in unorganized retail outlets, followed by the price (X3) with standard regression co-efficient 0.318 is the second major contributor of consumer preference while shopping in unorganized retail outlets. promotion (X2) with standard regression co-efficient 0.289 is the third major contributor of consumer preference while shopping in unorganized retail outlets, followed by the employee behavior (X11) with standard regression co-efficient 0.221 is the fourth major contributor of consumer preference while shopping in unorganized retail outlets, followed by the store features (X12), with standard regression co-efficient 0.170 is the fifth major contributor of consumer preference while shopping in unorganized retail outlets, followed by the complaint handling (X10), environment (X8), commitment (X4), and enjoyment (X6), are the least contributor/predictors of respondents preference while shopping in unorganized retail outlets.

Regression Analysis of Organized Retailing factors influencing on Preference of Respondents

Analysis and interpretation of objective - 3: To study the direct and indirect effect of place, promotion, price, commitment, alternative change, enjoyment of shopping, quality, convenient/complement, complaint handling, employee behavior and store features which are not significant Predictors of respondents buying preference towards organized retail outlets.

In order to test this objective a null hypothesis was formulated and path diagram technique has been applied.

Hypothesis: There is no significant direct and indirect effect of place, promotion, price, commitment, enjoyment, quality, alternative change, environment, convenient/complement, complaint handling, employee behavior and store features which are not significant predictors of buying preference of consumers towards organized retail outlets.

To achieve this hypothesis, the path technique has been applied and the results are presented in the following table:
Table 52. Results of the Path Analysis of Independent Variables on Buying Preference of Consumers (Organized Retailing)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent variable</th>
<th>Independent variables</th>
<th>Direct effect</th>
<th>Indirect Effects Through</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Preference</td>
<td></td>
<td>X1  X2  X3  X4  X5  X6  X7  X8  X9  X10 X11 X12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PR</td>
<td></td>
<td>1   .277** 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place (X1)</td>
<td></td>
<td>.361** .659** .243** .375**</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion (X2)</td>
<td></td>
<td>.213**</td>
<td>.467** .064</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Price (X3)</td>
<td></td>
<td>.128  -.041  -.249** .116  1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment (X4)</td>
<td></td>
<td>.071  .184*  .403** .467** .064</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative Change (X5)</td>
<td></td>
<td>.066  .267** .341** .212** -.358** .205** 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enjoyment (X6)</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.208*</td>
<td>.159  .324** .674** -.153 .717** .327**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment (X7)</td>
<td></td>
<td>.159  .294** .589** .482** -.322** .652** .273** .720**</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality (X8)</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.033  .356** .312** .235** -.265* .323** -.104 .542** .670**</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convenient/complement (X9)</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.148  -.197* -.061  .390** .009 .694** -.196* .622** .482** .277**</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complaint Handling (X10)</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.103  .505** .522** .484** -.121 .380** .165* .635** .626** .591** .283**</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee Behavior (X11)</td>
<td></td>
<td>.408**</td>
<td>.451** .773** .486** -.265** .399** .377 .505** .704** .358** .202* .636**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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From the results of the above table, the following inferences are made:

1. The direct effect of place (X1), promotion (X2), price (X3), quality (X7), store features (X12) are found to be statistically significant on buying preference of consumers towards organized retail outlets at 0.05% level of significance.

2. The indirect effect of place (X1) through promotion (X2), price (X3), alternative change (X5), enjoyment (X6), environment (X8), convenient/complement (X9), complaint handling (X10), employee behavior (X11), store features (X12) are found to be statistically significant on buying preference of consumers towards organized retail outlets at 0.05% level of significance.

3. The indirect effect of place (X1) through commitment (X4), quality (X7), are found to be statistically not significant on buying preference of consumers towards organized retail outlets at 0.05% level of significance.

4. The indirect effect of promotion (X2) through price (X3), commitment (X4), alternative change (X5), enjoyment (X6), quality (X7), environment (X8), convenient/complement (X9), complaint handling (X10), employee behavior (X11), store features (X12) are found to be statistically significant on buying preference of consumers at 0.05% level of significance.

5. The indirect effect of promotion (X2) through convenient/complement (X9) is found to be statistically not significant on buying preference of consumers towards organized retail outlets at 0.05% level of significance.

6. The indirect effect of price (X3) through place (X1), promotion (X2), alternative change (X5), enjoyment (X6), quality (X7), environment (X8), convenient/complement (X9), complaint handling (X10), employee behavior (X11), store features (X12) are found to be statistically significant on buying preference of consumers at 0.05% level of significance.
7. The indirect effect of price (X3) through commitment (X4) is found to be statistically not significant on buying preference of consumers towards organized retail outlets at 0.05% level of significance.

8. The indirect effect of commitment (X4), through promotion (X2) enjoyment (X6), environment (X8), convenient/complement (X9), store features (X12) are found to be statistically significant on buying preference of consumers at 0.05% level of significance.

9. The indirect effect of commitment (X4), through place (X1), price (X3) alternative change (X5), quality (X7), complaint handling (X10), employee behavior (X11) are found to be statistically not significant on buying preference of consumers towards organized retail outlets at 0.05% level of significance.

10. The indirect effect of alternative change (X5), through place (X1), promotion (X2), price (X3), enjoyment (X6), quality (X7), environment (X8), convenient/complement (X9), complaint handling (X10), Employee behavior (X11), store features (X12) are found to be statistically significant on buying preference of consumers at 0.05% level of significance.

11. The indirect effect of alternative change (X5), through commitment (X4), is found to be statistically not significant on buying preference of consumers towards organized retail outlets at 0.05% level of significance.

12. The indirect effect of enjoyment (X6), through place (X1), promotion (X2), price (X3), commitment (X4), alternative change (X5), quality (X7), Environment (X8), complaint handling (X10), Employee behavior (X11), store features (X12) are found to be statistically significant on buying preference of consumers towards organized retail outlets at 0.05% level of significance.
13. The indirect effect of enjoyment (X6), through convenient/complement (X9) is found to be statistically not significant on buying preference of consumers towards organized retail outlets at 0.05% level of significance.

14. The indirect effect of quality (X7), through promotion (X2), price (X3), alternative change (X5), enjoyment (X6), environment (X8), convenient/complement (X9), complaint handling (X10), employee behavior (X11), store features (X12) are found to be statistically significant on buying preference of consumers towards organized retail outlets at 0.05% level of significance.

15. The indirect effect of quality (X7), through place (X1), commitment (X4) are found to be statistically not significant on buying preference of consumers towards organized retail outlets at 0.05% level of significance.

16. The indirect effect of Environment (X8), through place (X1), promotion (X2), price (X3), commitment (X4), alternative change (X5), enjoyment (X6), quality (X7), convenient/complement (X9), complaint handling (X10), employee behavior (X11), store features (X12) are found to be statistically significant on buying preference of consumers towards organized retail outlets at 0.05% level of significance.

17. The indirect effect of (X9), through place (X1), promotion (X2), price (X3), commitment (X4), alternative change (X5), quality (X7), environment (X8), complaint handling (X10), employee behavior (X11), store features (X12) are found to be statistically significant on buying preference of consumers towards organized retail outlets at 0.05% level of significance.
18. The indirect effect of convenient/complement (X9), through enjoyment (X6), is found to be statistically not significant on buying preference of consumers towards organized retail outlets at 0.05% level of significance.

19. The indirect effect of complaint handling (X10), through place (X1), price (X3), alternative change (X5), enjoyment (X6), quality (X7), environment (X8), convenient/complement (X9), employee behavior (X11), store features (X12) are found to be statistically significant on buying preference of consumers towards organized retail outlets at 0.05% level of significance.

20. The indirect effect of complaint handling (X10), through promotion (X2), commitment (X4), are found to be statistically not significant on buying preference of consumers towards organized retail outlets at 0.05% level of significance.

21. The indirect effect of employee behavior (X11), through place (X1), promotion (X2), price (X3), alternative change (X5), enjoyment (X6), quality (X7), environment (X8), convenient/complement (X9), complaint handling (X10), store features (X12) are found to be statistically significant on buying preference of consumers towards organized retail outlets at 0.05% level of significance.

22. The indirect effect of Employee behavior (X11), through commitment (X4), found to be statistically not significant on buying preference of consumers towards organized retail outlets at 0.05% level of significance.

23. The indirect effect of store features (X12) through place (X1), promotion (X2), price (X3), commitment (X4), alternative change (X5), enjoyment (X6), quality (X7), environment (X8), convenient/complement (X9), complaint handling (X10), employee behavior (X11) are found to be statistically significant on buying preference of consumers towards organized retail outlets at 0.05% level of significance.
2. Path Model output Summary

Pictorial representation of intra-correlation among the Exogenous and endogenous variables.

Exogenous (independent)
Latent variables.

Endogenous (dependent)
Latent variable (Y)

Y = Buying Preference. X1 = Place, X2 = Promotion, X3 = Price, X4 = Commitment, X5 = Alternative Change, X6 = Enjoyment, X7 = Quality, X8 = Environment, X9 = Convenient/Complement, X10 = Complaint Handling, X11 = Employee Behavior, X12 = Store Features.
0.659** = Correlation co-efficient between X1 and X2,
0.243** = Correlation co-efficient between X1 and X3
-0.041 = Correlation co-efficient between X1 and X4
0.184* = Correlation co-efficient between X1 and X5
0.267** = Correlation co-efficient between X1 and X6
0.159 = Correlation co-efficient between X1 and X7,
0.294** = Correlation co-efficient between X1 and X8
0.356** = Correlation co-efficient between X1 and X9
-0.197* = Correlation co-efficient between X1 and X10
0.505** = Correlation co-efficient between X1 and X11
0.451** = Correlation co-efficient between X1 and X12
0.375** = Correlation co-efficient between X2 and X3
-0.249** = Correlation co-efficient between X2 and X4
0.403** = Correlation co-efficient between X2 and X5
0.341** = Correlation co-efficient between X2 and X6
0.324** = Correlation co-efficient between X2 and X7
0.589** = Correlation co-efficient between X2 and X8
0.312** = Correlation co-efficient between X2 and X9
0.061 = Correlation co-efficient between X2 and X10
0.522** = Correlation co-efficient between X2 and X11
0.773** = Correlation co-efficient between X2 and X12
0.116 = Correlation co-efficient between X3 and X4
0.467** = Correlation co-efficient between X3 and X5
0.212** = Correlation co-efficient between X3 and X6
0.674** = Correlation co-efficient between X3 and X7
0.482** = Correlation co-efficient between X3 and X8
0.235** = Correlation co-efficient between X3 and X9
0.390** = Correlation co-efficient between X3 and X10
0.484** = Correlation co-efficient between X3 and X11
0.486** = Correlation co-efficient between X3 and X12
0.064 = Correlation co-efficient between X4 and X5
-0.35 = Correlation co-efficient between X4 and X6
-0.153 = Correlation co-efficient between X4 and X7
-0.322** = Correlation co-efficient between X4 and X8
-0.265** = Correlation co-efficient between X4 and X9
0.009 = Correlation co-efficient between X4 and X10
-0.121 = Correlation co-efficient between X4 and X11
-0.256** = Correlation co-efficient between X4 and X12
0.205* = Correlation co-efficient between X5 and X6
0.717** = Correlation co-efficient between X5 and X7
0.652** = Correlation co-efficient between X5 and X8
0.323** = Correlation co-efficient between X5 and X9
0.694** = Correlation co-efficient between X5 and X10
0.380** = Correlation co-efficient between X5 and X11
0.399**=Correlation co-efficient between X5 and X12
0.327**=Correlation co-efficient between X6 and X7
0.273**=Correlation co-efficient between X6 and X8
-0.104=Correlation co-efficient between X6 and X9
-0.196*=Correlation co-efficient between X6 and X10
0.165*=Correlation co-efficient between X6 and X11
0.377**=Correlation co-efficient between X6 and X12
0.720**=Correlation co-efficient between X7 and X8
0.542**=Correlation co-efficient between X7 and X9
0.622**=Correlation co-efficient between X7 and X10
0.635**=Correlation co-efficient between X7 and X11
0.505**=Correlation co-efficient between X7 and X12
0.670**=Correlation co-efficient between X8 and X9
0.482**=Correlation co-efficient between X8 and X10
0.626**=Correlation co-efficient between X8 and X11
0.704**=Correlation co-efficient between X8 and X12
0.277**=Correlation co-efficient between X9 and X10
0.591**=Correlation co-efficient between X9 and X11
0.358**=Correlation co-efficient between X9 and X12
0.283**=Correlation co-efficient between X10 and X11
0.202*=Correlation co-efficient between X10 and X12
0.636**=Correlation co-efficient between X11 and X12
0.277** = Standard regression of coefficient of X1 in the multiple regression of Y.
0.361** = Standard regression of coefficient of X2 in the multiple regression of Y.
0.213** = Standard regression of coefficient of X3 in the multiple regression of Y.
0.128 = Standard regression of coefficient of X4 in the multiple regression of Y.
0.071 = Standard regression of coefficient of X5 in the multiple regression of Y.
0.066 = Standard regression of coefficient of X6 in the multiple regression of Y.
-0.208* = Standard regression of coefficient of X7 in the multiple regression of Y.
0.159 = Standard regression of coefficient of X8 in the multiple regression of Y.
-0.033 = Standard regression of coefficient of X9 in the multiple regression of Y.
-0.148 = Standard regression of coefficient of X10 in the multiple regression of Y.
-0.103 = Standard regression of coefficient of X11 in the multiple regression of Y.
0.408** = Standard regression of coefficient of X12 in the multiple regression of Y.

The path diagram indicates that store features (X12) with standard regression coefficient 0.408 has emerged as a first major contributor of consumer preference while shopping in organized retail outlets followed by promotion (X2) with standard regression coefficient 0.361 is the second contributor of consumer preference while shopping in organized retail outlets. Followed by the place (X1) with standard regression coefficient 0.277 is the third major contributor/predictor of respondent’s preference while shopping in organized retail outlets. Followed by price (X3) with standard regression coefficient 0.213 is the fourth major contributor of consumer preference while shopping in organized retail outlets, followed by quality (X7) with standard regression coefficient -0.208 is the fifth major contributor/predictor of respondent’s preference while shopping in organized retail outlets, alternative change, complaint handling (X10), alternative change (X5),
enjoyment (X6), commitment (X4) environment (X8) are least contributor of respondents preference while shopping in organized retail outlets.

This chapter has covered the detailed analysis of percentage, descriptive statistics, mean, standard deviation, t-test, analysis of variance, correlation and regression analysis with path diagram analysis of buying preference of respondents towards unorganized and organized retail outlets and chi-square test for consumer opinion towards overall service offer by the unorganized and organized retail outlets. It provides insight into consumers' choice on organized and unorganized retail formats; customer various buying factors influences preference of buying. Furthermore, the analysis throws light on the prospects of unorganized and organized retailing in India as per consumers view. Finally, based upon the analysis, a framework of consumers' perspective for emerging organized and unorganized retail formats has been developed.