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#### Abstract

At present retail stores facing more competition in retailing business. Good store design increase the visiting of more customers in to the store and increase the store goodwill, and price also plays major factor to use the customer giving preference and selection of the store. And as industry research has shown, there is much need to know the customer expectations, customer preferences and their store choices (features) and in this marketing project, we will find out solutions to identify the customer preference which will getting more customers and getting more profits. The survey is being conducted for the ADITYA BIRLA RETAIL LTD more supermarket based in CHENNAI city, to find out the customer preferences in choosing more supermarket. It is required to find out the preferences based on certain aspects (price, income, quality, satisfaction level of customers). The researcher has used factor analysis, ANOVA , t-test and regression analysis to interpret the study. This study focuses on analyzing the consumer's preferences of the specific attributes of retail store in Chennai, ADITYA BIRLA RETAIL LTD. The study starts with reviewing the earlier works in this area.
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## INTRODUCTION

The retail firms are spending a lot of their marketing resources to keep existing customers rather than to attract new ones. Customer satisfaction plays a key role in customer retention and also is a major differentiating factor among retail stores. Delivering satisfaction to the consumers has become one of the major drivers of profitability. In this scenario, the firms have to work on what attracts consumers and what will make them not to shift their choice towards competitors. Working out strategies in this direction requires a thorough understanding of the preferences of the consumers on the attributes that are considered of much significance
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## COMPANY PROFILE

## ADITYA BIRLA RETAIL LIMITED

Aditya Birla Retail Limited (ABRL) is the retail arm of Aditya Birla Group, a $\$ 41$ billion corporation. The company ventured into food and grocery retail sectors in 2007 with the acquisition of Trinethra Super Retail and subsequently expanded its presence across the country under the brand =more' with two formats supermarkets and Hypermarkets.
In keeping with its motto Quality 1st, ABRL takes pride in being the first ever Indian food and grocery retailer to receive the Food Safety Management System (F SMS) certification. The company bagged the award for ensuring that manufacturing, storage, distribution and sales of food adhere to the highest quality standards. The Aditya Birla Science and Technology Centre in Taloja drives the quest for worldclass quality through extensive research and development across food and non-food categories.

## Supermarket

More Conveniently located in neighborhoods, more supermarkets cater to the daily, weekly and monthly shopping needs of consumers. The product offerings include a wide range of fresh fruits and vegetables, groceries, personal care, home care, general merchandise and a basic range of apparels. Currently, there are 487 supermarkets across the country.

## Own Brands

Strives to delight customers through a wide range of brands that deliver high quality at attractive prices across ready-to-eat food, beverages tea staples, cereals, instant mixes, papad, pickles, apparel, footwear, household cleaning essentials, personal care and devotional products. The power brands VOW, Kitchen's Promise and Feasters - deliver world-class quality to discerning consumers. All these brands are developed in-house.
In addition, Own Brands across categories include selecta, Prarthana, More Choice, More Value, Paradise, Bluearth, TRU, Bjoyzz, Karinee, Kruff Jeans Company, Berwins, Incheels, Chatter Kids and Yo. ABRL aspires for its range of brands to be a customer's most preferred brand across product categories. ABRL's research and development centre in Taloja, spread across 3,380 square feet, formulates, tests and develops food as well as non-food products. Each of our brands undergoes stringent testing for shelf life and consumer acceptance before they are made available commercially. The vision of the company is to be the foremost Retail Brand which makes India healthy and happy, with an obsession to provide wholesome and freshest foods. Passionately deliver convenient, competitive and meaningful solutions to the evolving regular needs of the Indian consumer in a sustainable and responsible manner. The Awards and achievements of the company : More Quality 1st Supermarket wins Coca Cola Golden Spoon Award 2017 for 'Images Most Admired Food \& Grocery Retailer of the Year'. Aditya Birla Retail Limited bagged the World Retail Award 2016 for Retail Transformation and Re-invention at the World Retail Awards Congress, held in Dubai, UAE.Aditya Birla Retail Ltd. has been awarded the TOP 10
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RETAILERS Certificate of distinction by Retail Asia at the Retail Asia-Pacific Top500 2015 Awards More Megastore won the Coca Cola Golden Spoon Award 2016 by IMAGES in the category of Most Admired Large Format Food \& Grocery Retailer of the Year.

## OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

## PRIMARY OBJECTIVE:

To analyze the customer preference towards the purchase of retail products.

## SECONDARY OBJECTIVE:

To rank the purchase behavior of the customer, to identify the factors that influence the customer to purchase their products and to identify the customer expectation towards the product purchase.

## REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Boo Ho Voon (2006) Managing Service Quality, Vol. 17, Issue: 6, pp.595-619. A study and the research was to empirically develop a service - driven market orientation construct and test its relationships with service quality. The results show that the service - driven market orientation (SERVMO) that consists of six components (customer orientation, competitor orientation, inter-functional orientation, performance orientation, long-term orientation and employee orientation) has a significantly strong and positive relationship with service quality

Bo Edvardsson Managing Service Quality, 2005, Vol. 15, Issue: 2, pp.127-131. The focus is on the role of customers' emotions in service experiences. The paper presents six propositions related to service experiences when consuming services and the role of emotions in customer- perceived service quality.

Amy Wong Lianxi Zhou Journal of Retail \& Distribution Management, 2006, Vol.34, Issue: 4/5, p. 290. It explains the impact of relationship quality on key relational outcomes (customer loyalty and customer commitment). The findings suggest that the inclusion of the relationship quality construct in the service quality-satisfaction model can further enhance the predictive value of service quality

## RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

PERIOD OF THE STUDY: 6 months RESEARCH DESIGN: DESCRIPTIVE RESEARCH
SAMPLING METHOD: Convenience sampling is one of the main types of non-probability sampling. This sampling method allows the researcher to reach the people who are easy to reach.
SAMPLING UNIT : Sampling unit selected for this project is the visitors of ABRL, MORE SUPER MARKET SAMPLE SIZE: 200 has been chosen for the study.
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SOURCES OF DATA: The sources are both primary and secondary sources. This questionnaire aims to gather information related to identify the customer preference in more supermarket. Secondary data has been collected from the websites, various magazines, journals and other related library books.

DATA COLLECTION METHOD: Data's are collected through administered questionnaire. The questions are close ended, open ended questions and multiple choice types.

STATISTICAL TOOLS: The statistical tools used for this data analysis were
Factor analysis, Regression, T test, Anova

## ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION

SHOWING WHETHER THEY BUY MORE SUPERMARKET (ADITYA BIRLAGROUP RETAIL)

|  | OPTIONS | NO OF RESPONDENTS | PERCENTAGE |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $(\%)$ |  |  |  |
| 1. | YES | 160 | 80 |
| 2. | NO | 40 | 20 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 200 |

## SOURCE: PRIMARY DATA

## INFERENCE:

From the table it is seen that most of the respondents buy More supermarket (Aditya Birla Group Retail) while few of them don't buy More supermarket (Aditya Birla Group Retail)

## REASON FOR BUYING IN MORE SUPER MARKET (ADITYA BIRLA

GROUP RETAIL)

| S.NO | REASON | NO OF RESPONDENTS | PERCENTAGE <br> $(\%)$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1. | QUALITY | 110 | 55 |
| 2. | TASTE | 44 | 22 |
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| 3. | LESS PRICE | 18 | 9 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 4. | QUANTITY | 12 | 6 |
| 5. | PACKAGE | 16 | 8 |
|  | TOTAL | 200 | 100 |

SOURCE: PRIMARY DATA

## INFERENCE:

From the above table it is inferred that most of the respondents reason for buy MORE supermarket (Aditya Birla Group Retail) is mostly for its Quality 55\% While Quantity contribution only 6\%which influencing the customer to purchase from MORE

Factor Analysis
KMO and Bartlett's Test

| Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling <br> Adequacy. |  | 818 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Bartlett'sTest <br> of <br> Sphericity | Approx. Chi-Square | 642.219 |
|  | Df | 78 |
|  | Sig. | .000 |

Table shows key dimension items loading and communalities statistics.
Kaiser Meyer olkin measure of sampling adequacy of 0.818
Barlett's test of sphericity significance 0.000 .

## Total Variance Explained

| Compone nt | Initial Eigenvalues |  |  | Extraction Sums of Squared Loadings |  |  | Rotation Sums of Squared <br> Loadings |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Tot al | \% of | Cumulative \% | Tot al | \% <br> of | Cumulative \% | Tot al | \% of | Cumulative \% |
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| 1 | 4.7 <br> 36 | 36.428 | 36.428 | 4.7 <br> 36 | 36.428 | 36.428 | 3.2 <br> 30 | 24.844 | 24.844 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2 | 1.4 <br> 23 | 10.945 | 47.373 | 1.4 <br> 23 | 10.945 | 47.373 | 2.1 <br> 22 | 16.321 | 41.165 |
| 3 | 1.2 <br> 75 | 9.804 | 57.178 | 1.2 <br> 75 | 9.804 | 57.178 | 2.0 <br> 82 | 16.013 | 57.178 |
| 4 | .93 <br> 0 | 7.157 | 64.335 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5 | .78 <br> 4 | 6.029 | 70.364 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 6 | .73 <br> 0 | 5.619 | 75.982 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 7 | .61 <br> 1 | 4.702 | 80.684 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 8 | .57 <br> 6 | 4.430 | 85.114 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 9 | .56 <br> 9 | 4.376 | 89.490 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 10 | .43 <br> 4 | 3.335 | 92.825 |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

## INFERENCE

The total variance is explained from the above table. The rotation and the Eigen values are different for factors 1, 2, and 3.The Eigen values for factor 1, 2, and 3 are 4.736, 1.423 and 1.275.Percentage variance for factorials, 2 nd and 3 rd are $36+428,10+945$ and $9+804$
respectively.lt indicates that three factors are extracted from 13 factors and have cumulative percentage up to $57.177 \%$ of the total variance

## Regression Analysis

## Model Summary
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| Model | R | R Square | Adjusted R | Std. Error of the Estimate |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | $.481^{\text {a }}$ | .231 | Square |  |

a. Predictors: (Constant), customer expectation, customer service, customer attraction

## Inference

$23.1 \%$ is total variance in Satisfaction that is explained by independent variables. Null hypothesis (Ho): There is no significant impact on Satisfaction by customer expectation, customer service, customer attraction. Alternate hypothesis (Ha): There is significant impact on Satisfaction by customer attraction, customer service, customer expectation

ANOVA ${ }^{a}$

| Model |  | Sum | df | Mean <br> Square | F | Sig. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Regression | 4.926 | 3 | 1.642 | 14.611 | $.000^{\text {b }}$ |
|  | Residual | 16.407 | 146 | .112 |  |  |
|  | Total | 21.333 | 149 |  |  |  |

a. Dependent

Predictors: (Constant), customer expectation, customer service, customer attraction
Inference:
It is seen that Significance value is .000 which is less than 0.05 . So accept Alternate Hypothesis (Ha).
This implies that there is significant impact on Satisfaction with the store by customer attraction, customer service, customer expectation.

## Coefficients ${ }^{\text {a }}$

| Model | Unstandardized Coefficients |  | Standardized Coefficients | T | Sig. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | B | Std. Error | Beta |  |  |
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| 1 | (Constant) | .853 | .110 |  | 7.731 | .000 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Customer attraction | .071 | .045 | .139 | 1.580 | .116 |
|  | Customers service | .256 | .050 | .448 | 5.134 | .000 |
|  | Customer expectation | -.149 | .045 | -.272 | -3.323 | .001 |

The multiple linear regression Equation ,
$Y=a+b i \times 1+b 2 \times 2+b 3 \times 3+$ $\qquad$ +btXt
$Y=.853+.071$ (Customer attraction) +0.256 (Customer service) -.149 (Customer expectation)
T-Test
Group Statistics

|  | Gender | N | Mean | Std. Deviation | Std. Error <br> Mean |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Are you satisfied with this <br> store | Male | 72 | 1.17 | .444 | .052 |
|  | Female | 78 | 1.10 | .305 | .035 |

Null Hypothesis(Ho): There is no significant differences between Gender and Satisfaction Alternate Hypothesis(Ha) :There is significant differences between Gender and Satisfaction Independent Samples Test
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Inference:
From the above table it is inferred that the significance value is less than 0.05 . Hence accept Alternate Hypothesis (Ho). This implies that there is no significant differences between Gender and Satisfaction. ANOVA

AGE

## DEPENDENT VARIABLE I - SATISFACTION

## Descriptive
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| Are you satisfied with this store |  |  |  | Std. <br> Error |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  | 95\% <br> Confidenc <br> e |  | Minimum | Maximum |
|  | N | Mean | Std. <br> Deviation |  | Lower <br> Bound | Upper <br> Bound |  |  |
| "18-28" | 81 | 1.16 | . 402 | . 045 | 1.07 | 1.25 | 1 | 3 |
| 29-38" | 53 | 1.09 | . 354 | . 049 | 1.00 | 1.19 | 1 | 3 |
| "39-48" | 8 | 1.13 | . 354 | . 125 | . 83 | 1.42 | 1 | 2 |
| "49-58" | 7 | 1.14 | . 378 | . 143 | . 79 | 1.49 | 1 | 2 |
| "Above $58 "$ | 1 | 1.00 |  |  |  |  | 1 | 1 |
| Total | 150 | 1.13 | . 378 | . 031 | 1.07 | 1.19 | 1 | 3 |

Null Hypothesis (Ho) : There is no significant differences between Age and Satisfaction with the store. Alternate Hypothesis $(\mathrm{Ha}):$ There is significant differences between Age and Satisfaction with the store. ANOVA

| Are you satisfied with this store |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Sum of Squares | df | Mean Square | F | Sig. |
| Between Groups | .159 | 4 | .040 | .273 | .895 |
| Within Groups | 21.174 | 145 | .146 |  |  |
| Total | 21.333 | 149 |  |  |  |

Inference:
From the above table it is inferred that the significance value is greater than 0.05 . Hence accept Null

Hypothesis (Ho). This implies that there is no significant difference between Age and Satisfaction with the store.
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## ANOVA

## OCCUPATION

DEPENDENT VARIABLE - SATISFACTION

## Descriptive

| Are you satisfied with this store |  |  |  | Std. <br> Error |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | N | Mean | Std. <br> Deviation |  | 95\% Confidence Interval for Mean |  | Minimum | Maximum |
|  |  |  |  |  | Lower <br> Bound | Upper <br> Bound |  |  |
| Student | 30 | 1.07 | . 254 | . 046 | . 97 | 1.16 | 1 | 2 |
| self employed | 28 | 1.21 | . 499 | . 094 | 1.02 | 1.41 | 1 | 3 |
| Professional | 63 | 1.16 | . 410 | . 052 | 1.06 | 1.26 | 1 | 3 |
| service | 21 | 1.05 | . 218 | . 048 | . 95 | 1.15 | 1 | 2 |
| housewife | 8 | 1.13 | . 354 | . 125 | . 83 | 1.42 | 1 | 2 |
| Total | 150 | 1.13 | . 378 | . 031 | 1.07 | 1.19 | 1 | 3 |

Null Hypothesis(Ho) : There is no significant differences between Occupation and Satisfaction with the store.

Alternate Hypothesis (Ha) : There is significant differences between Occupation and
Satisfaction with the store.
ANOVA

| Are you satisfied with this store |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Sum of Squares | df | Mean Square | F | Sig. |
| Between Groups | .512 | 4 | .128 | .892 | .471 |
| Within Groups | 20.821 | 145 | .144 |  |  |
| Total | 21.333 | 149 |  |  |  |
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## Inference:

From the above table it is inferred that the significance value is greater than 0.05 . Hence accept Null

Hypothesis (Ho). This implies that there is no significant difference between Occupation and Satisfaction with the store.

INCOME
DEPENDENT VARIABLE - SATISFACTION

## Descriptive
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| Are you satisfied with this store |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | N | Mean | Std. <br> Deviation | Std. <br> Error | 95\% <br> Confidenc e |  | Minimum | Maximum |
|  |  |  |  |  | Lower <br> Bound | Upper <br> Bound |  |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { below } \\ & 10000 \end{aligned}$ | 43 | 1.12 | . 324 | . 049 | 1.02 | 1.22 | 1 | 2 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 10000 \\ & 20000 \end{aligned}$ | 25 | 1.32 | . 627 | . 125 | 1.06 | 1.58 | 1 | 3 |
| 20000- | 43 | 1.14 | . 351 | . 053 | 1.03 | 1.25 | 1 | 2 |


| 30000 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 30000 | 30 | 1.00 | .000 | .000 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1 | 1 |
| above <br> 50000 | 2 | 1.50 | .707 | .500 | -4.85 | 7.85 | 1 | 2 |
| Total | 15 <br> 0 | 1.13 | .378 | .031 | 1.07 | 1.19 | 1 | 3 |

Null Hypothesis (Ho) : There is no significant differences between Occupation and
Satisfaction with the store.
Alternate Hypothesis (Ha): There is significant differences between Occupation and Satisfaction with the store.

## ANOVA
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| Are you satisfied with this store |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Sum of Squares | Df | Mean Square | F | Sig. |
| Between Groups | 1.812 | 4 | .453 | 3.365 | .011 |
| Within Groups | 19.521 | 145 | .135 |  |  |
| Total | 21.333 | 149 |  |  |  |

## Inference:

From the above table it is inferred that the significance value is less than 0.05 . Hence accept Alternate
Hypothesis (Ha). This implies that there is a significant difference between Age and Turnover Intention. To identify the exact difference, post hoc test is obtained.Post Hoc Tests

## Multiple Comparisons

| Are you satisfied with this store Tukey HSD |  |  | Std. <br> Error | Sig. |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| (I) Income | (J) Income | Mean Difference (IJ) |  |  | $\begin{gathered} \hline 95 \% \\ \text { Confid } \end{gathered}$ | ence Interval |
|  |  |  |  |  | Lower <br> Bound | Upper <br> Bound |
| $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { below } \\ & 10000 \end{aligned}$ | 10000-20000 | -. 204 | . 092 | . 183 | -. 46 | . 05 |
|  | 20000-30000 | -. 023 | . 079 | . 998 | -. 24 | . 20 |
|  | 30000-40000 | . 116 | . 082 | . 620 | -. 11 | . 34 |
|  | above 50000 | -. 384 | . 265 | . 599 | -1.12 | . 35 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 10000- \\ & 20000 \end{aligned}$ | below 10000 | . 204 | . 092 | . 183 | -. 05 | . 46 |
|  | 20000-30000 | . 180 | . 092 | . 293 | -. 07 | . 44 |
|  | 30000-40000 | 水 | . 095 | . 008 | . 06 | . 58 |
|  | above 50000 | -. 180 | . 270 | . 963 | -. 92 | . 56 |
|  | below 10000 | . 023 | . 079 | . 998 | -. 20 | . 24 |
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| $\begin{aligned} & 20000- \\ & 30000 \end{aligned}$ | 10000-20000 | -. 180 | . 092 | . 293 | -. 44 | . 07 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 30000-40000 | . 140 | . 082 | . 440 | -. 09 | . 37 |
|  | above 50000 | -. 360 | . 265 | . 655 | -1.09 | . 37 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \hline 30000- \\ & 40000 \end{aligned}$ | below 10000 | -. 116 | . 082 | . 620 | -. 34 | . 11 |
|  | 10000-20000 | 水 | . 095 | . 008 | -. 58 | -. 06 |
|  | 20000-30000 | -. 140 | . 082 | . 440 | -. 37 | . 09 |
|  | above 50000 | -. 500 | . 266 | . 334 | -1.24 | . 24 |
| above$50000$ | below 10000 | . 384 | . 265 | . 599 | -. 35 | 1.12 |
|  | 10000-20000 | . 180 | . 270 | . 963 | -. 56 | . 92 |
|  | 20000-30000 | . 360 | . 265 | . 655 | -. 37 | 1.09 |
|  | 30000-40000 | . 500 | . 266 | . 334 | -. 24 | 1.24 |

*. The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.

## Inference:

The above table shows there is a significant differences between Income Group of 10000-20000 and 30000-40000 groups.

RANKING

| Descriptive Statistics |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | N | Mean | Rank |
| Price | 150 | 4.69 | 2 |
| Product quality | 150 | 2.45 | 1 |
| Convenience of purchase | 150 | 7.73 | 9 |
| Suggestion of person | 150 | 8.32 | 12 |
| Promotional activities | 150 | 7.94 | 10 |
| Availability of products | 150 | 6.18 | 5 |
| Brands | 150 | 5.87 | 4 |
| Product quantity | 150 | 8.23 | 11 |
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| Cleanliness | 150 | 4.95 | 3 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Parking facilities | 150 | 7.63 | 7 |
| Discounts and offers | 150 | 7.57 | 6 |
| Delivery | 150 | 7.67 | 8 |

## INFERENCE:

The above table represents that the PRODUCT QUALITY is ranked $1^{\text {st }}$ by the respondents, PRICE is ranked $2^{\text {nd }}$ by the respondents, CLENLINESS is ranked $3^{\text {rd }}$ by the respondents and BRAND is ranked $4^{\text {th }}$ by the respondents based on their usage.

## FINDINGS

- It is interpreted that, Kaiser Meyer olkin measure of sampling adequacy of 0.818
- The first component of the factor analysis is customer attraction factor which includes variables like quality of products, setting display, operating hours, arrangement of products in rack, warm and friendly service, variety of products.
- The second component of the factor analysis is customer service factor which includes variables like taking steps for your complaints, how you satisfied with price and cost, easy access of products in the supermarket, affordable price.
- The third component of the factor analysis is customer expectation factor which includes variables like billing facilities, service provided by the salesperson, directing and handling customer.
- There is significant impact on Satisfaction by customer attraction, customer service, and customer expectation.
- There is significant differences between Gender and Satisfaction


## SUGGESTIONS:

- Customer service should be improved.
- Proper training should be given to employees as to how to attract more customers and how to retain them.
- Seating facilities could be provided since there are aged people visiting the store.
- Price of products could be reduced in order to attract more valuable customers.
- More branded products could be introduced.
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- All the billing counters should be kept opened even during the week days
- Variety of products with good quality should be brought in


## CONCLUSION:

The research work is done with a very definite proposition of finding the customer satisfaction and expectation. .People prefer more branded and variety of products with good quality. Customer also feels that there should be proper customer service. As customers satisfaction plays a vital role, it has to be concentrated on seriously. In conclusion matching customer expectations and satisfaction through proper service of marketing activities will improve company reputation and create loyal customer
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