Factors that Affect the Behavior of Buyer in Food Court Stores

DeepikaPandoi

Asst.Professor, Institute of Business Management, GLA University, Mathura, deepika.pandoi@gla.ac.in

Abstract

The consumer behavior literature suggests that the customer sees a food manufactured goods as a combination of attribute such as ease, diversity and option, creation quality, non-seasonal accessibility, covering, sanitation and originality.To study the factors influencing buying choice of customers in food products a convenience sample of 100 responders were selected and were asked to provide responses from a well structured and verified questionnaire on seven variables. To analyze the collected data multiple linear regression tools was used and was found that packing, trademark and quality of the product are the major factors that influencing the dependent variable of the revision. The paper was followed by conclusion by means ofboundaries.

Keywords: Factors, Purchase Behavior, Food products, Stores

1. Introduction

In the past decade, consumer purchasing habits and consumption behaviors have changed dramatically due to unyielding food price inflation. In India, the consumption of store trademarks is increasing. It accounts for 16.4 per cent of overall food shopping in the country. Selection and consumption of food is a dynamic process affected by numerousfeatures that is categorized as promotion, emotional and sensory. The significantcorrosion of consumer buying influenceismoved the purchase behavioras ofcountrywidetrademark to accumulatetrademarks, but modify theassessment concept to concentrate far added on worth in groceries and domesticfoodstuffs purchasing decisions. Literature indicates that the success of the store trademarks can be correlated with monetary growth and reduction (Kaswengi and Diallo, 2015).All alternatives at the disposal of an individual buyer are to be evaluated as per the risk element associated with the same (Agrawal and Dhamija, 2020). The sensory properties of a given commodity are considered to be the principal determinant of consumer preference. The impact of manufactured goods knowledge on customer behavior is deliberated extensively (e.g. Deliza & MacFie, 1996; KaÈhko Ènen, Tuorila & Rita, 1996; Solheim& Lawless, 1996), presentations a major influence on human being preferences and valid scores. Numerous revisions (Cardello, Bell & Kramer, 1996; Cheng, Clarke & Heymann, 1990; Filser, 1994) have highlighted the effect of a trademark name in food preference, food suitability and customer demand, which is based on the product itself and the consumer's cultural context. However, the promotion variables (worth, value, manufactured goods eminence, safety awareness, exhibit and features) may also affect customer's option of store trademark and judgment taking. Nonetheless this chance presents a crowd of exclusive disputes predominantly in shaping the energetic features for shop trademark purchasing judgments in promising trade bazaar such as India. Although store trademarks have been traditionally and still utilized in the merchandise mix as the low-priced option, store trademarks has now advanced to the point that products provide high-quality components, manufactured goods consistency, and covering (DemandTec, 2010). The store trademarks as a category have risen year-on-year by 30-35 per cent (Gnanakumar, 2010). The growing inclination

towards the recognition of store trademarks has demonstrate the necessity to recognize the qualities that make customers view store trademark goods another way from national trademarks in the face of intensified food spending opposition for customer. In addition, growing competition within the grocery industry between seller store trademarks and producers or countrywidetrademarks is a major problem (Harcar, Kara and Kucukemiroglu, 2006). Having regard to the above-mentioned facts and lack of experientialproof, this investigation is encouraged to recognize the crucial features affecting customers purchasing behaviour for food goods in order to meet the changing needs of discerning consumers.

2. Review of Literature

Several studies were performed to explain the behavior of consumer trademark choices in dissimilar industries. Mainlyrevision scrutinizes the behavior of customertrademark and manufactured goods selection in conjunction by demographic and socio-economic aspects. In addition to demographic and socio-economic individuality, approach and behavioral characteristics are also decorated as significant determinants of manufactured goods and company preference (Baltas, George, 1997). Customer prior information and occurrence may favor the trademark to a greater degree, but it depends on the influence of prior customer awareness and cognitive capacity (Bettman, J.R and Park, C.W., 1980). And other studies have demonstrated that expectations of product excellence and addedcharacterhas a toughcapability to pressurepersons purchasing performancepreceding to social, emotional, and shopping patterns (Szymanski, DM, and Busch, 1987). Additional research also revealed the disparity in consumer experience in the advertising stimuli findings differing in buying behavioral action (Livesey, F; Lennon, 1978).Ramaswami, S., Goldman, A., and Krider, R.E. [10] introduced a 2002 report on the Obstacles to New Food Retail Formats. Consumers considered supermarkets to be greater to supermarket perishables, but these perceptions had no effect on new format's capability to snatch extracontribute from conventionalbazaar (Ramaswami, S., Goldman, A., and Krider, R.E., 2002).

3. Methodology

100 customers of food products were conveniently selected from Chennai city to lead last overview on the chose 08 components of food items for deciding impacting elements of item decision conduct of clients. The data were collected through a standardized questionnaire from the sample responders. Overall the questionnaire contained 30 items for the 7 variables. A principal component analysis (PCA) has been applied to approve the scales to decide if things are gathered to the relating factors and whether the quantity of components is equivalent to anticipate. Part extraction depended on Eigen esteems more prominent than 1. An aggregate of 7 parts were acquired with a normal change of 68.1 percent portrayed. Every segment things are in accordance with the individual factors. To decrease co linearity between factors, we pivoted the segments to acquire a turned symmetrical factor score for every segment, utilizing a Varimax strategy with Kaiser Normalization. We likewise estimated the composite unwavering quality worth (CR) and the separated normal fluctuation (AVE) as per Hair et al. (2016). Factor loads above 0.5, Cronbach's Alpha above 0.7, AVE above 0.5 and CR above 0.7 are normally viewed as satisfactory (Fornell and Larcker, 1981; Nunnally and Bernstein, 1994);

4. Results& Discussions

4.1 Socio-economic and Demographic

Both responders ismaturegentleman and feminine food trade customers, consisting of 53 feminine customers (53.0%) and 47 gentleman consumers (47.0%), the generation 46-60 living is the majoramount of the survey by 32 responders (42%), while "31-45 years" is the negligiblefigureby 21 responders (11.8%). The majorities (82.2 percent) of responders were married and a meager 17.8 percent were

unmarried. The majority of responders (58.4 percent) had graduation as their instructive credential, postgraduate quantity (29.3 percent) and as their minimum credential, at least 12.2 percent had SSC. Therefore the responders areintellectual overall. The illustration also incorporated a number of professions, like housewives, workers, tradecitizens and others (scholars, etc), thus generous the example a comparative dimension resulting byaddition of different professional classes. workers (36%) were the main professionalresponder group led by housewives (30.4%). Most responders (40.4 per cent) received between Rs.30,000-Rs.40,000 in terms of income. Just 12.5 percent of responders had higher profits than 50,000 rs. The bulk of responders (54.6%) reported that their family size was 3-5 members, and 80.0% belonged to the higher socioeconomic class.

Particulars	Description	Frequency	Percentages (%)	Mean	S.D
sex	Gentleman	53	53	-	-
	Feminine	47	47		
Age	16-30	23	23		
	31-45	21	21	25	3.2
	46-60	32	32		
	61-82	24	24		
Marital Status	Married	61	61		
	Unmarried	39	39		
Education	SSC/Intermediate/Diploma	31	31		
	Degree	42	42		
	PG & Above	27	27		
Occupation	Housewife	18	18		
	Employment	41	41		
	Business	18	118		
	others	33	33		
Place of Residence	Rural	63	63		
	Urban	37	37		

Table.1. Socio-economic and Demographic

	Gender				Age						Place of Residence				
	Men	Women	F-value	Significance	16-30	31-45	46-60	61-82	F-value	Significance	Rural	Urban	F-value	Significance	RMSE
Brand image of the product	-1.88	1.4	5.13	0.023	-0.235	0.24	3.65	-3.2	2.36	0.28	-0.21	0.24	1.44	0.032	4.63
Quality of the product	-0.12	1.6	6.32	0.013	0.54	0.6	0.2	0.45	2.58	0.65	0.32	0.26	2.03	0.053	5.24
Price of the product	2.4	2.36	3.25	0.823	0.62	1.36	1.25	-0.21	4.36	0.24	0.37	2.36	3.54	0.084	8.35
Availability of the product	0.21	1.14	5.21	0.021	-0.116	1.34	0.25	-1.35	5.35	0.36	-0.24	1.54	5.22	0.074	4.65
Seek alternatives before buying	0.333	1.15	2.02	0.0314	-0.36	0.15	0.46	0.45	6.52	0.24	-0.12	1.15	3.22	0.0314	4.36
Taste of the product	0.38	0.43	1.58	0.0482	-0.54	0.23	0.78	0.15	4.25	0.58	-0.21	0.63	3.54	0.0482	5.87
Packaging of the product	-0.35	1.24	3.25	0.0785	-0.78	1.54	0.51	0.11	3.54	0.24	-0.47	1.24	3.25	0.0785	6.54
Promotional incentives	-0.11	0.58	1.25	0.0811	-0.48	0.12	0.21	0.54	2.56	0.23	-0.22	0.58	6.52	0.0821	4.58
Number of Customers	53	47			23	21	32	24			63	37			

Table.2. Effects of the different socio demographic variables on the apparatus of the reproduction anywhere important variations were observed (P<.05) (mean values) [a]

Feminine segmentation of customers is more in preferring the food from stores (e.g. Axelson&Brinberg, 1989; Dennison & Shepherd, 1995; Shepherd & Farleigh, 1986). On this basis, it seems that, generally speaking, food-related conduct is obviously a gender-sensitive one, possibly as the fact that food decisions and food shopping are still mostly made by women (Guerrero et al., 1998).

representation	R	R square	Adju. R square	Std.Error of approximation	Change statistics				
					R Square modify	F-modify	Df1	Df2	Sig. F-modify
1	0.976[a]	.953	.779	3.87	.953	5.493	11	3	.094

Table.3. (Predictors: Trademark, Quality, price, availability, alternatives, taste, packing, and promotional Incentives; Dependent variable: Purchase behviour)

From the above table it is clear that Rsquare value is .953 which means 95.3 percent of the difference in the needy variable or outcome variable is clarified by predictors. In other words any change in the purchase behaviour is explained by Trademark, Quality, price, availability, alternatives, taste, packing, and promotional incentives up to 95%.

representation	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Regression	906.713	11	82.428	5.493	.000
Residual	45.021	3	15.007		
Total	951.733	14			

Table.4. ANOVA describes about F-ratio which tests the representation is a good fit or not. As the worth is significant the representation is a good fit to the data.

A predictors :(Trademark, Quality, price, availability, alternatives, taste, packing, and promotional Incentives)

representation	Unstandardized coefficients		Standardized coefficients	t	Sig.
	B	Std.Error	Beta		
(steady)	11.619	82.306		-.141	.000
Trademark of	.786	.752	-.558	-1.045	.000
product	.626	4.035	-.621	-1.394	.000
Quality of product	.017	5.535	-.167	-.545	.000
Price of product	.490	10.515	.311	.472	.000
Availability of	.485	1.424	.416	.341	.000
product	.566	.989	.709	.572	.000
To seek	.809	.329	1.148	2.460	.000
alternatives	.427	.182	.645	2.345	.000
Taste of product					
Packing of product					
Promotional					
Incentives					

Table.5. Dependent Variable: Purchase behavior

From the above table we can inferred that the effect of the trademark of a product is .786 which means for each strategy in enhancing value of trademark of a product there is an increase in purchases by 78.6%, similarly when the quality of product increase by one percent, the purchase will increase by 62.6%. For each improvement taken by the organization in terms of Taste, Availability, To Seek alternatives, Price, Packing, and Promotional Incentives there will be increase in purchase by 56.6%, 49%, 48.5%, 1.7%, 80.9%, & 42.7% respectively. It can be further understtod that the major influencing factors are Packing, Trademark, and Quality.

5. Conclusion

Understanding purchaser conduct is significant not just for publicists whose essential target is benefit making yet in addition for the administration and its administrative offices and society all in all. Shopper conduct surveys tend to be a corner stone of positive marketing campaign and helps marketers develop their marketing campaigns by recognizing things like the psychology of how customers imagine, experience, motivation and choose among dissimilaroption. After evaluating all the variables inside the prearrangedstructure, it is established that customer buying choice of food goods are considerably influenced by three variables as Packing, Trademark, and superiority. It men that store trademarkor national trademarks in Chennai region should concentrate on the Trademark, quality and Packing of food products to improve their sales. In our study packing role is having high significance related to food products due to perseveres and freshness of food is vital for customer to consume. The study suffers with few limitations firstly; our research considered only seven variables but there may be other actors like cultural, social, and environmental factors. Secondly, we have take sample from few areas in Chennai where the cultural and social conditions may be same. And finally our study conducted only on food products.

6. References

[1]   Baltas, George. "Determinants of store trademark choice: a behavioral analysis." Journal of product and trademark management 6, no. 5 (1997): 315-324.

[2]   Bettman, James R., and C. Whan Park. "Effects of prior knowledge and experience and phase of the choice process on consumer decision process: A protocol analysis." Journal of consumer research 7, no. 3 (December 1980): 234-248.

[3]   Dick, Alan, Arun Jain, and Paul Richardson. "How consumers evaluate store trademarks." Journal of Product &Trademark Management 5, no. 2 (1996): 19-28.

[4]   Fornell, C., Larcker, D.F., 1981. Evaluating structural equation models with unobservable variables and measurement error. J. Mark. Res. 18 (1), 39–50.

[5]   Hair, J.F., Hult, G.T.M., Ringle, C., Sarstedt, M., 2016. A primer on partial least squares structural equation modeling (PLS-SEM), Second ed. SAGE, Los Angeles.

[6]   Kothari, C.R. Research Methodology: Methods and Techniques. 3rd. New Delhi: New Age International Publishers, 2004.

[7]   Livesey, F., and P. Lennon. "Factors Affecting Consumers' Choice between Manufacturer Trademarks and Retailer Own Labels." European Journal of Marketing 12, no. 2 (1978): 158-170.

[8]   Malhotra, Naresh K., and Dash Satyabhusan. Marketing Research: An Applied Orientation. 6th. New Delhi: Prentice Hall, 2010.

[9]   Masoom, Muhammad Rehan, Syed Habib Anwar PASHA, and S.M. Asif-Ur RAHMAN. "Factors Affecting the Consumer Purchasing Decisions of Perishable Foods: Exploring the Attitudes and the Preferences." Management Dynamics in the Knowledge Economy 3, no. 3 (2015): 509-531.

[10]   Nunnally, J.C., Bernstein, I.H., 1994. Psychometric Theory, third ed. McGraw-Hill.

[11]   Parasuraman, A., Zeithaml, V.A., Berry, L.L., 1988. SERVQUAL: a multiple-item scale for measuring consumer perceptions of service quality. J. Retail. 64 (1), 12–

[12]   Semeijn, Janjaap, Allard C.R. van Riel, and A. Beatriz Ambrosini. "Consumer evaluations of store trademarks: effects of store image and product attributes." Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services 11 (2004): 247-258.

[13]   Statistics, Bangladesh Bureau of. http://www.bbs.gov.bd/site/page/2888a55d-d686-4736-bad0-54b70462afda/District-Statistics. June 26, 2013.

[14]   Szymanski, D. M., and P. S. Busch. "Identifying the generics-prone consumer: a meta-analysis." Journal of Marketing Research 24, no. 4 (1987): 425-431.

[15]   ASSOCHAM analysis (2010), "Steep Rise on Food Prices," available at: www.assocham.org/prels/printnews.php?id=2611.

[16]   Goldman, Arieh, S. Ramaswami, and Robert E. Krider. "Barriers to the advancement of modern food retail formats: theory and measurement." Journal of Retailing 78, no. 4 (2002): 281-295.

[17]   KPMG (2009), 'Indian Retail: Time to Change Lanes', http://economictimes.indiatimes.com/news/news-byindustry/

[18]   Maslow, A. H. "A Theory of Human Motivation." Psychological Review, Vol. 50, 370-396, 1943

[19]   services/retailing/Private-labels-to-continue-growing-in-retail-sector-KPMG/articleshow/4350105.cms

[20]   Agrawal, A. and Dhamija, S. (2020). Sway of demography-based factors over the decision-making procedure pertaining to household investors. International Journal on Emerging Technologies. Vol 11, 2, Pages 92-98