

AN EMPIRICAL EVALUATION OF CONSUMER BEHAVIOUR IN SUPER MARKET

Dr. P.Kannan Paulraj*

Ms.G.SowmyaJanani**

ABSTRACT

The research was entitled under an empirical evaluation of consumer behaviour in Mario super market, Rajapalayam. the study of consumer behaviour is the study of how individuals make decisions to spend their available resources (time, money, efforts) on consumption related items. It includes the study of what they buy, why they buy it, when they buy it, where they buy it, how often they buy it and how often they use it. Consumer behaviour is the study of how individual customers, groups or organizations select, buy, use, and dispose ideas, goods, and services to satisfy their needs and wants. To study the factors influencing consumer behaviour in Mario super market Rajapalayam. To find out the consumers expectation with regards products displayed in Mario super Market. The scope of study about “evaluation of consumer behaviour” towards Mario supermarket, Rajapalayam. Consumer behaviour is an attempt to understand and predict human action in the buying role. The data collected for research is fully primary data given by the respondents. There is chance for personal bias, the accuracy is not is not true. Mario supermarket is high level price in the product

*** Prof & Head, Department of Management Studies, P.S.R Engineering College, Sivakasi**

**** Final Year MBA, Department of Management Studies, P.S.R Engineering College, Sivakasi.**

INTRODUCTION

The term 'consumer behaviour' refers to the behaviour that consumers display in searching for, purchasing, using, evaluating, and disposing of products and services that they expect will satisfy their needs. The study of consumer behaviour is the study of how individuals make decisions to spend their available resources (time, money, efforts) on consumption related items. It includes the study of what they buy, why they buy it, when they buy it, where they buy it, how often they buy it and how often they use it.

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

In order to develop a framework for the study consumer behaviour it is helpful to begin by considering the evolution of the field of consumer research and the different paradigms of thought that have influenced the discipline. **Martin Evans, (1989)** Complementary approaches are proposed for understanding and targeting fashion consumers – concentrating especially on innovation theory and self-concept theory. **Hoyer, W.D., Macinnis, D.J. & Pieters, R. (2012)** The authors of the book discussed various factors affecting consumer behaviour for buying such as demographic and social influences (family and household), group influence, impact of advertising and internal influences (learning, perception, attitude etc.). **batra, s.k. & kazmi, s. (2008)** "The authors suggested consumer behaviour as individual differs as from group. The family decision for purchase decision is entirely different from individual decision making.

bagozzi, r. & warsaw, l. (1990) consumer behaviour is one of the massively studied topics by the researchers and marketers in the past and still being studied. **Dr. Rajesh Kumar pandey Asst. Professor** Consumer Behaviour leads to the understanding of reasons why consumers differ from one another in buying or using products and availing services.

LIMITATIONS

The study is confined to Rajapalayam city only. The data collected for research is fully primary data given by the respondents. There is chance for personal bias, the accuracy is not is not true.

OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

- To study the factors influencing consumer behaviour in Mario super market organization.
- To find out the consumers expectation with regards products displayed in Mario super Market.
- To study the consumers satisfaction levels towards Mario super market
- To suggest suitable measures that improving consumer behaviour in organization

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Current research paper is of descriptive type and based on primary data collected through questionnaire filled by the customers of mario super market Rajapalayam. Five point Likert scale (**HS** – Highly agree, **A** – Agree, **N** – Neutral, **DS** – Disagree, **HDS** – Highly Disagree) that best describes the extent to which the respondents agree with each items in the questionnaire was used. The secondary data includes reference books, journal, research papers and internet. Convenience sampling method has applied and 90 respondents has selected from customers and from that of respondents data were used for analysis. The collected data were analysed using statistical tools namely Percentage testing method.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

From the table 1, it is understood that, majority of respondents are female (57.8%) and the remaining (42.2%) of the respondents are male respondents. In agewise classification, 46.7% of respondents belongs to age group of 21-30 years. <20yrs respondents 22.2%. And majority wise 45.6% of respondents education is UG level and lastly 8.9% of respondents education is other category.

In occupation wise, 44.4% of respondent level is students 18.9% of respondents level is Self employed. 13.5 % of respondents level is government, 13.3% of respondents level is Government employee.

In Table 2, it is based on Weighted average analysis in product category, suspension has secured highest weighted value of 4.3.

In Table 3, it is based on Weighted average analysis in price category, Spare parts cost has highest weighted mean value of 4.04

In Table 4, it is based on Weighted average analysis in place, the availability of stock has highest weighted mean value is 4.38.

In Table 5, It is based on Weighted average analysis in promotion, providing discounts has highest weighted mean value is 4.04.

In Table 6 It is based on Weighted average analysis in people, providing has highest weighted value is 4.31

In the 7 it is based on weighted average analysis in process, providing has highest weighted value is 4.06.

.RECOMMENDATIONS

There is a huge competition ever since of floating population and increase in young professionals with a high income. Parking space seems to be complaints against the Mario by the customers so enough parking space should be provided. Special discounts must be available all round the year and not for just during festive season. Due to slow billing process customers need to wait time, at the peak hours all the billing counters should be kept active.

CONCLUSION

This research entitled an empirical evaluation of consumer behaviour in Mario super market competing for a consumer is a never ending challenge no matter how many attractive strategies are adopted by the retail outlets especially in the garment industry. It is evident that knowledge of the buying motives of consumers is essential for a marketer. A successful lunch completely relies on how consumers perceive innovation. Mario supermarket industry it is clear that, it has certainly adopted various innovative tactics to attract consumers a thought full research on such buying behaviour of the consumers in an organization.

REFERENCES

1. Backhaus, K. Hillig, T. and Wilken, r. (2007) “predicting purchase decision with different conjoint analysis methods”, *international journal of market research*. 49(3). pp. 341-364.
2. Bagozzi, R. & Warsaw, l. (1990) “trying to consumer” *journal of consumer research* pp. 127 – 140.
3. Batra, S.K. &Kazmi, S. (2008) “consumer behaviour” 2nd edition, excel books
4. Blackwell, r., miniard, p. and engel, j. (2006) “consumer behavior”, mason: thompson
5. Hoyer, w.d. &macinnis, d.j. (2008) “consumer behaviour”, 5th edition, cengage learning
6. Hoyer, W.D., Macinnis, D.J. &Pieters, R. (2012) “Consumer Behaviour j. (2006)
7. martin evans, (1989) "consumer behaviour towards fashion", *europaen journal of marketing*.
8. Martin Jayaraj .A(2017), “A Study On Consumer Behaviour Towards Two Wheeler Dealers In Coimbatore District”, “*International Journal of Management Research & Review*”, ISSN: 2249-7196/April 2017/ Volume 7/Issue 4/Article No-3/41
9. Rajarajan, M and Priyanga, T (2013) “Consumer Behaviour Towards Selected Household Appliances in Ramanathapuram District”, *Primax International Journal of Commerce and Management Research* Vol. 1, Issue No. 1, pp.1-10

Table 1 Demographic profile of the respondents

Factors	No.	%	Factors	No.	%
Age group			Occupation		
20 yrs	20	22.2	Government employee	12	13.3
21-30	42	46.7	Pvt employee	40	44.4
31-40	18	20.0	Self employed	10	11.1
41-above	10	11.1	students	17	18.9
			House wife	11	12.2
Gender			shopping		
Male	38	42.2	Every day	3	3.3
Female	52	57.8	Once a week	29	32.2
Marital			Fort night	17	18.9
Married	41	45.6	monthly	40	44.4
Unmarried	48	53.3			

Qualification			Spent for supermarket		
SSLC	13	14.4	<Rs. 1000	38	42.2
HSC	23	25.6	Rs. 1001-2000	19	21.1
UG	41	45.6	Rs. 2001-3000	21	23.3
PG	12	13.3	Rs.2001-3001	11	12.2
			Rs.4001&above	1	1.1
Income			Awareing Sources		
<10000	14	15.6	Newspaper	6	6.7
10001-20000	30	33.3	TV ad	18	20.0
200001-30000	11	12.2	Friends & relatives	49	54.4
40000<	8	8.9	Family	13	14.4
Family size			others	4	4.4
Upto 2	6	6.7	New customer of Mario supermarket		
3-5	67	74.4	Expected collection	15	16.7
5-7	14	15.6	Expected price	23	25.6
7 above	3	3.3	quality	40	44.4
			employee service	12	13.3
Basis of Instalments			Visit first time in Mario		
Full Payment	73	65.8	Excellent intra	7	7.8
Bank	27	24.3	Verity clear space	37	41.1
Private Finance	11	9.9	Neatly clear space	31	34.4
			Good mankind	13	14.4
Sales and service Mario			Price are affordable	2	2.2
Excellent	4	4.4	Purchasing of Mario		
Very good	29	32.2	Excellent	8	8.9
Good	55	61.1	very good	22	24.4
Poor	1	1.1	good	60	66.7
Very poor	1	1.1	Poor	0	0
			Very poor	0	0
Attracting feature in Mario			Expectation from mario		
Physical environment	8	8.9	discount	22	24.4
Service	33	36.7	Free offers	23	25.6
Quality	32	35.6	gifts	35	38.9
Maintains	17	18.9	Free travel pack	10	11.1

Table 2 Weighted average method in Product category

Factors	SA		A		N		DA		SDA		TOTAL	AVG	RANK
	N	S	N	S	N	S	N	S	N	S			
Product 1	40	200	42	168	5	15	2	4	1	1	388	4.3	I
Product 2	24	120	50	200	14	42	1	2	1	1	365	4.05	II
Product 3	29	145	32	128	26	78	2	4	1	1	356	3.95	IV
Product 4	26	130	40	160	20	60	3	6	1	1	357	3.96	III
Product 5	18	90	46	184	18	54	5	10	3	3	341	3.78	V
Product 6	35	175	32	128	17	51	5	10	1	1	365	4.05	II
Product 7	21	105	33	132	22	66	3	6	1	1	310	3.44	VI

Table 3 weighted average method in price category

Factors	SA		A		N		DA		SDA		TOTAL	AVG	RANK
	N	S	N	S	N	S	N	S	N	S			
price 1	22	160	37	148	15	45	5	10	1	1	364	4.04	I
Price 2	20	100	35	140	32	96	-	-	3	3	339	3.76	V
price 3	27	135	36	144	24	72	2	10	1	1	362	4.02	II
Price 4	21	105	43	172	19	57	7	14	-	-	348	3.86	V
Price 5	23	115	35	140	28	84	4	8	-	-	347	3.85	IV
Price 6	31	155	32	128	20	60	6	12	1	1	356	3.95	III

Table 4 weighted average method in place

Factors	SA		A		N		DA		SDA		TOTAL	AVG	RANK
	N	S	N	S	N	S	N	S	N	S			
Place 1	47	235	33	132	9	27	-	-	1	1	395	4.38	I
Place 2	40	200	42	168	8	24	-	-	-	-	392	4.35	II
Place 3	39	195	31	124	17	51	3	6	-	-	376	4.17	VI
Place 4	33	165	39	156	15	45	3	6	-	-	366	4.06	VII
Place 5	32	160	34	136	19	57	5	10	-	-	363	4.03	VIII
Place 6	35	175	38	152	15	45	1	2	1	1	385	4.27	III
Place 7	45	225	26	104	16	48	2	4	1	1	382	4.24	IV
Place 8	33	165	35	140	19	57	2	4	1	1	367	4.07	V

Table 5 weighted average method in promotion

Factors	SA		A		N		DA		SDA		TOTAL	AVG	RANK
	N	S	N	S	N	S	N	S	N	S			
Promo1	35	175	27	108	19	48	8	16	1	1	348	3.86	V
Promo 2	22	110	43	172	10	30	5	10	-	-	322	3.57	VII
promo 3	21	105	37	148	26	78	4	8	2	2	359	3.98	III
promo 4	31	155	34	136	22	66	2	4	1	1	362	4.02	II
promo 5	31	155	38	152	16	48	4	8	1	1	364	4.04	I
promo 6	27	135	39	156	20	60	3	6	1	1	358	3.97	IV
Promo 7	27	135	29	116	23	69	7	14	4	4	338	3.75	VI

Table 6 Result of Weighted Average Ranking

Factors	SA		A		N		DA		SDA		TOTAL	AVG	RANK
	N	S	N	S	N	S	N	S	N	S			
People1	40	200	40	160	9	27	-	-	1	1	388	4.31	II
People 2	26	130	47	188	15	45	2	4	-	-	367	4.07	III
People 3	25	125	39	156	22	66	3	6	1	1	357	3.93	V
People 4	28	140	41	164	18	54	3	6	-	-	364	4.04	IV
People 5	38	190	35	140	15	45	-	-	2	2	377	4.18	II

Table 7 result of weighted average ranking

Factors	SA		A		N		DA		SDA		TOTAL	AVG	RANK
	N	S	N	S	N	S	N	S	N	S			
Process 1	31	155	24	96	17	51	4	8	14	14	324	3.6	V
Process 2	28	140	41	164	15	45	6	12	-	-	361	4.01	II
Process 3	23	115	36	144	25	75	4	8	2	2	344	3.82	IV
process 4	26	130	32	128	25	75	6	12	1	1	347	3.85	III
process 5	31	155	34	136	25	75	-	-	-	-	366	4.06	I
Process 6	24	120	28	112	26	78	8	16	4	4	330	3.66	VI

Table 8 result of weighted average ranking

Factors	SA		A		N		DA		SDA		TOTAL	AVG	RANK
	N	S	N	S	N	S	N	S	N	S			
Physical 1	39	195	42	168	8	24	1	2	-	-	387	4.3	I
Physical 2	25	125	49	196	16	48	-	-	-	-	369	4.1	IV
Physical 3	38	190	32	128	18	54	1	2	1	1	375	4.16	III
Physical 4	25	125	43	172	16	48	4	8	2	2	355	3.94	V
Physical 5	40	200	33	132	14	42	3	6	-	1	380	4.22	II