Age and employment status – changing facets of grocery buying behavior: an exploratory study
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Abstract

The study examines the grocery shopping behavior of people living in and around Delhi, Chennai and Bengaluru. A pre-designed questionnaire was used to collect the primary data (experiences) from the respondents. Data was collected from 246 people residing in and around these three cities. The collected data was analyzed with the help of statistical tools such as averages, percentages, factor analysis, Student’s t-test, structural equation model and correlation. The objectives of this study were to know the extent to which

- older and younger respondents differ in their grocery shopping behavior
- employed and unemployed respondents differ in their grocery shopping behavior
- grocery shoppers are satisfied with their grocery shopping experience.

The study revealed that most grocery shoppers do grocery shopping once a week and the majority of the surveyed shoppers disclosed that they spend an hour grocery shopping during each visit. Although the respondents show some differences in their grocery shopping behavior depending on their age and employment status, there appear to be a number of similarities in their grocery shopping behavior: the shoppers look at the store circular either before or at the store and select brands based on newspaper flyers received by them; they like to buy branded items because of previous usage and the trust that they have on these brands; they are keen to buy fresh and new stocks of items and choose to shop at a particular grocery outlet where they get all their requirements.
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Introduction

Consumers make product decisions sometimes with little thought and sometimes with a lot of time and effort. Whatever may be the case, comprehending this complex behavior is critical and vital for marketers. The declining discretionary time has resulted in a shift in buying motivations and buying behavior across a range of products and services. For products like table salt and milk, consumers recognize a problem, make a decision, and spend little effort in seeking external information and evaluating alternatives. The purchase process for such items is virtually by habit and typifies low involvement decision-making. Routine problem-solving is typically the case for low-priced, frequently purchased products (Kerin et al., 2013). Supermarkets and grocery shopping are a part of our daily lives, a routine though an important type of consumer buying behavior. Food and grocery items reflect low levels of engrossment, are less expensive and have less accompanying social risk. They are high-frequency purchase items largely insulated from economic downturns.

Marketers long ago recognized that consumers research expensive products such as electronics online. However, in trying to find the best deals, more shoppers are going online to research groceries, personal grooming items and household maintenance products before buying them in physical stores.
(Schiffman and Wisenblit, 2015: 57). The purchase intentions and outcomes of grocery shoppers often differ depending on an array of factors and, thus, this shift in buying motivation and buying behavior call for an increased focus and attention by marketers and retailers to counter rivals and remain profitable.

Review of literature

Numerous studies have been undertaken to study the different facets of grocery shopping behavior of customers. Though studies examining the impact of age on consumer buying are available, employment status is a rarely touched upon variable. Product needs often vary with consumer’s age and age also influences our buying priorities (Schiffman and Wisenblit, 2015: 40).

Age, employment status and occupation had a significant association with the purchase of organic food. Consumers of organic food are found to be older (Roddy et al., 1996; Schifferstein and Ophuis, 1998; Cicia et al., 2002). On comparing younger consumers with older consumers, it has been found that younger consumers hold more positive attitudes toward organically grown food (Magnusson et al., 2001) older consumers are more likely to be purchasers of organic produce. One elucidation is that the price premiums for organic food may be more affordable by older respondents. Agarwal et al. (2016) looked into the demographics and purchase behavior of organic food buyers and found that as age increases, consumption of organic food increases, except for buyers in the 41–50 age group. Mostly people employed in private enterprises buy organic food. Bronnenberg and Mahajan (2001) incorporated heterogeneous geo-demographic data and found that the location of consumers strongly affects their responses to prices and promotions.

When examined with respect to the perceived risk in decision-making age is related to only two risk factors, namely source and physical dimensions and shows a linear relationship to both. It also affects the sources of information that are consulted in order to reduce risk (Simecock et al., 2006).

Nicholls and Bumgardner (2007) evaluated demographic factors related to consumer preferences for furniture from both commercial and underutilized species. They concluded that age and income were statistically significant demographic factors, with a stronger effect for age on consumer preferences. However, gender was not significant for such decisions.

A study by Gupta et al. (2008) on organized retailing and its effect on consumer buying behavior found that lower the age group, higher is the frequency of the respondents visiting shopping malls. Respondents in the 15–25 age group visit shopping malls more with an intention of whiling away their time whereas the rest of the age group visit shopping malls more because of the ambience and the convenience of buying the products. With an increase in the age group the respondents’ inclination towards shopping from malls increases. The respondents in the 15–25 age group were more attracted toward better display of the products whereas for the rest of the respondents, more important parameters were the cost saving, time saving and the better schemes made available at the shopping malls.

Choudhary and Sharma (2009) conducted a study in India in a city with dynamically growing organized retail sector. They found that there is a significant influence of the format of retail stores and location on the operational efficiency, though the degree of association was not very high.

A study conducted in a suburban shopping mall to assess the impact of pleasant ambient scent on consumer spending as a function of shopper age established that only young shoppers spent significantly more in the presence of the pleasant ambient smell (Chebat et al., 2009).

Lisa et al. (2009) conducted a study to examine the variations in consumers’ food retail behavior with respect to the demographic variable of age, based on food shoppers aged over 60 years and living independently in Northern Ireland. The results showed that as age increases older consumers’ retail buying and food-related behavior changes. With an increase in age, a decline in patronage of several retailers is evident and so is the consumers' perceived value of multi-purchase promotions and nutritional confidence. Combined with increasing age there is an apparent increase in the use of local shops, the enjoyment gained from shopping, the difficulty experienced in accessing food retail sites and the problems experienced when cooking.
Age has shown to even affect the buying behavior of items like clothing. Herve and Mullet (2009) studied the impact of age on the perceived importance and interaction of three factors known to influence people when buying clothes: price, durability and suitability. For younger participants, a low price was considered an appropriate reason to buy the item of clothing. For older participants, suitability was a more important factor, while for the oldest people, durability was the most important factor.

Ali et al. (2010) analyzed the preferences and behavior of consumers in order to propose a marketing strategy for a modern food/grocery market. The preferences of the consumers clearly indicated their preference for cleanliness/freshness of food products followed by price, quality, variety, packaging and non-seasonal availability. The consumers' preference mainly depended on the convenience in buying at the marketplace along with the availability of additional services, attraction for children, basic amenities and affordability. Most of the food and grocery items were purchased in loose form from adjoining outlets. Fruits and vegetables were mostly purchased daily or twice a week due to their perishable nature, whereas grocery items were less frequently purchased.

Bashar et al. (2013) conducted a study to determine the correlation of consumers’ demographic factors on the impulse buying behavior with respect to a number of single impulsivity indicators and one collective indicator. The results showed that demographic factors, such as the disposable income and age, are related to most impulse buying indicators and to the impulsivity collective indicator. However, educational qualification and gender produced marginal association with impulsive buying behavior.

Kirgiz (2014) conducted a study to assess the hedonic attitudes and behaviors of consumers in terms of demographic characteristics. He found a strong relationship between the age of consumers and their attitudes and behaviors.

According to the findings by National Consumer Agency Research, Ireland (2014), women take the lead responsibility when it comes to shopping for food and groceries and are not prepared to compromise on quality. The younger consumers, at large, are spreading their shopping across a number of stores.

A study by Bhatt and Bhatt (2015) to examine the consumer behavior towards packaged food in rural areas of Gujarat in India concluded that three factors namely, health, convenience and mood have significant relationship with age. Consumers in their twenties gave more emphasis to health and mood uplifting while those over forty years of age preferred convenience.

Consumers make product decisions sometimes with little thought and sometimes using a lot of time and effort. Whatever may be the case, comprehending this complex behavior is critical and vital for marketers. The declining discretionary time has resulted in a shift in buying motivations and buying behavior across a range of products and services. Supermarkets and grocery shopping are a part of our daily lives, a routine though an important type of consumer buying behavior. Food and grocery items reflect low levels of engrossment, are less expensive and have less accompanying social risk. They are high-frequency purchase items largely insulated from economic downturns. The purchase intentions and outcomes of grocery shoppers often differ depending on an array of factors and, thus, call for an increased focus and attention by marketers and retailers to counter rivals and remain profitable.

Objectives of the study

The aim of this study is to examine the grocery shopping behavior on the basis of age and employment status of residents living in and around the cities of Delhi, Chennai and Bengaluru and their post-purchase grocery shopping experience. To develop a holistic analysis of the stated research problem, the following objectives have been developed for the study:

- To know the extent to which older and younger respondents differ in their grocery shopping behavior
- To know the extent to which employed and unemployed respondents differ in their grocery shopping behavior
- To know whether the grocery shoppers are satisfied with their grocery shopping experience and to make a few suggestions based on the study.
Materials and Methods

A pre-designed questionnaire on a five-point scale was used to collect the primary data (shopping experiences) from people living in and around Delhi, Chennai and Bengaluru. The questionnaire was framed to elicit the shopping experiences of the respondents and was chosen using convenience sampling. Out of the 300 questionnaires distributed, 246 questionnaires received back were complete in all respects and were used as the sample for this study.

Sample profile

Demographic information reported on the study indicated the following: Male respondents represented 53% of the sample, while female respondents represented the remaining 47%. The respondents were in the following age ranges: 71% percent were under 40 years of age and 29%, above 40 years. The report also indicated that 79% of the respondents were married and the remaining 21% were single. About 10% of the respondents had studied up to school level, while 52% of the sample has a bachelor’s degree and about 38% had done their masters. The income levels of the respondents were as follows: 27% of the respondents were getting up to Rupees 25,000 per month, while 35% earned between Rupees 25,001 and 50,000, 21% earned between Rupees 50,001 and 75,000 per month and the remaining 17% earned above Rupees 75,000 per month.

Grocery shopping habits of the respondents in the study indicated the following:

Frequency of shopping: Most of the surveyed respondents indicated that they do grocery shopping once a week, about 31% of the respondents prefer to shop for groceries twice a week, 17% informed that they do shopping once a fortnight and 9% disclosed that they prefer to shop for groceries daily. Time spent during each grocery shopping visit of the respondents was as follows: The majority of the respondents spent an hour shopping for groceries: 30% of the respondents spend two hours every time they go for grocery shopping while about one-fifth of the surveyed respondents prefer to spend more than two hours when they do grocery shopping.

Results

To identify and analyze the grocery shopping behavior of the grocery shoppers, 22 variables were chosen for this study at the time of initial finalization of the questionnaire. In order to extract the various parameters that indicated the grocery shopping behavior of older and younger respondents, employed and unemployed respondents living in and around Delhi, Chennai, and Bengaluru and their post-purchase grocery shopping experience, a principal component analysis was applied on all the 22 statements included in the interval scale. Retaining only those factors that had Eigen values greater than one (as suggested by Kaiser), it could be inferred that five factors emerged totally. These five factors together explained 59.387% of the total variance.

Factor dimensions

Only those variables that had loadings > 0.50 were included in the process of extracting individual factors from the analytical results. The results are presented in Table 1. Thus, variables A to D and G and H constituted factor I. A close look at all the variables in factor I impelled the researchers to identify a common name. This factor was then conceptualized as “Grocery shopping based on price - Related Factor”. Variables E and F constituted factor II. A close look at the items in factor II guided the researchers to conceptualize this factor as “Grocery shopping on Impulse purchase - Related Factor”. In a similar way, variables I to K and M formed factor III. This was grouped under the heading “Grocery shopping of Listed Items - Related Factor”. Factor IV is termed as ‘Grocery shopping of Branded Items - Related Factor” and comprised variables L, N, O, P and R. Finally, variables U and V were grouped under the heading “Grocery Shopping at Regular Outlet - Related Factor”.

The major outcomes of the factor analysis are as follows: Choose products because of loyalty card and discounts (Factor loading .655). Buy more quantity of cleaning materials to reduce the number of items needed (Factor loading .648). Seek out and buy store brands to save money (Factor loading .632). Buy less variety to reduce the number of items needed (Factor loading .604) Look at the store
circular either before or at the store (Factor loading .576). Shop at multiple stores to find the lowest price (Factor loading .562). Stock up certain items because they were on sale (Factor loading .578). Make additional unplanned purchases after seeing products/deals at the store (Factor loading .503). List categories to buy (Factor loading .707). List specific private label/store brand items to buy (Factor loading .647). Use a store circular to make a list (Factor loading .643). Make a list based on ingredients needed for recipes (Factor loading .501). Select brands according to promotions and gift vouchers available (Factor loading .656). Select brands based on newspaper flyers received (Factor loading .631). Choose brands based on previous usage and trust of the brands (Factor loading .629). Choose brands based on advertisements and displays in the store (Factor loading .624). List specific brands to buy (Factor loading .598). Regularly shop at a particular grocery outlet because of the availability of all the requirements (Factor loading .673). Regularly shop at a particular grocery outlet because fresh and new stock is available there (Factor loading .628).

**Hypotheses testing**

In order to test whether grocery shopping behavior of the sample respondents differ according to age, an independent t-test was applied on all the 22 variables (of the interval scale). Significant differences were noticed among the younger and older respondents in 3 out of the 22 variables on which the test was applied. The results where significant differences have been noticed are presented in Table 2.

H1: “I make additional unplanned purchases after seeing products/deals in the store” is independent of age. Interpretation: The t-test shows a mean value of 4.09 for younger and 3.74 for older respondents, respectively, which signifies that there exists a difference. Since the P-value 0.016 < 0.01 (at 5% level of significance), hypothesis 1 is rejected.

H2: “I seek out and buy store brands to save money” is independent of age. Interpretation: The t-test shows a mean value of 3.55 for younger and 3.81 for older respondents, respectively, which signifies that there exists a difference. Since the P-value 0.033 < 0.01 (at 5% level of significance), hypothesis 2 is rejected.

H3: “I list specific private label/store brand items to buy” is independent of age. Interpretation: The t-test shows a mean value of 3.79 for younger and 4.10 for older respondents, respectively, which signifies that there exists a difference. Since the P-value 0.046 < 0.01 (at 5% level of significance), hypothesis 3 is rejected.

In order to test whether the grocery shopping behavior of the sample respondents differ according to employment status, an independent t-test was applied on all the 22 variables (of the interval scale). Significant differences were noticed among the employed and unemployed respondents in 8 out of the 22 variables on which the test was applied. The results where significant differences have been noticed are presented in Table 3.

H1: “I shop at multiple stores to find the lowest price” is independent of employment status. Interpretation: The t-test shows a mean value of 3.75 for employed and 4.20 for unemployed respondents, respectively, which signifies that there exists a difference. Since the P-value 0.008 < 0.01 (at 5% level of significance), hypothesis 1 is rejected.

H2: “I buy more quantity of cleaning materials to reduce the number of items needed” is independent of employment status. Interpretation: The t-test on shows a mean value of 3.70 for employed and 4.08 for unemployed respondents, respectively, which signifies that there exists a difference. Since the P-value 0.015 < 0.01 (at 5% level of significance), hypothesis 2 is rejected.

H3: “I look at the store circular either before or at the store” is independent of employment status. Interpretation: The t-test shows a mean value of 3.26 for employed and 3.62 for unemployed respondents, respectively, which signifies that there exists a difference. Since the P-value 0.040 < 0.01 (at 5% level of significance), hypothesis 3 is rejected.

H4: “I make additional unplanned purchases after seeing products/deals in store” is independent of employment status. Interpretation: The t-test shows a mean value of 3.89 for employed and 4.23 for unemployed respondents, respectively, which signifies that there exists a difference. Since the P-value 0.025 < 0.01 (at 5% level of significance), hypothesis 4 is rejected.
H5: “I stock up on certain items because they were on sale” is independent of employment status. Interpretation: The t-test shows a mean value of 3.65 for employed and 4.28 for unemployed respondents, respectively, which signifies that there exists a difference. Since the P-value 0.000 < 0.01 (at 5% level of significance), hypothesis 5 is rejected.

H6: “I seek out and buy store brands to save money” is independent of employment status. Interpretation: The t-test shows a mean value of 3.72 for employed and 3.33 for unemployed respondents, respectively, which signifies that there exists a difference. Since the P-value 0.036 < 0.01 (at 5% level of significance), hypothesis 6 is rejected.

H7: “I choose products because of loyalty card discounts” is independent of employment status. Interpretation: The t-test shows a mean value of 3.50 for employed and 3.86 for unemployed respondents, respectively, which signifies that there exists a difference. Since the P-value 0.036 < 0.01 (at 5% level of significance), hypothesis 7 is rejected.

H8: “I use store circulars to make the list” is independent of employment status. Interpretation: The t-test shows a mean value of 3.05 for employed and 3.59 for unemployed respondents, respectively, which signifies that there exists a difference. Since the P-value 0.002 < 0.01 (at 5% level of significance), hypothesis 8 is rejected.

Post-purchase experiences of grocery shoppers

In order to test the post-purchase satisfaction of the grocery shoppers, the structural equation modeling technique with the help of SAS software (Version 9.0) was applied on five hypotheses: H1: Grocery shopping based on price, H2: Grocery shopping on impulse purchase, H3: Grocery shopping of listed items, H4: Grocery shopping of branded items and H5: Grocery shopping at regular outlet.

The factors correlation matrix was used as an input in the model. The model is estimated using the maximum likelihood method. H2: Grocery shopping on impulse purchase with t-value of -3.1202. H3: Grocery shopping of listed items with t-value of 2.2637. H4: Grocery shopping of branded items with t-value of 3.5987 and H5: Grocery shopping at regular outlet with t-value 3.0622 are found to be significant (at 5% level of significance) in predicting the post-purchase satisfaction of the grocery shoppers. The results are presented in Table 4.

The correlation between the five factors and the two variables (frequency and time spent on grocery shopping) was calculated using the Pearson’s Correlation method. The results showed that the factor “shoppers spending more time on grocery shopping” is positively correlated with “shopping based on price and branded items factor at the 0.01 level (2-tailed test).

Discussion

On the basis of the different analyses carried out, the following picture emerges: The majority of the respondents do grocery shopping once a week and most of the surveyed respondents indicated that they spend an hour grocery shopping during each visit.

Factor analysis of the data clearly grouped the statements included in the interval scale into five factors. Application of the t-test on all the 22 variables (of the interval scale) to test whether the grocery shopping behavior of the sample respondents differ according to age showed significant differences among the younger and older respondents and the test of whether the grocery shopping behavior of the sample respondents differ according to employment status showed significant differences among the employed and unemployed respondents in 3 and 8 out of the 22 variables, respectively, on which the test was applied.

The structural equation modeling technique was applied on five factors to find out the post-purchase satisfaction of the grocery shoppers, and the results showed the following four factors: Grocery shopping on impulse purchase with a t-value of -3.1202, Grocery shopping of listed items with a t-value of 2.2637, Grocery shopping of branded items with a t-value of 3.5987 and Grocery shopping at regular outlet with a t-value of 3.0622 were found to be significant (at 5% level of significance) in predicting the post-purchase satisfaction of the grocery shoppers. Based on the findings of the various analyses carried out, it can be suggested that although the respondents show differences in their grocery shopping behavior, depending on their age and employment status, there appears to be a
number of similarities in their grocery shopping behavior. By understanding these similarities, grocery outlets can draw their marketing strategies.

The grocery shoppers have disclosed that they look at the store circular either before or at the store, select brands based on newspaper flyers received by them and also look at the advertisements and displays in the store when they go for grocery shopping.

- The stores can come out with store circulars which can be kept in a visible place, for example, at the entrance of the store, or distributed through local newspapers; even door-to-door distribution of the store circulars can be done in nearby areas. The store can put on display its advertisements, promotions and displays in strategic and visible places to help grocery shoppers.

The study shows that irrespective of the age or the employment status, the surveyed grocery shoppers like to buy branded items because of previous usage and the trust that they have on these brands.

- This provides an opportunity for the grocery store to keep note of not only the repeatedly purchased grocery items but also the preferred brands of grocery items purchased by the grocery shoppers and make sure to keep these branded items to meet their requirements.

The study shows that grocery shoppers prefer to buy regularly from a particular grocery store because of availability of fresh and new stock of items.

- Grocery stores can make sure to offer fresh and new stocks of grocery items to its shoppers and display this information clearly in visible places at the stores. In this manner grocery stores can attract customers and try and make them their regular and loyal customers over a period.

The study indicates that the grocery shoppers prefer to shop regularly at a particular grocery outlet because they get all their grocery requirements.

- This gives an opportunity for the grocery outlet to know the needs of its shoppers and make sure that the customers continue to get all their grocery needs met.

Limitations and future research

At the outset, it should be mentioned that any survey-based method, including that adopted in this study, involves measurement errors, for example, the elicitation of a scale measurement or the respondent’s ability to precisely report their level of agreement with the survey statements (Bodey and Grace, 2006). However, efforts were made to design the administered tool to be simple, easy to understand and respond. Convenient sampling was used to collect the data from 246 respondents living in and around Delhi, Chennai and Bengaluru. Regarding future research, it is suggested that more samples from other regions and cities can be taken for study. Further, separate studies can be undertaken on other shopping behavior toward FMCGs, consumer durables and electronic goods, to name a few.

Conclusion

Consumer grocery shopping is undergoing many changes. More and more online grocery outlets have come up. This change has also attracted and encouraged more people, particularly technology savvy people with time constraints, to go for online grocery shopping. Grocery stores should realize this development and try to ensure that grocery shoppers who come to their stores are well taken care of by making sure that they have a very positive and satisfying experience every time they come for shopping. This can happen only when the grocery stores understand the requirements of its shoppers to the last detail and see that the shoppers get what they are looking for. This will help the grocery stores not only to keep the shoppers happy and make them repeat customers but also ensure their growth and profits in the years to come.
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Table 1: Identification of factors related to residents of Delhi, Chennai and Bengaluru and grocery shopping behavior

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor Name</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Factor Loading</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Factor I – Grocery shopping based on prices - Related Factors</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>I choose products because of loyalty card discounts</td>
<td>.655</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>I buy more quantity of cleaning materials to reduce the number of items needed</td>
<td>.648</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>G</td>
<td>I seek out and buy store brands to save money</td>
<td>.632</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>I buy less variety to reduce the number of items needed</td>
<td>.604</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td>I look at the store circular either before or at the store</td>
<td>.576</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>I shop at multiple stores to find the lowest price</td>
<td>.562</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor II – Grocery shopping on impulse purchase of items - Related Factors</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>I stock up on certain items because they were on sale</td>
<td>.578</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E</td>
<td>I make additional unplanned purchases after seeing products/deals in store</td>
<td>.503</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor III – Grocery shopping of listed items - Related Factors</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I list categories to buy(e.g. coffee, frozen vegetables, toothpaste)</td>
<td>.707</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>I list specific private label/store brand items to buy</td>
<td>.647</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>J</td>
<td>I use store circulars to make the list</td>
<td>.643</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>K</td>
<td>I make a list based on ingredients needed for recipes</td>
<td>.501</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor IV – Grocery shopping of branded items - Related Factors</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>I select brands according to promotions and gift vouchers available with me</td>
<td>.656</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td>My selection of brands is based on newspaper flyers received by me</td>
<td>.631</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>I choose brands based on previous usage and trust of the brands</td>
<td>.629</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R</td>
<td>Advertisements and displays in the store help me to choose brands in the store</td>
<td>.624</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I list specific brands to buy</td>
<td>.598</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor V – Grocery shopping at regular outlets - Related Factors</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>I regularly shop at a particular grocery outlet because I get all my requirements</td>
<td>.673</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>V</td>
<td>I regularly shop at a particular grocery outlet because fresh and new stock is available there</td>
<td>.628</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Results of the Student’s t-test – age
Table 3: Results of Student’s t-test – employment status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Employment Status</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Employed</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>1.204</td>
<td>.009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>1.154</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Employed</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>1.151</td>
<td>.015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>1.011</td>
<td>.011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Employed</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>1.244</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>1.163</td>
<td>.035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Employed</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>1.048</td>
<td>.025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>4.23</td>
<td>1.058</td>
<td>.026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Employed</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>1.169</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>4.28</td>
<td>.944</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>Employed</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>1.168</td>
<td>.036</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>1.076</td>
<td>.031</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>Employed</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>1.272</td>
<td>.038</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unmarried</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>1.125</td>
<td>.029</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>Employed</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>1.272</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>3.59</td>
<td>1.178</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4: Results of structural equation modeling technique

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Standard error</th>
<th>Coefficient</th>
<th>t-Value</th>
<th>Significant in predicting the respondents satisfaction level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H1</td>
<td>Grocery shopping based on price</td>
<td>0.27251</td>
<td>0.06332</td>
<td>0.2324</td>
<td>Not Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H2</td>
<td>Grocery shopping on impulse purchase</td>
<td>0.11318</td>
<td>−0.35315</td>
<td>−3.1202</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H3</td>
<td>Grocery shopping of listed items</td>
<td>0.10242</td>
<td>0.23185</td>
<td>2.2637</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H4</td>
<td>Grocery shopping of branded items</td>
<td>0.22231</td>
<td>0.80004</td>
<td>3.5987</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H5</td>
<td>Grocery shopping at regular outlet</td>
<td>0.37800</td>
<td>1.15752</td>
<td>3.0622</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>