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#### Abstract

The introduction of retail chain stores in Sylhet has offered a new type of shopping experience for the customers of Sylhet city. The structured system of shopping in these stores has been quite different from the traditional 'Bazaar' based one in terms of shopping environment, customer involvement, available choices, pricing and mostly customer value. The study examined the perceived difference in shopping experience among the customers of chain stores in Sylhet city through survey. The aim of the study is to identify the underlying reasons behind the transformation of retail shopping preferences among these customers which is causing them to choose chain stores over the traditional markets for shopping. The study also suggest for some strategies to attract and retain customers to the chain stores on the context of locality and customer expectations.


Keywords: Retail shopping, Transformation, Preference, Retail chain stores.

## 1. Introduction:

Retail chain stores have been for more than five years in Sylhet city, a rapidly bulging township on all considerations in the north-eastern region Bangladesh. The city has been famous and is rapidly expanding due to its economic significance that is mostly backed up by the heavy flow of remittance by the expatriates, tea industry and tourism industry. The steep growth in population and living standards among the population of Sylhet city has attracted business of all kind in recent years. Following the path of other industries, in 2008, 'Swopno', a concern of ACI limited, Bangladesh started its operations in Sylhet with three outlets. In course of time, the store has added one more outlet and has increased substantial increment in revenue and product assortment. So far, Swopno is the only functional full scale retail chain in Sylhet, although the city has experience a few unsuccessful initiatives by others like 'Meena Bazaar'. Considering the heavily increasing customers in these outlets, a study on the transforming preferences of the customers' of Sylhet city towards shopping in retail chain stores bears importance. Although the number of studies on retail chain stores and their customers are in Bangladesh is only a few (Rana, Osman and Islam, 2014), studies in this domain of business is indeed required to explore its potentials.

In the way of development of the market, the retail chain stores in Sylhet city have experienced remarkable growth in the number of customers and volume of sales. The inherent reasons behind such growth shows a transformation of retail shopping preferences among the customers from traditional marketplaces to sophisticated and convenient retail chain stores that are offering a wide variety of items under one roof at a competitive price. Such reasons along with other ones like store image, reliability, perceived quality, store environment etc. have been empirically proven in studies conducted on retail industry around the world (Ram, 2013).

The study aims to find out and measure the impact of the factors that are contributing to the transforming retail shopping preferences among the customers of Sylhet city. The study has been conducted on 150 customers with a view to generate firsthand knowledge about this emerging market. Although not large enough to draw deeper findings, this study has been able to study the profile of the customers and identified some factors that can be considered significant behind the rapid growth of retail chain stores in Sylhet city.

## 2. Statement of the Problem:

The research problem of the study is:
'To identify and measure the impact of the factors behind the transformation of retail shopping preference towards retail chain stores over traditional marketplaces among the customers of Sylhet city'. It has to be explored that whether the transformation of preferences are being intense or not.

## 3. Research Questions:

a) What are the demographics of the customers patronizing retail chain stores in Sylhet city?
b) What is the pattern of shopping of the customers in the retail chain stores of Sylhet city?
c) What are the levels of impact of the different factors contributing to the preference towards retail supermarket chains over traditional marketplaces among the customers of Sylhet city?
d) What is the level of satisfaction among the customers of Sylhet city in shopping in retail chain stores compared to traditional marketplaces?

## 4. Literature Review:

A study conducted on the factors that influence the consumer in choosing departmental stores in Bangladesh where the author identified the factors influencing consumers to shop at Superstores in Bangladesh in specific six probable extrinsic cues (Rana, Osman and Islam, 2014). The six extrinsic cues- Brand Image, Perceived Price, Perceived Quality, Product Availability and Location of the store. In another research, customer retention has received considerable attention and has become a prime issue for food retail organizations desiring to stay in business, maximize profits and/or build and sustain competitive advantage in the food sector in his research study (Palto, 2010).

Sarwer and Ferdousi (2004) identified that the retail sector of Bangladesh is dominated by traditional shops; nonetheless, it has shown growth and modernization, keeping pace with overall economic growth, the increase in middle-class consumers, and changes in consumption patterns. The organized retail sector, including supermarkets, remains relatively small but consumes increasing volumes of imported food products and exhibits the fastest growth.

In factorizing the motivations behind preferring retail chain stores, several factors has come up in studies conducted in this domain (Kara et.al, 2009). Rao and Monroe (1989) provided a model relating price, perceived quality, perceived sacrifice, perceived value, and willingness to buy as factors behind preferring stores. However, their model identified that price as the strongest of the factors having multi-dimensional influence on customer perception and preferences. However, conforming to store personality has also been identified as a strong drive behind the transformation of retail store preference of customers where individual customers tend to differentiate a particular store from competitors, and position itself through characteristics like product availability, service quality, value for money, and store atmosphere (Blankson and Crawford, 2012; Martineau, 1958; d'Astous and Levesque, 2003; Brengman and Willems, 2008). For the stores themselves, other attributes, such as ambience, design and social components are also of concern (d'Astous and Levesque, 2003) as these could directly affect the perception of customers. Other aspects in concern are store name, store environment, service quality, store personnel, merchandise quality, and carried brand names (Brengman and Willems, 2009, Orth, Limon and Rose, 2010). Consumers develop a perception about a particular store's appropriateness based on its design, structure and qualities of the sales personnel which affect affects their shopping decisions (Fiore and Ogle, 2000; Harrell and Hurt, 1976). As consumers acquire first hand experience with the product assortment and the store environment, their perception of the store's value is enriched over time and this process influences their beliefs about the store (Fiore and Ogle, 2000; Darden and Babin, 1994).

## 5. Objective of the Study:

a) To study the patterns of shopping of the customers in the retail chain stores of Sylhet.
b) To identify and measure the factors contributing to the preference towards retail supermarket chains over traditional marketplaces among the customers of Sylhet city.
c) To measure the level of satisfaction among the customers of Sylhet city in shopping in retail chain stores compared to traditional marketplaces.

## 6. Research Hypothesis:

H1: The customers of Sylhet city are satisfied in shopping in retail chain stores compared to traditional marketplaces.
H2: The factors behind the transformation of retail preference of the customers of Sylhet city are strongly related to their satisfaction level with the selected store.

## 7. Methodology:

### 7.1 Nature of the Study:

This study is based on primary data collected through survey on 150 customers of retail chain stores of Sylhet city. This study is descriptive in nature and limited in scope. Compared to the possible size of the population, the study can be considered as a primer for a larger and deeper study.

### 7.2 Sampling technique and sample size:

The sample units for the study were chosen conveniently from the customers shopping in the four outlets (Uposhohor, Shibgonj, Zindabazar and Subidbazar) of the only retail chain store of Sylhet city, namely 'Swopno'. The sample of the study consists of 150 respondents.

### 7.3 Source of primary data:

Primary data for the study were collected in two phases. The first phase consisted of a focus group session conducted in participation of 8 regular customers of retail chain stores. The participants were asked to identify factors that are significant for their preference towards retail chains. The session came up with a few significant
factors which were incorporated in the survey questionnaire. In the second phase, primary data were collected from the respondents coming out of the retail outlets after shopping through respondent administered questionnaire survey. Hence, Mall intercept type of interviewing technique has been employed for the survey. The questionnaire used in the study contains a few multiple choice questions and a few scale based questions. The questions addressed the information requirements for the study i.e. profile of the respondents, respondents' pattern of shopping, factors contributing to the respondents' shifting preferences towards retail chain stores and the level of satisfaction among the respondents regarding to shopping in retail chain stores.

### 7.4 Sources of secondary data:

Secondary data for the study were collected from printed resources i.e. research journals and largely, from the internet.

### 7.5 Data Analysis:

PSPP (Open Source) software was used to conduct statistical analysis. The descriptive statistics, i.e. frequency, relative frequency, mean etc. were mainly used to study the respondent profile and other issues. The inferential statistics used in the study is 'One Sample T-Test' and 'Pearson Correlation' to test the hypothesis of the study. Regression test was also conducted to create a model of customer satisfaction with retail chain stores with the collected data.

## 8. Limitations of the Study:

Data for the study has been collected from only 150 respondents. The number is extremely small compared to the total number of customers visiting the store. The study can be considered as a pilot study. Due to the limited range of information collected through the study, the scope is limited and can be considered as an overview of the situation. Unwillingness of the customers to participate in surveys during shopping has also been a challenge to ensure sound information. Lack of knowledge and awareness of the customers concerning the factors contributing to their respective level of satisfaction for shopping in retail chain stores have also been significant constraints for ensuring consistency and reliability of the survey data and resulting analyses.

## 9. Projection of Research Data:

### 9.1 Respondents' Demographic Profile:

The data tables given are created through PSPP software. The tables contain different information on the profile of the respondents.

## [Insert Table: 01, 02, 03, 04, and 05 about here]

The gender wise distribution of respondents is nearly balanced with $52.7 \%$ male and $47.3 \%$ female respondents. $39.3 \%$ respondents were in the below 25 years, $53.3 \%$ in the 26 to 40 years, $7.3 \%$ in the 40 to 55 years, whereas none was found in the above 55 years group. Among the 150 respondents taken under the study, $88.7 \%$ lives in Sylhet city and $11.3 \%$ lives outside. $42.7 \%$ of the respondents are service holders, whereas $43.3 \%$ and $14.0 \%$ are business person and homemakers respectively. Outlet-wise distribution of respondents is $44.0 \%$ in the Zindabazar, $36.0 \%$ in the Uposhohor, $4.0 \%$ in the Subidbazar and 16.0 percent in the Shibhonj outlet.

### 9.2 Respondents'Shopping Profile:

The data tables given below are contain different information of the services delivered to the observed respondents. [Insert Table: 06, 07, 08, 09, 10, 11, 12, 13, and 14 about here]
$8.7 \%$ of the respondents were found to be visiting the store for less that 1 month, $46.7 \%$ for 1 to 6 months, $24.0 \%$ for 6 to 12 months and $20.7 \%$ for more than 12 months. Of the 138 respondents found to be visiting the store for 1 month or more, $1.4 \%$ were found to visit the store 1 to 3 times, $52.9 \%$ visit 4 to 6 times, $24.6 \%$ visit 7 to 9 times and $21.0 \%$ visit more than 9 times. $25.3 \%$ of the respondents said that, they shop at other similar stores, whereas $74.7 \%$ said that they don't. Among the respondents, $98.0 \%$ said that they regularly purchase grocery items from the store, whereas $83.3 \%$ purchase vegetable, $94.7 \%$ purchase fish and meat, $87.3 \%$ purchase cosmetics and skincare products, $19.3 \%$ purchase household items and $18.7 \%$ purchase other items.

### 9.3 Respondents' Perceived Importance of the Factors behind their Preferences:

For measuring the respondents' perceived importance of the different factors behind their preference towards the retail chain store, respondents were asked to rate the factors given in 5-point itemized rating scales. Here, on a 1 stands for unimportant, 2 for less important, 3 for somewhat important, 4 for important and 5 for extremely important. The factors given for rating were identified in the focus group session conducted at the earlier stage of the study. The following tables give the statistics of the ratings:
[Insert Table: 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, and 22 about here]
While rating 'Comfort' as a factor, $8.7 \%$ have found it unimportant, whereas $46.7 \%$ found it less
important, $22.0 \%$ found it somewhat important, $20.0 \%$ found it important and $2.7 \%$ found it extremely important. For the factor 'Bargaining free shopping opportunity', $0 \%, 8.7 \%, 46.7 \%, 26.0 \%$ and $18.7 \%$ of the respondents have rated it unimportant, less important, somewhat important, important and extremely important respectively. For the factor 'Assurance of quality', the respective ratings are given by $0 \%, 4.0 \%, 34.0 \%, 60.0 \%$ and $2.0 \%$ respondents. The figures for the factor 'Availability of variety of products' are $0 \%, 2.0 \%, 78.0 \%, 13.3 \%$ and $6.7 \%$, 'Availability of different brands' are $0 \%, 0 \%, 49.3 \%, 47.3 \%$ and $3.3 \%$, 'Economy in price and savings' are $0 \%$, $2.7 \%, 47.3 \%, 47.3 \%$ and $2.7 \%$, 'Assistance of store staffs' are $0 \%, 4.0 \%, 38.7 \%, 57.3 \%$ and $0 \%$, and 'Loyalty and rewards programs' are $0 \%, 10.7 \%, 46.7 \%, 38.7 \%$ and $4.0 \%$ for the five respective ratings.

### 9.4 Respondents' Perceived Satisfaction in Shopping in Retail Chain Stores:

For measuring the respondents' perceived level of satisfaction regarding to shopping in the retail chain store compared to that of traditional stores, respondents were asked to rate their satisfaction in a 5-point itemized rating scales. Here, on a 1 stands for highly dissatisfied, 2 for dissatisfied, 3 for neither satisfied no dissatisfied, 4 for satisfied and 5 for highly satisfied. The following table gives the statistics of the ratings:
[Insert Table: 23 about here]
None of the respondents were found to be highly dissatisfied or dissatisfied. $50.7 \%$ of the respondents were found neither satisfied nor dissatisfied, $47.3 \%$ of the respondents were found satisfied and $2.0 \%$ of the respondents was found highly satisfied.

## 10. Test of Research Hypotheses:

### 10.1 Results of t-Test:

The hypotheses of the study have been tested through the use of 'One Sample t- Test' and 'Chi-Square Test of Correlation'. Hypotheses 1 was tested by t- Test and Hypothesis 2 was tested using Chi-Square test.

## [Insert Table: 24-a and 24-b about here]

The 'One-Sample t-Test' yields a t-value of 0.302 with 149 degrees of freedom, resulting in a Sig. value of 0.763 with a test value of 3.50 (positive satisfaction score) at a $95 \%$ confidence level. From the test statistics, it can be implied that, for Hypothesis 1, the result is not significant. Thus, Null Hypotheses 1 is accepted. Therefore, it can be significantly implied that, the customers are satisfied with their shopping experience in the retail chain store compared to shopping in the traditional stores.

### 10.2 Results of Pearson Correlation Test:

To find out any correlation between the level of overall satisfaction the chain store compared to shopping in traditional stores and the factors behind the transformation of retail store preferences, 'Pearson Correlation' test has been performed on the cross tabulation data of the variables.

## [Insert Table: $\mathbf{2 5}$ about here]

For the factors 'Assurance of Quality' and 'Assistance of the Store Staffs', the correlation were found significant at $5 \%$ level of significance. For the factors 'Comfort', 'Bargaining free shopping opportunity', 'Availability of variety of products' and 'Availability of different brands' were found significant and yielded Pearson correlation score of $0.135,0.054,0.041$, and 0.031 respectively, showing positive but not so strong correlations with customer's level of satisfaction. On the other hand, the factors 'Economy in price and savings' and 'Loyalty and rewards program' yielded negative scores of -0.010 and -0.012 respectively, implying extremely weak inverse correlation with the level of satisfaction. Therefore, Hypothesis 2 cannot be accepted.

## 11. Regression:

A regression test has been conducted keeping satisfaction level as the dependent and the factors contributing to choosing chain store as the independent variable. The outcomes are as follows:
[Insert Table: 26-a, 26-b, 26-c, 26-d, and 26-e about here]
The regression test considered all the variables to estimate the models and yielded an R value of 0.456 and R-Square value of 0.208 . This means there is mentionable level of correlation between the dependent and independent variables and approximately $20 \%$ of the variations in the dependent variables can be explained by the model.

The F-test, which was used to test the significance of the whole model, yielded a p-value of 0.000 , which is significant at $5 \%$ significance level. Therefore, it can be implied that, the variations in the dependent variable is duly explained by the model.

Five of the eight regression coefficients namely, Assurance of quality (Qual), Availability of variety of products (Prod), Availability of different brands (Bran), Economy in price and savings (Econ), and Loyalty and rewards programs (Loyl) were found to be insignificant (at $5 \%$ level of significance). The rest three namely, Comfort (Comf), Bargaining free shopping opportunity (Barg), and Assistance of store staffs (Staf) were found to be significant, and therefore removed from the regression equation.

The resulting regression equation for the model based on the results of table 26-d (with significant coefficients removed) can be expressed as:

Satisfaction $=2.416+0.184 \mathrm{Qual}-0.012$ Prod -0.0157 Bran $+0.179 \mathrm{Econ}-0.025$ Loyl
From the above equation, it can be seen that, although all the factors should contribute positively to the dependant variable and hence have positive coefficients, the model does not show so. Moreover, the low value RSquare ( 0.208 ) implies that, nearly $80 \%$ of the variation in the dependent variable cannot be explained by the model. Therefore, it can be implied that, the model is not strong enough. The small size of the sample ( $\mathrm{n}=150$ ) and lack of knowledge or awareness of the respondents may cause the anomaly in the model.

## 12. Findings and Implications:

From the results of the hypotheses, it can be implied that, the customers of Sylhet city are satisfied with their shopping experience in the retail chain stores. This can be considered as a favorable prospect for the growth of such stores in the city. However, none of the factors considered for the study were found to be significantly contributing to the satisfaction level of the customers. Respondents' lack of awareness and knowledge of the factors contributing to their satisfaction in such activities may be considered as the reason for such outcome. Furthermore, the possibility of the presence of one or more latent factors strongly contributing to the respondents' satisfaction cannot be disposed off. The small sample size may be another reason behind weak regression model of the factors. Such type of study, therefore, should employ a larger sample size. At large, the study can be considered as a pilot study on the issue.

## 13. Suggestions for Further Study:

Based on the findings of the study, some suggestions can be made for further studies to be conducted in this issue. Employing a larger sample size, preferably calculated using sound statistical process is definitely required. Conducting more in-depth focus group session with more carefully selected respondents may be useful in identifying any missing or latent factors that were not identified in this study. The questionnaire should be larger in size and have questions communicating to the issues more clearly to the respondents. Respondents pre-screening may also be conducted to ensure that only knowledgeable and aware respondents are surveyed, which would significantly increase the strength of the study.

## 14. Conclusion:

Retail chain stores have opened new horizon of retail experience for the affluent customers of the city of Sylhet. Within the very short time of their existence in the city, they have come to draw a huge traffic with varied expectations and needs. The satisfaction of the customers is keeping the stores on the track of growth and prosperity and also paving the way for the entry of many more of similar stores. The primary objective of the study was to identify the factors contributing to the transformation of the retail preference among the customers of Sylhet city and to measure their impacts. The study has been successful in identifying some of the factors and acts as a primer for further and deeper studies to identify and measure the factors to the full.
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Tables:
Table 01: Gender of the customer

|  | Response Category | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Valid | Male | 79 | 52.7 | 52.7 | 52.7 |
|  | Female | 71 | 47.3 | 47.3 | 100.0 |
|  | Total | 145 | 100.0 | 100.0 |  |

Table 02: Age of the respondent

|  | Response Category | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Valid | Below 25 years | 59 | 39.3 | 39.3 | 39.3 |
|  | 25 to 40 years | 80 | 53.3 | 53.3 | 92.7 |
|  | 40 to 55 years | 11 | 7.3 | 7.3 | 100.0 |
|  | Total | 150 | 100.0 | 100.0 |  |

Table 03: Area if Residence of the customer

| Valid | Response Category | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Sylhet city | 133 | 88.7 | 88.7 | 88.7 |
|  | Outside Sylhet city | 17 | 11.3 | 11.3 | 100.0 |
|  | Total | 150 | 100.0 | 100.0 |  |

Table 04: Occupation of the respondent

| Valid | Response <br> Category | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Service | 64 | 42.7 | 42.7 | 42.7 |
|  | Business | 65 | 43.3 | 43.3 | 86.0 |
|  | Home maker | 21 | 14.0 | 14.0 | 100.0 |
|  | Total | 150 | 100.0 | 100.0 |  |

Table 05: Outlet-wise distribution of the respondents

|  | Response <br> Category | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Valid | Zindabazar | 66 | 44.0 | 44.0 | 44.0 |
|  | Uposhohor | 54 | 36.0 | 36.0 | 80.0 |
|  | Subidbazar | 6 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 84.0 |
|  | Shibgonj | 24 | 16.0 | 16.0 | 100.0 |
|  | Total | 150 | 100.0 | 100.0 |  |

Table 06: How long the respondent is shopping from the store

|  | Response Category | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Valid | Less than 1 month | 13 | 8.7 | 8.7 | 8.7 |
|  | 1 to 6 months | 70 | 46.7 | 46.7 | 55.3 |
|  | 6 to 12 months | 36 | 24.0 | 24.0 | 79.3 |
|  | More than 12 months | 31 | 20.7 | 20.7 | 100.0 |
|  | Total | 150 | 100.0 | 100.0 |  |

Table 07: Number of times in a month the respondent shops from the store

|  | Response Category | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Valid | 1 to 3 times | 2 | 1.3 | 1.4 | 1.4 |
|  | 4 to 6 times | 73 | 48.7 | 52.9 | 54.3 |
|  | 6 to 9 times | 34 | 22.7 | 24.6 | 79.0 |
|  | 10 times or more | 29 | 19.3 | 21.0 | 100.0 |
|  | Total | 138 | 92.0 | 100.0 |  |
| Missing | 0 | 12 | 8.0 |  |  |
| Total |  |  |  |  |  |

Table 08: Does the respondent shop from any other store

|  | Response Category | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Valid | Yes | 38 | 25.3 | 25.3 | 25.3 |
|  | No | 112 | 74.7 | 74.7 | 100.0 |
|  | Total | 150 | 100.0 | 100.0 |  |

Table 09: Does the respondent purchase grocery items from the store

|  | Response <br> Category | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Valid | No | 3 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 |
|  | Yes | 147 | 98.0 | 98.0 | 100.0 |
|  | Total | 150 | 100.0 | 100.0 |  |

Table 10: Does the respondent purchase vegetable from the store

|  | Response <br> Category | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | No | 25 | 16.7 | 16.7 | 16.7 |
|  | Yes | 125 | 83.3 | 83.3 | 100.0 |
|  | Total | 150 | 100.0 | 100.0 |  |

Table 11: Does the respondent purchase fish and meat from the store

|  | Response <br> Category | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Valid | No | 8 | 5.3 | 5.3 | 5.3 |
|  | Yes | 142 | 94.7 | 94.7 | 100.0 |
|  | Total | 150 | 100.0 | 100.0 |  |

Table 12: Does the respondent purchase cosmetics and skincare products from the store

| Valid | Response <br> Category | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | No | 19 | 12.7 | 12.7 | 12.7 |
|  | Yes | 131 | 87.3 | 87.3 | 100.0 |
|  | Total | 150 | 100.0 | 100.0 |  |

Table 13: Does the respondent purchase household items from the store

|  | Response <br> Category | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | No | 121 | 80.7 | 80.7 | 80.7 |
|  | Yes | 29 | 19.3 | 19.3 | 100.0 |
|  | Total | 150 | 100.0 | 100.0 |  |

Table 14: Does the respondent purchase other items from the store

| Valid | Response Category | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | No | 122 | 81.3 | 81.3 | 81.3 |
|  | Yes | 28 | 18.7 | 18.7 | 100.0 |
|  | Total | 150 | 100.0 | 100.0 |  |

Table 15: Importance of comfort as a factor to prefer this chain store over traditional stores

|  | Response Category | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Valid | Unimportant | 13 | 8.7 | 8.7 | 8.7 |
|  | Less important | 70 | 46.7 | 46.7 | 55.3 |
|  | Somewhat important | 33 | 22.0 | 22.0 | 77.3 |
|  | Important | 30 | 20.0 | 20.0 | 97.3 |
|  | Extremely important | 4 | 2.7 | 2.7 | 100.0 |
|  | Total | 150 | 100.0 | 100.0 |  |

Table 16: Importance of bargaining free shopping opportunity as a factor to prefer this chain store over traditional stores

|  | Response Category | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Valid | Less important | 13 | 8.7 | 8.7 | 8.7 |
|  | Somewhat important | 70 | 46.7 | 46.7 | 55.3 |
|  | Important | 39 | 26.0 | 26.0 | 81.3 |
|  | Extremely important | 28 | 18.7 | 18.7 | 100.0 |
|  | Total | 150 | 100.0 | 100.0 |  |

Table 17: Importance of assurance of quality as a factor to prefer this chain store over traditional stores

|  | Response Category | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Valid | Less important | 6 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 |
|  | Somewhat important | 51 | 34.0 | 34.0 | 38.0 |
|  | Important | 90 | 60.0 | 60.0 | 98.0 |
|  | Extremely important | 3 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 100.0 |
|  | Total | 150 | 100.0 | 100.0 |  |

Table 18: Importance of availability of variety of products as a factor to prefer this chain store over traditional stores

|  | Response Category | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Valid | Less important | 3 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 |
|  | Somewhat important | 117 | 78.0 | 78.0 | 80.0 |
|  | Important | 20 | 13.3 | 13.3 | 93.3 |
|  | Extremely important | 10 | 6.7 | 6.7 | 100.0 |
|  | Total | 150 | 100.0 | 100.0 |  |

Table 19: Importance of availability of different brands as a factor to prefer this chain store over traditional stores

|  | Response Category | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Valid | Somewhat important | 74 | 49.3 | 49.3 | 49.3 |
|  | Important | 71 | 47.3 | 47.3 | 96.7 |
|  | Extremely important | 5 | 3.3 | 3.3 | 100.0 |
|  | Total | 150 | 100.0 | 100.0 |  |

Table 20: Importance of economy in price and savings as a factor to prefer this chain store over traditional stores

|  | Response Category | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Valid | Less important | 4 | 2.7 | 2.7 | 2.7 |
|  | Somewhat important | 71 | 47.3 | 47.3 | 50.0 |
|  | Important | 71 | 47.3 | 47.3 | 97.3 |
|  | Extremely important | 4 | 2.7 | 2.7 | 100.0 |
|  | Total | 150 | 100.0 | 100.0 |  |

Table 21: Importance of assistance of store staffs as a factor to prefer this chain store over traditional stores

|  | Response Category | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Valid | Less important | 6 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 |
|  | Somewhat important | 58 | 38.7 | 38.7 | 42.7 |
|  | Important | 86 | 57.3 | 57.3 | 100.0 |
|  | Total | 150 | 100.0 | 100.0 |  |

Table 22: Importance of loyalty and rewards programs as a factor to prefer this chain store over traditional stores

|  | Response Category | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Valid | Less important | 16 | 10.7 | 10.7 | 10.7 |
|  | Somewhat important | 70 | 46.7 | 46.7 | 57.3 |
|  | Important | 58 | 38.7 | 38.7 | 96.0 |
|  | Extremely important | 6 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 100.0 |
|  | Total | 150 | 100.0 | 100.0 |  |

Table 23: Level of satisfaction compared to shopping in traditional stores

| Valid | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative <br> Percent |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied | 76 | 50.7 | 50.7 | 50.7 |
|  | Satisfied | 71 | 47.3 | 47.3 | 98.0 |
|  | Highly satisfied | 3 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 100.0 |
|  | Total | 150 | 100.0 | 100.0 |  |

Table 24-a: One-Sample Statistics

|  | N | Mean | Std. Deviation | Std. Error Mean |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Level of satisfaction compared to <br> shopping in traditional stores | 150 | 3.51 | .540 | .044 |

Table 24-b: One-Sample Test

|  | Test Value $=3.5$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | t | df | Sig. (2- <br> tailed) | Mean <br> Difference | $95 \%$ Confidence Interval of the <br> Difference |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | Lower | Upper |  |  |
| Level of satisfaction compared <br> to shopping in traditional stores | .302 | 149 | .763 | .013 | -.07 | .10 |  |

Table 25: Pearson Correlations

|  |  | Level of satisfaction in shopping in this chain store compared to shopping in traditional stores |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Importance of comfort as a factor to prefer this chain stores over traditional stores | Pearson Correlation | . 135 |
|  | Sig. (2-tailed) | . 098 |
|  | N | 150 |
| Importance of bargaining free shopping opportunity as a factor to prefer this chain stores over traditional stores | Pearson Correlation | . 054 |
|  | Sig. (2-tailed) | . 509 |
|  | N | 150 |
| Importance of assurance of quality as a factor to prefer this chain stores over traditional stores | Pearson Correlation | . $244 * *$ |
|  | Sig. (2-tailed) | . 003 |
|  | N | 150 |
| Importance of availability of variety of products as a factor to prefer this chain stores over traditional stores | Pearson Correlation | . 041 |
|  | Sig. (2-tailed) | . 614 |
|  | N | 150 |
| Importance of availability of different brands as a factor to prefer this chain stores over traditional stores | Pearson Correlation | . 031 |
|  | Sig. (2-tailed) | . 704 |
|  | N | 150 |
| Importance of economy in price and savings as a factor to prefer this chain stores over traditional stores | Pearson Correlation | -. 010 |
|  | Sig. (2-tailed) | . 900 |
|  | N | 150 |
| Importance of assistance of store staffs as a factor to prefer this chain stores over traditional stores | Pearson Correlation | .193* |
|  | Sig. (2-tailed) | . 018 |
|  | N | 150 |
| Importance of loyalty and rewards programs as a factor to prefer this chain stores over traditional stores | Pearson Correlation | -. 012 |
|  | Sig. (2-tailed) | . 881 |
|  | N | 150 |

Table 26-a: Variables Entered/Removed

| Model | Variables Entered | Variables Removed | Method |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | All requested variables entered | None | Enter |

Table 26-b: Model Summary ${ }^{\text {b }}$

| Model | R | R Square | Adjusted R Square | Std. Error of the Estimate |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | $.456^{\mathrm{a}}$ | .208 | .163 | .494 |

a. Predictors: (Constant), Importance of loyalty and rewards programs, Importance of economy in price and savings, Importance of availability of variety of products, Importance of bargaining free shopping opportunity, Importance of availability of different brands, Importance of assurance of quality, Importance of assistance of store staffs, Importance of comfort.
b. Dependent Variable: Level of satisfaction compared to shopping in traditional stores.

Table 26-c: ANOVA ${ }^{\text {b }}$

| Model |  | Sum of Squares | df | Mean Square | F | Sig. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Regression | 9.050 | 8 | 1.131 | 4.634 | $.000^{\mathrm{a}}$ |
|  | Residual | 34.423 | 141 | .244 |  |  |
|  | Total | 43.473 | 149 |  |  |  |

a. Predictors: (Constant), Importance of loyalty and rewards programs, Importance of economy in price and savings, Importance of availability of variety of products, Importance of bargaining free shopping opportunity, Importance of availability of different brands, Importance of assurance of quality, Importance of assistance of store staffs, Importance of comfort.
b. Dependent Variable: Level of satisfaction compared to shopping in traditional stores

Table 26-d: Coefficients ${ }^{\text {a }}$

| Model |  | Unstandardized Coefficients |  | Standardized Coefficients | t | Sig. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | B | Std. Error | Beta |  |  |
| 1 | (Constant) | 2.416 | . 770 |  | 3.136 | . 002 |
|  | Comfort (Comf) | . 671 | . 181 | 1.229 | 3.703 | . 000 |
|  | Bargaining free shopping opportunity (Barg) | -. 628 | . 200 | -1.040 | -3.143 | . 002 |
|  | Assurance of quality (Qual) | . 184 | . 077 | . 205 | 2.388 | . 018 |
|  | Availability of variety of products (Prod) | -. 012 | . 070 | -. 013 | -. 166 | . 868 |
|  | Availability of different brands (Bran) | -. 157 | . 084 | -. 163 | -1.874 | . 063 |
|  | Economy in price and savings (Econ) | . 179 | . 081 | . 199 | 2.212 | . 029 |
|  | Assistance of store staffs (Staf) | . 270 | . 088 | . 288 | 3.059 | . 003 |
|  | Loyalty and rewards programs (Loyl) | -. 025 | . 060 | -. 033 | -. 412 | . 681 |

a. Dependent Variable: Level of satisfaction compared to shopping in traditional stores

Table 26-e: Residuals Statistics ${ }^{\text {a }}$

|  | Minimum | Maximum | Mean | Std. Deviation | N |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Predicted Value | 3.11 | 4.57 | 3.51 | .246 | 150 |
| Std. Predicted Value | -1.654 | 4.280 | .000 | 1.000 | 150 |
| Standard Error of Predicted <br> Value | .076 | .217 | .116 | .035 | 150 |
| Adjusted Predicted Value | 3.11 | 4.70 | 3.51 | .251 | 150 |
| Residual | -.874 | 1.508 | .000 | .481 | 150 |
| Std. Residual | -1.768 | 3.051 | .000 | .973 | 150 |
| Stud. Residual | -1.836 | 3.113 | .001 | 1.004 | 150 |
| Deleted Residual | -.968 | 1.569 | .001 | .513 | 150 |
| Stud. Deleted Residual | -1.852 | 3.214 | .002 | 1.008 | 150 |
| Mahal. Distance | 2.526 | 27.859 | 7.947 | 5.661 | 150 |
| Cook's Distance | .000 | .189 | .008 | .017 | 150 |
| Centered Leverage Value | .017 | .187 | .053 | .038 | 150 |

a. Dependent Variable: Level of satisfaction compared to shopping in traditional stores

## Annex-01: Survey Questionnaire

(Note: The questionnaire used for the study was typed in Bengali for the convenience of the respondents)

## Date of Survey:

## Name of the Store:

Instruction: Put tick ( $\sqrt{ }$ ) mark beside your selected answer. Write down answers for descriptive questions. Follow instructions given with the options to move to next question.

1. Your Name:
2. Your Profession: a) Service b) Business c) Homemaker d) Others:
3. Your Age: a) Below 25 Years b) $25-40$ Years c) $41-55$ Years d) Above 55 Years
4. How long have you been shopping in this store? (Instruction: If your answer is ' $a$ ', move to question 6 , for others, move to question 5)
a) Less than 1 month b) $1-6$ months $\mathbf{c}) 6-12$ months d) More than 12 months
5. How many times in month do you shop in this store?
a) $1-3$ times b) $4-6$ times c) $7-9$ times d) 10 times or more.
6. Do you shop at any other chain store?
a) Yes (mention:
) b) No
7. What type of products do you purchase from this store? (Instruction: You may select more than one option) a) Grocery b) Vegetable c) Fish \& Meat d) Cosmetics and Skincare d) Households e) Other
8. How much are the following factors contributing to your preference to shop in this retail chain in comparison to that of in traditional marketplace? (Instruction: Score each factor from 1 to 5. Here, 1 implies 'Unimportant' and 5 implies 'Extremely Important')
a) Comfort (Score: $\qquad$
b) Opportunity for bargaining free shopping (Score: $\qquad$ ..)
c) Availability of different types of products at the same place (Score: $\qquad$ ..)
d) Availability of different brands at the same place (Score: ...)
e) Economy and savings (Score: $\qquad$ ..)
f) Assistance of the store staffs (Score: ................)
g) Loyalty programs and rewards (Score: ...............)
h) Others:
. (Score: $\qquad$ .)
9. What is your level of satisfaction in shopping in this store compared to that of the traditional marketplace? a) Highly dissatisfied b) Dissatisfied c) No comments d) Satisfied e) Highly Satisfied

## - Thank you -

## Annex-02: Basic Descriptive Statistics

Table A2-1

|  | $\ddot{0}$ 0 0 0 0 0 $\pm$ $\Xi_{0}$ 0 0 0 0 | $\#$ <br> 0 <br> 0 <br> 0 <br> 0 <br> 0 <br> 0 <br> 0 <br> $\#$ <br>  <br> 0 <br> 0 <br> 0 <br> 0 |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Does the respondent shop } \\ & \text { from any other store } \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| N Valid | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 138 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 |
| N | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Mean | 1.49 | 1.68 | 1.11 | 1.71 | 1.92 | 2.57 | 2.65 | 1.75 | 1.98 | 1.83 | 1.95 | 1.87 |
| Std. Error of Mean | . 042 | . 049 | . 026 | . 057 | . 086 | . 075 | . 070 | . 036 | . 011 | . 031 | . 018 | . 027 |
| Mode | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Std. Deviation | . 502 | . 606 | . 318 | . 698 | 1.059 | . 915 | . 825 | . 436 | . 140 | . 374 | . 225 | . 334 |
| Skewness | . 042 | . 287 | 2.464 | . 460 | . 987 | . 279 | . 569 | -1.146 | -6.927 | -1.807 | -4.016 | -2.268 |
| Std. Error of Skewness | . 201 | . 198 | . 198 | . 198 | . 198 | . 198 | . 206 | . 198 | . 198 | . 198 | . 198 | . 198 |
| Kurtosis | -2.026 | -. 627 | 4.127 | -. 871 | -. 256 | -. 895 | -1.023 | -. 697 | 46.599 | 1.282 | 14.319 | 3.185 |
| Std. Error of Kurtosis | . 400 | . 394 | . 394 | . 394 | . 394 | . 394 | . 410 | . 394 | . 394 | . 394 | . 394 | . 394 |


|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| N | Valid | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 |
|  | Missing | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Mean |  | 1.81 | 1.81 | 2.61 | 3.55 | 3.60 | 3.25 | 3.54 | 3.50 | 3.53 | 3.36 | 3.51 |
| Std. Error of Mean |  | . 032 | . 032 | . 081 | . 073 | . 049 | . 049 | . 046 | . 049 | . 047 | . 059 | . 044 |
| Mode |  | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 3 | $3^{\text {a }}$ | 4 | 3 | 3 |
| Std. Deviation |  | . 396 | . 391 | . 988 | . 894 | . 602 | . 601 | . 563 | . 599 | . 575 | . 726 | . 540 |
| Skewness |  | -1.569 | -1.625 | . 462 | . 286 | -. 673 | 1.717 | . 412 | . 000 | -. 774 | -. 033 | . 335 |
| Std. Error of Skewness |  | . 198 | . 198 | . 198 | . 198 | . 198 | . 198 | . 198 | . 198 | . 198 | . 198 | . 198 |
| Kurtosis |  | . 467 | . 648 | -. 577 | -. 798 | . 118 | 2.744 | -. 826 | -. 385 | -. 388 | -. 321 | -1.098 |
| Std. Error of Kurtosis |  | . 394 | . 394 | . 394 | . 394 | . 394 | . 394 | . 394 | . 394 | . 394 | . 394 | . 394 |
| a. Multiple modes exist. The smallest value is shown |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

