Volume : 5 | Issue : 4 | April 2016 • ISSN No 2277 - 8179 | IF : 3.508 | IC Value : 69.48

Impact of Dealers Preference on Garments Merchandising on Men's Apparels With Reference to Rsr Garments, Tirupur

Management

KEYWORDS : Dealers perception, Garments Merchandising, Dealer, Apparel

A. JOHN WILLIAM	Assistant Professor, Department of MBA, Karpagam College of Engineering, Coimbatore
P. INDHUMATHI	II-MBA, Department of Management Studies, Karpagam College of Engineering, Coimbatore
S. NAGAMANI	Assistant Professor, Department of Management Studies, EASA College of Engineering, Coimbatore

ABSTRACT

The research paper highlights the dealers preference on garments merchandising on apparels , the objective of the study is to find out the causes for deviation in dealers choice, and to analyze the complaints on the quality. and a descriptive type of reached was considered and a sample of 48 dealers are the respondents further a structured questionnaire was designed with 4 scale of measurement and furthermore the study examines using the statistical tool chi square with various dependant and independent factors..

The textile sector in India ranks next to agriculture. Textile is one of India's oldest industries and has a formidable presence in the national economy in as much as it contributes to about 14% of manufacturing value-addition, accounts for around 1/3 of our gross export earnings and provides gainful employment to millions of people. The textile industry occupies a unique place in our country. One of the earliest to come into existence in India, it accounts for 14% of total industrial production, contributes to nearly 30% of the total exports and is the second largest employment generator after agriculture.

The cotton industry occupies an important role in the economy of the country because of its contribution to the industrial output, employment generation and foreign exchange earnings. The wearing of clothing is exclusively a human characteristic and is a feature of most human societies. . Clothing and textiles have been important in human history and reflects the materials available to a civilization as well as the technologies that had been mastered

Review of Literature

Research done by **Sinha and Banerjee (2004)** gives deeper insight into Indian shopper behavior. The analysis is based on seven constructs and 43 variables. This study addresses the question of retail outlet selection, but it does a generic study of all modern formats of retailing. So the seven factors justify the shopper behavior in outlet selection, but don't specify the behavior for any specific outlet.

The study by **Goswami and Mishra (2008)** on traditional kirana stores visa-a-vis organized Supermarkets for grocery shopping has identified factors related to grocery store patronage and identified dimensions of customers" needs and desire which are relevant for grocery store choice. In this study 44 attributes were considered that led to 11 factors. This research though based on grocery store choice, the main objective is to differentiate.

Bashar & Irshad, (2012) has considered impact of form display, window display, promotional signage and floor merchandising by taking sample size of 250 Indian respondents by applying Pearson correlation. His findings are that window display and impulsive purchasing are positively correlated. Impulse buying and store display are not correlated. Floor merchandising is also correlated with impulse buying.

Mehta & Chugan, (2012) has studied the contact of merchandising on shopper impulse buying behavior. He took sample size of 84 customers visiting the retail stores of India and find that window display has direct relation with impulse buying. However no significant relation is found between form display and impulse buying but floor merchandising shows direct relation.

S. Madhavi & T. S. Leelavati (2013) have tried to contribute to a deeper understanding about the impact of visual merchandising on consumer buying behavior in shopping stores. The paper analyses the influence of visual merchandising, especially the one related to the shop-windows, on consumer buying behavior according to store attributes most valued by consumers

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

- Lack in quantity supply/order.
- Deviation in choice.
- Lack in customer retention.
- Increase in quality complaints.

OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

- To study the factors influencing on dealers preference.
- To analyze the amount order undertaken by the garments.
- To know the causes for deviation in customer choice.
- To study the variety of product type and marketability.

SAMPLE SIZE

Here it is a simple random sampling the sample size is determined using the formula:

Sample size n=NX/(X+N-1)

$SS= Z^2 * (P) * (I-P)/C^2$

$= (1.96)^2 * (.5) * (1-.5)/.04$

$= 0.9604/0.4$

$= 24.01$

ANOVA

COMPARISON OF MOST SELLING PRODUCTS AND QUANTITY OF MATERIALS

H0: There is no relationship between most selling products and quantity of materials.

H1: There is a relationship between most selling products and quantity of materials

MOST SELLING/ QUANTITY	T-SHIRTS	POLO SHIRTS	POINT COLLAR	SPREAD COLLAR	TOTAL
KILOGRAMS	3	4	4	2	13
DOZENS	5	8	3	3	19
TONS	2	2	3	2	9

MOST SELLING/ QUANTITY	T-SHIRTS	POLO SHIRTS	POINT COLLAR	SPREAD COLLAR	TOTAL
OTHERS	2	1	2	2	7
TOTAL	12	15	12	9	48

CALCULATION:

Correction factor = T^2/n
$=48^2/16$
$=2304/16$
$=144.$

Column sum of squares(CSS)= $\sum T_j^2/n_j - T^2/n$
$=[144/4+225/4+144/4+81/4]$
$=148.5-144$
$=4.5$

Total sum of square (TSS) = $\sum\sum X_{ij}^2 - T^2/n$
$= [9+25+4+4+16+64+4+1+\ldots\ldots+4]$
$=188-144$
$=42$

Row sum of square (RSS) = $\sum T_i^2/n_i - T^2/n$
$=[169/4+361/4+81/4+49/4]$
$=165-144$
$=21$

Residual sum of square= TSS-CSS-RSS
$=42-4.5-21$
$=16.5$

SOURCE OF VARIANCE	SUM OF SQUARE	DEGREE OF FREEDOM	MEAN SUM OF SQUARE	F-RATIO
BETWEEN COLOMN	4.5	3	1.5	
BETWEEN ROW	21	3	7	0.819
RESIDUALS	16.5	9	1.83	
TOTAL	42	15		3.825

INFERENCE:
No. of rows: 4 No. of columns: 4

Degree of freedom = (4-1)(4-1)=3

Table value=3.86, calculated value=0.819 5% level of Significance

From the above calculation it is clear that calculated value is (0.819) < tabulated value (3.86). So there is no relationship between most selling products and quantity of materials. Hence Null Hypothesis H0 is accepted.

FACTORS FOR CHOOSING DEALERSHIP AND MOST SELLING PRODUCTS

H0: There is no relationship between factors for choosing dealership and most selling products.

H1: There is a relationship between factors for choosing dealership and most selling products.

FACTORS/ MOST SELLING	SALES VOLUME	CUSTOMER CHOICE	GOOD SERVICE	QUALITY	TOTAL
T-SHIRTS	7	4	3	1	15
POLO SHIRTS	2	7	2	4	15
POINT COLLAR	2	3	1	2	8
SPREAD COLLAR	1	3	3	3	10
TOTAL	12	17	9	10	48

CALCULATION:

Correction factor = T^2/n
$=48^2/16$
$=2304/16$
$=144.$

Column sum of squares (CSS) = $\sum T_j^2/n_j - T^2/n$
$= [144/4+289/4+81/4+100/4]$
$= 153.5-144$
$= 9.5$

Total sum of square (TSS) = $\sum\sum X_{ij}^2 - T^2/n$
$=(49+4+4+1+16+\ldots\ldots+9)$
$= 194-144$
$=50$

Row sum of square (RSS) = $\sum T_i^2/n_i - T^2/n$
$= [225/4+225/4+64/4+100/4]$
$= 153.5-144$
$= 9.5$

Residual sum of square = TSS-CSS-RSS
$= 50-9.5-9.5$
$= 31$

SOURCE OF VARIANCE	SUM OF SQUARE	DEGREE OF FREEDOM	MEAN SUM OF SQUARE	F-RATIO
BETWEEN COLOMN	9.5	3	3.16	
BETWEEN ROW	9.5	3	3.16	0.918
RESIDUALS	31	9	3.44	
TOTAL	50	15		0.918

INFERENCE:
No. of rows: 4 No. of columns: 4

Degree of freedom = (4-1)(4-1)=3

Table value=3.86, calculated value=0.918 5% level of Significance

From the above calculation it is clear that calculated value is (0.918) < tabulated value(3.86). So there is no relationship between factors for choosing dealership and most selling products. Hence Null Hypothesis H0 is accepted.

COMPARISON OF TYPES OF PRODUCTS DEALING WITH AND SATISFACTORY LEVEL OF CREDIT PERIOD

H0: There is no relationship between types of products dealing with and satisfactory level of credit period.

H1: There is a relationship between types of products dealing with and satisfactory level of credit period.

DEALING/ CREDIT	T-SHIRTS	TRACK PANTS	3/4TH PANTS	TROUERS	TOTAL
HIGHLY SATISFIED	4	3	3	3	13
SATISFIED	5	7	4	1	17
DISSATISFIED	2	2	2	2	8
NEITHER SATISFIED NOR DISSATISFIED	4	2	2	2	10
TOTAL	15	14	11	8	48

CALCULATION:

Correction factor = T^2/n
$=48^2/16$
$=2304/16$
$=144.$

Column sum of squares(CSS)= $\sum T_j^2/n_j - T^2/n$
$= [225/4+196/4+121/4+64/4]$
$= 151.5-144$
$= 7.5$

Total sum of square (TSS) = $\sum\sum X_{ij}^2 - T^2/n$
$= [16+25+4+16+\ldots\ldots+4]$
$= 178-144$
$= 34$

Row sum of square (RSS) = $\sum T_i^2/n_i - T^2/n$
$= [169/4+289/4+64/4+100/4]$
$= 155-144$
$= 11.5$

Residual sum of square = TSS-CSS-RSS
$= 34-7.5-11.5$
$= 15$

SOURCE OF VARIANCE	SUM OF SQUARE	DEGREE OF FREEDOM	MEAN SUM OF SQUARE	F-RATIO
BETWEEN COLOMN	7.5	3	2.5	
BETWEEN ROW	11.5	3	3.83	1.50
RESIDUALS	15	9	1.66	
TOTAL	34			2.30

Volume : 5 | Issue : 4 | April 2016 • ISSN No 2277 - 8179 | IF : 3.508 | IC Value : 69.48

INFERENCE:
No. of rows: 4 No. of columns: 4

Degree of freedom = (4-1)(4-1)=3

Table value=3.86, calculated value=1.50 5% level of Significance

From the above calculation it is clear that calculated value is (1.50) < tabulated value (3.86). So there is no relationship types of products dealing with and satisfactory level of credit period. Hence Null Hypothesis H0 is accepted.

COMPARISON OF QUALITY AND COMPLAINTS
H0: There is no relationship between quality and complaints.

H1: There is a relationship between quality and complaints.

QUALITY/ COMPLAINTS	COLOR	FEASIBILITY	PRICE	FITNESS	TOTAL
NO PROBLEMS	5	5	2	1	13
LACK IN STITCHING	5	5	3	2	15
COLOR FADE	3	4	2	2	11
PRINTING PROBLEM	4	2	2	1	9
TOTAL	17	16	9	6	48

CALCULATION:

Correction factor = T^2/n
=$48^2/16$
=2304/16
=144.

Column sum of squares (CSS) = $\sum T_j^2/n_j - T^2/n$
= [289/4+256/4+81/4+36/4]
= 165.5-144
= 21.5

Total sum of square (TSS) = $\sum\sum X_{ij}^2 - T^2/n$
= (25+25+9+16+25+.....+1)
= 176-144
= 32

Row sum of square (RSS) = $\sum T_i^2/n_i - T^2/n$
= [169/4+225/4+121/4+81/4]
= 149-144
=5

Residual sum of square = TSS-CSS-RSS
= 32-21.5-5
= 5.5

SOURCE OF VARIANCE	SUM OF SQUARE	DEGREE OF FREEDOM	MEAN SUM OF SQUARE	F-RATIO
BETWEEN COLOMN	21.5	3	7.16	11.74
BETWEEN ROW	5	3	1.66	
RESIDUALS	5.5	9	0.611	2.72
TOTAL	32			

INFERENCE:
No. of rows: 4 No. of columns: 4

Degree of freedom = (4-1)(4-1)=3

Table value=3.86, calculated value=11.74 5% level of Significance

From the above calculation it is clear that calculated value is (11.74) > tabulated value (3.86). So there is relationship between quality and complaints. Hence Null Hypothesis H0 is not accepted.

COMPARISON OF TYPES OF PRODUCTS DEALING WITH AND QUALITY RANK
H0: There is no relationship between types of products dealing with and quality rank.

H1: There is a relationship between types of products dealing with and quality rank.

TYPES/ RANK	T-SHIRTS	TRACK PANTS	3/4TH PANTS	TROUSERS	TOTAL
COLOR	2	4	5	4	15
FEASIBILITY	2	4	6	3	15
PRICE	3	2	4	1	10
FITNESS	1	3	3	1	8
TOTAL	8	13	18	9	48

CALCULATION:

Correction factor = T^2/n
=$48^2/16$
=2304/16
=144.

Column sum of squares(CSS)=$\sum T_j^2/n_j - T^2/n$
= [64/4+169/4+324/4+81/4]
= 159.75-144
= 15.75

Total sum of square (TSS) = $\sum\sum X_{ij}^2 - T^2/n$
= (4+4+9+16+.....+2)
= 176-144
= 32

Row sum of square (RSS) = $\sum T_i^2/n_i - T^2/n$
= [225/4+225/4+100/4+64/4]
= 153.5-144
= 9.5

Residual sum of square = TSS-CSS-RSS
= 32-15.75-9.5
= 6.75

SOURCE OF VARIANCE	SUM OF SQUARE	DEGREE OF FREEDOM	MEAN SUM OF SQUARE	F-RATIO
BETWEEN COLOMN	15.75	3	5.25	7
BETWEEN ROW	9.5	3	3.16	
RESIDUALS	6.75	9	0.75	4.21
TOTAL	32			

INFERENCE:
No. of rows: 4 No. of columns: 4

Degree of freedom = (4-1)(4-1)=3

Table value=3.86, calculated value=7.0 5% level of Significance

From the above calculation it is clear that calculated value is (7.0) > tabulated value (3.86). So there is relationship between types of products dealing with and quality rank. Hence Null Hypothesis H0 is not accepted.

COMPARISON OF FACTORS THAT INFLUENCE TO BUY AND TYPES

H0: There is no relationship between factors that influence to buy and types.

H1: There is a relationship between factors that influence to buy and types.

TYPES/ FACTORS	T-SHIRTS	TRACK PANTS	3/4TH PANTS	TROUSERS	TOTAL
QUALITY	5	1	2	3	11
PRICE	3	4	4	4	15
SALES PROMOTION	3	4	3	2	12
PACKING	2	3	2	3	10
TOTAL	13	12	11	12	48

CALCULATION:

Correction factor = T^2/n
=$48^2/16$
=2304/16
=144.

Column sum of squares (CSS) = $\sum T_j^2/n_j - T^2/n$
= [169/4+144/4+121/4+144/4]
= 144.5-144
=0.5

Total sum of square (TSS) = $\sum\sum X_{ij}^2 - T^2/n$
= (25+9+9+4+.....+9)
= 160-144 =16.

Residual sum of square = TSS-CSS-RSS
= 16-0.5-3.5
= 12

= [121/4+225/4+144/4+100/4]
= 147.5-144
= 3.5

SOURCE OF VARIANCE	SUM OF SQUARE	DEGREE OF FREEDOM	MEAN SUM OF SQUARE	F-RATIO
BETWEEN COLOMN	0.5	3	0.16	0.12
BETWEEN ROW	3.5	3	1.16	
RESIDUALS	12	9	1.33	0.87
TOTAL	16			

INFERENCE:
No. of rows: 4 No. of columns: 4

Degree of freedom = (4-1)(4-1)=3

Table value=3.86, calculated value=0.12 5% Level of Significance

From the above calculation it is clear that calculated value is (0.12) < tabulated value (3.86). So there is no relationship between factors that influence to buy and types. Hence Null Hypothesis H0 is accepted.

FINDINGS
From the ANOVA it was found that there is no relationship between most selling products and quantity of materials. Since the calculated value(0.819) lesser than table value(3.86). So null hypothesis is accepted.

From the ANOVA it was found that there is no relationship between factors for choosing dealership and most selling products. Since the calculated value(0.918) lesser than table value(3.86). So null hypothesis is accepted.

From the ANOVA it was found that there is no relationship between types of products dealing with and satisfactory level of credit period..Since the calculated value(1.50) lesser than table value(3.86). So null hypothesis is accepted.

From the ANOVA it was found that there is relationship between quality and complaints. Since the calculated value(11.74) q than table value(3.86). So null hypothesis is rejected.

From the ANOVA it was found that there is relationship between types of products dealing with and quality rank. Since the calculated value(7.0) greater than table value(3.86). So null hypothesis is rejected.

From the ANOVA it was found that there is no relationship between factors that influences to buy and types of apparels. Since the calculated value(0.12) lesser than table value(3.86). So null hypothesis is accepted

CONCLUSION
The study enables us to understand dealers preference and it highlight the garments merchandising as per the preference of dealers in the meanwhile it will help the garments to standardize and retain their regular business therefore the company have to bring the dealers to their attention through attractive merchandising to regularize their business further the company can able to identify potential dealers to enhance the company towards next level.

References

1. Bashar, A., Ahmed, I. (2012). Visual merchandising and consumer impulse buying behavior: An Empirical study of Delhi & NCR, International Journal of Retail Management & Research, Vol.2, 2012, ISSN 2277-4750
2. Mehta, N. P. & Chugan P. K. (2012). Visual merchandising: Impact on consumer behavior. Global Business and Technology Association, pp.607-614, New York USA.
3. Paromita Goswami, Mridula S. Mishra, (2009) "Would Indian consumers move from kirana stores to organized retailers when shopping for groceries?", Asia Pacific Journal of Marketing and Logistics, Vol. 21 Iss: 1, pp.127 - 143
4. S. Madhavi and T. S. Leelavati (2013) Impact of merchandising on consumer behaviour towards women apparel, International Journal of Management Research & Business Strategy, Vol. 2, No. 4, October 2013 ISSN 2319-345X