## FOOTWEARS



BY<br>PRIYA TYAGI POOJA VERMA RAJU SHARMA PREETI SHARMA

## OBJECTIVE

I.To analyze the consumers brand preferences for Shoes.
2. To evaluate consumers attitude towards the usage of Shoes .
3. To evaluate consumers perception about the important factors pertaining to Shoes purchase decision.

## HYPOTHESES

I.There is no significant difference in the ranking of different Leather Shoes brands as given by consumers
2. There is no significant difference in the ranking of different Sports Shoes brands by consumers
3.There is no significant difference among the consumers of Shoes on the factors like age, marital status and income etc.
4. Different factors which are important in the purchase decision of Shoes do not differ significantly.

## HYPOTHESIS 1

-There is no significant difference in the ranking of different Leather Shoes brands as given by
consumers
To test the hypothesis, Friedman statistic test was applied.
Chi square value (calculated) $=374.13$
Critical Chi square value $(0.05, I 0)=I 8.03$
Chi square value (calculated) is greater than critical chi square value, hence this hypothesis is rejected and it can be concluded that there is significant difference in the ranking of different Leather Shoes brands as given by consumers

## HYPOTHESIS 2

- There is no significant difference in the ranking of different Sports Shoes brands as given by consumers
- To test the hypothesis, Friedman statistic test was applied.
- Chi square value (calculated) $=439.13$
- Critical Chi square value $(0.05,9)=16.09$
- Chi square value (calculated) is greater than critical chi square value, hence this hypothesis is rejected and it can be concluded that there is significant difference in the ranking of different sports Shoes brands as given by consumers

HYPOTHESIS 3(A)
There is no significant difference among the attitude of consumers of different age towards shoes.
To test this hypothesis ANOVA was applied with following results
Anova: Single Factor

SUMMARY

| Groups | Count | Sum | Average | Variance |
| :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| $18-25$ | 29 | 1747 | 60.24138 | 24.40394 |
| $26-35$ | 41 | 2491 | 60.7561 | 22.13902 |
| $36-45$ | 20 | 1249 | 62.45 | 27.31316 |
| $46-45$ | 10 | 615 | 61.5 | 64.27778 |


| Source of Variation | SS | df |  | MS | $F$ | P-value | F crit |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Between |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Groups | 63.63868 |  | 3 | 21.21289 | 0.763763 | 0.517116 | 2.699393 |
| ANOVA |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Within |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Groups | 2666.321 |  | 96 | 27.77418 |  |  |  |
| Total | 2729.96 |  | 99 |  |  |  |  |

Since F calculated is less than F critical at 95\% significance level, hence Null hypothesis is accepted.
So, it can be concluded that consumers of different age groups do not differ significantly on their attitude towards the use of shoes.

## HYPOTHESIS 3(B)

There is no significant difference among the attitude of consumers of different educational background towards shoes.
To test this hypothesis ANOVA was applied with following results
Anova: Single
Factor
SUMMARY

| Groups | Count | Sum | Average | Variance |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Under- |  |  |  |  |
| Graduate | 17 | 1002 | 58.94118 | 22.43382 |
| Graduate | 25 | 1565 | 62.6 | 43.5 |
| Post- Graduate | 32 | 1971 | 61.59375 | 23.41028 |
| Other | 26 | 1564 | 60.15385 | 17.41538 |


| Source of <br> Variation | SS | df | MS | F | P-value | Fcrit |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ANOVA <br> Between <br> Groups | 165.9155 |  | 3 | 55.30515 | 2.070672 | 0.109186 |
| Within <br> Groups | 2564.045 | 96 | 26.7088 |  |  |  |
| Total | 2729.96 | 99 |  |  |  |  |

Since F calculated is less than F critical at 95\% significance level, hence Null hypothesis is accepted.
So, it can be concluded that consumers of different educational background do not differ significantly on their attitude towards the use of shoes.

## HYPOTHESIS 3(C)

There is no significant difference among the attitude of consumers of different income bracket towards shoes.
To test this hypothesis ANOVA was applied with following results

Anova: Single
Factor

SUMMARY

| Groups | Count | Sum | Average | Variance |
| :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Below 20,000 | 7 | 403 | 57.57143 | 27.61905 |
| 20,000-40,000 | 54 | 3345 | 61.94444 | 30.7327 |
| 40,001-60,000 | 33 | 2001 | 60.63636 | 21.92614 |
| Above 60,000 | 6 | 353 | 58.83333 | 14.16667 |


| Variation | SS | df |  | MS | F | P-value |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | F crit | Between |
| :--- |
| Groups |
| Within |
| Groups |

Since F calculated is less than F critical at 95\% significance level, hence Null hypothesis is accepted.
So, it can be concluded that consumers of different income brackets do not differ significantly on their attitude towards the use of shoes.

# HYPOTHESIS 3(D) 

There is no significant difference among the attitude of consumers of different occupation towards shoes.
To test this hypothesis ANOVA was applied with following results
Anova: Single Factor

SUMMARY

| Groups | Count | Sum | Average | Variance |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Student | 27 | 1613 | 59.74074 | 17.89174 |
| Housewife | 18 | 1112 | 61.77778 | 39.83007 |
| Service | 19 | 1186 | 62.42105 | 23.36842 |
| Business | 16 | 993 | 62.0625 | 28.0625 |
| Professionals | 19 | 1139 | 59.94737 | 33.94152 |

ANOVA

| Source of Variation | SS | $d f$ | MS | $F$ | P-value | F crit |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Between |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Groups | 131.0256 | 4 | 32.75641 | 1.186638 | 0.321802 | 2.468533 |
| Within |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Groups | 2594.813 | 94 | 27.60439 |  |  |  |
| Total | 2725.838 | 98 |  |  |  |  |

Since F calculated is less than F critical at 95\% significance level, hence Null hypothesis is accepted.
So, it can be concluded that consumers of different occupation do not differ significantly on their attitude towards the use of shoes.

## HYPOTHESIS 4

Different factors which are important in the purchase decision of Shoes do not differ significantly.
To test this hypothesis ANOVA was applied with following results

Anova: Single Factor SUMMARY

| Groups | Count | Sum | Average | Variance |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Brand | 100 | 410 | 4.1 | 0.858586 |
| Price | 100 | 382 | 3.82 | 0.755152 |
| Current |  |  |  |  |
| Trends | 100 | 371 | 3.71 | 1.096869 |
| Availability | 100 | 383 | 3.83 | 0.910202 |
| Comfort | 100 | 447 | 4.47 | 0.696061 |
| Popularity | 100 | 372 | 3.72 | 1.112727 |
| Durability | 100 | 417 | 4.17 | 1.051616 |

ANOVA

| Source of Variation | SS | $d f$ | MS | $F$ | P-value | F crit |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Between |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Groups | 47.89714 | 6 | 7.982857 | 8.621844 | 4.63E-09 | 2.111645 |
| Within |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Groups | 641.64 | 693 | 0.925887 |  |  |  |
| Total | 689.5371 | 699 |  |  |  |  |

Since F calculated is greater than F critical at $95 \%$ significance level, hence Null hypothesis is rejected.
So, it can be concluded that different factors hold different importance.

## Which kinds of shoes do you prefer most?

| Type of shoes | Count |
| :--- | ---: |
| Sports Shoes / Casual <br> shoes | 81 |
| Leather Shoes | 19 |



## What factor influenced you to switch over to other brands？

| Factors | Count |
| :--- | ---: |
| Price | 27 |
| Change in trend | 39 |
| Peer effect | 10 |
| Just to try new <br> brand | 16 |
|  | 8 |
| Promotion $/$ <br> Discount |  |

回price

回 change in trend
peer effect
＠just to try new brand

回discount

## What do you do with your old

 shoes?| Treatment | Cou |
| :--- | ---: |
| nt |  |$|$| Keep them forever | 14 |
| :--- | ---: |
| Throw them | 42 |
| Give them to |  |
| anybody | 9 |
| Don't care about <br> them |  |

count


On an average how much do you think you should spend a year on shoes?

| Money <br> Spent | Count |
| :--- | ---: |
| $0-1000$ | 15 |
| $1001-2000$ | 28 |
| $2001-3000$ | 29 |
| $3001-4000$ | 16 |
| $4000+$ | 12 |



## CONSUMER PROFILES

I. Age Profile:

| Under <br> $18-25$ | 29 |
| :--- | :--- |
| $26-35$ | 41 |
| $36-45$ | 20 |
| $46-55$ | 9 |


2. Gender

| Male | 66 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Female | 34 |

Gender



## 3. Monthly Family income (Rs.)

| Below 20,000 | 7 |
| :--- | :--- |
| $20,000-40,000$ | 54 |
| $40,001-60,000$ | 33 |
| Above 60,000 | 6 |

Income


# 4. Educational qualification 

■ under graduate ■ Graduate
$■$ Post-Graduate ■others
Ůnder- Graduate
Graduate
Post- Graduate
Others:
5. Occupation

Student
Service
Business
Professionals
Others:
17
25
32
26
5. Occupation

27 18
19
17
19

student
Service
$\square$ Business

- Professionals

■ Others


