J Euro Eco His.
ISSN : 0391-5115
Volume 7, Issue 3 (2026)
THE JOURNAL OF EUROPEAN ECONOMIC HISTORY

Expectation – Reality Gap in Retailers' Perceptions: A Study of Product Performance and Retailer Satisfaction

Praveen Paul Jeyapaul
Associate Professor, Department of Management Studies,
Thiagarajar College, Madurai
Email: praveen_mba@tcarts.in

Abstract
In order to determine the discrepancy between their opinions on the attributes expected from manufacturing companies and the attributes offered by the companies, the expectations and actual satisfaction of retailers with a specific kitchenware and appliance brand from a south Indian manufacturer are compared in this study. The data was analysed using SPSS Software, and research is descriptive in nature. Using a structured questionnaire, data was gathered from 193 retailers in the districts of Tamil Nadu such as Madurai, Virudhunagar, Tirunelveli, Tenkasi, and Tuticorin. To summarise the data and determine whether there was an association between the various factors, chi square with cross tabulation was utilised. According to the analysis and findings from the chi square test, there is association between the location of outlet and pattern of customers visiting shops per day, and there is no association between other factors considered. A paired sample t - test was used to compare the expected level of satisfaction from all of the aspects taken into account with the actual state of satisfaction. According to the data, there was a statistically significant gap between what retailers expected and how well the manufacturers really performed in meeting the needs of retailers.

KEYWORDS: Retailer expectation, satisfaction, location, brand image paired sample t test

1. INTRODUCTION

Kitchenware and durable items for home usage including refrigerators, microwave ovens, dishwashers and electric kettles are included in the consumer durables category. Various factors, including the upcoming boom in retail, higher discretionary income, and a rise in the degree of wealth of a sizeable portion of the population, have contributed to the sector's tremendous expansion in India in recent years (Chhabra, Shiriskar, & Srinivasan, 2026). According to a study by The Indian Brand Equity Foundation, it predicts that the consumer durable market in India would rank fifth globally by 2027 because of the rapid changes the market is undergoing. Consumers' purchasing habits in the market for consumer durables alter over time as a result of shifting social, cultural, and environmental conditions as well as changes in marketing methods (IBEF, 2026). This calls for a thorough examination of customer attitudes towards durable goods. The customer always seeks to maximize satisfaction, and as a result, seeks to discover new sources of supply to meet requirements as effectively as feasible (Talukdar, Kashyap, Kalita, & Bordoloi, 2020). The share of gold jewelry in expenditure on durable goods was anticipated to be close to 24% in rural India, whereas it was around 20% in urban India on the contrary, only 9% of families in rural India had refrigerators, compared to over 21% in urban areas (Nigam, 2018).

A broad group of home appliances known as "white goods" are typically finished in white enamel at the manufacturer and are generally used in the kitchen or laundry. The market for consumer

durable goods is extremely competitive, complicated, and undergoing fast change. Company executives in the industry for consumer durable white goods are aware of the value of having timely, reliable, consistent information and data at their fingertips in order to build, maintain, and manage client relationships across divisions (Singh, Kushwaha, & Kushwaha, 2025). Almost everyone owns white goods, which are typically perceived as necessities that are used quietly and enjoyed in homes. They are largely affected by the qualities of the things, as opposed to being influenced by others. Simple and scale intensive production, product similarity, low exposure to technological changes, restricted research and development, and lengthy product life are some characteristics that characterise and are shared by all-white items (Vijayalashmi & Vinothini, 2022). Expected product attributes could not be as expected, especially for those with little product expertise or no personal experience (Erasmus, Makgopa, & Kachale, 2012).
Together with increasing rural incomes, accelerating urbanisation, the expanding middle class, and shifting lifestyles, India has seen an increase in demand for consumer appliances (Jeyapaul & Christa, 2020) . Shorter product replacement cycles and a shift in the perception of owning appliances which were once seen as luxuries but are now seen as necessities are the results of rising disposable incomes and simple financing options. The consumer durables sector is in high demand as a result of the availability of an increasing number of gadgets, many of which are unnecessary. A large number of the products are improved versions of what consumers currently own. For instance, customers seek high tech LED TVs even though they already have a flat-screen TV available to them, and their current models is still functional (Shalini & Abarna, 2019). In the era of retail power, manufacturers must now devise new tactics to remain competitive. Manufacturers who successfully use order fulfilment services may have an impact on store loyalty (Beth, John, & Theodore, 2008). Modern retail in this industry is developing to meet the different needs of the consumer, be they related to convenience, fashion, or price, rather than just meeting their functional needs (Indirajith & Sathya, 2018).

2. REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Retailers must comprehend their customers and their experiences as consumer expectations for home appliances continue to change if they are to guarantee and profit from high levels of customer happiness by knowing how your customers rank your company's practises and services in comparison to those of competitors can help you gain a competitive edge (Power, 2019) . Manufacturer and retailer work together to give value to customers, and the brand is a vital factor for both the customer and the reseller. At the retail level, the brand management system essentially loses control of the brand as the sales force focuses on pricing incentives to secure store replenishment (Webster, 2000) . Retailers may offer top notch customer service to set themselves apart from the competition, cultivate client loyalty, and create long-term competitive advantage (Grewal & Michael, Retailing research: Past, present, and future, 2007). Retailers can understand customer behavior in terms of loyalty, cooperation, and involvement with the retail outlet by segmenting customers based on relational benefits as viewed by these consumers (Irene, Maria, & Ruiz, 2012) . Manufacturers have switched from strategies that focused on the ability to enter and exit markets, products, and enterprises swiftly in regards to shifting needs and requirements of customers, as marketplaces have become more dynamic (Erasmus, Makgopa, & Kachale, 2012)
From a broader perspective, the behavior of retailers is also crucial. A significant aspect in defining the shape of many businesses is the growing conditioning influence they exert on manufacturers (Pellegrini & Zanderighi, 2006). Retailers who can effectively mine big data for insights can forecast consumer behaviour more accurately, create offers that are more appealing to customers, target their markets in a better way, and create tools that influence consumer

behaviour in favour of their products. Big data can therefore set up positive, cyclical processes of consumer involvement and engagement, which results in increased profitability (Grewal, Roggeveen, & Nordfalt, The Future of Retailing, 2017)

Competition amongst consumer durable goods has expanded customer choice and reduced the significance of customer dominant brands to the point that many have begun to lose their framework and individuality (Lincoln, 2006). As a result, retailers now exert a disproportionate amount of influence over consumers' purchasing decisions (Sharman, 1984). According to study, most consumers would not switch outlets or go further to purchase preferred brand because there is minimal product differentiation and diminishing brand perceptions (Thomason, Lincoln, & Aconis, 2006).

Service excellence and ideal self-congruence are crucial factors in determining the likelihood that a customer would come back because they are antecedents of consumer pleasure and brand image was a predictor of consumer satisfaction and had a favourable impact on it (Anwar, Dastagir, & Min, 2019). Brand loyalty contributes significantly to competitive advantage. Share of the market, high penetration in the market, significant return on investment, and eventually high whole equity are all benefits of strong whole loyalty. The enormous quantities of money that businesses spend on the creation and evaluation of their brand image demonstrate the importance that consumers place on a brand's image. Yet, very little is known on the connection between brand perceptions and purchasing patterns (Romaniuk & Sharp, 2002) . Instead of relying on advertisements to change consumers' perceptions, businesses should find new ways to promote their products or use different mediums to change people's perceptions. Companies should use engaging content to raise consumer awareness (Sunderaraj, 2018) . Long term partnerships between manufacturers and retailers help to build brand recognition, and satisfying customer needs encourages loyalty. When marketers hurry to create fictitious loyalty programmes, they frequently don't appear to have given the primary reasons why customers remain loyal to an organisation as a whole (Kabiraj & Shanmugan, 2010).

Customer satisfaction is greatly influenced by sales force behaviour; thus it follows that salespeople and sales managers will raise customer contentment through accommodating commercialism behaviour and by creating several customer feedback mechanisms. Customer expectations of product performance and actual product performance are the main factors that determine customer happiness. It's crucial to comprehend the connection between customer satisfaction, consumer expectations of product performance, and actual product performance before studying the impact of sales force customer interaction (Grewal & Sharma, The Effect of Salesforce Behavior on Customer Satisfaction: An Interactive Framework, 2014). Salespeople are frequently viewed as essential components of the retail interaction since they have a substantial impact on attitudes and actions of consumers. Functionality is frequently viewed as a requirement for retail enterprises to succeed and has long been acknowledged as a key strategic retailing weapon (Gaby, et al., 2010).

Consumers may be drawn in by trustworthy advertisements. Consumers must receive accurate information from the makers. When buying durable items, two key considerations are quality and brand identity. Hence, businesses must offer high quality goods, and they have worked to establish their brands. Product development is crucial in the world of durable goods. As the company continues to produce the product, it could be necessary to increase its manufacturing or channel of distribution in order to generate sufficient profits (Indirajith & Sathya, 2018). High advertising expenditures serve as indicators of brand value as well as signals of product quality. When viewed as a tool for information exchange, advertising has a significant impact on pre-purchase stages and is a key activity in relationship building (Artur, Karen, Adamantios, & Kathrina Petra, 2009) . The more money spent on brand promotion, the greater the brand

awareness level, the better the quality of the product as viewed by the consumer, and the more associations that are connected to the product, building its brand image (Angel & Manuel, 2005). Due to their increased market power, retailers are able to negotiate better manufacturer support through advertising allowances and lower advertising costs (Voss & Kathleen, 2003).

With the knowledge of loyalty card details and store distance, retailers may implement specialized methods and offers to target to certain customer groups and win back their business (Lars, 2007). Customers' views and experiences can be improved by training workers to provide "service" with a social aim and brand image. This will also make clients feel that the process of service is more hedonistic and recognizable (Lin, Lin, & Wang, 2020). The replacement patterns of first-generation product owners have a big impact on the sales of second generation products. For example, the replacement patterns for televisions bought in the 1970s and 1980s are anticipated to have a big impact on the sales of advanced technology products sold during the 1990s (Barry, 2016).

When perceived quality outperforms or underperforms expectations, contentment is a function of both the direct impact of quality and the gain (loss) in satisfaction that results from the unpleasant surprise of discovering quality to be more (less) than expected (Anderson & Sullivan, 1993) . A retailer must ensure that he or she provides the goods that customers have come to expect from them. But, for a customer to develop loyalty to a shop, other non - functional components must also live up to the customer's expectations (Josee & Ruyter, 1997). Customers' "wallet share" is very essential to retailers, and it's crucial to understand how customers split their purchases between different locations and whether and how retail managers can capture a larger portion of their customers' overall category spending (Anne, 2003). Consumer satisfaction was found to be influenced by perceived service quality and corporate image, indicating that customers will be more satisfied with the service if they consistently obtain higher service quality and have a favorable impression of the company (Srivastava & Sharma, 2014).

Excellent logistics is regarded as the most crucial component to satisfy retailers and is a major source of competitiveness between businesses (Asawawibul, et al., 2025) . An essential component of competitive success today in a time of shortening product life cycles, expanding product lines, shifting distribution networks, and evolving technology is mastery of logistics (Graham, 2018). Changes in customer attitudes and behavior towards durable goods for everyday use are evolving rapidly (Umavathy & Senthil, 2018). In order to try and persuade customers that their assortments of products are better, retailers need to be mindful of a number of aspects (Morales, Kahn, McAlister, & Broniarczyk, 2005)

It is crucial for the business to comprehend the expectations of the retailer because satisfaction is tied to the expectations the retailer has of the company. If retailer expectations are satisfied, contentment results, which improves the relationship (Samar & Dubey, 2014). In order to reap the benefits of potential increases in customer retention and customer loyalty, manufacturing companies are eager to boost quality of service and to satisfy customers (Murali, Pugazhendhi, & Muralidharan, 2016) . Both retailers and producers aim to maximize profits and improve efficiency within the channels of distribution. However, in practice, distribution occurs among a network of retailers, manufacturers and consumers (Glynn, 2007). When referring to customer profitability strategies, it's important to remember that profits from customers come after retailers' investments have been made. Researchers have claimed that not all profitable customers are faithful, and they advise classifying customers according to their allegiance and profitability (Anand, Kumar, & Song, 2016).

Manufacturers want to increase their part of the profitable revenue available, therefore leveraging service quality and customer satisfaction to keep all merchants committed and loyal may not be the most profitable strategy. Manufacturers must establish strategies for managing

the resulting portfolio of retailer relationships and selectively pursue closer links with retailers (Sramek, Droga, Mentzer, & Myers, 2009). When considering order fulfilment from a procedural standpoint, Different order fulfilment dimensions have a favourable impact on satisfaction for various client segments. A cognitive evaluation of a customer's overall purchasing experience considers (1) overall satisfaction, (2) fulfilment of what was expected, and (3) satisfaction is influenced by how far the real product differs from the customer's imagined ideal product (Beth, John, & Theodore, 2008).

3. RESEARCH HYPOTHESIS

The objective of the study was to examine the discrepancy between perceptions of retailers on the attributes they expected from manufacturers and what those attributes actually offered, as well as to compare retailers' perceptions of their expected and actual satisfaction with a specific brand of kitchen appliance manufacturers based in south India. The null hypothesis in this regard is that there is no significant difference between the retailers' expectations for the satisfaction criteria and their actual experiences with those attributes.

4. METHODOLOGY AND DESIGN

To understand what the retailers felt about the attributes taken into consideration and their opinions on the above mentioned objective, data were gathered from retailers of kitcheware. The nature of this research study is descriptive. Primary and secondary sources of data were gathered to conduct this study. By a literature review and past researches on retailer satisfaction, the numerous items pertinent to the study were determined and included in the questionnaire. The Table 1 below lists the factors that were taken into account while determining satisfaction levels of retailers.

The survey included pertinent demographic questions as well as Likert scale (five point) questions with responses varying from very high satisfied to very low satisfied. Using a structured questionnaire, a research study was conducted among 193 kitchenware and appliance dealers in the Tamil Nadu districts of Madurai, Virudhunagar, Tirunelveli, Tenkasi, and Tuticorin. Since the study is limited to the specified districts, it may not necessarily reveal a pattern that holds true across the entire nation. IMB® SPSS Statistics® was used to conduct a chi square test with cross tabulation in order to describe the results and get insight into the retailers' general purchase pattern for kitchenware and appliances.

Table 1: Factors for comparing retailer satisfaction levels between expected and actual

Sl.	Attributes
1.	Brand image
2.	Product quality
3.	Product variety
4.	Reasonable Price
5.	Damage Return Policy
6.	Latest technology
7.	Availability
8.	Increased Credit period
9.	Salesperson relationship
10	Frequent visit by salesperson
11	Timely delivery of products
12	Display and seasonal offers
13	Attractive advertisement

J Euro Eco His.
ISSN : 0391-5115
Volume 7, Issue 3 (2026)
THE JOURNAL OF EUROPEAN ECONOMIC HISTORY

A paired sample t test was carried out in order to compare retailers' perceptions of their expectations with the satisfaction attributes and what they actually received. The following model is suggested and is given in Table 2 to compare manufacturer's expected level of service from the attributes considered with the retailer's evaluation of the reality. The study's multiple aspects are drawn from previous research on various aspects of retailer satisfaction.

Table 2: Expected versus Actual Retailer Satisfaction Attributes

Expected Attributes		**Actual Attributes**
Expected Brand image	⟷	Actual Brand image
Expected Product quality	⟷	Actual Product quality
Expected Product variety	⟷	Actual Product variety
Expected Reasonable Price	⟷	Actual Reasonable Price
Expected Damage return policy	⟷	Actual Damage return policy
Expected Latest technology	⟷	Actual Latest technology
Expected Availability of products	⟷	Actual Availability of products
Expected Increased Credit period	⟷	Actual Increased Credit period
Expected Salesperson relationship	⟷	Actual Salesperson relationship
Expected Frequent visit by salesperson	⟷	Actual Frequent visit by salesperson
Expected Timely delivery of products	⟷	Actual Timely delivery of products
Expected Display and seasonal offers	⟷	Actual Display and seasonal offers
Expected Attractive advertisement	⟷	Actual Attractive advertisement

5. DESCRIPTION OF DATA

The data presented below was gathered from kitchenware and kitchen appliance retailers in districts like Virudhunagar, Tirunelveli, Madurai, Tuticorin, and Tenkasi. The data gathered describes aspects like the location of the retail store, years of experience in business, the frequency of placing an order, pattern of customers visiting shops per day, status of sales per day and during occasion time.

Table 3: Description of Retailers

Factors	**Particulars**	**No. of Retailers**
Location	Rural	22
	Semi-urban	75
	Urban	97
Experience inbusiness	Less than 5 years	3
	5-10 years	118
	11-20 years	53
	Above 20 years	19
Frequency oforders Placed	Monthly once	93
	Quarterly	100
Pattern of customers visiting shops per day	Less than 10 customers	8
	10-20 customers	145
	21-30 customers	39
	More than 30 customers	1
Status of sales per day	Low	53

	Medium	136
	High	4
Status of sales during occasion time	Low	0
	Medium	104
	High	89

It can be highlighted that only 19 retailers is in this particular business longer than twenty years. In addition, 52% of retailers place orders on a quarterly basis, compared to 48% of them who carry out their purchase once in a month. Majority of retailers have a 5 to 10 years of experience in business which is 61% and only 2% of retailers have less than 5 years of experience. Nearly 10-20 customers visiting the shops per day and only 1% of retailers have pattern of customers visiting the shops as more than 30 customers.
To identify whether there is a significant difference between the groups and to obtain even more insight into the association between experience of retailers in that business and order placement frequency as well as the relationship between the retailers' location and the frequency of orders placed. The cross tabulation findings are shown in Table 4 and 6, and the chi square test outcomes are shown in Table 5.

Table 4 : Cross-tabulation between location of retail outlet and average number of customers visit per day.

Average customers visit per day	Location	Rural	Urban	Semi-urban	Total
Less than 10 customers	Count	5	2	1	8
	% within Average customers visit per day	62.5%	25.0%	12.5%	100.0%
	% within Location	23.8%	2.1%	1.3%	4.1%
	% of Total	**2.6%**	**1.0%**	**0.5%**	**4.1%**
10-20 customers	Count	13	68	64	145
	% within Average customers visit per day	9.0%	46.9%	44.1%	100.0%
	% within Location	61.9%	70.1%	85.3%	75.1%
	% of Total	**6.7%**	**35.2%**	**33.2%**	**75.1%**
20-30 customers	Count	3	26	10	39
	% within Average customers visit per day	7.7%	66.7%	25.6%	100.0%
	% within Location	14.3%	26.8%	13.3%	20.2%
	% of Total	**1.6%**	**13.5%**	**5.2%**	**20.2%**
More than 30 customers	Count	0	1	0	1
	% within Average customers visit per day	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%
	% within Location	0.0%	1.0%	0.0%	0.5%
	% of Total	**0.0%**	**0.5%**	**0.0%**	**0.5%**
Total	Count	21	97	75	193
	% within Average customers visit per day	10.9%	50.3%	38.9%	100.0%
	% within Location	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	% of Total	**10.9%**	**50.3%**	**38.9%**	**100.0%**

Observing the cross tabulation between the location of retail outlet and average visit of the

customers visit per day, it can be seen that 2.6% of retailers are from rural out of all the respondents (193) say that less than 10 customers are visiting per day, while 1.0% of retailers from urban out of all the respondents (193) say that less than 10 customers are visiting per day and 0.5% of retailers from semi urban out of all the respondents (193) say that less than 10 customers are visiting per day. Totally, 4.1% of retailers (8 retailers out of 193) say that less than 10 customers are visiting the shop per day. Out of 21 rural retailers, 23.8% say that less than 10 customers are visiting per day. 97 urban retailers, 2.1% say that less than 10 customers are visiting per day. Out of 75 semi urban retailers, 1.3% say that less than 10 customers are visiting per day. Of all the retailers who say that less than 10 customers are visiting per day, rural retailers constitute 62.5%, urban retailers constitute 25% and semi urban constitute 12.5%. The same explanation for the values pertaining to the remaining group of retailers.

A chi-square test is conducted to see if there is a significant difference in the average number of customers visited per day between the groups of retailers from different locations; results are shown in Table 5. The hypothesis states that difference between the retailers from different locations and the average number of customers visit per day is not significantly different.

Table 5: Chi Square Test between the location of retail outlet and Average customers visit per day for kitchenware products

	Values	**Degrees of Freedom**	**Asymptotic Significance (2- sided)**
Pearson Chi-Square	29.088	6	.000
Likelihood Ratio	19.940	2	.003

According to chi square test findings from Table 5, the asymptotic significance is lesser than 0.05 ($p<0.05$). Asymptotic significance refers to using both tails as the critical regions of a normal theoretical sample distribution to ascertain statistical significance. Since the asymptotic significance is lesser than 0.05, we reject the null hypothesis and arrive at the conclusion that there is a substantial difference between average number of consumers visiting outlet and their location of the retail store. So, it follows that the location of the retail store affects how many consumers typically visit each day.

Table 6: Cross-Tabulation between Retailer experience in Business and Average customers visit per day

Average customers visit per day	**Years of experience of retailers**	**Less than 5 years**	**5 to10 years**	**10 to 20 years**	**More than 20 years**	**Total**
Less than 10 customers	Count	1	3	4	0	8
	% within Average customers visit per day	12.5%	37.5%	50.0%	0.0%	100.0%
	% within Years of experience	33.3%	2.5%	7.5%	0.0%	4.1%
	% of Total	**0.5%**	**1.6%**	**2.1%**	**0.0%**	**4.1%**
10-20 customers	Count	2	93	36	14	145
	% within Average customers visit per day	1.4%	64.1%	24.8%	9.7%	100.0%
	% within Years of	66.7%	78.8%	67.9%	73.7%	75.1%

	experience					
	% of Total	**1.0%**	**48.2%**	**18.7%**	**7.3%**	**75.1%**
20-30 customers	Count	0	22	12	5	39
	% within Average customers visit per day	0.0%	56.4%	30.8%	12.8%	100.0%
	% within Years of experience	0.0%	18.6%	22.6%	26.3%	20.2%
	% of Total	**0.0%**	**11.4%**	**6.2%**	**2.6%**	**20.2%**
More than 30 customers	Count	0	0	1	0	1
	% within Average customers visit per day	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%
	% within Years of experience	0.0%	0.0%	1.9%	0.0%	0.5%
	% of Total	**0.0%**	**0.0%**	**0.5%**	**0.0%**	**0.5%**
Total	Count	3	118	53	19	193
	% within Average customers visit per day	1.6%	61.1%	27.5%	9.8%	100.0%
	% within Years of experience	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	% of Total	**1.6%**	**61.1%**	**27.5%**	**9.8%**	**100.0%**

According to the results from cross tabulation in above table, it can be seen that 4.1% of retailers out of all the respondents (193) say that less than 10 customers are visiting per day, while 75.1% of retailers out of all the respondents (193) say that 10-20 customers are visiting per day and 20.2% of retailers from out of all the respondents (193) say that 20-30 customers are visiting per day. Out of 145 retailers, who have 10-20 customers visit per day, 1.4% of them have lesser than 5 years of experience, 64.1% of retailers have 5-10 years of experience, 24.8% of retailers have 10-20 years of experience and 9.7% of retailers have more than 20 years of experience. The same explanation for the values pertaining to other groups.

A chi-square test is conducted, with the findings shown in table 7, to see if there is a significant difference between the average customer visit and the retailer's experience. The null hypothesis states that there is no significant difference between the retailer's experience and average customers visit per day.

Table 7: Chi Square Test between Years of experience of retailers and Average customers visit per day for kitchenware products

	Values	**Degrees of Freedom**	**Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)**
Pearson Chi-Square	13.675	9	.134
Likelihood Ratio	11.067	9	.271

According to chi-square test findings from table 7, the asymptotic significance is more than 0.05 ($p<0.05$). Asymptotic significance refers to using both tails as the critical regions of a normal theoretical sample distribution to ascertain statistical significance. Since the asymptotic significance is greater than 0.05, we accept the null hypothesis and states that there is no significant difference in the experience of the retailer and average customers visit per day. Thus,

we can conclude that the experience of the retailer has nothing to do with average customers visit per day in the retail outlet.

6. ANALYSIS OF DATA AND OUTCOME

6.1 Impact of various factors on retailers overall satisfaction towards ideal products

The impact of several factors such as brand image, product quality, product variety, reasonable price, latest technology, display and seasonal offers on the retailers overall opinion on kitchenware and appliances is analysed using linear regression. Linear regression was carried out separately for each variable and the SPSS output was compiled and presented in the table 2.10**.** The results in the table gives the effects of independent variables (brand image, product quality, product variety, reasonable price, latest technology, display and seasonal offers) on the dependent variable (overall opinion). The regression equation for each factor will be in the form of $y = \alpha+\beta x$, where y is the overall opinion of the retailers and β is the regression coefficient of the respective antecedent and x is the antecedent of overall opinion.

Table 8: Results of linear regressions between retailers overall opinion on ideal products and factors affecting satisfaction

Factors	R	Coefficient	Const	t	Adj R^2	Change statistics		
						R^2	F	Sig.
Brand image	.118	1.071	1.429	1.639	.009	.014	2.687	.103
Product quality	.215	0.419	2.430	3.041	.041	.046	9.249	.003
Product variety	.089	0.158	3.175	1.236	.003	.008	1.529	.218
Reasonable price	.206	0.275	4.234	17.569	.037	.042	8.458	.004
Latest technology	.022	-0.021	3.607	21.126	.005	.000	.089	.766
Display and seasonal offers	.289	0.290	3.095	24.122	.079	.084	17.409	.000

While observing the table, it is evident that the independent variable such as product quality, reasonable price, display and seasonal offers has a significant impact on retailers' overall opinion on ideal products. For product quality ($F = 9.249$; $p< 0.01$) explaining a variance of 4.6%. Here, the significance value is lesser than 0.01, we reject null hypothesis that there is no significant impact of product quality on retailers' overall satisfaction, and we accept the alternate hypothesis that quality of the product has a significant impact on retailers overall satisfaction towards ideal products.

The F statistic shows the extent to which the null hypothesis truer. The F statistic demonstrates the strength of the null hypothesis. The null hypothesis is more likely to be true if the F statistic is smaller. The F statistic typically falls around 1.0 when the null hypothesis is proven and is larger when the alternative is true. In this case, F statistic is smaller to the factors product variety and latest technology signifies that null hypothesis is truer and all other cases F value is quite big which signifies the fact that alternative hypothesis is much true. The other independent variable namely reasonable price ($F = 8.458$; $p< 0.01$), display and seasonal offers ($F = 17.409$; $p< 0.01$) also prove that significant impact on the retailers overall satisfaction on ideal products.

The correlation coefficients are nevertheless regarded as being significant even though they are relatively low. Also, R^2 values are relatively low. This shows that these factors are not crucial in determining how retailers are satisfied. Overall retailer satisfaction is positively impacted by all of these factors and this indicates that as the influence of these factors grows, retailers' overall satisfaction with products also grows. The following is a linear regression equation.

J Euro Eco His.
ISSN : 0391-5115
Volume 7, Issue 3 (2026)
THE JOURNAL OF EUROPEAN ECONOMIC HISTORY

$$y = 2.430 + 0.419 \text{ x Product quality} \quad (1)$$
$$y = 4.234 + 0.275 \text{ x Reasonable price} \quad (2)$$
$$y = 3.095 + 0.290 \text{ x Display and seasonal offers} \quad (3)$$

6.2 Comparing expectation and actual satisfaction of retailers towards Kitchen appliances

In a perfect retail scenario, the manufacturer's performance ought to correspond to the retailers' expectations. The expected level of satisfaction from the various attributes taken into account was compared with the actual level of satisfaction using a paired sample t test to see if that is accurate for the sample of retailers under study. The results of the test which is the Paired Sample Statistics, and the Paired Sample Test are shown in Table 8 and Table 9. The Paired Samples Statistics displays the descriptive statistics like mean and standard deviation of the expected versus actual opinion on different variables.

Table 8: Paired sample statistics

Paired factors		Mean value	Standard Deviation	Standard Error Mean
Pair 1	A* - Brand image	1.64	.580	.042
	E# - Brand image	1.99	.102	.007
Pair 2	A – Product quality	1.84	.989	.072
	E – Product quality	2.69	.474	.034
Pair 3	A - Product variety	2.22	.978	.071
	E - Product variety	2.39	.519	.037
Pair 4	A – Reasonable price	1.45	.661	.048
	E – Reasonable price	2.46	.692	.050
Pair 5	A – Damage return policy	1.98	1.002	.072
	E - Damage return policy	2.54	2.203	.159
Pair 6	A – Latest technology	1.95	.643	.046
	E – Latest technology	2.23	.946	.068
Pair 7	A – Availability	1.76	.652	.047
	E – Availability	2.28	.583	.042
Pair 8	A- Increased Credit period	1.90	.681	.049
	E - Increased Credit period	2.21	.532	.038
Pair 9	A - Sales person relationship	1.54	.653	.047
	E - Sales person relationship	2.54	.595	.043
Pair 10	A - Frequent visit by salesperson	1.51	.622	.045
	E - Frequent visit by salesperson	2.61	2.212	.159
Pair 11	A – Timely delivery of products	1.57	.675	.049
	E – Timely delivery of products	2.49	.597	.043
Pair 12	A – Display and seasonal offers	2.11	.734	.053
	E – Display and seasonal offers	1.60	.919	.066
Pair 13	A – Attractive advertisement	2.24	.696	.051
	E – Attractive advertisement	1.64	.936	.068

* - Actual opinion on variables
# - Expectation on variables

When comparing the mean values between the actual and expectation, it is clear that aspects like brand image, product variety, the latest technology, and extended credit periods

(highlighted in pairs 1, 3,6, and 8) are nearly identical. At this stage, it can be suggested that the retailers' expectations of these characteristics mirror the actual performance of the kitchenware manufacturers. Similar arguments can be made for the other cases, it is inferred that the retailers' expectations don't line up with the manufacturer's actual performance. The majority of these cases had significant discrepancies between actual and expected performance.

The results provided in paired samples test table 9 are examined to see that discrepancy or congruence between expected and actual experience is statistically significant. The hypothesis stated here is that there is no discernible difference between the satisfaction factors that are expected and those that are actually experienced.

Table 9: Paired sample test

Factors paired		$\bar{x}$	σ	Std. Error Mean	95% confidence interval of the difference		T	Df	Sig.
					Lower	Upper			
P1	A-Brand image E-Brand image	-.352	.578	.042	-.434	-.270	-8.475	192	.000
P2	A-Product quality E-Product quality	-.853	1.041	.075	-1.002	-.705	-11.330	192	.000
P3	A-Product variety E-Product variety	-.167	1.173	.085	-.334	.000	1.969	192	.050
P4	A-Reasonable price E-Reasonable price	-1.005	1.058	0.76	-1.155	-.855	-13.197	192	.000
P5	A-Damage return policy E-Damage return policy	-.554	2.498	.180	-.909	-.200	-3.084	192	.002
P6	A-Latest technology E-Latest technology	-.280	1.053	.076	-.429	-.130	-3.691	192	.000
P7	A-Availability E-Availability	-.528	.866	.062	-.651	-.406	-8.475	192	.000
P8	A-Increased Credit period E-Increased Credit period	-.311	.864	.062	-.434	-.188	-4.998	192	.000
P9	A-Sales person relationship E-Sales person relationship	-1.005	.857	.062	-1.127	-.884	-16.296	192	.000
P10	A-Frequent visit by salesperson E-Frequent visit by salesperson	-1.098	2.360	.170	-1.433	-.763	-6.467	192	.000
P11	A-Timely delivery of products E-Timely delivery of products	-.917	.934	.067	-1.050	-.784	-13.597	192	.000

P12	A-Display and seasonal offers E-Display and seasonal offers	-.513	1.250	.090	.335	-.690	5.699	192	.000
P13	A-Attractive advertisement E-Attractive advertisement	-.599	1.326	.097	.408	-.790	6.178	192	.000

There is a statistically significant gap between the satisfaction factors that are expected and those that are actually experienced.in meeting their needs in every case when the p-value is lesser than 0.05. (Null rejected). The one-tailed paired sample t-test on Table 8 showed that the actual performance is less ($\bar{x}$ = 1.64, ☐ = 0.580) compared to expected performance ($\bar{x}$ = 1.99, ☐ = 0.102), t (192), p ≤ 0.05.

Looking at Table 9, the mean difference between the actual opinion on brand image and the expected brand image is - 0.352; the actual opinion value is less than expected t (192) = - 8.475, significance value (p) ≤ 0.05. The same inference can be made for all the other cases too, and in all the cases, the gap is negative (paired difference $\bar{x}$) indicating that the fact that the expectation is more than the reality.

7. RESULTS AND CONCLUSIONS

When the gap between retailers' expectations and manufacturer performance for each of the attributes that will encourage them to stock kitchenware was examined, it was found that almost all of the factors chosen for the study had higher retailer expectations than manufacturer performance. In the majority of these instances, the actual performance that really occurred and what was expected differed significantly.

Additionally, the one tailed paired sample t-test demonstrated that the expected performance was higher than the actual performance, with the paired difference x is negative stating that expectation is higher than actual performance. Retailers will be encouraged to stock the products if there is a narrowing of the gap between what they expect from manufacturers in terms of various attributes.

The negative mean of over the factor is a highly significant value because each of the responses were sought on a five-point scale. This indicates that the retailers seriously consider these factors as they have potential impact on their satisfaction. The fact that characteristics like product variety and the latest technology have the smallest gaps shows that manufacturers are able to make their products follow the most recent fashions in terms of functionality and design. Both Retailers and manufacturers collaborate as partners in order to give their customers the most value possible at best prices because retailers are sources to offer competitive data based on their pricing, quality, dependability, and market trends which are very crucial to meet the expectations of their customers. The manufacturer of kitchenware should focus on the numerous factors that contribute to the retailer's satisfaction.

Bibliography

1) Anand, A., Kumar, V., & Song, H. (2016). Future of Retailer Profitability : An Organizing Framework. *Journal of Retailing*, 24. doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jretai.2016.11.003
2) Anderson, W. E., & Sullivan, M. W. (1993). The Antecedents and Consequences of Customer Satisfaction for Firms. *Marketing Science, 12*(2), 125-143.
3) Angel, V. R., & Manuel, S. (2005, April). The impact of marketing communication and price on brand equity. *Brand Management, 12*(6), 431-454.

4) Anne, W. M. (2003, February). Share of wallet in retailing: the effects of customer satisfaction, loyalty cards and shopper characteristics. *Journal of Retailing, 79*, 97-106. doi:Doi:10.1016/S0022-4359(03)00008-3
5) Anwar, S., Dastagir, G., & Min, L. (2019). Effect of Service Quality, Brand Image, Perceived Value on Customer Satisfaction and Loyalty. *International Journal of Business, Economics and Management Works, 6*(3), 24-30.
6) Artur, B., Karen, C. S., Adamantios, D., & Kathrina Petra, Z. R. (2009, April). The Impact of Product-Country Image and Marketing Efforts on Retailer-Perceived Brand Equity: An Empricial Analysis. *Journal of Retailing, 85*(4), 437-452. doi:Doi:10.1016/j.jretai.2009.04.004
7) Asawawibul, S., Na-Nan, K., Pinkajay, K., Jaturat, N., Kittichotsatsawat, Y., & Hu, B. (2025). The influence of cost on customer satisfaction in e-commerce logistics: Mediating roles of service quality, technology usage, transportation time, and production condition. *Journal of Open Innovation: Technology, Market, and Complexity*, 100482.
8) Barry, B. L. (2016, August Tuesday). The Dynamic Pricing of Next Generation Consumer Durables. *Marketing Science, 11*(3), 251-265.
9) Beth, D. S., John, T. M., & Theodore, P. S. (2008). Creating consumer durable retailer customer loyalty through order fulfillment service operations. *Journal of Operations Management, 26*, 781-797. doi:Doi:10.1016/j.jom.2007.07.001
10) Chhabra, N., Shiriskar, J., & Srinivasan, G. (2026). Current and Future Market of the Dietary Supplements and Nutraceuticals in the Global Economy. In B. Mukherjee, *Dietary Supplements and Nutraceuticals* (pp. 1–48). Singapore: Springer.
11) Erasmus, A. C., Makgopa, M. M., & Kachale, G. M. (2012). The paradox of progress: inexperienced consumers' choice of major household appliances. *Journal of Family Ecology and Consumer Sciences, 89-101*, 13.
12) Gaby, O. S., Kristof, W. d., Hans, K., Mirella, K., Janny, H., & Harry, C. (2010, August). The impact of quality on store loyalty: A contingency approach. *Total Quality Management, 12*(3), 307-322. doi:DOI: 10.1080/09544120120034474
13) Glynn, M. S. (2007). How Retail Category Differences Moderate Retailer Perceptions of Manufacturer Brands. *Australasian Marketing Journal, 15*(2), 55-67.
14) Graham, S. (2018, July). The rediscovery of Logistics. *Harvard Business Review*, 71-79.
15) Grewal, D., & Michael, L. (2007). Retailing research: Past, present, and future. *Journal of Retailing, 83*(4), 447-464.
16) Grewal, D., & Sharma, A. (2014). The Effect of Salesforce Behavior on Customer Satisfaction: An Interactive Framework. *The Journal of Personal Selling and Sales Management, 11*(3), 13-23. Retrieved from http://www.jstor.org/stable/40471436
17) Grewal, D., Roggeveen, L. A., & Nordfalt, J. (2017). The Future of Retailing. *Journal of Retailing*, 6.
18) IBEF. (2026). *Indian Consumer Market*. Ministry of Commerce and Industry, Government of India. New Delhi: India Brand Equity Foundation.
19) Indirajith, R., & Sathya, P. (2018). A Study on Purchase Behavior of Consumer Durable Goods with Special Reference to Tiruvarur District. *International Journal of Scientific Research and Management (IJSRM), 06*(02), 8. doi:DOI: 10.18535/ijsrm/v6i2.em02
20) Irene, S. G., Maria, E., & Ruiz, M. (2012, September). Retail Customer Segmentation Based on Relational Benefits. *Journal of Relationship Marketing*, 253-266. doi:DOI: 10.1080/15332660902991197
21) Jeyapaul, P. P., & Christa, J. (2020). Ranking of decision-making criteria for purchase of air conditioners using analytical hierarchy process–Retailers perspectives. *Journal of Critical Reviews, 7*(13), 184-195.

22) Josee, B., & Ruyter, K. d. (1997, April). On the relationship between store image, store saisfaction and store loyalty. *European Journal of Marketing, 32*(5/6), 499-513.
23) Kabiraj, S., & Shanmugan, J. (2010). Development of a conceptual framework for brand loyalty: A Euro-Mediterranean perspective. *Journal of Brand Management, 18(4-5)*, 285–299. doi:Doi:10.1057/bm.2010.42
24) Lars, W. M. (2007, April). The effects of loyalty programs on customer lifetime duration and share of wallet. *Journal of Retailing, 83*(02), 223-236. doi:Doi:10.1016/j.jretai.2007.01.002
25) Lin, Y. H., Lin, F. J., & Wang, K. H. (2020). The effect of social mission on service quality and brand image. *Journal of Business Research*, 9. doi:Doi:10.1016/j.jbusres.2020.10.054
26) Lincoln, K. (2006). Beat the brand squeeze Brand Strategy (203). 30-31.
27) Morales, A., Kahn, B. E., McAlister, L., & Broniarczyk, S. M. (2005). Perceptions of assortment variety: The effects of congruency between consumers' internal and retailers' external organization. *Journal of Retailing, 81*(2), 159-169. doi:Doi:10.1016/j.jretai.2005.03.007
28) Murali, S., Pugazhendhi, S., & Muralidharan, C. (2016). Modelling and Investigating the relationship of after sales service quality with customer satisfaction, retention and loyalty. *Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services, 30*, 67-83. doi:Doi:10.1016/j.jretconser.2016.01
29) Nigam, A. (2018, December). Consumer Purchase of Consumer Durables. *Journal of Emerging Technologies and Innovative Research (JETIR),* 5(12), 7.
30) Pellegrini, L., & Zanderighi, L. (2006, July 28). New products: manufacturers' versus retailers' decision criteria. *The International Review of Retail, Distribution and Consumer Reasearch*. doi:DOI: 10.1080/09593969100000014
31) Power, J. D. (2019). Appliance Retailer Satisfaction Study. 5.
32) Romaniuk, J., & Sharp, B. (2002, November). Measuring brand perceptions: Testing quantity and quality. *Journal of Targeting, Measurement and Analysis for Marketing, 11*(3), 218–229.
33) Samar, S. A., & Dubey, R. (2014). Redefining retailer's satisfaction index: A case of FMCG market in India. *Procedia Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 279 – 290.
34) Shalini, V., & Abarna, K. (2019, March). Consumer Buying Behaviour Towards Home Appliances in Chennai City. *Journal of Emerging Technologies and Innovative Research (JETIR), 6*(3), 126-132.
35) Sharman, G. (1984). The rediscovery of logistics. *Harvard Business Review , 62*(5), 71–79.
36) Singh, P., Kushwaha, R., & Kushwaha, J. (2025). Retail Innovation's Impact on Competitiveness in the Retail Sector: Evidence From SAP-LAP Analysis. In S. Rajput, F. A. Malik, S. Mahajan, & A. Javed, *Retail Innovations in Business Models* (pp. 255-278). IGI Global Scientific Publishing.
37) Sramek, B. D., Droga, C., Mentzer, J. T., & Myers, M. B. (2009, May). Creating commitment and loyalty behavior among retailers: what are the roles of service quality and satisfaction? *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 440–454. doi:DOI 10.1007/s11747-009-0148-y
38) Srivastava, K., & Sharma, N. K. (2014, October). Service Quality, Corporate Brand Image, and Switching Behavior: The Mediating Role of Customer Satisfaction and Repurchase Intention. 19. doi:DOI: 10.1080/15332969.2013.827020
39) Sunderaraj, R. (2018, August). Impact of Advertisement on Buying Behaviour of Consumers in Sivakasi. *ICTACT Journal on Management Studies, 04*(03), 800-808. doi:DOI: 10.21917/ijms.2018.0108
40) Talukdar, R., Kashyap, D., Kalita, M., & Bordoloi, J. (2020, November). Factors influencing the decision to purchase consumer durable goods A study in Assam. *International Journal of Management (IJM), 11*(11), 300-307. doi:DOI: 10.34218/IJM.11.11.2020.029

41) Thomason, K., Lincoln, K., & Aconis, A. (2006). *Retailization: Brand Survival in The Age of Retail Power. Kogan Page Ltd., UK.*
42) Umavathy, G., & Senthil, N. K. (2018, September). A Study on Consumer Behaviour towards Durable Products Purchase Behaviour Changes in India. *Shanlax International Journal of Commerce, 6*(1), 5. doi:https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.1419404
43) Venkedasubramaniam, A., & Maruthupandian, P. (2019). A Study on Women Satisfaction towards Selected Home Appliances. *International Journal of Multidisciplinary, 04*(02), 3.
44) Vijayalashmi, & Vinothini. (2022, August). Consumer Buying Behaviour Towards White Goods in Thiruvarur District. *International Journal of Creative Research Thoughts (IJCRT), 10*(8), 133-139.
45) Voss, G. B., & Kathleen, S. (2003). Exploring the effect of retail sector and firm characteristics on retail price promotion strategy. *Journal of Retailing, 79*, 16. doi:doi:10.1016/S0022-4359(03)00003-4
46) Webster, F. E. (2000). Understanding the relationships among brands, consumers, and resellers. *Journal of the Academy of Marekting Science, 28*(1), 7.
47) Yang, C. C. (2003). Establishment and applications of the integrated model of service quality measurement. *Managing Service Quality: An International Journal, 13(4), 310–324*, 18.