

# **REVIEW OF RESEARCH**

ISSN: 2249-894X IMPACT FACTOR : 5.7631 (UIF) VOLUME - 9 | ISSUE - 9 | JUNE - 2020



# **ONLINE AND OFFLINE SHOPPING : COMPARATIVE STUDY**

Mr. Swapnil Shashikant Dongardive and Dr. M. K. Thitte

## ABSTRACT

*E-commerce is the trade of goods and services through digital mode. B2C (business-to-customer) or online shopping is a major part of e-commerce. The trend towards online shopping has been on the rise. Time-saving components, easy payment methods and availability of a variety of products have led to an increase in online shopping. The growing use of smartphones has made it easier for consumers in a developing country like India to shop online. In India, however, people have started using the internet to buy goods and services online even though they consider offline shopping more* 



satisfying. Therefore, there is a need to analyze the reasons behind this contradictory behavior of consumers.

**KEYWORDS**: Online Shoping, Offline Shopping, Consumer.

## **INTRODUCTION**

E-commerce or mobile commerce is the buying and selling of goods and services on the Internet. With the growing scope of ICT, especially the Internet, the global business community is moving towards business-to-business (B2B) e-commerce. While e-commerce is a broad concept, online shopping or B2C (business-to-consumer) commerce is a part of it. In online shopping, customers can shop online using a range of different devices such as desktop computers, laptops, tablets and smartphones. Setting up a store on the Internet allows vendors to expand their market and reach customers who cannot afford a traditional store. Online shopping has become a new trend of shopping nowadays and is soon becoming an important part of lifestyle. Easy access to online shopping is the main attraction of customers. The benefits of shopping online also come with potential risks and risks that consumers should be aware of.

From the very beginning man has not been able to sustain himself and he has always depended on nature / environment and other human beings. To sustain life from the primitive age i.e. from the Stone Age to the present day; There is a need for cooperation between society and other human beings. In the Stone Age, goods, skins, bones, fruits, grains, vegetables and tools were exchanged for subsistence. In the Bronze and Copper Ages, small pieces of metal or coins were exchanged to buy fruits, vegetables, clothes and food for their livelihood. The development of the currency has replaced this pattern and now the purchasing power of products has been equated. With increasing modernization / new developments, shopping for products on an individual and family basis has become widely used as 'shopping'. Shopping involves the purchase of products for the maintenance of daily life and for recreation, relaxation, luxury, etc. Traditional shopping means going to the store to buy products from a specific local store. They offer some 'offers' and 'limited discounts' after setting their own selling price (with profit). Products may be limited in stock and they offer brands that may be limited to the local area for distribution. They cannot meet the needs of the people and they have to find another shop for it. It is possible that a person may not get what they actually need and may have to adjust for something else as a replacement or else they may have to contact / contact major cities / distributors for their needs which may be another burden. No wear and tear of time, price and product for them which cannot be changed / returned. Billing for payments may not be accurate / original or may be a duplicate bill book to save tax from traditional shopkeepers. Shopkeepers may exploit or not provide adequate incentives / wages to their employees. Traditional shopping has always been a top priority for individuals.

#### **OBJECTIVES:**

- 1. To analyse factors driving online buying of consumers
- 2. To analyse factors driving offline buying of consumers
- 3. To analyse the impact of demographics elements on online offline buying behaviour of consumer.

#### **HYPOTHESIS:**

 $H_{01}$ : There is no significance difference between factor driven on online and offline shopping behaviour.  $H_{a1}$ : There is significance difference between factor driven on online and offline shopping behaviour  $H_{02}$ : There is no significance difference between impact of demographics elements on online – offline buying behaviour of consumer.

 $H_{a2}$ : There is significance difference between impact of demographics elements on online – offline buying behaviour of consumer.

# **STUDY SCOPE:**

The importance of this study is to know the purchasing behavior of consumers for online and offline shopping. The study was conducted in Aurangabad andJalna in Maharashtra where the internet penetration rate is higher than other cities. Furthermore, the study looks at the comparative prevalence of online vs offline shopping modes. Respondents in this research study were from different demographic profiles.

#### **SELECTION OF THE SAMPLE:**

The population includes all consumers in Aurangabad and Jalna who shop offline and online. Population was divided according to population and then representation was taken from all levels. The customer sample is selected using a layered objective sample. The final sample size of the study is 300 customers which was determined using the following procedure: -

Sr. No.	Name of the City	Description	Customers
1		Distributed Questionnaire	435
2	Aurangabad and	Received Back Questionnaire	372
3	Jalna	Discarded Questionnaire	72
4		Eligible Subject	300

## **Table 1.1 Sample Selection**

Data analysis is defined as the process of clearing, modifying, and modelling data to find information useful for business decision making. The purpose of data analysis is to extract useful information from the data and make decisions based on the data analysis. The data analysis process is

nothing more than gathering information using the right application or tool that allows you to explore the data and find the pattern in it.

Sr. No.	Gender	No of Respondent	Percentage	Mean	SD
1.	Male	159	53.00	22.71	48.42
2.	Female	141	47.00	20.14	42.79
Total		300	100.00		

Source: Fieldwork

Gender wise distribution of the study made in this research study, due to check how many of male and female consumers are visit for the online and offline buying.

The study reveals in the above table 4.2 about the gender wise distribution of the respondents and it was observed that out of 300 selected respondent 159 (53.00%) are the male respondent and remaining 141 (47.00%) of the respondents are the female respondent, also the mean value of male respondent is 22.71 and SD is 48.42, whereas the mean value of female respondents is 20.14 and SD is at 42.79. It is been concluded that there is not a big difference between male and female consumers in visiting online and offline shops for shopping.

Sr. No.	Age	No of Respondent	Percentage	Mean	SD
1.	< 20	87	29.00		
2.	21 - 40	132	44.00		
3.	41 - 60	51	17.00	75.00	44.69
4.	Above 61	30	10.00		
Total		300	100.00		

 Table 1.3Age wise Distribution of the Respondent

Source: Fieldwork

Age wise distribution of the respondent were also done in this research study, due to check the what is the age of the respondent visiting online and offline shops for buying purposes. The above table 1.3 describes about the age wise distribution of the respondent and it was observed that out of 300 respondent 87 (29.00%) of the respondents are below <20 years of age, 132 (44.00%) of the respondents are between 21 – 40 years of age, 51 (17.00%) of the respondents are between 41 – 60 years of age and remaining 30 (10.00%) of the respondents are above 61 years of age. It was observed in this study that most of the respondents are between 21 – 40 years of age. Also the mean value of age distribution of the respondent is 75.00 and SD is at 44.69.

Sr. No.	Occupation	No of Respondent	Percentage	Mean	SD
1.	Student	49	16.33	8.16	2.63
2.	Housewife	71	23.67	9.83	1.57
3.	Employee	124	41.33	17.71	5.28
4.	Business	56	18.67	9.33	5.53
5.	Other	00	00.00	00.00	0.00
Total		300	100.00		

# Table 1.4 Occupation wise Distribution of the Respondent

Source: Field work

The above table 1.4 describes about the occupation wise distribution of the selected respondent and it was observed that out of 300 respondent 49 (16.33%) of the respondent are student in junior/senior colleges with 8.16 is the mean value and 2.63 is the SD value, 71 (23.67%) of the

respondents are housewife at their home with 9.83 is the mean value and 1.57 is the SD value, 124 (41.33%) of the respondents are employees in government and private organization in selected study areas with 17.71 is the mean value and 5.28 is the SD value, whereas 56 (18.67%) of the respondents are having their own business in the selected area with 9.33 is the mean value and 5.53 is the SD value. The study observed that most of the respondents are occupationally employees in various government and private organization.

Sr. No.	Income	No of Respondent	Percentage	Mean	SD
1.	<25000	94	31.33	15.00	4.15
2.	25001 - 50000	127	42.33	17.50	3.14
3.	50001 - 75000	69	23.00	09.85	3.33
4.	Above 75001	10	03.34	2.50	1.29
Total		300	100.00		

# Table 1.5 Income (Monthly) wise Distribution of the Respondent

Source: Field work

Income is money that a person or business receives in exchange for providing work, products or services, or investing capital. An individual's income can also come from pensions, government benefits or gifts. The above table 1.5 describes about the income wise distribution of the respondent and it was observed that out of 300 respondent 94 (31.33%) of the respondent having < 25000 rupee of monthly income and 15.00 is the mean value and 4.15 is the SD value, 127 (42.33%) of the respondents are having their monthly income between 25001 – 50000 rupees and 17.50 is the mean value and 3.14 is the SD value, whereas 69 (23.00%) of the respondents are having their monthly income between 50001 – 75000 rupees and 9.85 is the mean value and 3.33 is the SD value. The study observed that most of the respondents are having 25001 – 50000 rupees of monthly income in which some of them are employees in govt. and private organization and some of them are having their income through their business.

<b>C</b>	Frequently Shopping	Online	Online		
Sr. No		No of Respondent	Percentage	No of Respondent	Percentage
1.	Daily	05	01.68	69	23.00
2.	Weekly	21	07.00	42	14.00
3.	15 Days Once	37	12.33	74	24.67
4.	Monthly	84	28.00	103	34.33
5.	Occasionally	25	08.33	12	04.00
6.	Festival	91	30.33	00	00.00
7.	Yearly Once	37	12.33	00	00.00
Tota	1	300	100.00	300	100.00

# Table 1.6 How Frequently do you visit for shopping (Online/Offline)

Source: Fieldwork

The above table 1.6 describes about the frequency to visit for shopping at online or offline and it was observed that for online shopping out of 300 respondent 05 (1.68%) of the respondents are have frequency of daily shopping, 21 (7.00%) of the respondents are visit weekly once for online shopping, 37 (12.33%) of the respondents were visiting once in a 15 days for online shopping, 84 (28.00%) of the respondents were visit monthly once for the online shopping, 25 (8.33%) of the respondents were visit occasionally that is if they are not able to get through offline shopping or when offers are provided at online then they will visit online shopping and 91 (30.33%) of the respondent were visit the online

shopping when there is any festival occasion like Deewali, Dasara, Ramdan etc... and remaining 37 (12.33%) of the respondent were visit yearly once for online shopping.

About the offline shopping out of 300 respondent 69 (23.00%) of the respondent are visit daily for purchasing of some grocery and daily required product for home, 42 (14.00%) of the respondents were weekly visit for the offline shopping, 74 (24.67%) of the respondents were visit 15 days once for offline shopping as required their requirement, 103 (34.33%) of the respondents were purchase the all required product and most of these product are kitchen related products at offline shopping and only 12 (4.00%) of the respondents were visit offline shops very occasionally like at the time of any function at their home.

Sr. No	Offline	No	%	Online	No of	%
	Satisfaction	Respondent		Satisfaction	Respondent	
1.	HS	65	21.67	HS	124	41.33
2.	S	78	26.00	S	139	46.33
3.	NSND	20	06.67	NSND	00	00.00
4.	D	79	26.33	D	27	09.00
5.	HD	58	19.33	HD	10	03.66
		300	100.00	Total	300	100.00

# Table 1.7 Satisfaction Level with Offline and Online Shopping

Source: Primary Data

The above table 1.7 describes about the respondents satisfaction level at offline and online shopping and it was observed about the offline shopping satisfaction level of the respondent that out of 300 respondent 65 (21.67%) of the respondents are highly satisfied with offline shopping at retail stores, 78 (26.00%) of the respondents are satisfied while making the offline shopping at retail store, 20 (6.67%) of the respondents are not satisfied nor dissatisfied while making the offline shopping, 79 (26.33%) of the respondents are strongly dissatisfied while making offline shopping with retail stores.

The study also describes about respondents satisfaction level with online shopping and it was observed that out of 300 respondent 124 (41.33%) of the respondents are strongly satisfied with making online shopping, 139 (46.33%) of the respondents are satisfied with making online shopping, none of the respondents are neither satisfied nor dissatisfied, 27 (09.00%) of the respondents are dissatisfied with making online shopping and remaining 10 (03.33%) of the respondents are strongly dissatisfied with making online shopping.

# 1. Factor Driven on Online and Offline Buying Behaviour

 $H_{01}$ : There is no significance difference between factor driven on online and offline buying behaviour.  $H_{a1}$ : There is significance difference between factor driven on online and offline shopping behaviour

Offline	Online
60	60
4656.5	3446.5
5	5
0	
8	
0	
1	
2.306004	
	60 4656.5 5 0 8 0 1

Source: Primary Data

From the above hypothesis testing it is observed that with the help of t-test calculation the calculated 't' critical two tail value if 2.306004 which is less than 0.05 significant value, hence it is proven that There is no significance difference between factor driven on online buying behaviour.

## 2. Factor driven on online and offline buying behaviour:

 $H_{02}$ : There is no significance difference between factor driven on online and offline buying behaviour.  $H_{a2}$ : There is significance difference between factor driven on online and offline buying behaviour.

	Offline	Online
Mean	229.2	166.0667
Variance	2938.6	5810.495
Observations	15	15
Pearson Correlation	-0.18088	
Hypothesized Mean Difference	0	
df	14	
t Stat	2.41585	
P(T<=t) two-tail	0.029945	]
t Critical two-tail	2.144787	]

## **CONCLUSION:**

Offline buying results show that manufacturer reliability was a highly influential factor, as it was followed by sales service, product description and store environment. Overall respondents have an average understanding of offline purchases. In offline shopping, respondents are satisfied with manufacturer's reliability, product description, after-sales service, store environment and variety of availability and brand of products.Online shopping decision then plan and offer. Overall respondents have a good idea about online shopping. Online shoppers are extremely satisfied with the variety of products, plans and offers and availability of brands, time saving, 24 x 7 shopping facility, convenient delivery, money saving, delivery facility, competitive price, more comfortable shopping and product return facility.

## **REFERENCES:**

- 1. Alok Gupta, Bo-chiuan Su and Zhiping Walter, An Empirical Study of Consumer Switching from Traditional to Electronic Channels: A Purchase-Decision Process Perspective, *International Journal of Electronic Commerce*, Vol. 8, No. 3, Mobile Commerce Applications (Spring, 2004), pp. 131-161, 2004.
- 2. BhavikNawa, A Comparative Study on Consumer Behaviour towards Online and Offline Shopping, *International Journal of Creative Research Thoughts*, Vol-6, Issue-2, pp. 1852-1858, 2018.
- 3. Davender Kumar and KirtiKhurana, A Comparative Study of Online and Offline Shopping in Haryana, *International Journal of Marketing and Business Communication*, Vol-8, Issue-4, pp. 1-6, 2019.
- 4. Ethan Lieber and Chad Syverson, 'Online vs. Offline Competition', University of Chicago Booth School of Business, 5807 S. Woodlawn Ave., Chicago, IL 60637, 2010
- 5. Mahesh Kumar and Sobha P.G., Online Shopping Behaviour among Higher Education Students with Special Reference to Palakkad, Kerala, India, *IJARIIE-ISSN(0)-2395-4396*, Vol-1, Issue-5, pp. 507-513, 2015.
- 6. Mingming Shi and Jun Zhou and Zhou Jiang, 'Consumer Heterogeneity and Online vs. Offline Retail Spatial Competition', Frontiers of Business Research in China, Vol-13, Issue-10, pp. 1-19, 2019.

7. NebojšaVasić, MiloradKilibarda and TanjaKaurin, The Influence of Online Shopping Determinants on Customer Satisfaction in the Serbian Market, *Journal of theoretical and applied electronic commerce research*, Vol-14, Issue-2, pp. 70-89, 2019.