

2024-05-07

# Drivers of formal and informal retail patronage in emerging markets

Rajaguru, R

<https://pearl.plymouth.ac.uk/handle/10026.1/22465>

---

10.1108/IJRDM-04-2023-0205

International Journal of Retail & Distribution Management

Emerald

---

*All content in PEARL is protected by copyright law. Author manuscripts are made available in accordance with publisher policies. Please cite only the published version using the details provided on the item record or document. In the absence of an open licence (e.g. Creative Commons), permissions for further reuse of content should be sought from the publisher or author.*

## Drivers of formal and informal retail patronage in emerging markets

### Abstract

**Purpose:** This study examines how formal retail formats (FRFs), and informal retail formats (IRFs) may co-exist as substitutes and complements in emerging markets because of store patronage driven by customers' chronic shopping orientations, and differences in salesperson consultation in the two retail formats.

**Design/methodology/approach:** Using a shopping motivational orientation framework, we develop and test a moderated-mediation model using survey data from 515 shoppers of formal and informal grocery retail outlets in India.

**Findings:** While task-focused and experiential-focused shopping orientations influence both FRF and IRF patronage, store satisfaction mediates these relationships and crucially attenuates the negative impact of task-focused orientation on FRF patronage. Salesperson consultation moderates the mediating effects of satisfaction in the link between shopping orientation and patronage of both FRFs and IRFs.

**Research limitations/implications:** The findings suggest that FRFs and IRFs could co-exist as complements and substitutes when patronage is examined as repeated visits determined by shopping orientation, mediated by satisfaction and moderated by salesperson consultation.

**Practical implications:** For FRFs and IRFs to be complements, both formats must prioritize their distinctive attributes that satisfy a consumers' chronic shopping orientation. Substitution depends on how both retail formats prioritize salesperson consultation and in-store characteristics that appeal to consumers' chronic orientation during specific shopping trips.

**Originality:** Whilst FRFs must satisfy task-focused shoppers to compete with IRFs, salesperson consultation can inhibit such satisfaction. However, the extent of co-existence between FRFs and IRFs depends on how each format leverages salesperson consultation to enhance satisfaction of experiential-focused shoppers.

**Keywords:** *Retailing, emerging markets, formal and informal retail formats, shopping orientation, patronage, satisfaction*

## Introduction

The retailing sector is a major contributor to the gross domestic products (GDPs) and a key driver of economic growth in most emerging markets (Minimol and Nair, 2020). With large population bases, strong GDP growth, and fast-growing middle class, emerging markets are attractive investment destinations for global retail giants (Singh and Wagner, 2019). In India, food and grocery retailing makes-up 60% of the retail market and remains one of the most promising sectors for launching a retail business (Hiremath *et al.*, 2023). As one of the fastest-growing retail markets globally, the Indian retail sector attracts more than half of FDIs (Minimol and Nair, 2020), and is projected to grow at 9% annually, from \$779 billion to \$1.8 trillion between 2019 and 2030 (India Brand Equity Foundation, 2022).

Often described as the next retail frontier, emerging markets have attracted global retailers often competing with local informal retailers (Jerath *et al.*, 2016). Although, comparatively, global retailers have enhanced retailing capabilities (Kardes *et al.*, 2021), they still face stiff competition from local informal retail formats (IRF) (Dholakia *et al.*, 2018; Singh and Wagner, 2019). Thus, while the entry of large supermarket chains into emerging markets has reduced IRF numbers, those remaining IRFs have become stronger competitors of global retail giants (Jerath *et al.*, 2016). Scholars call for further research on factors driving patronage of formal retail format (FRF) and IRF in emerging markets, as new findings challenge traditional retail theories (Dholakia *et al.*, 2018; Jerath *et al.*, 2016). This study responds to these calls and examines the drivers of FRF and IRF patronage in an emerging market.

FRFs include licensed supermarkets and hypermarkets with formal operations and salaried employees, while IRFs are mostly family-owned neighborhood shops – commonly known as *kirana* stores in India (Dholakia *et al.*, 2018), and smaller groceries stores closer to residential areas (Goswami and Mishra, 2009). This study conceptualizes patronage as repeated store

1  
2  
3 visits across formats over time (Uncles and Kwok, 2009). Such patronage behavior can  
4 facilitate substitution when consumers switch between FRF and IRF on different shopping trips  
5 or complementarity when consumers use both formats during multi-purpose shopping (Bonfrer  
6 *et al.*, 2022). To understand these dynamics, it is crucial to identify what motivates consumers  
7 in the same segment to patronize either FRF or IRF.  
8  
9

10  
11 However, prior literature on patronage of FRFs and IRFs in emerging markets has mostly  
12 focused on factors influencing consumers from different market segments to choose either  
13 format (Maruyama and Wu, 2014; Maruyama *et al.*, 2016). Studies investigating these factors  
14 for consumers within the same market segment, often view the impact of these factors on one  
15 format as inversely related to the other (Hino, 2014; Kardes *et al.*, 2021; Paswan *et al.*, 2010).  
16 Therefore, how consumers in the same segment patronize FRFs and IRFs as substitutes or  
17 complements in emerging markets remains less understood. This study advances research in  
18 emerging markets' retailing by investigating the mechanisms through which consumer  
19 shopping orientation affects patronage of FRFs and IRFs as substitutes or complements for  
20 consumers in the same segment.  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38

39 The balance of this paper proceeds as follows. First, we review the literature on FRF and IRF  
40 patronage in emerging markets. Next, we present a conceptual model and hypotheses. Then we  
41 discuss the methods, data analysis, and results. Subsequently, we discuss the findings and their  
42 implications. Finally, the study limitations and directions for future research are presented.  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49

## 50 **2. Literature Review**

### 51 *Shopping patterns and market structure analysis of FRF and IRF in emerging markets*

52  
53 Prior research has examined the relationship between FRFs and IRFs in emerging markets (e.g.,  
54 Hino, 2014; Tran and Sirieix, 2020), from a market structure or evolution perspective by mostly  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 focusing on how consumers' food-shopping patterns shape the evolving relationship between  
4 FRFs and IRFs (see the systematic literature review in Appendix 1). Market structure analysis  
5  
6 is a valuable tool for understanding competition and for assessing the substitutability and  
7  
8 complementarity of market offerings (Matthe *et al.*, 2022). It also facilitates understanding of  
9  
10 cross-shopping behavior and retail format competition including the structure and evolution of  
11  
12 FRF and IRF competition in emerging markets (Bonfrer *et al.*, 2022).  
13  
14  
15

16  
17 From a market evolution perspective scholars used a market entry lens to identify  
18  
19 socioeconomic class, retail outputs and consumer economic abilities as key drivers of  
20  
21 patronage of FRF (Narayan *et al.*, 2015). Some scholars argue for FRFs to replace IRFs due to  
22  
23 modern shopping offered by FRFs but acknowledge that many still prefer IRFs (Maruyama  
24  
25 and Wu, 2014; Maruyama *et al.*, 2016). Some scholars differentiate competitive advantage of  
26  
27 both formats with environmental factors driving patronage of FRF online (Kardes *et al.*, 2021),  
28  
29 and IRFs offline (Dholakia *et al.*, 2018). Thus, FRF and IRF patrons may not be mutually  
30  
31 exclusive as customers may shop across both formats to satisfy different motives.  
32  
33  
34

35  
36 Although some studies measure the effects of cross-shopping behavior on FRF and IRF  
37  
38 indirectly through IRFs share of wallet spent (Paswan *et al.*, 2010), and FRF market share  
39  
40 (Hino 2014) or directly by modelling consumer choices at both formats to deduce IRF market  
41  
42 share and FRF profitability (Jerath *et al.*, 2016), these studies mostly overlook customer  
43  
44 motivations driving patronage of both formats. Customer motivation is crucial in identifying  
45  
46 store attributes appealing to customers with different shopping orientations and driving  
47  
48 patronage of both IRF and FRF. While Dholakia *et al.*, (2018) identified some of these motives  
49  
50 with qualitative study, the motives driving patronage of both formats remains underexplored.  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

### 3. Conceptual Framework and Hypotheses Development

Prior customer-oriented research employs judgmental, behavioral or motivational approaches to analyze market structures and to determine substitution and complementarity among offerings (Matthe *et al.*, 2022). Judgmental approach uses hypothetical perceptual maps for customers to evaluate substitution or complementarity but overlooks real-world customer choices whereas the behavioral approach uses scanner panel data to analyze customer inter-purchase times and switching behavior, but overlooks shopping motives (Shocker *et al.*, 1990; Yang *et al.*, 2021). Motivation approach evaluates customer motives for choosing between offerings or retail formats as complements or substitutes based on their offerings (Matthe *et al.*, 2022; Satyam *et al.*, 2022). This study adopts motivation approach to examine the drivers of FRF and IRF patronage as substitutes and complements in emerging markets.

According to shopping motivation theorists, the intensity, persistence, and direction of an individual's effort is a result of either extrinsic or intrinsic stimuli (Bonfrer *et al.*, 2022; Deci and Ryan, 1985). Extrinsic motivation emphasizes the reward for attaining a desired outcome, while intrinsic motivation focuses on the reward in the process of undertaking a task (Deci and Ryan, 1985). Thus, extrinsic motivation emphasizes store attributes as key drivers of patronage (Yokoyama *et al.*, 2022), while intrinsic motivation emphasizes consumers' shopping orientation as either task-focused or experiential-focused (Albrecht *et al.*, 2017; Büttner *et al.*, 2014). Task-focused shoppers rationalize shopping through costs-benefits analyses arising from store visits (Yokoyama *et al.*, 2022) whereas experiential-focused shoppers indulge in the shopping process by seeking pleasure, entertainment, and enjoyment from store visits (Elmashhara and Soares, 2019; Djelassi *et al.*, 2018).

Previous studies have identified variations in consumers' chronic shopping orientation, with some leaning towards experiential-focused while others favor a task-focused approach (Buttner

1  
2  
3 *et al.*, 2014; Ganesh *et al.*, 2007). Kaltcheva *et al.*, (2011) suggest that a consumer's shopping  
4  
5 orientation is influenced by the interplay between their chronic orientation and situational  
6  
7 factors, with typical store environments prompting the chronic orientation while extraordinary  
8  
9 store environments evoke a more atypical orientation. Thus, while consumers generally align  
10  
11 their shopping orientation with their chronic preference, situational factors can activate a  
12  
13 corresponding situational orientation overriding the chronic orientation (Büttner *et al.*, 2013).  
14  
15  
16

17  
18 Despite the situational overlaps in the two orientations, this study follows existing retail  
19  
20 research dichotomizing the two orientations and categorizes shoppers as either chronically  
21  
22 task-focused or experiential-focused (Büttner *et al.*, 2015; Kaltcheva and Weitz, 2006). Thus,  
23  
24 a consumer can only be either task-focused or experiential-focused but not both. This  
25  
26 categorization aligns with the theorization that different attributes of both formats can appeal  
27  
28 to the same market segment, inducing consumers, with either orientation as chronic consumer  
29  
30 traits, to patronize FRFs and IRFs as substitutes across shopping trips and as complements on  
31  
32 multi-purpose shopping.  
33  
34  
35

36  
37 However, the study argues that either format may appeal to both orientations as chronic  
38  
39 orientations because shoppers with different shopping orientations may patronize the same  
40  
41 format to satisfy different expectations (Kesari and Atulkar 2016). This argument is consistent  
42  
43 with findings in FRF settings that experiential-focused shoppers prefer store atmospherics  
44  
45 whereas task-focused shoppers prefer efficient store-layout (van Rompay *et al.*, 2012).  
46  
47 Nonetheless, emerging markets' research shows that service personalization through  
48  
49 salesperson interactions strongly influences food and grocery retail patronage (Arditto *et al.*,  
50  
51 2020) and the choice of IRF is mostly influenced by salespersons interactions (Dholakia *et al.*,  
52  
53 2018; Jerath *et al.*, 2016). Accordingly, we advance a moderated-mediated conceptual model,  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 in which the effects of shopping orientation on patronage of FRFs and IRFs are mediated by  
4 store satisfaction, and this mediation is moderated by salesperson consultation (see Figure 1).  
5  
6  
7

8  
9 ----Insert Figure 1 here----  
10

### 11 12 **3.1 Determinants of patronage of FRF and IRF**

#### 13 14 **3.1.1 Effect of Task-focused and Experience-focused Orientation on Patronage**

15  
16 Prior research shows that task-focused shoppers prefer spacious stores, while experiential-  
17 focused shoppers favor high-arousing store environments with enjoyable atmospherics  
18 (Kaltcheva and Weitz 2006; Van Rompay *et al.*, 2012). Additionally, task-focused shoppers  
19 tend to shop less frequently than experiential-focused ones (Baker and Wakefield, 2012).  
20 Comparatively, FRFs are located at distant malls, have spacious layouts and extensive  
21 assortments that suit occasional shopping because of transport limitations (Jerath *et al.*, 2016).  
22 However, IRFs are located close to residential neighborhoods, have limited space, shallow  
23 assortments, lower prices, and often require staff assistance and this encourages frequent  
24 shopping as well (Dholakia *et al.*, 2018; Maruyama and Wu, 2014). Accordingly, task-focused  
25 shoppers may patronize FRFs for spacious layout, while experiential-focused shoppers  
26 patronize FRFs to enjoy the store atmospherics (Van Rompay, *et al.*, 2012). Whereas IRFs may  
27 attract task-focused shoppers for their lower prices, IRFs may attract experiential-focused  
28 shoppers to interact with familiar store staff for shopping intimacy (Baker and Wakefield,  
29 2012; Paswan *et al.*, 2010). As both formats have features that could appeal to both task-  
30 focused and experiential-focused consumers, FRFs and IRFs may complement each other.  
31  
32 Accordingly, we propose that:  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53

54  
55 *H1: Task-focused orientation has a positive effect on store patronage for both (a) IRFs*  
56 *and (b) FRFs.*  
57  
58  
59  
60



1  
2  
3 *H2: Experiential-focused orientation has a positive effect on store patronage for both*  
4  
5 *(a) IRFs and (b) FRFs.*  
6  
7

### 8 3.1.2 Effect of Task-focused and Experiential-focused Orientations on Satisfaction 9

10  
11 Prior research analyzed how shopping orientations affect store satisfaction in brick-and-mortar  
12 stores (Kesari and Atulkar, 2016) and discovered that consumers' satisfaction varies based on  
13 store attributes (Yokoyama *et al.*, 2022). Task-focused shoppers seeking to save time and  
14 money with easy access to products (Kaltcheva and Weitz, 2006), may find satisfaction in FRFs  
15 offering prior information on promotions and efficient shopping layouts helping to streamline  
16 the shopping task (Büttner *et al.*, 2015). Conversely, IRFs may satisfy task-focused shoppers  
17 with convenient location and narrower assortment that facilitates quicker decision-making  
18 (Maruyama *et al.*, 2016). From market structures and shopping motivation perspectives, task-  
19 focused consumers find satisfaction in both retail formats and view them as complements and  
20 substitutes. Therefore:  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33

34  
35 *H3: Task-focused orientation has a positive effect on satisfaction with both (a) IRFs*  
36 *and (b) FRFs.*  
37  
38  
39

40  
41 Experiential-focused shoppers, valuing shopping experiences, social interactions, and  
42 recreation, may find satisfaction in IRFs because their proximity to residential areas allows for  
43 frequent visits (Baker and Wakefield, 2012; Elmashhara and Soares, 2019; Kaltcheva and  
44 Weitz, 2006). However, they can also derive satisfaction from FRFs with wider assortments,  
45 enabling comparison and enjoyable shopping atmosphere (Calvo-Porrall and Lévy-Mangín,  
46 2018). Thus:  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53

54  
55 *H4: Experiential-focused orientation has a positive effect on satisfaction with both (a)*  
56 *FRFs and (b) IRFs.*  
57  
58  
59  
60

### 3.1.3 Effect of task-focused and experiential focused orientation on patronage of retail formats through satisfaction

Prior research has established store satisfaction as a mediator between shopping motivation and patronage, primarily focusing on extrinsic factors like store attributes (Nair, 2018) or situational shopping value (Djelassi *et al.*, 2018). From an intrinsic motivation perspective, task-focused shoppers are likely to revisit FRFs if their expectations on monetary promotions and efficient layouts are met (Büttner *et al.*, 2015; van Rompay *et al.*, 2012). Similarly, they may return to IRFs if their expectations regarding proximity, familiarity with store layout, and quicker decision-making from narrower product assortments are met (Maruyama *et al.*, 2016).

Therefore:

*H5: Store satisfaction mediates the relationships between task-focused orientation and store patronage of a) FRFs and b) IRFs.*

Experiential-focused shoppers are likely to revisit any format as long as their expectations on social interaction and recreation are met during any given visit (Kaltcheva and Weitz, 2006). Such shoppers are also more likely to revisit FRFs because of satisfaction with wider product assortment and enjoyable store atmospherics (Calvo-Porrá and Lévy-Mangín, 2018; Djelassi *et al.*, 2018). Accordingly:

*H6: Store satisfaction mediates the relationships between experiential-focused orientation and store patronage of a) FRFs and b) IRFs.*

### 3.1.4 Moderating role of salesperson consultation on the mediating effect of store satisfaction

Customer service employee interactions affect perceived service quality and store satisfaction (Söderlund, 2018). Consultation during shopping can be initiated by either the shopper or salesperson (Haas and Kenning, 2014). While some scholars found proactive salespeople to enhance store satisfaction (Söderlund, 2018), others found face-to-face interaction and jokes

1  
2  
3 by salespersons to inhibit satisfaction (Söderlund and Oikarinen, 2018). Task-focused shoppers  
4 approaching shopping with an implemental mind-set (Büttner *et al.*, 2014) would be less  
5 inclined to engage in conversations with salespersons. Additionally, salespeople's-initiated  
6 interactions may hinder satisfaction and patronage for such customers at both IRFs and FRFs  
7 (Söderlund and Oikarinen, 2018). Therefore:  
8  
9

10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15 *H7: Salesperson consultation negatively moderates the mediating role of store*  
16 *satisfaction in the link between task-focused orientation and store patronage for (a)*  
17 *IRFs and (b) FRFs.*  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22

23 However, experiential-focused shoppers viewing shopping as a recreational or entertainment  
24 activity (Albrecht *et al.*, 2017) and approaching shopping with a deliberative mind-set may  
25 engage salespeople to discuss issues (un)related to the shopping task to enrich their shopping  
26 experience (Büttner *et al.*, 2014). Therefore:  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32

33  
34 *H8: Salesperson consultation positively moderates the mediating role of store*  
35 *satisfaction in the link between experiential-focused orientation and store patronage*  
36 *for (a) IRFs and (b) FRFs.*  
37  
38  
39  
40

#### 41 **4. Methodology**

##### 42 *4.1 Research context and sample*

43  
44  
45  
46  
47 As India is one of the leading emerging global economies it was selected as the study context  
48 to test our model. Data was collected in three tier 1 cities (Mumbai, Bangalore, and Chennai)  
49 where several formal outlets co-exist with informal ones. These cities have high presence of  
50 IRFs and popular Indian FRFs. Within a kilometre radius, there were around one FRF to 14-  
51 17 IRFs (17 in Chennai, 16 in Mumbai and 14 in Bangalore). The three cities were randomly  
52 selected from out of eight Indian cities with populations exceeding one million (Lata *et al.*,  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

2021) to ensure random distribution of the sample. The three cities have comparable per capita income, employment opportunities and are the education, economic and cultural hubs in India.

A qualitative study of 60 shoppers was conducted to inform the questionnaire development for the quantitative study. The questionnaire, developed in English and back-translated to the local language by language specialists for language consistency, was pilot-tested on 30 shoppers in each of the three cities and modifications were made based on their feedback. In the quantitative study, 515 face-to-face surveys were conducted (218 in IFRs and 297 in FRFs). Respondents had to be over 18 year of age and with shopping experience from both FRFs and IRF. A comparison between the respondents and 25 non-respondents with similar demographics on the measurement items for store patronage showed no significant response differences, indicating no non-response bias in the study.

To assess for common method variance (CMV) that can arise from using the same instrument to measure exogenous and endogenous constructs simultaneously, we used the following procedures proposed in literature. First, respondent anonymity and data confidentiality were assured during the data collection. Second, measures from extant literature were used to reduce CMV bias as recommended by Podsakoff *et al.*, (2003). Third, during the questionnaire development stage, a marker variable, “*Response to government initiatives*” that was theoretically unrelated to all the study constructs was included in the questionnaire (Podsakoff *et al.*, 2003). There were no significant correlations between the marker variable and all the study variables in FRF and IRF sub-samples, thereby confirming no common method bias.

The following are the details of the respondents’ profile. 56.9% of the respondents were male and 43.1% female. Most respondents, i.e., 30.9%, were between 35 and 44 years of age, 28.4% were below 25, 22.1% were between 25 and 34, and 18.5% were over 45. 40.2% of the respondents had a higher secondary certificate or below, 36.0% had post-secondary certificates

1  
2  
3 or diplomas, with 23.4% being graduate or postgraduates. 34.2% of the respondents were  
4 located in Chennai, 32.5% in Mumbai, and 33.3% in Bangalore.  
5  
6  
7

#### 8 9 *4.2 Measures of constructs*

10  
11 The measurement items for task-focused orientation, experiential-focused orientation (Baker  
12 and Wakefield, 2012; Büttner *et al.*, 2014; 2015), salesperson consultation (Hass and Kenning,  
13 2014), store satisfaction (Marques *et al.*, 2013) and store patronage (Grewal *et al.*, 2003) were  
14 drawn from prior literature. Modifications to the measurement items were made to reduce  
15 ambiguity and complexity in interpretation.  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22

23  
24 Age, gender, education and location were included as control variables, as these demographic  
25 characteristics have been identified to affect store satisfaction and patronage in literature  
26 (Chang *et al.*, 2023; Grewal *et al.*, 2003). The results indicated no significant effect of control  
27 variables on the dependent variable, suggesting homogeneity and no issues with nesting the  
28 data. Table 1 shows the measurement items of all the study constructs.  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35

### 36 37 **5. Analysis and results**

#### 38 39 *5.1 Analysis*

40  
41 To assess the reliability and validity of the measures, a two-step approach advocated by  
42 Anderson and Gerbing (1988) was used. Exploratory factor analysis and then confirmatory  
43 factor analysis (CFA) were used to assess the internal and external consistency of the measures.  
44 A CFA model was specified for all the major study constructs. The overall fit of the  
45 measurement model indicated that the six-factor model had an acceptable fit to the data ( $\chi^2/df$   
46 =135.31/117 = 1.15, CFI = .99, NFI = .94) and were all within the acceptable thresholds,  
47 suggesting good model fit. The measurement items' standardized factor loadings ranged from  
48 .51 to .90, exceeding the .50 cut-off point (Browne and Cudeck, 1993), suggesting convergent  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 validity (see Table 1). To assess discriminant validity, the average variance extracted (AVE)  
4 was examined. The square root of the AVEs were well above the highest correlations of the  
5 study (Fornell and Larcker, 1981). While squared root of the AVEs for task-focused  
6 orientation, experiential-focused orientation, salesperson consultation and store patronage were  
7 well-above the correlations between these constructs, the squared root of the AVE for store  
8 satisfaction (.871) was slightly higher than the correlation between store satisfaction and store  
9 patronage (.868), still confirming discriminant validity.

10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20 The estimated correlation parameter between any pairs of constructs was constrained to unity,  
21 and then, after freeing them, the difference between the  $\chi^2$  values of the constrained and the  
22 unconstrained models were assessed (Anderson and Gerbing, 1988). The  $\chi^2$  difference test was  
23 significant at the  $p < .01$  level, suggesting no perfect correlation between the constructs. Thus,  
24 discriminant validity was assumed. Descriptive statistics and bivariate correlation coefficients  
25 are shown in Table 1.

26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
The results indicated a correlation between task-focused and experiential-focused orientations  
( $r = 0.617$ ). The correlation coefficient less than 0.80 indicates that collinearity is less likely to  
exist (Kalnins, 2018; Shrestha, 2020). Additionally, the potential existence of multi-  
collinearity was assessed by calculating the variance inflation factor (VIF) and tolerance; a VIF  
score below 2.0 and a tolerance score above 0.5 suggests that the results of the regression  
coefficient is less likely to be affected by the correlation in the independent variables (task-  
focused and experiential-focused). The condition index score of below 15 further assures that  
multicollinearity is not a concern in this study (Belsley et al., 1980; Kalnins, 2018).

---Insert Table 1 here---

To examine the moderated-mediation relationships specified in the conceptual model (see  
Figure 1), PROCESS model 8 (Hayes, 2018) was used to assess if the indirect effects of task-

1  
2  
3 focused and experiential-focused orientations on store patronage through store satisfaction  
4 were significant at low (-1SD), moderate (mean) and high (+1SD) levels of salesperson  
5 consultation. The bootstrapping method that is considered superior to the Sobel test for testing  
6 mediation effects (Hayes, 2018), was used to assess significance of the indirect effects at 95%  
7 confidence interval and 1000 re-samples. Four models were specified to estimate  
8 the conditional indirect effects, the direct and mediated effects while the index of the  
9 moderated-mediation were used to interpret the results. The results of the direct, indirect effects  
10 and moderated mediation analyses are shown in Figure 2 and Tables 2 and 3.

11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23 ---Insert Tables 2 & 3 here---

## 24 25 26 5.2 Results

### 27 28 29 5.2.1 Direct effects

30  
31  
32 Contrary to our H1 predictions, the results indicate no significant effect of task-focused  
33 orientation on patronage of IRF ( $\beta = .056$ , ns), but shows significant negative effect on FRF  
34 patronage ( $\beta = -.139$ ,  $p \leq .05$ ), see Table 2. Experiential-focused orientation had no significant  
35 effects on patronage of IRF ( $\beta = .096$ , ns) and FRF ( $\beta = .021$ , ns), disproving H2a and H2b. The  
36 results indicated significant positive effects of task-focused orientation on store satisfaction  
37 with IRF ( $\beta = .441$ ,  $p \leq .05$ ), and FRF ( $\beta = .221$ ,  $p \leq .05$ ), supporting H3a and H3b respectively.  
38 Consistent with our predictions in H4a and H4b, experiential-focused orientation had  
39 significant positive effects on store satisfaction with FRF ( $\beta = .434$ ,  $p \leq .001$ ) and IRF ( $\beta =$   
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65  
66  
67  
68  
69  
70  
71  
72  
73  
74  
75  
76  
77  
78  
79  
80  
81  
82  
83  
84  
85  
86  
87  
88  
89  
90  
91  
92  
93  
94  
95  
96  
97  
98  
99  
100  
101  
102  
103  
104  
105  
106  
107  
108  
109  
110  
111  
112  
113  
114  
115  
116  
117  
118  
119  
120  
121  
122  
123  
124  
125  
126  
127  
128  
129  
130  
131  
132  
133  
134  
135  
136  
137  
138  
139  
140  
141  
142  
143  
144  
145  
146  
147  
148  
149  
150  
151  
152  
153  
154  
155  
156  
157  
158  
159  
160  
161  
162  
163  
164  
165  
166  
167  
168  
169  
170  
171  
172  
173  
174  
175  
176  
177  
178  
179  
180  
181  
182  
183  
184  
185  
186  
187  
188  
189  
190  
191  
192  
193  
194  
195  
196  
197  
198  
199  
200  
201  
202  
203  
204  
205  
206  
207  
208  
209  
210  
211  
212  
213  
214  
215  
216  
217  
218  
219  
220  
221  
222  
223  
224  
225  
226  
227  
228  
229  
230  
231  
232  
233  
234  
235  
236  
237  
238  
239  
240  
241  
242  
243  
244  
245  
246  
247  
248  
249  
250  
251  
252  
253  
254  
255  
256  
257  
258  
259  
260  
261  
262  
263  
264  
265  
266  
267  
268  
269  
270  
271  
272  
273  
274  
275  
276  
277  
278  
279  
280  
281  
282  
283  
284  
285  
286  
287  
288  
289  
290  
291  
292  
293  
294  
295  
296  
297  
298  
299  
300  
301  
302  
303  
304  
305  
306  
307  
308  
309  
310  
311  
312  
313  
314  
315  
316  
317  
318  
319  
320  
321  
322  
323  
324  
325  
326  
327  
328  
329  
330  
331  
332  
333  
334  
335  
336  
337  
338  
339  
340  
341  
342  
343  
344  
345  
346  
347  
348  
349  
350  
351  
352  
353  
354  
355  
356  
357  
358  
359  
360  
361  
362  
363  
364  
365  
366  
367  
368  
369  
370  
371  
372  
373  
374  
375  
376  
377  
378  
379  
380  
381  
382  
383  
384  
385  
386  
387  
388  
389  
390  
391  
392  
393  
394  
395  
396  
397  
398  
399  
400  
401  
402  
403  
404  
405  
406  
407  
408  
409  
410  
411  
412  
413  
414  
415  
416  
417  
418  
419  
420  
421  
422  
423  
424  
425  
426  
427  
428  
429  
430  
431  
432  
433  
434  
435  
436  
437  
438  
439  
440  
441  
442  
443  
444  
445  
446  
447  
448  
449  
450  
451  
452  
453  
454  
455  
456  
457  
458  
459  
460  
461  
462  
463  
464  
465  
466  
467  
468  
469  
470  
471  
472  
473  
474  
475  
476  
477  
478  
479  
480  
481  
482  
483  
484  
485  
486  
487  
488  
489  
490  
491  
492  
493  
494  
495  
496  
497  
498  
499  
500  
501  
502  
503  
504  
505  
506  
507  
508  
509  
510  
511  
512  
513  
514  
515  
516  
517  
518  
519  
520  
521  
522  
523  
524  
525  
526  
527  
528  
529  
530  
531  
532  
533  
534  
535  
536  
537  
538  
539  
540  
541  
542  
543  
544  
545  
546  
547  
548  
549  
550  
551  
552  
553  
554  
555  
556  
557  
558  
559  
560  
561  
562  
563  
564  
565  
566  
567  
568  
569  
570  
571  
572  
573  
574  
575  
576  
577  
578  
579  
580  
581  
582  
583  
584  
585  
586  
587  
588  
589  
590  
591  
592  
593  
594  
595  
596  
597  
598  
599  
600  
601  
602  
603  
604  
605  
606  
607  
608  
609  
610  
611  
612  
613  
614  
615  
616  
617  
618  
619  
620  
621  
622  
623  
624  
625  
626  
627  
628  
629  
630  
631  
632  
633  
634  
635  
636  
637  
638  
639  
640  
641  
642  
643  
644  
645  
646  
647  
648  
649  
650  
651  
652  
653  
654  
655  
656  
657  
658  
659  
660  
661  
662  
663  
664  
665  
666  
667  
668  
669  
670  
671  
672  
673  
674  
675  
676  
677  
678  
679  
680  
681  
682  
683  
684  
685  
686  
687  
688  
689  
690  
691  
692  
693  
694  
695  
696  
697  
698  
699  
700  
701  
702  
703  
704  
705  
706  
707  
708  
709  
710  
711  
712  
713  
714  
715  
716  
717  
718  
719  
720  
721  
722  
723  
724  
725  
726  
727  
728  
729  
730  
731  
732  
733  
734  
735  
736  
737  
738  
739  
740  
741  
742  
743  
744  
745  
746  
747  
748  
749  
750  
751  
752  
753  
754  
755  
756  
757  
758  
759  
760  
761  
762  
763  
764  
765  
766  
767  
768  
769  
770  
771  
772  
773  
774  
775  
776  
777  
778  
779  
780  
781  
782  
783  
784  
785  
786  
787  
788  
789  
790  
791  
792  
793  
794  
795  
796  
797  
798  
799  
800  
801  
802  
803  
804  
805  
806  
807  
808  
809  
810  
811  
812  
813  
814  
815  
816  
817  
818  
819  
820  
821  
822  
823  
824  
825  
826  
827  
828  
829  
830  
831  
832  
833  
834  
835  
836  
837  
838  
839  
840  
841  
842  
843  
844  
845  
846  
847  
848  
849  
850  
851  
852  
853  
854  
855  
856  
857  
858  
859  
860  
861  
862  
863  
864  
865  
866  
867  
868  
869  
870  
871  
872  
873  
874  
875  
876  
877  
878  
879  
880  
881  
882  
883  
884  
885  
886  
887  
888  
889  
890  
891  
892  
893  
894  
895  
896  
897  
898  
899  
900  
901  
902  
903  
904  
905  
906  
907  
908  
909  
910  
911  
912  
913  
914  
915  
916  
917  
918  
919  
920  
921  
922  
923  
924  
925  
926  
927  
928  
929  
930  
931  
932  
933  
934  
935  
936  
937  
938  
939  
940  
941  
942  
943  
944  
945  
946  
947  
948  
949  
950  
951  
952  
953  
954  
955  
956  
957  
958  
959  
960  
961  
962  
963  
964  
965  
966  
967  
968  
969  
970  
971  
972  
973  
974  
975  
976  
977  
978  
979  
980  
981  
982  
983  
984  
985  
986  
987  
988  
989  
990  
991  
992  
993  
994  
995  
996  
997  
998  
999  
1000

### 5.2.2 Mediating effects

The results shown in Table 2 indicate that store satisfaction mediates the link between task-focused orientation and patronage of FRFs ( $\beta = .106$ ,  $p \leq .05$ ) and IRFs ( $\beta = .397$ ,  $p \leq .05$ ),

1  
2  
3 which support H5a and H5b, respectively. The effects of experiential-focused orientation on  
4 patronage through store satisfaction were positive and significant for FRFs ( $\beta = .424, p \leq .05$ )  
5 and IRFs ( $\beta = .497, p \leq .05$ ). These findings support both H6a and H6b.  
6  
7  
8  
9

### 10 11 5.2.3 Moderating role of salesperson consultation on the mediating effect of store satisfaction

12  
13 The results involve conditional indirect effects and moderated mediation effects at low,  
14 medium and high levels of salesperson consultation (see Table 3). The results show that the  
15 index of the moderated-mediation for salesperson consultation regarding the mediation of store  
16 satisfaction in the link between task-focused orientation and store patronage was significant  
17 but negative for IRF (indirect effects =  $-.466$ , boot  $SE = .064$ , 95% bias corrected CI [ $-.61$  to  $-.32$ ]).  
18 Thus, H7a was supported, as bias-corrected confidence intervals did not straddle a zero.  
19 However, the index of the moderated-mediation for salesperson consultation regarding the  
20 mediation of store satisfaction in the link between task-focused orientation and store patronage  
21 was insignificant for FRF (indirect effects =  $-.189$ , boot  $SE = .145$ , 95%CI [ $-.49$  to  $.06$ ]), Thus,  
22 H7b was not supported, as the CIs straddled a zero. These results of the simple slope analysis  
23 suggest that the effects of task-focused orientation on store patronage through store satisfaction  
24 are weaker at higher levels of salesperson consultation only in the IRF context (see Figure 2).  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41

42 ---Insert Figure 2 here---

43  
44  
45 Supporting H8(a) and H8(b), the results indicate that the index of moderated mediation effects  
46 were positive and significant indicating the moderation effect of salesperson consultation on  
47 the mediation effects of store satisfaction on the relationship between experiential-focused  
48 orientation and store patronage for IRF (indirect effects =  $.454$ , boot  $SE = .076$ , 95% CI [ $.32$  to  
49  $.61$ ]) and FRF (indirect effects =  $.204$ , boot  $SE = .113$ , 95% CI = [ $.01$  to  $.43$ ]). These did not  
50 straddle a zero. Figure 2 shows stronger conditional indirect effects of experiential-focused  
51 orientation on patronage at higher levels of salesperson consultation for both IRFs and FRFs.  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60



## 6. Discussion

This study examined how shopping orientation influences patronage of FRF and IRF in emerging markets. The results show that both task-focused and experiential-focused orientations have a significant positive impact on store satisfaction in both IRF and FRF, confirming previous research indicating that shopping motivation influences store satisfaction in both online and offline shopping settings (Kesari and Atulkar 2016). From market structures perspective, we contend that while having distinct attributes, IRF and FRF offer asymmetric complementary shopping experiences for task-focused and experiential-focused shoppers because task-focused shoppers exhibited greater satisfaction with IRF, while experiential-focused shoppers perceived greater satisfaction with FRF.

The result suggests that satisfaction fully mediates the relationship between experiential-focused orientation and patronage of IRF and FRF. However, its mediation role between task-focused orientation and patronage of FRF and IRF is respectively partial and full. These confirm previous research that found satisfaction to mediate shopping motivation and store patronage (Djelassi *et al.*, 2018; Nair, 2018) and suggest that both formats can induce patronage from task-focused and experiential-focused shoppers if they satisfy these shoppers.

The negative moderation of salesperson consultation of the mediation role of satisfaction in the relationship between task-focused orientation and patronage of IRF suggests that personalizing services with salespeople can reduce satisfaction and patronage among task-focused shoppers. Thus, although salespeople's presence can enhance convenience and safety (Söderlund, 2016), task-focused shoppers at IRFs may view salesperson interaction as intrusive and time-wasting, contradicting Söderlund's (2018) finding that proactive salespersons increase satisfaction.

Finally, the positive moderation of salesperson consultation of the mediation role of satisfaction in the relationship between experiential-focused orientation and patronage of both FRF and

1  
2  
3 IRF support previous findings on personalized services enhancing store satisfaction  
4 (Söderlund, 2018). However, personalized services benefit experiential-focused shoppers in  
5  
6 emerging markets like India, which is contrary to Söderlund and Oikarinen's (2018) findings  
7  
8 suggesting that extensive salesperson interaction can inhibit store satisfaction and patronage.  
9  
10  
11

## 12 13 **7. Theoretical contributions**

14  
15  
16 Extant research on retailing in emerging markets has examined how FRFs and IRFs serve  
17  
18 different customer segments with the same offerings (Maruyama and Wu, 2014; Maruyama *et*  
19  
20 *al.*, 2016), or serve the same segment with different offerings (Hino, 2014; Jerath *et al.*, 2016;  
21  
22 Kardes *et al.*, 2021). By demonstrating how task-focused and experiential-focused shopping  
23  
24 orientations drive FRF and IRF patronage through store satisfaction, this study shows that *both*  
25  
26 FRFs and IRFs can serve the same segment when each of them prioritizes how their offerings  
27  
28 satisfy consumers' chronic shopping orientation on specific shopping trips. Conversely, *either*  
29  
30 FRF or IRF can serve customers in different segments by prioritizing distinct store attributes  
31  
32 satisfying shoppers with different chronic orientations across shopping trips.  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37

38 However, this study's key contribution involves the role salesperson consultation plays in  
39  
40 moderating, the mediating effects of satisfaction in the relationship between task-focused and  
41  
42 experiential-focused orientations and patronage of both FRF and IRFs. The study reveals that  
43  
44 while salesperson consultation reduces satisfaction and patronage of IRFs for task-focused  
45  
46 shoppers, it enhances satisfaction and patronage for both FRFs and IRFs by experiential-  
47  
48 focused shoppers. These findings advance knowledge on competition between FRFs and IRFs  
49  
50 in emerging markets, as the traditional set-up of IRFs in emerging markets is inherently  
51  
52 personalized (Dholakia *et al.*, 2018; Maruyama and Wu, 2014) compared to FRFs (Jerath *et*  
53  
54 *al.*, 2016). The findings suggest that FRFs can compete by adopting less personalized approach  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 to attract chronic task-focused shoppers across shopping trips while IRFs focus on personalized  
4 service offering to attract chronic experiential-focused shoppers across shopping trips.  
5  
6  
7

8  
9 Second, this study is one of the first to examine the evolving retailing market structure of FRF  
10 and IRF around shopping motivation in emerging markets. Extant research has explored how  
11 established shopping behaviors for IRF hinder FRF adoption or IRF modernization (Maruyama  
12 *et al.*, 2016; Narayan *et al.*, 2015). Some scholars investigate factors driving customers in  
13 emerging markets to choose IRF over FRF (Dholakia, *et al.*, 2018) or one format over the other  
14 (Hino, 2014; Tran, and Sirieix, 2020). This study examines how task-focused and experiential-  
15 focused orientations influence patronage of both FRF and IRF and suggests that adopting a  
16 shopping orientation perspective can reveal their complementarity within the same segment  
17 when consumers visit these formats on multipurpose shopping trips.  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29

30 Third, although existing research emphasizes cross-shopping behaviors as key drivers of  
31 patronage of either FRF or IRF in emerging markets (Tran and Sirieix, 2020), how cross-  
32 shopping behaviors affect patronage of either format has been measured separately through  
33 market share of FRF (Hino, 2014) or share of wallet spent at IRF (Paswan *et al.*, 2010). By  
34 examining how the same shopping orientation influences patronage as repeated visits to FRF  
35 and IRF through satisfaction, this study indicates that FRF and IRF competition may not always  
36 be a zero-sum game. Rather, it can be a win-win situation if either format prioritizes customer  
37 satisfaction during store visits.  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48

49 Finally, the study extends market structure analysis in retailing literature from consumer  
50 motivation perspective by examining substitution and complementarity between FRFs and  
51 IRFs in emerging markets. While store satisfaction serves as the mechanism through which  
52 shoppers patronize FRFs and IRFs as substitutes and complements, satisfaction attenuates the  
53 negative effect of task-focused orientation on FRF patronage.  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

## 8. Managerial implications

This study has several managerial implications for retailing strategy in emerging markets. First, given that both task-focused and experiential-focused orientations influence patronage of both FRF and IRF through satisfaction, both formats can co-exist as substitutes and complements for customers, if they both satisfy customers' shopping orientations. Such coexistence may occur if FRFs focus on store layout, spaciousness, and atmospherics, while IRFs focus on locational convenience, lower prices and store staff interactions.

Second, as experiential-focused and task-focused shoppers exhibit frequent and less frequent store visits respectively, FRF can design loyalty schemes to encourage frequent store visits by experiential-focused shoppers, while designing monetary promotion schemes to induce store visits by task-focused shoppers. IRFs may prioritize convenient location that enable frequent (occasional) visits by experiential-focused (task-focused) shoppers to satisfy their chronic shopping orientations.

Third, salesperson interaction moderates the mediation role of satisfaction on patronage and implies that retailers should promote salesperson interactions as a store-specific or format-specific attribute rather than a situational one. FRFs can use different promotion strategies to induce in-store personal and non-personal interactions respectively for experiential and task-focused shoppers whereas IRFs must differentiate between these shopper types at the store entrance to avoid distraction of task-focused shoppers in the shopping process.

Finally, while task-focused shoppers exhibited greater satisfaction with IRF, experiential-focused shoppers perceived greater satisfaction with FRF. Thus, IRFs should reduce store access costs and limit personalized interactions for task-focused shoppers, while FRFs can

enhance satisfaction for experiential-focused shoppers by promoting group and family shopping atmospherics.

### 9. Limitations and areas for further research

Like all research, this study has some limitations that could offer directions for future research. First, this study relies on cross-sectional survey data, which limits the generalizability of the findings across time. Future researchers could adopt a longitudinal or experimental research designs to assess causality across the factors identified in the current research. Second, while this study examined how task-focused and experiential-focused orientations determine FRF and IRF store patronage, examining shopping behavior among FRFs is more mainstream. Therefore, future research may examine how task-focused and experiential-focused orientations determine patronage across formal, but different, retail formats. Third, this research focused on shoppers in India, which is one of several emerging market economies. Future research could test the model advanced in this study in other emerging economies. Finally, future research can examine this study's conceptual model in different retail sectors and online retail contexts.

### REFERENCES

- Albrecht, C.M., Hattula, S. and Lehmann, D.R., (2017), "The relationship between consumer shopping stress and purchase abandonment in task-oriented and recreation-oriented consumers", *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, Vol. 45 No. 5, pp.720-740.
- Anderson, J. C. and Gerbing, D. W. (1988), "Structural equation modeling in practice: A review and recommended two-step approach", *Psychological Bulletin*, Vol. 103 No 3, p. 411.
- Arditto, L., Cambra-Fierro, J. J., Fuentes-Blasco, M., Jaraba, A. O. and Vázquez-Carrasco, R. (2020), "How does customer perception of salespeople influence the relationship? A study in an emerging economy", *Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services*, Vol. 54, p. 101952.
- Baker, J. and Wakefield, K. L. (2012), "How consumer shopping orientation influences perceived crowding, excitement, and stress at the mall", *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, Vol. 40 No. 6, pp. 791-806.
- Belsley, D. A., Kuh, E., and Welsch, R. E. (1980). *Regression diagnostics: Identifying influential data and sources of collinearity*. New York: Wiley.
- Bonfrer, A., Chintagunta, P. and Dhar, S. (2022), "Retail store formats, competition and shopper behavior: A systematic review", *Journal of Retailing*, Vol. 98 pp. 71–91.

- 1  
2  
3 Browne, M.W. and Cudeck, R. (1993), "Alternative ways of assessing model fit", *Sage Focus Editions*,  
4 Vol. 154, pp. 136-36.  
5  
6 Büttner, O.B., Florack, A. and Göritz, A.S. (2013), "Shopping orientation and mindsets: How motivation  
7 influences consumer information processing during shopping", *Psychology & Marketing*, Vol. 30 No.  
8 9, pp.779-793.  
9  
10 Büttner O. B., Florack, A. and Göritz, A. S. (2014), "Shopping orientation as a stable consumer disposition  
11 and its influence on consumers' evaluations of retailer communication", *European Journal of*  
12 *Marketing*, Vol. 48, pp. 1026-45.  
13  
14 Büttner, O.B., Florack, A. and Göritz, A.S. (2015), "How shopping orientation influences the  
15 effectiveness of monetary and nonmonetary promotions", *European Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 49  
16 No.1/2, pp. 170-89.  
17  
18 Calvo-Porrall, C. and Lévy-Mangín, J.P. (2018) "Pull factors of the shopping malls: an empirical  
19 study", *International Journal of Retail & Distribution Management*, Vol. 46 No. 2, pp.110-124.  
20  
21 Chang, Y. W., Hsu, P. Y., Chen, J., Shiau, W. L., and Xu, N. (2023) "Utilitarian and/or hedonic shopping–  
22 consumer motivation to purchase in smart stores", *Industrial Management & Data Systems*, Vol. 123  
23 No. 3, pp. 821-842.  
24  
25 Deci, E. L. and Ryan, R. M. (1985), "The general causality orientations scale: Self-determination in  
26 personality", *Journal of Research in Personality*, Vol. 19 No. 2, pp. 109-134.  
27  
28 Dholakia, R. R., Dholakia, N. and Chattopadhyay, A. (2018), "Indigenous marketing practices and  
29 theories in emerging economies: Consumer behavior and retail transformations in India", *Journal of*  
30 *Business Research*, Vol. 86, pp. 406-15.  
31  
32 Djelassi, S., Godefroit-Winkel, D. and Diallo, M.F., (2018), "Does culture affect the relationships among  
33 utilitarian and non-utilitarian values, satisfaction and loyalty to shopping centres? Evidence from two  
34 Maghreb countries", *International Journal of Retail & Distribution Management*. Vol. 46 No. 11/12,  
35 pp. 1153-1169.  
36  
37 Elmashhara, M.G. and Soares, A.M. (2019), "The impact of entertainment and social interaction with  
38 salespeople on mall shopper satisfaction: The mediating role of emotional states", *International*  
39 *Journal of Retail & Distribution Management*, Vol. 47 No. 2, pp. 94-110  
40  
41 Fornell, C. and Larcker, D.F. (1981), "Structural equation models with unobservable variables and  
42 measurement error: Algebra and statistics", *Journal of Marketing Research*, Vol. 18, pp. 382-88.  
43  
44 Ganesh, J., Reynolds, K. E. and Lockett, M. G. (2007), "Retail patronage behavior and shopper  
45 typologies: a replication and extension using a multi-format, multi-method approach", *Journal of the*  
46 *Academy of Marketing Science*, Vol. 35, pp. 369-381.  
47  
48 Grewal, D., Baker, J., Levy, M. and Voss, G. B. (2003), "The effects of wait expectations and store  
49 atmosphere evaluations on patronage intentions in service-intensive retail stores", *Journal of*  
50 *Retailing*, Vol. 79, No. 4, pp. 259-268.  
51  
52 Haas, A. and Kenning, P. (2014), "Utilitarian and hedonic motivators of shoppers' decision to consult  
53 with salespeople", *Journal of Retailing*, Vol. 90 No. 3, pp. 428-41.  
54  
55 Hayes, A. F. (2018), *Introduction to mediation, moderation, and conditional process analysis: A*  
56 *regression-based approach (2nd edition)*, The Guilford Press, New York.  
57  
58 Hino, H. (2014), "Shopping at different food retail formats: Understanding cross-shopping behaviour  
59 through retail format selective use patterns", *European Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 48 No. 3/4, pp.  
60 674-98.  
61  
62 Hiremath, S., Panda, A., and Pasumarti, S. S. (2023), "An empirical investigation of customer  
63 characteristics on retail format selection—a mediating role of store image", *Journal of Indian Business*  
64 *Research*, Vol. 15 No 1, pp. 55-75.  
65  
66 India Brand Equity Foundation (2022), "Indian retail industry analysis", Available at:  
67 <https://www.ibef.org/industry/indian-retail-industry-analysis-presentation> (accessed April 02, 2023).  
68  
69 Jerath, K., Sajeesh, S. and Zhang, Z. J. (2016), "A model of unorganized and organized retailing in  
70 emerging economies", *Marketing Science*, Vol. 35 No. 5, pp. 756-78.

- 1  
2  
3 Kalnins, A. (2018). Multicollinearity: How common factors cause Type 1 errors in multivariate  
4 regression. *Strategic Management Journal*, Vol. 39 No. 8, pp. 2362-2385.
- 5 Kaltcheva, V. D., Patino, A. and Chebat, J. C. (2011), "Impact of retail environment extraordinariness on  
6 customer self-concept", *Journal of Business Research*, Vol. 64 No. 6, pp. 551-557.
- 7 Kaltcheva, V. and Weitz, B. A. (2006), "The moderating influence of motivational orientation on the  
8 relationship between shopping environment arousal and behavior", *Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 70 No.  
9 1, pp. 107-18.
- 10  
11 Kardes, I., Reinecke Flynn, L. and Dugan, M. (2021), "Online retailing: Determinants of competition  
12 between multinationals and local firms in emerging markets", *International Journal of Retail &  
13 Distribution Management*, Vol. 49 No. 2, pp.263-280.
- 14 Kesari, B. and Atulkar, S. (2016), "Satisfaction of mall shoppers: A study on perceived utilitarian and  
15 hedonic shopping values", *Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services*, Vol. 31, pp. 22-31.
- 16 Lata, K., Thapa, K. and Rajput, A. S. (2021), "Liveability of Indian Cities and Spread of Covid-19--Case  
17 of Tier-1 Cities", *Indian Journal of Public Administration*, Vol. 67, No. 3, pp. 365-382.
- 18 Marques, S. H., Cardoso, M. M., and Palma, A. P. (2013), "Environmental factors and satisfaction in a  
19 specialty store", *The International Review of Retail, Distribution and Consumer Research*, Vol. 23,  
20 No. 4, pp. 456-474.
- 21  
22 Maruyama, M. and Wu, L. (2014), "Quantifying barriers impeding the diffusion of supermarkets in China:  
23 The role of shopping habits", *Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services*, Vol. 21 No. 3, pp. 383-  
24 393.
- 25 Maruyama, M., Wu, L. and Huang, L. (2016), "The modernization of fresh food retailing in China: The  
26 role of consumers", *Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services*, Vol 30, pp. 33-39.
- 27 Matthe, M., Ringel, D.M. and Skiera, B. (2022), "Mapping market structure evolution", *Marketing  
28 Science*. pp. 1-25
- 29 Minimol, M. C. and Nair, S. B. (2020), "Do Macroeconomic indicators encourage foreign direct  
30 investment in Indian retail?" *Journal of Management Research*, Vol. 20, No. 1, pp. 26-33.
- 31 Nair, S.R. (2018), "Analyzing the relationship between store attributes, satisfaction, patronage intention  
32 and lifestyle in food and grocery store choice behavior", *International Journal of Retail & Distribution  
33 Management*, Vol 46 No. 1, pp. 70-89.
- 34 Narayan, V., Rao, V. R. and Sudhir, K. (2015), "Early adoption of modern grocery retail in an emerging  
35 market: evidence from India", *Marketing Science*, Vol. 34 No. 6, pp. 825-42.
- 36 Paswan, A., Pineda, M. D. L. D. S. and Ramirez, F. C. S. (2010), "Small versus large retail stores in an  
37 emerging market—Mexico", *Journal of Business Research*, Vol. 63 No. 7, pp. 667-672.
- 38 Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., Lee, J. Y. and Podsakoff, N. P. (2003), "Common method biases in  
39 behavioral research: A critical review of the literature and recommended remedies", *Journal of  
40 Applied Psychology*, Vol. 88 No. 5, pp. 879-903.
- 41 Satyam, Aithal, R.K. and Pradhan, D. (2022) "Resilience of an evolved retail agglomeration: case of rural  
42 periodic markets in emerging economies", *International Journal of Retail & Distribution  
43 Management*, Vol. 50 No.11, pp.1395-1411.
- 44 Shocker, A. D., Stewart, D. W. and Zahorik, A. J. (1990), "Determining the competitive structure of  
45 product-markets: Practices, issues, and suggestions", *Journal of Managerial Issues*, pp. 127-159.
- 46 Shrestha, N. (2020). Detecting multicollinearity in regression analysis. *American Journal of Applied  
47 Mathematics and Statistics*, Vol. 8 No. 2, pp. 39-42.
- 48 Singh, S. and Wagner, R. (2019), "How Indian home-grown businesses outsmart the MNCs", *European  
49 Business Review*, Vol. 31 No. 6, pp. 849-869
- 50 Söderlund, M. (2016), "Employee mere presence and its impact on customer satisfaction", *Psychology &  
51 Marketing*, Vol. 33 No. 6, pp. 449-64.
- 52 Söderlund, M. (2018), "The proactive employee on the floor of the store and the impact on customer  
53 satisfaction", *Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services*, Vol. 43, pp. 46-53.
- 54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

- 1  
2  
3 Söderlund, M. and Oikarinen, E. L. (2018), "Joking with customers in the service encounter has a negative  
4 impact on customer satisfaction: Replication and extension", *Journal of Retailing and Consumer*  
5 *Services*, Vol. 42, pp. 55-64.
- 6 Tran, V. H. and Sirieix, L. (2020), "Shopping and cross-shopping practices in Hanoi Vietnam: An  
7 emerging urban market context", *Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services*, Vol. 56, p. 102178.
- 8 Uncles, M. D. and Kwok, S. (2009), "Patterns of store patronage in urban China", *Journal of Business*  
9 *Research*, Vol. 62 No. 1, pp. 68-81.
- 10  
11 Van Rompay, T. J., Tanja-Dijkstra, K., Verhoeven, J. W., and van Es, A. F. (2012) "On store design and  
12 consumer motivation: Spatial control and arousal in the retail context", *Environment and*  
13 *Behavior*, Vol. 44 No. 6, pp. 800-820.
- 14  
15 Yang, Y., Zhang, K. and Kannan, P.K. (2022), "Identifying market structure: A deep network  
16 representation learning of social engagement", *Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 86 No. 4, pp.37-56.
- 17  
18 Yokoyama, N., Azuma, N. and Kim, W. (2022), "Moderating effect of customer's retail format perception  
19 on customer satisfaction formation: An empirical study of mini-supermarkets in an urban retail market  
20 setting", *Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services*, Vol. 66, p.102935.
- 21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60



## Figures

Figure 1: Conceptual Model





Figure 2: Slope analysis of salesperson consultation as a moderator of the mediating role of store satisfaction



TFO = Task-focused orientation; EFO = Experiential-focused orientation; SP = Store patronage; SPC = Salesperson consultation; SS= Store satisfaction.

Table 1: Confirmatory Factor Analysis, Correlation and Descriptive Statistics

Confirmatory Factor Analysis		Correlation Analysis and Descriptive Statistics								
	SFL	AVE/CR	Task-focused	Experiential-focused	Salesperson consultation	Store satisfaction	Store patronage	Marker variable	Mean	SD
<b>Task-focused orientation</b>										
My primary objective in shopping is get it done.	.678	<b>CR = .750</b>	<b>.764#</b>	.617**	-.097*	.345**	.315**	-.015	4.209	.878
I concentrate on getting the shopping done.	.764	AVE = .501								
My primary aim in shopping is to complete as planned.	.677									
<b>Experiential-focused orientation</b>										
In shopping, I prefer being immersed in exciting products.	.506	<b>CR = .843</b>		<b>.714#</b>	-.326**	.444**	.403**	-.052	4.225	1.068
In shopping I prefer to explore and touch different products	.927	AVE = .583								
In shopping, I like to consider wide selection of products.	.834									
In shopping, I expect joy and pleasure.	.723									
<b>Salesperson consultation</b>										
The store employed enough salespersons.	.733	<b>CR = .910</b>			<b>.821#</b>	-.296**	-.237**	-.057	3.925	1.265
Salespersons are friendly.	.625	AVE = .674								
Salesperson responds well to requests and questions.	.910									
Salesperson is honest.	.943									
Salesperson is trustworthy.	.850									
<b>Store satisfaction</b>										
I preferred to shop at this store/ market.	.880	<b>CR = .926</b>				<b>.871#</b>	.867**	-.037	4.687	1.231
I feel happy when I shop at this store/market.	.831	AVE = .758								
My shopping experience at this store/market have always been pleasant.	.866									
I am very satisfied with this store/market.	.905									
<b>Store patronage</b>										
I will visit the store/market in the future.	.892	<b>CR = .925</b>					<b>.868#</b>	-.001	4.793	1.290
I will shop at this store/market in future.	.834	AVE = .754								
I consider this store/market as my first choice.	.852									
I intend to keep shopping at this store/market.	.894									
<b>Marker Variable</b>										
									2.654	0.989

\*\_p&lt;.05; #\_ Square root of average variance extracted; SFL - Standardized Factor Loadings; CR – Composite Reliability; AVE – Average Variance Extracted;

LLCI - Lower Limit Confidence Interval ; ULIC – Upper Limit Confidence Interval

**Table 2: Direct, Mediated and Moderated Mediation Effects**

	Store Satisfaction		Store Patronage	
	Co-efficient	LLCI	ULCI	ULCI
<b>Direct effects</b>				
H1a: Task-focused (Informal)				.201
H1b: Task-focused (Formal)				-.007
H2a: Experiential-focused (Informal)				.040
H2b: Experiential-focused (Formal)				.329
H3a: Task-focused (Informal)	.441 (p≤.05)	.142	.479	
H3b: Task-focused (Formal)	.221 (p≤.05)	.054	.268	
H4a: Experiential-focused (Informal)	.144 (p≤.05)	.012	.156	
H4b: Experiential-focused (Formal)	.434 (p≤.05)	.231	.539	
<b>Mediating effects (Indirect Effect) through store satisfaction</b>				
Store satisfaction (Informal)				
Store satisfaction (Formal)				.874
H5a: Task-focused (Informal)	.795 (p≤.05)		.725	.923
H5b: Task-focused (Formal)	.860 (p≤.05)		.796	.603
H6a: Experiential-focused (Informal)	.397 (p≤.05)		.149	.349
H6b: Experiential-focused (Formal)	.106 (p≤.05)		.041	.673
<b>Moderated Mediation effect (Salesperson Consultation as a moderator)</b>				
H5a: Task-focused (Informal) X Salesperson Consultation Store satisfaction -> Store patronage	.497 (p≤.05)		.187	.638
H5a: Task-focused (Formal) X Salesperson Consultation Store satisfaction -> Store patronage	.424 (p≤.05)		.165	
H5b: Task-focused (Formal) X Salesperson Consultation Store satisfaction -> Store patronage	-.466 (p≤.05)		-.610	-.320
H6a: Experiential-focused (Informal) X Salesperson Consultation Store satisfaction -> Store patronage	-.189 (p≤.05)		-.489	.060
H6a: Experiential-focused (Formal) X Salesperson Consultation Store satisfaction -> Store patronage	.454 (p≤.05)		.316	.612
H6b: Experiential-focused (Formal) X Salesperson Consultation Store satisfaction -> Store patronage	.204 (p≤.05)		.014	.431
<b>Control Variables</b>				
Gender (Informal)	.0481 (p≤.05)	.006	.090	.027
Location (Informal)	.012 (ns)	-.023	.047	.035
Education (Informal)	.065 (ns)	-.018	.149	.038
Gender (Formal)	.0472 (p≤.05)	.005	.089	.029
Location (Formal)	.010 (ns)	-.025	.045	.036
Education (Formal)	.069 (ns)	-.014	.154	.041
R <sup>2</sup> (Informal)	.322			
R <sup>2</sup> (Formal)	.525			

\* \_ p≤.05; #\_ Square root of average variance extracted; LLCI - Lower Limit Confidence Interval; ULIC - Upper Limit Confidence Interval; ns - not significant

**Table 3: Conditional moderated mediation indirect Effect**

Salesperson Consultation as a Moderator	Effect	SE	LLCI	ULCI
<b>Task-focused (Informal) X Salesperson Consultation</b>				
<b>Store satisfaction -&gt; Store patronage</b>				
Low	.438 (p≤.05)	.14	.282	.756
Medium	-.082 (ns)	.15	-.306	.263
High	-.649 (p≤.05)	.19	-1.039	-.292
Index of moderated mediation	-.466 (p≤.05)	.06	-.610	-.320
<b>Task-focused (Formal) X Salesperson Consultation</b>				
<b>Store satisfaction -&gt; Store patronage</b>				
Low	.104 (ns)	.14	-.168	.372
Medium	-.210 (ns)	.22	-.771	.311
High	-.399 (p≤.05)	.40	-.945	-.348
Index of moderated mediation	-.189 (p≤.05)	.15	-.489	.060
<b>Experiential-focused (Informal) X Salesperson Consultation</b>				
<b>Store satisfaction -&gt; Store patronage</b>				
Low	-.085 (ns)	.12	-.337	.149
Medium	.525 (p≤.05)	.07	.384	.668
High	.976 (p≤.05)	.11	.775	1.192
Index of moderated mediation	.454 (p≤.05)	.07	.316	.612
<b>Experiential-focused (Formal) X Salesperson Consultation</b>				
<b>Store satisfaction -&gt; Store patronage</b>				
Low	-.131 (ns)	.20	-.542	.044
Medium	.072 (p≤.05)	.10	.136	.261
High	.412 (p≤.05)	.13	.162	.345
Index of moderated mediation	.204 (p≤.05)	.11	.014	.431

LLCI - Lower Limit Confidence Interval; ULIC – Upper Limit Confidence Interval; SE – Standard Error

## Appendix 1: Systematic Literature Review

Research publication	Methodology	Evolution of competition between FRF & IRF	Determinants of patronage:		Modelling the drivers of consumer patronage patterns		Measurement of format patronage		FRF & IRF comparison in the same study					
			Same for FRF&IRF	Different for FRF&IRF	Independents	Mediators; Moderators	Format output	Format choice	Format trips	FRF	IRF	Both		
Goldmana Ramaswami and Krider (2002)	Behavioral modelling	Barriers to the advancement of modern food retail formats	✓		✓			✓				✓		
Goldman and Hino (2005)	Survey	Barriers to FRF market share growth	✓		✓			✓						✓
Maruyama and Trung (2007)	Survey	Preferences between IRF and FRF	✓		✓			✓						✓
Hino (2010)	Survey	Market entry by FRF and consumer adoption of FRF	✓		✓			✓						✓
Paswan, Pineda, and Ramirez (2010)	Survey	How consumer preference to shop from IRF is affected by patronage of FRF	✓		✓			✓						✓
Maruyama and Trung (2010)	Survey	Consumer choice between FRF and IRF	✓		✓			✓						✓
Amine and Lazaout (2011)	Qualitative	Consumer reaction to FRF emergence	✓		✓			✓						✓
Dholakia, Dholakia, and Chattopadhyay (2012)	Qualitative	Co-existence between FRF and IRF	✓		✓			✓						✓
Maruyama and Wu (2014)	Survey	Patronage of IRF as a barrier to FRF adoption	✓		✓			✓						✓
Hino (2014)	Survey	How consumer patronage of FRF is affected by patronage of IRF	✓		✓			✓						✓
Narayan, Rao and Sudhir (2015)	Household panel data	Socioeconomic class likely to adopt FRF and the impact of IRF	✓		✓			✓						✓
Hino (2015)	Survey	How food consumers patronize FRF and IRF	✓		✓			✓						✓
Maruyama Wu and Huang (2016)	Survey	Role of consumer in modernizing food retailing through patronage of FRF and IRF	✓		✓			✓						✓
Jerath, Sajeesh, and Zhang (2016)	Behavioral modelling	How consumer patronage behaviors affect market share of IRF and profitability of FRF	✓		✓			✓						✓
Dholakia, Dholakia, and Chattopadhyay (2018)	Qualitative	How consumer patronage patterns for FRF and IRF reveals IRF dominance over FRF	✓		✓			✓						✓
Anderson, Iacovone, Kankanhalli, and Narayanan (2022)	Experiment	How modernization of IRFs affects patronage of IRFs	✓		✓			✓						✓
<b>Current research</b>	Survey	<b>How consumer patronage behaviors reveals co-existence between FRF and IRF</b>	✓		✓			✓						✓