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# Executive summary

Customer behavior is a very important subject in retail marketing. Understanding your customers will allow you to predict and affect purchases a customer does. By influencing the shopping behavior of a customer, retailers can make more money out of customers. Influencing a customer in the wrong way can make a customer spend less or even damage your company by getting a bad image for example.

Employee-customer interaction is an often studied subject for a long time. In particular subjects as customer loyalty and the perceptions of customers about service quality. New studies in neuro-economics investigate the effects of the interaction between employees with certain characteristics and intentions and customers. I will investigate if a different orientation of the employee causes a difference in the willingness to buy of a customer. Most of the academics do not focus their study at “the timing of approach effect”, what means that they do not consider the timing of approaching a customer as an important factor of employee-customer interaction. I believe the timing of approaching is an important factor in the employee-customer interaction. The timing of approach might be of an influence on the willingness to buy of a customer. Therefore I will investigate the direct effect of time of approaching a customer on the willingness to buy of the customer.

As a customer you will be contacted by an employee if you enter a store. Every customer is different and so the employee can have different effects on the willingness to buy of customers. In which way the employee can be of an influence on a customer depends on the autonomy of that customer. Some customers might be willing to get more help or advice from an employee than other customers. In my research I will investigate whether the preferred autonomy of a customer affects the direct effect of time of approach and the orientation of employees on willingness to buy.

Nowadays people act and think differently than formerly. Society have become more aware of how different people can be and also homosexuality has been accepted more. Emancipation for women has become more and more in the last years. Also more former female activities are done by male and vise versa. In my research I will investigate whether gender affects the direct effect of time of approach and the orientation of employees on willingness to buy.

My thesis will be focused on the direct effects of the timing of approaching a customer and orientation of an employee on the willingness to buy a new product of a customer. Also moderating effects of preferred autonomy and gender on these direct effects will be investigated.

*Theoretical background*

My research is based on different kinds of literature streams. To determine the direct effects on the willingness to buy of that customer, I first carried out research about the willingness to buy of a new product a fashion store. I secondly investigated the two subjects which might have direct effects on the willingness to buy, namely the time of approaching a customer and the orientation of the employee. Last, I investigated two subjects which might affect the direct effects on willingness to buy, namely preferred autonomy and gender.

This research is focused on the willingness to buy a new product in a fashion store. Literature about the product life cycles of new products (*Kotler and Keller 12th edition 2006; Fisher 1997)* and the relationship between service quality and behavioral responses *(Valarie et al 1996)* constitute this*.* New products at fashion stores are considered as innovative products. Product life cycles of those products are shorter as products life cycles of functional products, because of imitators who want to erode the competitive advantages of innovative products. Competitive advantages are very important because innovative products have high profit margins. The relationship between service quality and behavioral responses (Valarie et al 1996) can be favorable or unfavorable for a company. Strong empirical support was found for improved service quality having an increasing effect on favorable responses and a decreasing effect on unfavorable responses towards a company. This means good service quality has a positive effect on the willingness to buy of customers.

Timing of approach at customer-employee interaction is based on literature of the concreteness of shopping goals in the buying process of customers (Lee and Ariely 2006) and the relationship between approach time of an employee and the purchasing likelihood of the customer (Hendriksen 2012).

Lee and Ariely (2006) show that customers have a less concrete shopping goals when entering a store but more concrete goals when their shopping process progresses.

Hendriksen (2012) conducted a path of the relationship between the time of approaching a customer and the likelihood of a purchase by that customer. This path shows an inverted U-shape relationship between the approach time and purchasing likelihood. This means that approaching customers too early in their buying process will harm their purchase likelihood. The purchasing likelihood of a customer is also being harmed when approaching that customer too late. There is a ‘medium stage’ in terms of time in which there is an optimum. The optimum is the approach time at which the likelihood of purchasing products is the highest and in the research of Hendriksen that optimum is between 107 and 116 seconds after entering the store. I will only investigate the early stage and the late stage in the buying process to contrive the difference between being approached just after entering a store and being approached just before leaving the store.

For the effect of the orientation of the employee on the willingness to buy of a customer my research was based on literature about the orientation of employees (Bagozzi et al 2011).

An employee can be oriented in two ways: customer oriented and sales oriented. When an employee is customer oriented, the employee wants what is best for the customer. These employees empathize with customers and focus on their needs and satisfaction. Sales oriented employees do what is best for themselves. These employees focus on their own targets, they do everything to make the sale without considering the needs of the customer. Customer oriented employees have genetics that suggest that they can recognize opportunities more easily than sales oriented employees. This suggests also that customer oriented employees are more able to use the aspect of timing when approaching a customer.

For the moderating effect of gender on, my research is based on the literature about gender roles (Witkowski 1999, Reekie 1992 and Fischer and Arnold 1990).

For a long time in history there were certain activities that primarily were seen as female activities (Witkowski 1999), but later in time the image changes and male were accepted to do those activities also. For example the image of a shopping male became more acceptable (Reekie 1992). The activity of shopping de-genders in general, but there is a difference in some type of shopping (Fischer and Arnold 1990). For example, female might be more involved in shopping for grocery and male might be more involved in shopping for tools.
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# Introduction

Important strategies retailers use are focused on the optimization of resources. In this period, where economic crisis hits the wallet of every retailer, it is important to be competitive and innovative. The ‘traditional’ retailer has to compete with online retailers nowadays, who have cost advantages because of the online process. To minimize costs and keep up with the competition, retailers have to be efficient.

A large part of retailers’ costs are spent on employees. To be efficient, optimization of employees must be in retailers’ strategy and so employees can be seen as resources. Employees have to make sure customers buy their products and so generate income for the store. Retailers’ strategy for the customer-employee interaction is mainly focused on providing better sales. Customers are more likable to become loyal when improving customer services[[1]](#footnote-1).

However, the way in which customers are being approached and the timing at which they are being approached might be of influence on the customers purchasing decision. Some customers may like to be left alone during their shopping process and some customers might like to be approached early or late in their shopping process. As we look at the way customers are being approached I can imagine that some customers want to be in charge and some customers want to be lead and informed by an employee. I also can image there might be a difference between male and female so gender might be of an influence on the purchasing decision.

I hope to help retailers in optimizing their strategy on employees. I hope to get an outcome in the decision of how customers must be treated and at which point after entering a store they would like to be approached. This all to increase the willingness to buy of a customer. The outcomes can be used as a guideline for employees on how to approach a customer and so how to be more efficient.

My framework is build upon two literature streams: (1) Optimal timing of employee approach to customers (Lee and Ariely 2006 and Hendriksen 2012) and (2) orientation of employees (Bagozzi et al 2011).

The aim of this master’ thesis is to examine the direct effects of the timing of approaching a customer and the orientation of an employee, within a fashion retail store, on the willingness to buy of the customer. Gender will be included by investigating the moderating effect of this variable on the direct effects.

This thesis is divided in four main parts. In the first part, I discuss the theoretical background and conceptual framework for my hypotheses. In the second part I discuss data and methodology. In the third part I explain my analysis and discuss the results of my research. Finally, I conclude the thesis with an overall discussion, managerial implication and limitations of my thesis.

# Theory

This chapter is devoted to a review of existing literature of the willingness to buy/pay for new products and direct effects of four variables on willingness to buy. As variables for the direct effects on willingness to buy I will use the employees’ orientation towards a customer and the timing of approaching a customer (early stage vs. late stage). For variables that might affect these direct effects, I choose preferred autonomy of the customer and the gender of the customer. The existing literature serves as a framework and as input for the hypotheses used in this research.

Goal of my research is to determine what effects employees have on the willingness to buy of a customer during their buying progresses. The focus will be on willingness to buy a new product at a fashion store.

2.1 Willingness to buy a new product at a fashion store

“Willingness to pay is the amount a person would be "willing to pay" to obtain a good or service. It is what the person is willing to sacrifice to get the good. It is the amount of money a person can give up, receive the good, and have their utility remain the same.” (<http://www.warziniack.com/Site/Teaching_files/benefits.pdf>)[[2]](#footnote-2) Willingness to pay can also be for avoiding something, i.e. a person may be willing to pay a certain amount of money to avoid something that is undesired. For example, someone may pay a certain amount of money to avoid travelling by public transport. A group of customers that is willing to pay for a product at a specific period are the customers that are willing to buy that product. In this study, the focus is on the willingness to buy a new (innovative) product at a fashion store. This willingness to buy is determined by the demand for such new products at a fashion store.

Kotler and Keller (12e edition)[[3]](#footnote-3) describe lifecycles of products. Products have their own lifecycles where one can see the demand for the products over time. Most product lifecycles have a bell-shaped curve that is divided in four different stages: introduction, growth, maturity and decline. The introduction stage is the first stage of the lifecycle where the product is introduced. This is a period of slow growth of demand for products. The second stage is called the growth stage and in this stage the demand for the product will increase rapidly. Third is the maturity stage, this is the period of a slowdown of demand for the product because of the acceptance the product has achieved by most potential buyers. Fourth and last stage is a period of decline where the demand shows a downward drift. Not all products have the same bell-shaped curve as mentioned before. Fisher (1997)[[4]](#footnote-4) shows a difference in demand between functional and innovative products. Functional products are products that satisfy basic needs and they do not change much over time. Therefore, demand for such products is predictable and the product lifecycles are long. Profit margins are low for functional products so stores such as fashion stores also introduce innovative products. Innovative products can enable higher profit margins for companies, but demand for these innovative products is unpredictable. The product lifecycles of innovative products are shorter than those of functional products because of imitators who want to erode the competitive advantages of innovative products. Companies have to be innovative to keep their products ahead of the competition, but this means more variety of products. The combination of the variety of products and the shorter lifecycles of the products causes an increase of unpredictability.

Valarie *et al* (1996)[[5]](#footnote-5) investigated the relationship between service quality and behavioral responses. They conducted a conceptual framework of the impact of service quality on particular behaviors, which can both be favorable and unfavorable for a company. Service quality include both perceived service performance and problem experience and resolution. In my research I will only mention the relationship between service quality and the behavioral response of willing to purchase, because willingness to buy is relevant to my research. Valarie *et al* (1996) found strong empirical support for improved service quality having an increasing effect on favorable responses and a decreasing effect on unfavorable responses towards a company. This means good and improved service quality has a positive effect on the willingness to purchase goods from a company. When introducing a new product in a fashion store, good service will help to increase willingness to buy. For example, customers can be influenced by getting relevant information about the new product and can get to the point of purchase.

Conceptual framework

Within this research the direct effects of four different variables, within a fashion retail store, on the willingness to buy of the customer is examined. The four variables examined are employees orientation towards a customer, the timing of approaching a customer (early stage vs. late stage), preferred autonomy of the customer and the gender of the customer. Control variables age and income will be held constant to test the relative impact of the independent variables.

This research is based on the model in figure 1, conceptual framework.

Gender of the customer

Timing of approach

Willingness to buy

Orientation of the approaching employee

Control variables

**Figure 1:** Conceptual framework

2.2 Direct effects on willingness to buy

2.2.1 Customer – Employee Interaction: Timing of Approach

To determine the direct effect of time of approach by employees on the willingness to buy of customers, we first have to consider time of approach in general. As the term already explains, time of approach is the moment at which an employee approaches a customer after entering the store. I my research, timing of approach includes the early stage (just after entering the store) of approaching a customer versus the late stage (just before leaving the store) of approaching a customer.

Customers have motives for shopping and they have shopping goals at the point of entering a store. Tauber (1972)[[6]](#footnote-6) divides the customers’ motives in personal motives(e.g. diversion, physical activity), social motives(e.g. social experience outside the home, status and authority) and impulse shopping. Lee and Ariely (2006)[[7]](#footnote-7) show that “consumers have less concrete shopping goals when they first enter a store but more concrete shopping goals and well-defined preferences as their shopping progresses (perhaps after they have gained greater exposure to the products in the store and/or have had more time to consider these products in relation to their own needs and preferences)” (Lee and Ariely, 2006). Consumers have a lower degree of certainty in their earlier shopping stage and consumers have a bigger range of expected amount of money they spend in that same stage.

Research has been done to conduct a path of the relationship between approach time of an employee and the purchasing likelihood of the customer. Hendriksen (2012)[[8]](#footnote-8) found an inverted- U shape relationship between approach time of an employee and the purchasing likelihood of the customer. When an employee approaches a customer too early, the customer is less likely to make a purchase. When an employee approaches a customer too late, the customer is also less likely to make a purchase but more likely than when the approach is too early. Hendriksen (2012) discovered that within the medium stage of time the chance of a purchase is the most when approaching customers at this point. That optimum is between 107 and 116 seconds, so the chance of a purchase is the largest when approaching a customer between 107 and 116 seconds after entering the store. Approaching too early or too late in a shopping visit significantly reduces a customers’ probability of purchase.



**Figure 2:** Inverted- U shape relationship between approach time of an employee and the purchasing likelihood of the customer (Sources: Hendriksen 2012).

Although research done by Hendriksen (2012) does not involve purchase likelihood of new products, I do think this inverted- U shape relationship will also occur in case of buying a new product. As concluded by Lee and Ariely (2006), goals of shopping customers are less concrete at the point of entering a store and more concrete when they proceed in their shopping progresses. Approaching customers with less concrete shopping goals may lead to a point of purchase, but because of the uncertainty it may also scare of a customer so that he/she leaves the store. Approaching customers with more concrete shopping goals may lead to the point of purchase, because those customers need just a final ‘push’ towards that point of purchase.

Because this research only focuses on the difference between an early approach versus an late approach, I expect approaching customers in the late stage of their shopping progresses will lead to a higher willingness to buy a new product by a customer in comparison with a customer who is being approached in the early stage of their shopping progresses.

**[H1] Approaching a customer in the late stage of their shopping progresses will lead to a higher willingness to buy a new product by a customer than approaching a customer in the early stage of their shopping progresses.**

2.2.2 Orientation of the Employee Approaching a Customer

Approaching customers in the right way is important to enhance the probability that these customers are willing to buy a product. Brady and Cronin Jr. (2001)[[9]](#footnote-9) concluded that service quality received by customers must be perceived to be responsive, empathetic and reliable. So in case of the approach of an employee towards a customer, the employee has to be responsive, empathetic and reliable according to Brady and Cronin Jr. (2001). Bitner, Booms, and Tetreault (1990)[[10]](#footnote-10) concluded that customers are more satisfied when employees possess the willingness, competence and ability to solve their problems. Bitner, Booms, and Tetreault (1990) also concluded that employees who have the ability to adapt special requests and needs enhance the satisfaction of customers. Saxe and Weitz (1982)[[11]](#footnote-11) defined a concept of customer orientation in salespeople, a concept of customer-oriented selling. Within this concept, all activities of a firm have to be focused on the satisfaction of the customers. In this way mutually and long-term relationships can be established.

Bagozzi *et al (*2011)[[12]](#footnote-12) did more research about the orientation of salespeople. When approaching or helping customers, employees are customer oriented or sales oriented. Customer oriented employees empathize with customers and focus on their needs and satisfaction. Sales oriented employees focus on their own targets, they will do everything to make the sale without considering the needs of the customer.

The willingness to buy of a customer may differ due to the timing of being approached by an employee (Hendriksen 2012, Lee and Ariely 2006) . As the timing of approach by an employee may influence the willingness to buy of a customer, I suspect the way an employee approaches a customer also may be of an influence on the willingness to buy of a customer. There might be a direct effect of the orientation of an employee towards a customer on the willingness to buy of a customer. I believe the type of orientation of an employee towards a customer influences the effect on the willingness to buy of that customer.

Bagozzi *et al* (2011) explored genetic and neurological bases for customer orientation (CO) and contrasted them with sales orientation (SO). They studied CO versus SO and opportunity recognition. To recognize opportunities, three kinds of knowledge are relevant. The first one is contextual knowledge formation, this means you have to be able to connect a target stimulus to a source. A statement or need of the customer has to be connected to a category or abstract framework that meets the needs of the customer.

Second is the motivation to learn about customers, this means you have to be curious and ready to uncover the needs of a customer and determine in what way these needs meet the products of a company. Third is buying center knowledge formation. Customers are multiple parties in buying centers, they are not the same and they have individual perceptions in selling situations. Buying center knowledge formation is the ability to understand the various reasons for different interpretations of a problem, implication for sales and factors inhibiting buying. Not only the ability to be aware of multiple points of view is good, but also the fact that those multiple points of view motivate salespeople to come up with solutions is needed to succeed. This will have a higher buy-in for multiple parties in the buying center. CO is related to opportunity recognition and SO is not. The reason is that CO is about listening to the customer and find out which product would be most helpful and SO is about selling products to the customer without caring about the customer.

Bagozzi *et al* (2011) also searched for genetic differences between CO and SO. The study finds that CO people are more curious, seek novelty and are intrinsically motivated to help customers in the best way possible. Another finding is that sales orientated people prefer immediate gratification and are cognitively inflexible. These two traits also back up the finding that SO is not related to opportunity recognition. The findings in a third study validate the meaning of CO and SO once more. It finds that “CO is related to processes involved in inferring the beliefs, desires, and intentions of others and resonating with the feelings of others, while at the same time putting oneself in the shoes of others, so to speak. Note that salespeople scoring high on SO do not exhibit any of these activations whatsoever.”(Bagozzi *et al* (2011) pages 13, 14).

Opportunity recognition

**•** Contextual knowledge formation

**•** Motivation to learn from customers

**•** Buying center knowledge formation

Studies 2 & 3 Study 1

Customer

versus sales

orientation

Genetic and neurological

bases of selling orientations

**FIGURE 3:** Overview model for variables and tests of hypotheses in Studies 1–3

(“Genetic and Neurological Foundations of Customer Orientation: Field and Experimental Evidence.”, page 2)

Now that we have found that CO will be more profitable in the long run than SO, companies should try to hire people with high CO. They should check their C.V. for indications of CO and once they are hired they should be given space to come up with new solutions to customer needs. This also suggests that employees with high CO have a higher probability of increasing the willingness to buy of a customer than employees with a high SO. Employees with a high SO will probably not even care about the customer and they will only think about ‘making’ the deal. CO employees will consider the needs of the customer and will approach the customer with the intention to fulfill the needs of the customer instead of ‘making’ the deal. Hence, I expect when employees with sales orientation (SO), approach a customer, the customer’s willingness to buy decreases. In contrast, I hypothesize when employees with customer orientation (CO) approach a customer, the customer’s willingness to buy increases.

**[H2a] When the approaching employee has a sales orientation, approaching a customer leads to lower willingness to buy.**

**[H2b] When the approaching employee has a customer orientation, approaching a customer leads to higher willingness to buy.**

2.2.3 Moderating Effect of Customer’s Gender

I choose to use gender as second moderating variable of the effects of approach timing and employee orientation on the customer’s willingness to buy.

For a long time in history, shopping was primarily seen as a female activity in domestic sphere. Witkowski (1999)[[13]](#footnote-13) observed that the acquisition of domestic goods was the responsibility of women. Later on, the image of the shopping male became more accepted. Reekie (1992)[[14]](#footnote-14) concluded a change in the male/female ratio of retail space because of the increasing retail venues and shopping malls. More and more male were shopping at retail venues and shopping malls. Also shopping was no longer seen as an unskilled and demeaning activity for women, but as skilled, creative and fun.

As the activity of shopping is no longer a female activity in general, it does not mean that it also has to be within different degrees of shopping or shopping for different kind of goods. Fischer and Arnold (1990)[[15]](#footnote-15) concluded that female are more involved in Christmas gift shopping then male for example. In general, there will be a difference between genders in shopping for fashion and shopping for garage tools.

I expect gender not to moderate the effect of employee orientation on a customer’s willingness to buy. I hypothesize when a male or female customer is being approached by a sales oriented employee, the willingness to buy will decrease and when a male or female customer is being approached by a customer oriented employee, the willingness to buy will be higher.

**[H3a] When a male customer is approached by a sales oriented employee, his willingness to buy decreases less than when a female customer is approached by a sales oriented employee.**

**[H3b] When a male customer is approached by a customer oriented employee, his willingness to buy increases more than when a female customer is approached by a customer oriented employee.**

I expect gender to moderate the effect of approach timing on a customer’s willingness to buy. As discussed at the customer’s preferred autonomy section, customers with more concrete shopping may be hurt in his/her willingness to buy when being approached in the early stage of their shopping progresses (Lee and Ariely 2006, Edward L. Deci and Richard M. Ryan 1987).

I expect male customers to have more concrete shopping goals and therefore to have more power in the interpersonal behavior. This means when male customers are being approached in the early stage of their shopping progresses, their willingness to buy decreases. I also expect female to have less concrete shopping goals and therefore to have less power in the interpersonal behavior. This means when female customers are being approached in the early stage of their shopping progresses, their willingness to buy increases.

**[H4a] When a male customer is approached in the early stage of his shopping progresses, his willingness to buy will decrease more than when a female customer is approached in the early stage of his shopping progresses.**

**[H4b] When a male customer is approached in the late stage of his shopping progresses, his willingness to buy will increase more than when female customer is approached in the late stage of his shopping progresses.**

2.3.3 Control variables

Besides the influence of the two moderators on the direct effects of approach timing and employee orientation on customer’s willingness to buy, I will use control variables. The control variables are age and income. These control variables will be held constant to test the relative impact of the independent variables.

2.3 Overview Hypothesis

An overview of the hypotheses in my research. The last column are expected signs which are related to the expected effects on the willingness to buy of a customer.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Nr. Hypothesis** | **Hypothesis** | **Expected** |
|  | *Direct effects* |  |
| *H1* | Approaching a customer in the late stage of their shopping progresses will lead to a higher willingness to buy a new product by a customer than approaching a customer in the early stage of their shopping progresses | Early  <  Late |
| *H2* | When the approaching employee has a sales orientation, approaching a customer leads to lower willingness to buy than when the approaching employee has a customer orientation. | SO  <  CO |
|  | *Moderating effects* |  |
| *H3a* | When a male customer is approached by a sales oriented employee, his willingness to buy decreases less than when a female customer is approached by a sales oriented employee. | Male  + SO  >  Female  + SO |
| *H3b* | When a male customer is approached by a customer oriented employee, his willingness to buy increases more than when a female customer is approached by a customer oriented employee. | Male  + CO  >  Female  + CO |
| *H4a* | When a male customer is approached in the early stage of his shopping progresses, his willingness to buy will decrease more than when a female customer is approached in the early stage of his shopping progresses. | Male  + Early  <  Female  + Early |
| *H4b* | When a male customer is approached in the late stage of his shopping progresses, his willingness to buy will increase more than when female customer is approached in the late stage of his shopping progresses. | Male  + Late  >  Female  + Late |

# Methodology

Goal of my research is to determine what effects employees have on the willingness to buy of a customer during their buying progresses. The focus will be on willingness to buy a new product at a fashion store. A challenge that I might face is to be able to measure willingness to buy. Data for this research is gathered by online questionnaires.

3.1 Data

The data for this research is gathered by four online questionnaires. I ran a survey-experiment where respondents were randomly allocated to four different conditions. It has a 2x2 between-subject design where I manipulate (1) timing of approach (early vs. late) and (2) the orientation of the employee (sales oriented vs. customer oriented). This manipulation is in order to measure willingness to buy. Every respondent makes a decision whether to buy a new pair of jeans or going to a weekend out after being manipulated by timing of approach and the orientation of the employee. This design is repeated in the same questionnaire but in the second case the respondent has to make the decision between new headphones and a weekend out. This second design ensures that a general conclusion about the willingness to buy can be made.

Questions about age, income and education were asked for the contribution as control variables. Gender is asked for the usage of a moderating variable. Respondents are asked to fill in the extent to which they value fashion and weekend out. They were also asked to fill in the extent to which they find it difficult to choose a pair of jeans and fashion in general.

Willingness to buy is measured by different imaginable stories that respondents have to read and judge. Each questionnaire contains two stories, but those stories are different in each of the four questionnaires. A respondent has to make two choices, because one questionnaire contains two stories. At the end of the first story the respondent makes a decision whether to buy a new pair of jeans or going to a weekend out. At the end of the second story the respondent makes a decision whether to buy a new headphone or going to a weekend out. The imaginable stories among the four questionnaires differ in timing of being approached by an employee and the orientation of that employee. At the first questionnaire, a customer is being approached just after entering the store and the employee has got a customer oriented approach. At the second questionnaire, a customer is being approached just after entering the store and the employee has got a sales oriented approach. At the third questionnaire, a customer is being approach just before leaving the store and the employee has got a customer oriented approach. At the fourth questionnaire, a customer is being approached just before leaving the store and the employee has got a sales oriented approach.

*3.2 Respondents*

The questionnaires were put together by using Thesistools.com. From there the questionnaires were put online randomly through a redirecting url link, so respondents fill in one questionnaire without knowing which of the four questionnaires they filled in.

Gathering respondents was done by making use of direct mailing and promoting the url link on Facebook, Twitter and Linkedin.

The first randomized questionnaire was filled in much more than the other three, because of the fact that the url link of that questionnaire was copied instead of the redirecting url link.

I do not expect this will hurt the outcome, because a simular amount of respondents of that questionnaire is used for the analysis.

# Results and Analysis

After explaining the methodology, this section will describe the analysis and appoint the results that came out.

First, I analyzed the full model and the groups separately for the descriptive statistics. Second, I analyzed the full model by doing a logistic regression. I also performed a logistic regression on jeans and headphones. By performing these logistic regressions, the influence of the two direct variables (timing of approach and orientation of the employee) and the two indirect variables (gender and preferred autonomy of the customer) on the willingness to buy of the customer are analyzed.

*4.1 Descriptive statistics*

The total amount of respondents is 175. A number of 133 respondents filled in the questionnaire completely, so only those respondents can be involved. Descriptive statistics for the full model are (Appendices descriptive statistics full model: 1-4):

| **Statistics** | | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | | Gender | Age | Monthly income | Eduction |
| N | Valid | 133 | 133 | 133 | 133 |
| Missing | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Mean | | ,39 | 2,08 | 2,84 | 4,56 |
| Std. Error of Mean | | ,042 | ,110 | ,112 | ,099 |
| Std. Deviation | | ,490 | 1,265 | 1,296 | 1,144 |

**Figure 4:** Descriptive statistics for the full model

Gender: the group of all the respondents exist of 81 male respondents and 52 female respondents.

Age: the average age is 30 to 39 years old and the most frequent age is 18 to 29 years old. This most frequent age is due to the fact that many fellow students and friends of mine filled in the questionnaire. The standard deviation of age within this group is 1,265. In terms of the four possible age groups, this means that the ages of people deviates a lot from the average age group.

Income: the average income is 2000 euro’s to 3000 euro’s and it is also the most frequent income. The standard deviation of monthly income within this group is 1,296. In terms of the five groups of income, this means there is a lot deviation of respondents’ incomes from the average income.

Education: most people have a HBO degree and next, most people have a masters’ degree or higher. The average level of education is high, this is related to the large number of fellow students that filled in my questionnaires. The standard deviation of education within this group is 1,144, this is a low deviation in a group of six categories. In other words, the level of education among the respondents involved is high.

The respondents filled in one of four random questionnaires, so there are four different groups of respondents. The descriptive statistics of the first group (Appendices descriptive statistics group 1: 1-4):

| **Statistics** | | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | | Gender | Age | Monthly income | Education |
| N | Valid | 22 | 22 | 22 | 22 |
| Missing | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Mean | | ,36 | 1,86 | 2,82 | 4,59 |
| Std. Error of Mean | | ,105 | ,257 | ,313 | ,234 |
| Std. Deviation | | ,492 | 1,207 | 1,468 | 1,098 |

**Figure 5:** Descriptive statistics of group 1

Gender: group 1 exists out of a total of 22 respondents, 14 male respondents and 8 female respondents.

Age: the average age is 30 to 39 years old and the most frequent age is 18 to 29 years old. This is comparable with the full model. The standard deviation of age within this group is 1,207. In terms of the four possible age groups, this means that the ages of people deviate a lot from the average of the group. Within group 1 the ages deviate less than the ages of the full model, but it is comparable.

Income: most frequent monthly income is lower than 500 euro’s and 2000 euro’s to 3000 euro’s. The average monthly income is 1000 euro’s to 2000 euro’s. The reason of the amount of monthly incomes lower than 500 euro’s can be that most students only have a part time job. The standard deviation of monthly income within this group is 1,468. So the monthly incomes of the respondents in this group are very diffused.

Education: most people have a HBO degree and after that, most people have a masters’ degree or higher. The average level of education is high, this is related to the large number of fellow students that filled in my questionnaires. The standard deviation of education within this group is 1,098. This is a low deviation in a group of six categories. In other words, the level of education among the respondents involved is high.

The descriptive statistics of the second group (Appendices descriptive statistics group 2: 1-4):

| **Statistics** | | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | | Gender | Age | Monthly income | Education |
| N | Valid | 32 | 32 | 32 | 32 |
| Missing | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Mean | | ,28 | 2,75 | 3,44 | 4,47 |
| Std. Error of Mean | | ,081 | ,233 | ,174 | ,174 |
| Std. Deviation | | ,457 | 1,320 | ,982 | ,983 |

**Figure 6:** Descriptive statistics of group 2

Gender: group 2 exists out of a total of 32 respondents, 23 male respondents and 9 female respondents.

Age: the average age is 40 to 49 years old and the most frequent age is 50+years old. This is not comparable with the full model. The standard deviation of age within this group is 1,320. In terms of the four possible age groups, this means that the ages of people deviates a lot from the average of the group. Within group 2 the ages deviate more than the ages of the full model, but it is comparable.

Income: most frequent monthly income is 2000 euro’s to 3000 euro’s. The average monthly income is 1000 euro’s to 2000 euro’s. The reason of the amount of monthly incomes is the fact that there were more respondents with a higher age than average. The standard deviation of monthly income within this group is 0,982. So the monthly incomes of the respondents are converged.

Education: most people have a HBO degree and after that, most people have a masters’ degree or higher. The average level of education is high. The standard deviation of education within this group is 0,983. So this means the respondents have about the same level of education.

The descriptive statistics of the third group (Appendices descriptive statistics group 3: 1-4):

| **Statistics** | | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | | Gender | Age | Monthly income | Education |
| N | Valid | 55 | 55 | 55 | 55 |
| Missing | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Mean | | ,42 | 1,27 | 2,13 | 4,71 |
| Std. Error of Mean | | ,067 | ,088 | ,145 | ,187 |
| Std. Deviation | | ,498 | ,651 | 1,072 | 1,383 |

**Figure 7:** Descriptive statistics of group 3

Gender: group 3 exists out of 55 respondents, 32 male respondents and 23 female respondents.

Age: the average age is 18 to 29 years old and that is also the most frequent age category. The standard deviation of age within this group is 0,651. This means that the ages of people doesn’t deviate a lot from the average of the group. Within group 3 the ages deviate less than the ages of the full model.

Income: both most frequent monthly income and average monthly income is 500 euro’s to 1000 euro’s. The reason is the high amount of younger respondents involved. The standard deviation of monthly income within this group is 1,072. So the monthly incomes of the respondents are converged.

Education: most people have a masters’ degree or higher in this group. The average level of education is a college degree, because there is also a high amount of people who did HBO or have a college degree. The standard deviation of education within the group is 1,383. So the level of education is somewhat more diffused within this group than within the other groups and the full model. The diffusion is in the higher level of education categories, so in general the level of education is high within this group.

The descriptive statistics of the fourth group (Appendices descriptive statistics group 4: 1-4):

| **Statistics** | | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | | Gender | Age | Monthly income | Education |
| N | Valid | 24 | 24 | 24 | 24 |
| Missing | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Mean | | ,50 | 3,21 | 3,71 | 4,29 |
| Std. Error of Mean | | ,104 | ,199 | ,221 | ,141 |
| Std. Deviation | | ,511 | ,977 | 1,083 | ,690 |

**Figure 8:** Descriptive statistics of group 4

Gender: group 4 exists out of 24 respondents, 12 male respondents and 12 female respondents.

Age: the average age is 40 to 49 years old. The most frequent age category is that of 50+. The standard deviation of age within this group is 0,977. This means that the ages of people don’t deviate a lot from the average of the group. Within group 4 the ages deviate less than the ages of the full model. Respondents in group 4 are in general older than respondents within the other groups and within the full model.

Income: both most frequent monthly income and average monthly income is 2000 euro’s to 3000 euro’s. The reason for this is the high amount of older respondents involved. The standard deviation of monthly income within this group is 1,083. So the monthly incomes of the respondents are converged.

Education: both most frequent level of education and average level of education is HBO. The standard deviation of education within the group is 0,690. So the level of education is converged within this group. The average level of education is somewhat lower within this group than within other groups en within the full model. The level of education is in general high within this group.

4.2 Statistical analyses

For analyzing the model in this thesis, a logistical regression was run to estimate the influences of the variables on the willingness to buy of a customer. As mentioned before, two variables (timing of approach and orientation of the employee) were used to estimate a direct effect and two variables (gender and preferred autonomy of the customer) were used to estimate a indirect effect. Logistical regressions were run for the full model, the jeans and the headphones.

In this part, the ‘fit’ of the model and the results will be discussed. The size of the sample is somewhat limited. For this reason an 0.10 alpha will be used for the significant tests. So all parameters will be considered as statistically significant with p-value <=0.10.

In each model, the -2 Log likelihood, Cox & Snell R2, Nagelkerke R2 and the Hosmer andLemeshow test will be discussed. These tests will be discussed to see if the models fit and to predict the estimated results better than when just the constant is included. The -2LL states the unexplained variance in the model. High scores for the -2LL state that there is a lot of unexplained variance (Field, 2009). The Cox & Snell R2 and Nagelkerke R2 both state about the predictive power of the model with high results meaning the model better predicts the outcome (Field, 2009)[[16]](#footnote-16). The Hosmer and Lemeshow test state the overall model fit, where a non-significant outcome of this test states that the model fits the data well[[17]](#footnote-17). The interpretation for the test is similar to the standard R² in linear regression.

Full model:

The full model is designed to test the willingness to buy of a customer for both jeans and headphones. The earlier mentioned control variables were also included to increase the ‘fit’ and predictive power of the model. The model with the predictive variables is given below:

Pi(Y) = \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_1\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

–(-2,336 – 2,063\*Gender - 0,119\*Age + 0,157\*Income + 0,242\*Education - 0,284\*EA - 1,004\*CO 1+e + 0,545\*Gen\_Early + 1,992\*Gen\_Cor

Where Pi(Y) is the willingness to buy of customer ‘i” based on the included predictor variables and their significance.

The analysis of the full model show an overall statistics score of 10.820 with a degree of freedom of 8 which is significant at P > 0,1. This means the coefficients for the variables not

in the model are not significantly different from zero. In other words, the addition of one or more of these variables to the model will not significantly affects its predictive power.

In the full model, few variables are significant. These variables are Gender, Customer Orientation, Gender X Customer Orientation and the constant. The -2LL score is 199,770 versus 210.89 after adding the predictor variables. This model is better in predicting willingness to buy with the predictor variables included than it was before the predictor variables were included.

The Cox & Snell R² and the Nagelkerke R² are respectively ,041 and ,075 which means that predictor variables badly predict the outcome of the model. Hosmer and Lemeshow test show a badly fit of the model with a Chi² of 10,927 for 8 degrees of freedom and a significance of 0,206.

Jeans:

The “Jeans” model is designed to test the willingness to buy of a customer for jeans. The control variables were also included to increase the ‘fit’ and predictive power of the model. The model with the predictive variables is given below:

Pi(Y) = \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_1\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

–(-2,478 – 1,086\*Gender - 0,124\*Age + 0,035\*Income + 0,371\*Education + 0,095\*EA -1,536\*CO 1+e + 0,204\*Gen\_Early + 1,628\*Gen\_Cor

Where Pi(Y) is the willingness to buy of customer ‘i” based on the included predictor variables and their significance.

The analysis of the “Jeans” model show an overall statistics score of 6,833 with a degree of freedom of 8 which is significant at P > 0,1. This means the coefficients for the variables not in the model are not significantly different from zero. In other words, the addition of one or more of these variables to the model will not significantly affects its predictive power. Only the Customer Orientation and constant in this model are significant. The -2LL score is 98,686 versus 105,445 after adding the predictor variables. This model is better in predicting willingness to buy with the predictor variables included than it was before the predictor variables were included.

The Cox & Snell R² and the Nagelkerke R² are respectively 0,050 and 0,091 which means that predictor variables badly predict the outcome of the model. Hosmer and Lemeshow test show a badly fit of the model with a Chi² of 7,801 for 8 degrees of freedom and a significance of 0,453.

Headphones

The “Headphones” model is designed to test the willingness to buy of a customer for headphones. The control variables were also included to increase the ‘fit’ and predictive power of the model. The model with the predictive variables is given below:

Pi(Y) = \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_1\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

–(--2,424 – 20,394\*Gender - 0,058\*Age + 0,309\*Income + 0,144\*Education - 0,621\*EA - 0,534\*CO 1+e + 0,731\*Gen\_Early + 19,814\*Gen\_Cor

Where Pi(Y) is the willingness to buy of customer ‘i” based on the included predictor variables and their significance.

The analysis of the “Headphones” model show an overall statistics score of 8,920 with a degree of freedom of 8 which is significant at P > 0,1. This means the coefficients for the variables not in the model are not significantly different from zero. In other words, the addition of one or more of these variables to the model will not significantly affects its predictive power. None of the variables in this model are significant. The -2LL score is 94,217 versus 105,445 after adding the predictor variables. This model is better in predicting willingness to buy with the predictor variables included than it was before the predictor variables were included.

The Cox & Snell R² and the Nagelkerke R² are respectively 0,081 and 0,148 which means that predictor variables badly predict the outcome of the model. Hosmer and Lemeshow test show a badly fit of the model with a Chi² of 6,105 for 8 degrees of freedom and a significance of 0,635.

4.3 Results

For each model, the results will be discussed by pointing out the most important indicators from the output in SPSS. The green marked faces in figures 9, 10 and 11 stand for the variables used in the analysis. The constant (β) and the predictor variables will be discussed in relation to the hypotheses. As written above, the size of the sample is somewhat limited and for this reason an 0.10 alpha will be used for the significant tests. So all parameters will be considered as statistically significant with p-value <=0.10.

The SPSS output tables also include the Wald statistic, the standard error and the Ex(B).

For discussing the results and so examine the hypotheses, the estimation results of the full model (figure 9), the “Jeans” model (figure 10) and the “Headphones” model (figure 11) are needed:

Full model:

| **Variables in the Equation** | | | | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | | B | S.E. | Wald | df | Sig. | Exp(B) |
| Step 1a | Gender | -2,063 | ,911 | 5,133 | 1 | ,023 | ,127 |
| Age | -,119 | ,215 | ,306 | 1 | ,580 | ,888 |
| Monthlyincome | ,157 | ,198 | ,633 | 1 | ,426 | 1,170 |
| Education | ,242 | ,186 | 1,696 | 1 | ,193 | 1,274 |
| EarlyApproach | -,284 | ,470 | ,364 | 1 | ,546 | ,753 |
| CustomerOrient | -1,004 | ,555 | 3,272 | 1 | ,070 | ,367 |
| gen\_early | ,545 | ,912 | ,357 | 1 | ,550 | 1,724 |
| gen\_cor | 1,992 | ,973 | 4,189 | 1 | ,041 | 7,331 |
| Constant | -2,336 | 1,263 | 3,418 | 1 | ,064 | ,097 |
| a. Variable(s) entered on step 1: Gender, Age, Monthlyincome, Education, EarlyApproach, CustomerOrient, gen\_early, gen\_cor. | | | | | | | |

**Figure 9:** Estimation results for full model

“Jeans” model:

| **Variables in the Equation** | | | | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | | B | S.E. | Wald | df | Sig. | Exp(B) |
| Step 1a | Gender | -1,086 | 1,096 | ,983 | 1 | ,321 | ,337 |
| Age | -,124 | ,304 | ,167 | 1 | ,683 | ,883 |
| Monthlyincome | -,035 | ,295 | ,014 | 1 | ,907 | ,966 |
| Education | ,371 | ,279 | 1,768 | 1 | ,184 | 1,449 |
| EarlyApproach | ,095 | ,715 | ,018 | 1 | ,894 | 1,100 |
| CustomerOrient | -1,536 | ,843 | 3,320 | 1 | ,068 | ,215 |
| gen\_early | ,204 | 1,215 | ,028 | 1 | ,867 | 1,226 |
| gen\_cor | 1,628 | 1,210 | 1,809 | 1 | ,179 | 5,095 |
| Constant | -2,478 | 1,866 | 1,765 | 1 | ,184 | ,084 |
| a. Variable(s) entered on step 1: Gender, Age, Monthlyincome, Education, EarlyApproach, CustomerOrient, gen\_early, gen\_cor.  **Figure 10:** Estimation results for “Jeans” model | | | | | | | |

“Headphones” model:

| **Variables in the Equation** | | | | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | | B | S.E. | Wald | df | Sig. | Exp(B) |
| Step 1a | Gender | -20,394 | 8735,358 | ,000 | 1 | ,998 | ,000 |
| Age | -,058 | ,316 | ,034 | 1 | ,854 | ,943 |
| Monthlyincome | ,309 | ,278 | 1,235 | 1 | ,266 | 1,362 |
| Education | ,144 | ,255 | ,321 | 1 | ,571 | 1,155 |
| EarlyApproach | -,621 | ,644 | ,930 | 1 | ,335 | ,537 |
| CustomerOrient | -,534 | ,772 | ,479 | 1 | ,489 | ,586 |
| gen\_early | ,731 | 1,517 | ,232 | 1 | ,630 | 2,078 |
| gen\_cor | 19,814 | 8735,358 | ,000 | 1 | ,998 | 4,027E8 |
| Constant | -2,424 | 1,785 | 1,843 | 1 | ,175 | ,089 |
| a. Variable(s) entered on step 1: Gender, Age, Monthlyincome, Education, EarlyApproach, CustomerOrient, gen\_early, gen\_cor. | | | | | | | |

**Figure 11:** Estimation results for “Headphones” model

**[H1]** *Approaching a customer in the late stage of their shopping progresses will lead to a higher willingness to buy a new product by a customer than approaching a customer in the early stage of their shopping progresses.*

By looking at the estimation results of the three models, we can see if H1 has to be rejected or not. For the full model, a Beta of -2,84 for EarlyApproach would explain a loss by 2,84 for willingness to buy when a customer is approached early. Although this would suggest that H1 is true (approaching a customer in the late stage will lead to a higher willingness to buy than approaching a customer in the early stage), the variable of EarlyApproach is not significant (p=0,546, p>0,1). The non significant value of EarlyApproach means a rejection of H1. For the “Jeans” model, a Beta of 0,095 for EarlyApproach would explain an increase by 0,095 for willingness to buy when a customer is approached early. This would suggest that H1 has to be rejected (approaching a customer in the late stage will lead to a higher willingness to buy than approaching a customer in the early stage). The variable of EarlyApproach is not significant (p=0,894, p>0,1), so the non-significant value of EarlyApproach means that H1 has to be rejected anyway. For the “Headphones” model, a Beta of -0,621 for EarlyApproach would explain a loss by 0,621 for willingness to buy when a customer is approached early. Although this would suggest that H1 is true (approaching a customer in the late stage will lead to a higher willingness to buy than approaching a customer in the early stage), the variable of EarlyApproach is not significant (p=0,335, p>0,1). The non significant value of EarlyApproach means a rejection of H1.

For all three models, the EarlyApproach variable is not significant, so H1 has to be rejected.

**[H2]** *When the approaching employee has a sales orientation, approaching a customer leads to lower willingness to buy than when the approaching employee has a customer orientation.*

By looking at the estimation results of the three models, we can see if H2 has to be rejected or not. For the full model, a Beta of -1,004 for CustomerOrient would suggest a loss for willingness to buy of 0, 1,004 when an approaching employee has a customer orientation. The CustomerOrient variable is significant (p=0,070, P<0,1). This means H2 will be rejected for the full model, because when the approaching employee has a sales orientation, approaching a customer leads to higher willingness to buy than when the approaching employee has a customer orientation. For the “Jeans” model, a Beta of -1,536 for CustomerOrient would suggest a loss for willingness to buy of 1,536 when an approaching employee has a customer orientation. The CustomerOrient variable is significant (p=0,068, P<0,1). This means H2 will be rejected for the “Jeans” model, because when the approaching employee has a sales orientation, approaching a customer leads to higher willingness to buy than when the approaching employee has a customer orientation. For the “Headphones” model, a Beta of -0,534 for CustomerOrient would suggest a loss for willingness to buy of 0,534 when an approaching employee has a customer orientation. This means H2 will be rejected for the “Headphones” model, because when the approaching employee has a sales orientation, approaching a customer leads to higher willingness to buy than when the approaching employee has a customer orientation. The CustomerOrient variable is not significant (p=0,489, P>0,1), so the non significant value of CustomerOrient means that H2 has to be rejected any way for the “Headphones” model.

H2 has to be rejected for the three models.

**[H3a]** *When a male customer is approached by a sales oriented employee, his willingness to buy decreases less than when a female customer is approached by a sales oriented employee.*

The following regression is applicable:

Pi(Y)= B0 +B1\*Gender+B2\*CustomerOrient+B3\*Gen\_Cor+e

By looking at the estimation results of the three models, we can see if H3a has to be rejected or not. Figure 9 shows that variables Gender, CustomerOrient and Gen\_Cor for the full model are significant. For sales oriented, the B of CustomerOrient is 0. For male, the B of Gender is 0. This means that when a male customer is approached by a sales oriented employee, his willingness to buy will not change. For female, the B of Gender is 1. The beta for Gender is -2,063, so this means when a female customer is approached by a sales oriented employee, her willingness to buy will decrease. H3a will not been rejected. Figure 10 shows that only variable CustomerOrient for the “Jeans” model is significant. This means that the gender of a customer is not of an influence on the willingness to buy. H3a will be rejected. Figure 11 shows none of the concerned variables for the “Headphones” model are significant. This means H3a will be rejected.

H3a will not be rejected for the full model, but H3a will be rejected for the “Jeans” model and the “Headphones” model.

**[H3b]** *When a male customer is approached by a customer oriented employee, his willingness to buy increases more than when a female customer is approached by a customer oriented employee.*

The following regression is applicable:

Pi(Y)= B0 +B1\*Gender+B2\*CustomerOrient+B3\*Gen\_Cor+e

By looking at the estimation results of the three models, we can see if H3b has to be rejected or not. Figure 9 shows that variables Gender, CustomerOrient and Gen\_Cor are significant. For sales oriented, the B of CustomerOrient is 1. For male, the B of Gender is 0. This means that when a male customer is approached by a sales oriented employee, his willingness to buy will decrease by 1,004 (CustomerOrient -1,004). For female, the B of Gender is 1. This means her willingness to buy will decrease by 1,075 (Gender (-2,063) + CustomerOrient (-1,004) + Gen\_Cor(1,992)). This means when a male customer is approached by a customer oriented employee, his willingness to buy decreases less than when a female customer is approached by a customer oriented employee. H3b will be rejected. Figure 10 shows that only variable CustomerOrient for the “Jeans” model is significant. This means that the gender of a customer is not of an influence on the willingness to buy. H3b will be rejected. Figure 11 shows none of the concerned variables for the “Headphones” model are significant. This means H3b will be rejected.

H3b has to be rejected for all the three models.

**[H4a]** *When a male customer is approached in the early stage of his shopping progresses, his willingness to buy will decrease more than when a female customer is approached in the early stage of his shopping progresses.*

The following regression is applicable:

Pi(Y)= B0 +B1\*Gender+B2\*EarlyApproach+B3\*Gen\_Early+e

By looking at the estimation results of the three models, we can see if H6a has to be rejected or not. Figure 9 shows only variable Gender for the full model is significant. This means only the variable Gender is of influence on the willingness to buy. The beta for Gender is -2,063, so this means when a female customer is approached by in the early stage of her shopping progresses, her willingness to buy will decrease more (decrease of 2,063) than when a male customer is approached in the early stage of his shopping progresses (decrease of 0). This means H4a will be rejected.

Figure 10 shows none of the concerned variables for the “Jeans” model are significant. This means H4a will be rejected. Figure 11 shows none of the concerned variables for the “Headphones” model are significant. This means H4a will be rejected.

H4a has to be rejected for all the three models.

**[H4b]** *When a male customer is approached in the late stage of his shopping progresses, his willingness to buy will increase more than when female customer is approached in the late stage of his shopping progresses.*

The following regression is applicable:

Pi(Y)= B0 +B1\*Gender+B2\*EarlyApproach+B3\*Gen\_Early+e

By looking at the estimation results of the three models, we can see if H4b has to be rejected or not. Figure 9 shows only variable Gender for the full model is significant. This means only the variable Gender is of influence on the willingness to buy. The beta for Gender is -2,063, so this means when a female customer is approached by in the late stage of her shopping progresses, her willingness to buy will decrease more (decrease of 2,063) than when a male customer is approached in the late stage of his shopping progresses (decrease of 0). This means H4b will be rejected.

Figure 10 shows none of the concerned variables for the “Jeans” model are significant. This means H4b will be rejected. Figure 11 shows none of the concerned variables for the “Headphones” model are significant. This means H4b will be rejected.

H4b has to be rejected for all the three models.

# Conclusions

After describing the analysis and the results, this chapter will be devoted to discuss the main findings, managerial implications and the limitations of the results.

5.1 Conclusions

As stated earlier, goal of my research was to determine what effects employees have on the willingness to buy of a customer during their buying progresses. The focus was on willingness to buy a new product at a fashion store.

The effect of time of approaching a customer in a retail store on the willingness to buy of that customer was examined. Approach time was not measured in actual time, but in an early versus late stage of customers shopping progresses. Because the values for the estimation results of the variables for the approach time are not significant at the three models, the influence of approach time cannot be determined. This might mean that customers do not want to be approached or that customers want to be approached in a ‘medium’ stage of their shopping progresses.

The effect of customer orientation of an employee in a retail store on the willingness to buy of a customer was examined. This was measured in customer orientation versus sales orientation by an employee. Concluded in this research for shopping for a new product in general and shopping for a new product in a fashion store can be that when the approaching employee has a sales orientation, approaching a customer leads to higher willingness to buy than when the approaching employee has a customer orientation. For the “Headphones” model, we cannot determine an influence of the orientation of the orientation of the employee towards a customer. This might mean that the customer orientation of an employee does not affect customers in stores where they sell these products.

In this research, gender as a moderator effect was examined on the effects of approach time and customer orientation on the willingness to buy of a customer. For the moderator effect of gender on the effect of the customer orientation of an employee on the willingness to buy of a customer there is a significant difference between male and female. In general, when a male customer is approached by a sales oriented employee, his willingness to buy will decrease less than when a female customer is approached by a sales oriented employee. This does not apply for buying jeans or headphones. We can also conclude that when a male or female customer is approached by a customer oriented employee, their willingness to buy will decrease. We also can conclude that when a male customer is approached by a customer oriented employee, his willingness to buy decreases more than when a female customer is approached by a customer oriented employee.

When looking at the moderating effect of gender on the direct effect of time of approach by an employee on the willingness to buy of a customer, the only significant estimated variable is that of gender in the full model. Because the values for the estimation results of the variables for the approach time are not significant at the three models, the influence of approach time cannot be determined. This also means that the moderating effect of gender cannot be determined either.

5.2 Implication

From this research the following managerial implications within a fashion retail setting can be derived.

When a customer visits a fashion retail store to buy a new product, these customers can be better approached by an employee with sales orientation than an employee with customer orientation. If an employee also considers their orientation by looking at the gender of the customer, a male customer can better be approached by an employee with sales orientation and a female customer can better be approached by an employee with customer orientation. In this research, the estimated variable of customer orientation is negative, so this could suggest that it might be better not approaching customers at all. In that case, managers might consider not approaching customers at all and let employee function as a people who only help customers when asked.

Time of approach in terms of early versus late stage of the shopping progresses on customers is not considered to be of an influence on the willingness to buy of customers. In this case, managers might consider to approach customers in a ‘medium’ stage of their shopping progresses or managers might consider not approaching customers at all and let employee function as a people who only help customers when asked. The ‘medium’ stage is the time between the early stage and the late stage of a customers’ shopping progresses.

5.3 Limitations

In the first place, the willingness to buy of customers is a far more complex study than shown in this research. There are far more variables which influences a customers’ willingness to buy than the ones I investigated. The output of the logistic regression models show that few variables are significant (The precise willingness to buy of a customer can never be explained fully).

Second, the variable ‘timing of approach’ is measured by comparing an early stage of entry with a late stage of entry at a store. This means I didn’t investigate timing in actual time, but in early stage versus late stage. In this way there is not an outcome in optimal timing, but only in approaching a customer in the early stage of their shopping progresses or approaching a customer in the late stage of their shopping progresses.

Third, the data gathered is based on four online randomized surveys. One of the surveys has been filled in a lot more than the other three because of a mistake by putting the url online. This fault was encountered the same evening, but still the survey has been filled in more. This can give a somewhat distorted image of the outcomes, but if one compares the four different groups, group three is not specifically different.

Fourth, the randomized surveys are mostly filled in by students, friends, family and acquaintances. This is why some descriptive statistics are very similar within groups and among groups. This might have a slight effect on the outcomes because of demographic similarities.

5.4 Future research

Within this subject of customers willingness to buy and what drives that willingness to buy, there can be done a lot of research in the future. In this research, the focus was on the willingness to buy a new product in a fashion retail store. We looked at the time of approach of the employee and the type of orientation of the employee. The gender of customers was considered as an influence moderator effect on the direct effects on willingness to buy (time of approach and orientation of the employee).

Future research can be focused on different types of stores, but also other factors can be included as for example factors that explain what drives a customer. In the buying progresses of customers there are a lot of factors of influence of the outcome to be willing to buy a product or not. These factors can be observed and unobserved. Also for the time of approach, this factor can be extended to actual time of approach. This means that the time of approach can be measured in actual time instead of an early versus late stage of shopping progresses.

The willingness to buy of customers is very complex and is the result of a behavioral and psychological process. I therefore think there has to be done a lot of research in the future to come to a more profound insight in the behavioral and psychological process of willingness to buy of customers.
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# Appendices

7.1 Frequency tables full model:

| 1. **Gender** | | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
| Valid | 0 | 81 | 60,9 | 60,9 | 60,9 |
| 1 | 52 | 39,1 | 39,1 | 100,0 |
| Total | 133 | 100,0 | 100,0 |  |

| 1. **Age** | | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
| Valid | 1 | 69 | 51,9 | 51,9 | 51,9 |
| 2 | 17 | 12,8 | 12,8 | 64,7 |
| 3 | 15 | 11,3 | 11,3 | 75,9 |
| 4 | 32 | 24,1 | 24,1 | 100,0 |
| Total | 133 | 100,0 | 100,0 |  |

| 1. **Monthly income** | | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
| Valid | 0 | 1 | ,8 | ,8 | ,8 |
| 1 | 25 | 18,8 | 18,8 | 19,5 |
| 2 | 29 | 21,8 | 21,8 | 41,4 |
| 3 | 30 | 22,6 | 22,6 | 63,9 |
| 4 | 35 | 26,3 | 26,3 | 90,2 |
| 5 | 13 | 9,8 | 9,8 | 100,0 |
| Total | 133 | 100,0 | 100,0 |  |

| 1. **Education** | | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
| Valid | 1 | 1 | ,8 | ,8 | ,8 |
| 2 | 7 | 5,3 | 5,3 | 6,0 |
| 3 | 5 | 3,8 | 3,8 | 9,8 |
| 4 | 62 | 46,6 | 46,6 | 56,4 |
| 5 | 20 | 15,0 | 15,0 | 71,4 |
| 6 | 38 | 28,6 | 28,6 | 100,0 |
| Total | 133 | 100,0 | 100,0 |  |

7.2 Frequency tables per group:

**Group 1:**

| 1. **Gender** | | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
| Valid | 0 | 14 | 63,6 | 63,6 | 63,6 |
| 1 | 8 | 36,4 | 36,4 | 100,0 |
| Total | 22 | 100,0 | 100,0 |  |

| 1. **Age** | | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
| Valid | 1 | 13 | 59,1 | 59,1 | 59,1 |
| 2 | 3 | 13,6 | 13,6 | 72,7 |
| 3 | 2 | 9,1 | 9,1 | 81,8 |
| 4 | 4 | 18,2 | 18,2 | 100,0 |
| Total | 22 | 100,0 | 100,0 |  |

| 1. **Monthly income** | | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
| Valid | 1 | 6 | 27,3 | 27,3 | 27,3 |
| 2 | 4 | 18,2 | 18,2 | 45,5 |
| 3 | 3 | 13,6 | 13,6 | 59,1 |
| 4 | 6 | 27,3 | 27,3 | 86,4 |
| 5 | 3 | 13,6 | 13,6 | 100,0 |
| Total | 22 | 100,0 | 100,0 |  |

| 1. **Education** | | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
| Valid | 2 | 1 | 4,5 | 4,5 | 4,5 |
| 4 | 13 | 59,1 | 59,1 | 63,6 |
| 5 | 1 | 4,5 | 4,5 | 68,2 |
| 6 | 7 | 31,8 | 31,8 | 100,0 |
| Total | 22 | 100,0 | 100,0 |  |

**Group 2:**

| 1. **Gender** | | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
| Valid | 0 | 23 | 71,9 | 71,9 | 71,9 |
| 1 | 9 | 28,1 | 28,1 | 100,0 |
| Total | 32 | 100,0 | 100,0 |  |

| 1. **Age** | | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
| Valid | 1 | 9 | 28,1 | 28,1 | 28,1 |
| 2 | 5 | 15,6 | 15,6 | 43,8 |
| 3 | 3 | 9,4 | 9,4 | 53,1 |
| 4 | 15 | 46,9 | 46,9 | 100,0 |
| Total | 32 | 100,0 | 100,0 |  |

| 1. **Monthly income** | | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
| Valid | 1 | 1 | 3,1 | 3,1 | 3,1 |
| 2 | 4 | 12,5 | 12,5 | 15,6 |
| 3 | 11 | 34,4 | 34,4 | 50,0 |
| 4 | 12 | 37,5 | 37,5 | 87,5 |
| 5 | 4 | 12,5 | 12,5 | 100,0 |
| Total | 32 | 100,0 | 100,0 |  |

| 1. **Education** | | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
| Valid | 2 | 1 | 3,1 | 3,1 | 3,1 |
| 4 | 22 | 68,8 | 68,8 | 71,9 |
| 5 | 1 | 3,1 | 3,1 | 75,0 |
| 6 | 8 | 25,0 | 25,0 | 100,0 |
| Total | 32 | 100,0 | 100,0 |  |

**Group 3:**

| 1. **Gender** | | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
| Valid | 0 | 32 | 58,2 | 58,2 | 58,2 |
| 1 | 23 | 41,8 | 41,8 | 100,0 |
| Total | 55 | 100,0 | 100,0 |  |

| 1. **Age** | | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
| Valid | 1 | 45 | 81,8 | 81,8 | 81,8 |
| 2 | 6 | 10,9 | 10,9 | 92,7 |
| 3 | 3 | 5,5 | 5,5 | 98,2 |
| 4 | 1 | 1,8 | 1,8 | 100,0 |
| Total | 55 | 100,0 | 100,0 |  |

| 1. **Monthly income** | | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
| Valid | 1 | 18 | 32,7 | 32,7 | 32,7 |
| 2 | 20 | 36,4 | 36,4 | 69,1 |
| 3 | 11 | 20,0 | 20,0 | 89,1 |
| 4 | 4 | 7,3 | 7,3 | 96,4 |
| 5 | 2 | 3,6 | 3,6 | 100,0 |
| Total | 55 | 100,0 | 100,0 |  |

| 1. **Education** | | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
| Valid | 1 | 1 | 1,8 | 1,8 | 1,8 |
| 2 | 5 | 9,1 | 9,1 | 10,9 |
| 3 | 3 | 5,5 | 5,5 | 16,4 |
| 4 | 13 | 23,6 | 23,6 | 40,0 |
| 5 | 11 | 20,0 | 20,0 | 60,0 |
| 6 | 22 | 40,0 | 40,0 | 100,0 |
| Total | 55 | 100,0 | 100,0 |  |

**Group 4:**

| 1. **Gender** | | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
| Valid | 0 | 12 | 50,0 | 50,0 | 50,0 |
| 1 | 12 | 50,0 | 50,0 | 100,0 |
| Total | 24 | 100,0 | 100,0 |  |

| 1. **Age** | | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
| Valid | 1 | 2 | 8,3 | 8,3 | 8,3 |
| 2 | 3 | 12,5 | 12,5 | 20,8 |
| 3 | 7 | 29,2 | 29,2 | 50,0 |
| 4 | 12 | 50,0 | 50,0 | 100,0 |
| Total | 24 | 100,0 | 100,0 |  |

| 1. **Monthly income** | | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
| Valid | 0 | 1 | 4,2 | 4,2 | 4,2 |
| 2 | 1 | 4,2 | 4,2 | 8,3 |
| 3 | 5 | 20,8 | 20,8 | 29,2 |
| 4 | 13 | 54,2 | 54,2 | 83,3 |
| 5 | 4 | 16,7 | 16,7 | 100,0 |
| Total | 24 | 100,0 | 100,0 |  |

| 1. **Education** | | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
| Valid | 3 | 2 | 8,3 | 8,3 | 8,3 |
| 4 | 14 | 58,3 | 58,3 | 66,7 |
| 5 | 7 | 29,2 | 29,2 | 95,8 |
| 6 | 1 | 4,2 | 4,2 | 100,0 |
| Total | 24 | 100,0 | 100,0 |  |

7.3 Logistic Regression

Full model:

| **Case Processing Summary** | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Unweighted Casesa | | N | Percent |
| Selected Cases | Included in Analysis | 266 | 100,0 |
| Missing Cases | 0 | ,0 |
| Total | 266 | 100,0 |
| Unselected Cases | | 0 | ,0 |
| Total | | 266 | 100,0 |
| a. If weight is in effect, see classification table for the total number of cases. | | | |

| **Dependent Variable Encoding** | | |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Original Value | | Internal Value |
| dimension0 | ,00 | 0 |
| 1,00 | 1 |

*Block 0: Beginning Block*

| **Classification Tablea,b** | | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Observed | | Predicted | | |
|  | WTBuy | | Percentage Correct |
|  | ,00 | 1,00 |
| Step 0 | WTBuy | ,00 | 230 | 0 | 100,0 |
| 1,00 | 36 | 0 | ,0 |
| Overall Percentage | |  |  | 86,5 |
| a. Constant is included in the model. | | | | | |
| b. The cut value is ,500 | | | | | |

| **Variables in the Equation** | | | | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | | B | S.E. | Wald | df | Sig. | Exp(B) |
| Step 0 | Constant | -1,855 | ,179 | 107,061 | 1 | ,000 | ,157 |

| **Variables not in the Equation** | | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | | | Score | df | Sig. |
| Step 0 | Variables | Gender | 3,475 | 1 | ,062 |
| Age | ,034 | 1 | ,854 |
| Monthlyincome | ,600 | 1 | ,439 |
| Education | 1,201 | 1 | ,273 |
| EarlyApproach | ,255 | 1 | ,614 |
| CustomerOrient | 1,065 | 1 | ,302 |
| gen\_early | ,739 | 1 | ,390 |
| gen\_cor | ,348 | 1 | ,555 |
| Overall Statistics | | 10,820 | 8 | ,212 |

*Block 1: Method = Enter*

| **Omnibus Tests of Model Coefficients** | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | | Chi-square | df | Sig. |
| Step 1 | Step | 11,120 | 8 | ,195 |
| Block | 11,120 | 8 | ,195 |
| Model | 11,120 | 8 | ,195 |

| **Model Summary** | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Step | -2 Log likelihood | Cox & Snell R Square | Nagelkerke R Square |
| 1 | 199,770a | ,041 | ,075 |
| a. Estimation terminated at iteration number 6 because parameter estimates changed by less than ,001. | | | |

| **Hosmer and Lemeshow Test** | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Step | Chi-square | df | Sig. |
| 1 | 10,927 | 8 | ,206 |

| **Classification Tablea** | | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Observed | | Predicted | | |
|  | WTBuy | | Percentage Correct |
|  | ,00 | 1,00 |
| Step 1 | WTBuy | ,00 | 230 | 0 | 100,0 |
| 1,00 | 36 | 0 | ,0 |
| Overall Percentage | |  |  | 86,5 |
| a. The cut value is ,500 | | | | | |

| **Variables in the Equation** | | | | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | | B | S.E. | Wald | df | Sig. | Exp(B) |
| Step 1a | Gender | -2,063 | ,911 | 5,133 | 1 | ,023 | ,127 |
| Age | -,119 | ,215 | ,306 | 1 | ,580 | ,888 |
| Monthlyincome | ,157 | ,198 | ,633 | 1 | ,426 | 1,170 |
| Education | ,242 | ,186 | 1,696 | 1 | ,193 | 1,274 |
| EarlyApproach | -,284 | ,470 | ,364 | 1 | ,546 | ,753 |
| CustomerOrient | -1,004 | ,555 | 3,272 | 1 | ,070 | ,367 |
| gen\_early | ,545 | ,912 | ,357 | 1 | ,550 | 1,724 |
| gen\_cor | 1,992 | ,973 | 4,189 | 1 | ,041 | 7,331 |
| Constant | -2,336 | 1,263 | 3,418 | 1 | ,064 | ,097 |
| a. Variable(s) entered on step 1: Gender, Age, Monthlyincome, Education, EarlyApproach, CustomerOrient, gen\_early, gen\_cor. | | | | | | | |

Jeans:

| **Case Processing Summary** | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Unweighted Casesa | | N | Percent |
| Selected Cases | Included in Analysis | 133 | 100,0 |
| Missing Cases | 0 | ,0 |
| Total | 133 | 100,0 |
| Unselected Cases | | 0 | ,0 |
| Total | | 133 | 100,0 |
| a. If weight is in effect, see classification table for the total number of cases. | | | |

| **Dependent Variable Encoding** | | |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Original Value | | Internal Value |
| dimension0 | ,00 | 0 |
| 1,00 | 1 |

*Block 0: Beginning Block*

| **Classification Tablea,b** | | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Observed | | Predicted | | |
|  | WTBuy | | Percentage Correct |
|  | ,00 | 1,00 |
| Step 0 | WTBuy | ,00 | 115 | 0 | 100,0 |
| 1,00 | 18 | 0 | ,0 |
| Overall Percentage | |  |  | 86,5 |
| a. Constant is included in the model. | | | | | |
| b. The cut value is ,500 | | | | | |

| **Variables in the Equation** | | | | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | | B | S.E. | Wald | df | Sig. | Exp(B) |
| Step 0 | Constant | -1,855 | ,253 | 53,530 | 1 | ,000 | ,157 |

| **Variables not in the Equation** | | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | | | Score | df | Sig. |
| Step 0 | Variables | Gender | ,291 | 1 | ,590 |
| Age | ,005 | 1 | ,943 |
| Monthlyincome | ,003 | 1 | ,954 |
| Education | 1,771 | 1 | ,183 |
| EarlyApproach | ,762 | 1 | ,383 |
| CustomerOrient | 1,545 | 1 | ,214 |
| gen\_early | ,052 | 1 | ,819 |
| gen\_cor | ,014 | 1 | ,907 |
| Overall Statistics | | 6,833 | 8 | ,555 |

*Block 1: Method = Enter*

| **Omnibus Tests of Model Coefficients** | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | | Chi-square | df | Sig. |
| Step 1 | Step | 6,759 | 8 | ,563 |
| Block | 6,759 | 8 | ,563 |
| Model | 6,759 | 8 | ,563 |

| **Model Summary** | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Step | -2 Log likelihood | Cox & Snell R Square | Nagelkerke R Square |
| 1 | 98,686a | ,050 | ,091 |
| a. Estimation terminated at iteration number 5 because parameter estimates changed by less than ,001. | | | |

| **Hosmer and Lemeshow Test** | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Step | Chi-square | df | Sig. |
| 1 | 7,801 | 8 | ,453 |

| **Classification Tablea** | | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Observed | | Predicted | | |
|  | WTBuy | | Percentage Correct |
|  | ,00 | 1,00 |
| Step 1 | WTBuy | ,00 | 115 | 0 | 100,0 |
| 1,00 | 18 | 0 | ,0 |
| Overall Percentage | |  |  | 86,5 |
| a. The cut value is ,500 | | | | | |

| **Variables in the Equation** | | | | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | | B | S.E. | Wald | df | Sig. | Exp(B) |
| Step 1a | Gender | -1,086 | 1,096 | ,983 | 1 | ,321 | ,337 |
| Age | -,124 | ,304 | ,167 | 1 | ,683 | ,883 |
| Monthlyincome | -,035 | ,295 | ,014 | 1 | ,907 | ,966 |
| Education | ,371 | ,279 | 1,768 | 1 | ,184 | 1,449 |
| EarlyApproach | ,095 | ,715 | ,018 | 1 | ,894 | 1,100 |
| CustomerOrient | -1,536 | ,843 | 3,320 | 1 | ,068 | ,215 |
| gen\_early | ,204 | 1,215 | ,028 | 1 | ,867 | 1,226 |
| gen\_cor | 1,628 | 1,210 | 1,809 | 1 | ,179 | 5,095 |
| Constant | -2,478 | 1,866 | 1,765 | 1 | ,184 | ,084 |
| a. Variable(s) entered on step 1: Gender, Age, Monthlyincome, Education, EarlyApproach, CustomerOrient, gen\_early, gen\_cor. | | | | | | | |

Headphones:

| **Case Processing Summary** | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Unweighted Casesa | | N | Percent |
| Selected Cases | Included in Analysis | 133 | 100,0 |
| Missing Cases | 0 | ,0 |
| Total | 133 | 100,0 |
| Unselected Cases | | 0 | ,0 |
| Total | | 133 | 100,0 |
| a. If weight is in effect, see classification table for the total number of cases. | | | |

| **Dependent Variable Encoding** | | |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Original Value | | Internal Value |
| dimension0 | ,00 | 0 |
| 1,00 | 1 |

*Block 0: Beginning Block*

| **Classification Tablea,b** | | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Observed | | Predicted | | |
|  | WTBuy | | Percentage Correct |
|  | ,00 | 1,00 |
| Step 0 | WTBuy | ,00 | 115 | 0 | 100,0 |
| 1,00 | 18 | 0 | ,0 |
| Overall Percentage | |  |  | 86,5 |
| a. Constant is included in the model. | | | | | |
| b. The cut value is ,500 | | | | | |

| **Variables in the Equation** | | | | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | | B | S.E. | Wald | df | Sig. | Exp(B) |
| Step 0 | Constant | -1,855 | ,253 | 53,530 | 1 | ,000 | ,157 |

| **Variables not in the Equation** | | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | | | Score | df | Sig. |
| Step 0 | Variables | Gender | 4,399 | 1 | ,036 |
| Age | ,110 | 1 | ,741 |
| Monthlyincome | 1,316 | 1 | ,251 |
| Education | ,048 | 1 | ,827 |
| EarlyApproach | ,025 | 1 | ,874 |
| CustomerOrient | ,047 | 1 | ,829 |
| gen\_early | ,975 | 1 | ,323 |
| gen\_cor | ,514 | 1 | ,474 |
| Overall Statistics | | 8,920 | 8 | ,349 |

*Block 1: Method = Enter*

| **Omnibus Tests of Model Coefficients** | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | | Chi-square | df | Sig. |
| Step 1 | Step | 11,228 | 8 | ,189 |
| Block | 11,228 | 8 | ,189 |
| Model | 11,228 | 8 | ,189 |

| **Model Summary** | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Step | -2 Log likelihood | Cox & Snell R Square | Nagelkerke R Square |
| 1 | 94,217a | ,081 | ,148 |
| a. Estimation terminated at iteration number 20 because maximum iterations has been reached. Final solution cannot be found. | | | |

| **Hosmer and Lemeshow Test** | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Step | Chi-square | df | Sig. |
| 1 | 6,105 | 8 | ,635 |

| **Classification Tablea** | | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Observed | | Predicted | | |
|  | WTBuy | | Percentage Correct |
|  | ,00 | 1,00 |
| Step 1 | WTBuy | ,00 | 115 | 0 | 100,0 |
| 1,00 | 18 | 0 | ,0 |
| Overall Percentage | |  |  | 86,5 |
| a. The cut value is ,500 | | | | | |

| **Variables in the Equation** | | | | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | | B | S.E. | Wald | df | Sig. | Exp(B) |
| Step 1a | Gender | -20,394 | 8735,358 | ,000 | 1 | ,998 | ,000 |
| Age | -,058 | ,316 | ,034 | 1 | ,854 | ,943 |
| Monthlyincome | ,309 | ,278 | 1,235 | 1 | ,266 | 1,362 |
| Education | ,144 | ,255 | ,321 | 1 | ,571 | 1,155 |
| EarlyApproach | -,621 | ,644 | ,930 | 1 | ,335 | ,537 |
| CustomerOrient | -,534 | ,772 | ,479 | 1 | ,489 | ,586 |
| gen\_early | ,731 | 1,517 | ,232 | 1 | ,630 | 2,078 |
| gen\_cor | 19,814 | 8735,358 | ,000 | 1 | ,998 | 4,027E8 |
| Constant | -2,424 | 1,785 | 1,843 | 1 | ,175 | ,089 |
| a. Variable(s) entered on step 1: Gender, Age, Monthlyincome, Education, EarlyApproach, CustomerOrient, gen\_early, gen\_cor. | | | | | | | |
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