



International Journal of Applied Business and Economic Research

ISSN : 0972-7302

available at <http://www.serialsjournals.com>

© Serials Publications Pvt. Ltd.

Volume 15 • Number 22 (Part 2) • 2017

Shopper Typology of Generation Y Consumer in India

Sujata Khandai¹, Bhawna Agarwal², Chenedzai Mafini³ and Marillal Dhurup⁴

¹Professor (Marketing), Amity University Uttar Pradesh, Noida, India. Email: skbandai@amity.edu, sujata.kbandai@gmail.com

²Associate Professor (General Management), Amity University Uttar Pradesh, Noida, India. Email: bagarwal@amity.edu

³Professor (Marketing), Vaal University of Technology, Vanderbüllpark, South Africa. Email: chenedzaim@vut.ac.za

⁴Associate Professor (Marketing), Vaal University of Technology, Vanderbüllpark, South Africa. Email: royd@vut.ac.za

ABSTRACT

Introduction: The population representing the Generation Y is a force to be reckoned with in India, with one third of its population aged 30 or less. Hence, marketers have evinced a deep and abiding interest in understanding their shopping behavior .

Objective: This study is an attempt to investigate the different aspects of shopping styles of Generation Y Indian consumers.

Methodology: Data was collected by means of a mall intercept survey. Exploratory Factor Analysis was employed to identify the various shopping styles. Analysis of variance (ANOVA) was thereafter used to examine the influence of age on shopping styles. Multiple post-hoc comparisons using Tukey HSD and Bonferroni tests were conducted to determine the differences in shopping behavior between the age groups within the Generation Y cohort.

Findings: Seven shopping styles applicable to the Generation Y cohort was identified.

Originality/Value: A study of this nature to understand the shopping behavior of the Generation Y consumer, which constitutes such a large population, has not yet been conducted in India. An accurate understanding of buyer behavior of the Generation Y cohort may help marketers in designing appropriate marketing strategies which will further result in maximizing customer satisfaction.

Keywords: Consumer typology, Generation Y, Shopping styles, Shopping behaviour.

1. INTRODUCTION

A generation is a product of the current time and is uniquely shaped by technology, media, social markers and events (Van den Bergh & Behrer, 2011). Because each cohort travels through life together and

experiences similar events at a similar age, they can share a common social, political, historical and economic environment. Thus each generation has unique expectations, experiences, generational history, lifestyle, values and demographics that influence their buying behavior (Williams & Page, 2011). Generation theorists propose that macro environment changes bring with them significant and distinct changes in consumer behavior patterns (Strauss & Howie, 1999). So, cohort generations share a common and distinct social character shaped by their experiences through time (Schewe & Noble, 2000). There are no precise dates when the generation starts and ends. Researchers and commentators use birth years ranging from the early 1980s to the early 2000s and in 2015 are aged somewhere between 15 – 35 years. There are approximately 1.38 billion Generation Y in the world today (US Census Bureau, 2012).

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

Studies prove that Generation Yers today are in the marketplace with the numbers and purchasing power to have an unprecedented impact on most of the economies globally (Noble, Haytko, Phillips, 2009). This generation has been reared in a consumption driven society and has access to substantially more money than any teen group in history had (Morton 2002). Woolburg & Pokryvczynski (2001) describe Generation Y as the best educated and most culturally diverse generation in history, a combination which others believe has made this generation exceedingly tolerant and open-minded toward different lifestyles such as homosexuality, single parent households, etc (Morton 2002). This generation has grown up in a time of enormous and fast paced changes including virtually full employment opportunities for women, dual income households as standard, wide array of family types seen as normal, significant respect for ethnic and cultural diversity, a heightened social awareness and widespread use of computers at home and in schools (William & Page, 2011). Generation Y wants products and services that serve their functional needs as well as those that have a purpose and meaning. Hence, they support brands they perceive to be ethical, good for the environment and which are doing something positive for the future (Yarrow & O'Donnell, 2009). Ethical issues such as labor, mistreatment and animal abuse influence this generation's perception greatly (Van den Bergh & Behrer, 2011). Generation Yers use fashion brands as a way of creating identity (Jugessur & Cohen, 2004). Their individuality and image centricity make brand and product customization very important. They actively use fashion as one of the mediums to reflect their individuality. This generation demands the latest trends in record time and gets bored easily (Yarrow & O'Donnell, 2009).

Researchers have also delved into Gen Ys attitude towards advertising (Beard 2003), celebrity endorsers (Bush et. al., 2004; Stevens et. al., 2003), corporate sponsorship (Bennett & Lachowetz, 2004), ethical Internet-related behaviors (Firestone & Mitchell, 2004) and the media (Shaerer, 2002). Findings increasingly paint a portrait of a generation that is media and technology savvy and yet worldly enough to see through the many advertising tactics.

2.1. Generation Y or the Millennial Generation

Generation theorists propose that macro environment changes bring with them significant and distinct changes in consumer behavior patterns (Strauss & Howe, 1999). So, cohort generations share a common and distinct social character shaped by their experiences through time (Schewae & Noble, 2000). This is a generation that has lived through the age of internet, cable television, globalization, 9/11 and environmentalism. Such shared experiences during one's youth unite and shape a generation.

Generation Y, otherwise known as the Millennial Generation (born between early 1980s and 2000) has been bred on a diet of technology. This is a rather restless generation and also, the smartest, most globalised, collaborative, socially active and focused. This is also a generation which is easily distracted and hopelessly clueless one day and exhibits extreme determination and focus the next. Gen Y is packed with contradictions, a fact evident in everything from their social media activity and consumption patterns to how they respond to melting ice caps and economics. He is basically a complicated creature. His loyalty does not come easy or cheap and they are loyal to no one except to themselves. In India, especially, social media is driving an uneasy and sometimes, an all consuming fear of missing out. Millennials fear that their peers are in the know about or in possession of more or something better than them. Nearly seven in ten admit that any fear of missing out has been amplified by social media and more than six in ten say they get uneasy or nervous when they learn that their friends or peers are doing something they are not. When it comes to big ticket purchases, millennials still do consult and look for approval from their parents. In the USA, Generation Y represents 70 million people between the ages of 14 and 30. India's Generation Y population is 426 million and China has 218 million in that segment. The people belonging to Generation Y in India largely share similar characteristics like being open minded, ambitious, positive, confident, independent and at the same time they exhibit traits like being overly impatient, selfish, prefer quick money and do not significantly espouse Indian culture and values.

2.2. Consumer Decision Making Style

Kendall (1996) views this aspect of decision making style analysis to “basic consumer personality”. Consumer decision making style may be defined as “a mental orientation characterizing a consumer’s approach to making choices” (Sproles & Kendall, 1990). Decision making is the mental process by which a consumer makes choices. It is regarded as a basic consumer personality as it has cognitive and affective characteristics (Sproles & Kendall, 1986). On the basis of past research, consumer decision making styles can be categorized into three main approaches: the psychological lifestyle approach (Lastovicka, 1982), the consumer typology approach (Darden & Ashton, 1975; Moschis, 1976) and the consumer characteristic approach (Sproles 1985; Sproles & Kendall 1986; Sproles & Sproles, 1990). Sproles and Kendall (1986) identified eight mental characteristics of consumer decision making which include high quality consciousness, brand consciousness, novelty-fashion consciousness, hedonistic shopper consciousness, impulsiveness, confusion over choice of brands, stores and consumer information and habitual brand loyal orientation towards consumption. But this could not be generalized across all cultures as one of the major challenges in cross cultural research has always been the attainment of measurement equivalency (Hui & Triandis, 1985).

3. RESEARCH PROBLEM AND SIGNIFICANCE OF STUDY

Over the years, marketers have found it useful to identify general orientations towards shopping and buying (Bakewell & Mitchell, 2003). It is useful to marketers since it provides a quantitative instrument for classifying heterogeneous shopping styles into discrete categories of orientation. As a cohort, Generation Y has access to a vast amount of information and hence has grown to be a discernible shopper. As a result, this generation exhibits differing shopping orientations, thereby provoking the need for more extensive empirical introspection (Jin & Kim, 2003). Due to the widely differing circumstances, it is possible that

Generation Y consumers may have developed shopping styles that are different from those of previous generations (Ma & Neihm, 2006; Bakewell & Mitchell, 2003). Taking this into consideration, it is imperative to examine if the established shopping styles are applicable to Generation Y as well. Marketers are equally keen to understand the shopping styles of Generation Y as this segment constitutes a huge percentage of India's population today. Also, Generation Y constitutes a rather wide age group, spanning from 15 years to 35 years. It is possible that consumers belonging to different age groups within the cohort exhibit different shopping orientation. This study also aims to explore that aspect.

The current study seeks to ascertain the shopping styles applicable to Generation Y consumers in India and thereafter to determine whether the shopping styles of Generation Y consumers differs based on their age. The significance of this study lies in the fact that the findings may assist marketers to develop and implement strategies to meet the needs of Indian Generation Y consumers.

4. DATA COLLECTION

A self administered mall intercept survey was conducted in New Delhi, the capital city of India and its neighbouring suburbs. In India, mall intercept surveys may be regarded as a valuable method of collecting data because it is rather difficult to conduct telephone surveys as most potential respondents are not very responsive on phone. Questionnaires were administered by volunteers in three of the larger malls in the National Capital Region of Delhi. The survey was conducted over four consecutive weekends when each of the malls identified, experience the highest footfall. For the purpose of getting responses, the volunteer approached customers as they were leaving the mall and asked them to participate in the survey. A total of 300 questionnaires were filled by respondents. Since some respondents were in a hurry or filled in answers without serious consideration, 29 questionnaires were found to have missing data and so had to be discarded and hence a total of 271 questionnaires constituted the sample size. Of the 271 respondents, 65.3% were males and 34.7% were females. 67.2% of the sample were in the age group 16 – 20 years, 17.7% in the age group 21-25 years and 15.12% in the age bracket 25 – 30 years.

The questionnaire used to collect data was structured and of a self administered type. It was compiled using the Likert scale. The questionnaire was divided into two sections. Section A consisted of questions related to shopping styles. The product category indicated in the questionnaire to investigate shopping styles was fashion apparel. Section B elicited respondents' demographic information.

5. METHODOLOGY

Exploratory Factor Analysis was used to identify the shopping styles of Generation Y consumers. This statistical technique was used for the current study as there did not exist *a priori* hypothesis about the factors or patterns of measured variables (Malhotra 2009). Since the age of a Generation Yer spans from 15 years to 35 years, the imperative was to also study the impact of age on shopping behavior. ANOVA test was used to assess the impact of age on the shopping behavior. Further, to determine the differences in shopping behavior between the age groups within the Generation Y cohort, multiple post-hoc comparisons using Tukey HSD and Bonferroni tests were conducted.

To determine the suitability of data for factor analysis, the Bartlett's Test of Sphericity and Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy was conducted (Pett, Lackey & Sullivan, 2003). The Bartlett's

test of sphericity was significant at $p < 0.000$, from which it could be inferred that the data set was not an identity matrix with zero correlations and was suitable for factor analysis (Aldaign & Buttle, 2002). The KMO measure of sampling adequacy was 0.863 which implies that factor analysis is useful with the given data (Table 1).

Table 1
KMO and Bartlett's Test

KMO Measure of Sampling Adequacy		0.853
Bartlett's Test of Sphericity	Approx Chi-Square	4.975E3
	Df	990
	Significance	0.000

5.1. Shopping Behavior of the Generation Y Consumer

The percentage of variance explained, the scree plot and Eigen value criterion guided the extraction of factors. In addition, items that loaded heavily on more than one factor were eliminated and those items which had cross loading or low factor loading (< 0.5) were also eliminated. Eleven factors with Eigen value of more than one and with a cumulative percentage of 61.65% were extracted. From these eleven factors, only nine factors with a total percentage variance at 55.8% were retained as the last two factors were eliminated on account of low factor loading. Of these nine factors, only seven factors were considered meaningful as the Cronbach Alpha statistic for two of the nine factors was below acceptable limits. Eventually, these seven factors described the shopping behavior of Generation Y consumer.

The Cronbach Alpha test was conducted to assess the internal consistency of the instrument (Leo et. al, 2005). Reliability tests were conducted on all 45 items. All measures were adapted from highly reliable borrowed measures. Since borrowed scales measure the constructs in a new setting or the first time, the cut off value was fixed at 0.6. The items that had low or negative inter- correlation was deleted. The Cronbach Alpha coefficient of the nine factors ranged from 0.544 to 0.904. Since the cut off was 0.6, factors 7 and 9 were not taken into consideration for purpose of this study. All the other factors are above 0.6, indicating satisfactory levels of internal consistency in terms of reliability. The overall Cronbach Alpha coefficient stands at 0.912 which is above the accepted benchmark of 0.6 and thus considered satisfactory. From Table 2, it is evident that since factors 7 and 9 are below acceptable limits, the other seven factors are considered meaningful to describe shopping behavior of Generation Y consumer.

Table 2
Cronbach Alpha: Item Reliability Analysis

<i>Factor</i>	<i>Cronbach Alpha</i>	<i>Number of Items</i>
Factor 1	0.907	11
Factor 2	0.757	6
Factor 3	0.802	5
Factor 4	0.716	4
Factor 5	0.640	4
Factor 6	0.668	4

<i>Factor</i>	<i>Cronbach Alpha</i>	<i>Number of Items</i>
Factor 7	0.544	2
Factor 8	0.628	2
Factor 9	0.567	2
Overall factor	0.912	45

From Table 3, it is evident that the Generation Y cohort exhibits 7 shopping styles. The total variance explained by the extracted factors is 61.652%, indicating that the other 38.248% is accounted for by extraneous variables that do not constitute part of this study. The relatively high percentage of variance explained also serves to confirm construct validity within the scales used. The seven meaningful factors extracted include fashion conscious consumer, brand conscious consumer, hedonistic consumer, quality conscious consumer, novelty seeking consumer, consumer confused by over choice, and habitual/brand loyal consumer. Factor analysis was performed on each of the seven constructs to determine the percentage of variance explained by each factor.

Table 3
Total Variance Explained

<i>Component</i>	<i>Initial Eigen values</i>			<i>Extraction Sums of Squared Loadings</i>			<i>Rotation Sums of Squared Loadings</i>		
	<i>Total</i>	<i>% of Variance</i>	<i>Cumulative %</i>	<i>Total</i>	<i>% of Variance</i>	<i>Cumulative %</i>	<i>Total</i>	<i>% of Variance</i>	<i>Cumulative %</i>
1	11.051	24.557	24.557	11.051	24.557	24.557	6.551	14.558	14.558
2	2.935	6.521	31.079	2.935	6.521	31.079	2.932	6.516	21.074
3	2.330	5.178	36.257	2.330	5.178	36.257	2.892	6.427	27.501
4	1.919	4.264	40.520	1.919	4.264	40.520	2.641	5.869	33.370
5	1.786	3.969	44.490	1.786	3.969	44.490	2.385	5.300	38.671
6	1.555	3.455	47.944	1.555	3.455	47.944	2.299	5.108	43.779
7	1.421	3.157	51.101	1.421	3.157	51.101	1.892	4.204	47.983
8	1.344	2.987	54.089	1.344	2.987	54.089	1.810	4.021	52.005
9	1.247	2.770	56.859	1.247	2.770	56.859	1.722	3.826	55.830
10	1.125	2.499	59.358	1.125	2.499	59.358	1.311	2.913	58.743
11	1.032	2.294	61.652	1.032	2.294	61.652	1.309	2.910	61.652
12	.980	2.177	63.829						
13	.901	2.002	65.831						
14	.859	1.908	67.740						
15	.846	1.879	69.619						
16	.813	1.806	71.425						
17	.755	1.679	73.104						
18	.731	1.625	74.730						
19	.707	1.570	76.300						
20	.692	1.537	77.837						
21	.673	1.495	79.332						
22	.628	1.397	80.729						
23	.618	1.373	82.101						
24	.603	1.341	83.442						
25	.573	1.273	84.715						
26	.545	1.211	85.926						

Shopper Typology of Generation Y Consumer in India

<i>Component</i>	<i>Initial Eigen values</i>			<i>Extraction Sums of Squared Loadings</i>			<i>Rotation Sums of Squared Loadings</i>		
	<i>Total</i>	<i>% of Variance</i>	<i>Cumulative %</i>	<i>Total</i>	<i>% of Variance</i>	<i>Cumulative %</i>	<i>Total</i>	<i>% of Variance</i>	<i>Cumulative %</i>
27	.526	1.169	87.095						
28	.508	1.129	88.224						
29	.482	1.071	89.295						
30	.447	.992	90.287						
31	.438	.973	91.260						
32	.403	.895	92.154						
33	.374	.831	92.986						
34	.360	.800	93.786						
35	.344	.765	94.551						
36	.327	.727	95.278						
37	.311	.691	95.970						
38	.289	.643	96.613						
39	.271	.603	97.215						
40	.235	.522	97.738						
41	.230	.511	98.248						
42	.218	.484	98.732						
43	.209	.464	99.196						
44	.197	.437	99.633						
45	.165	.367	100.000						

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

Table 4 describes each of the shopping behaviour of the Generation Y consumer. Factor one, labeled fashion conscious consumer consisted of 11 items and accounted for 24.557% of the variance. A fashion conscious consumer is one who invests a great deal of his/her time, money and resources in fashion. Factor 2, which describes the brand conscious consumer accounts for 6.521% of the variance. According to the survey, a brand conscious Generation Y consumer is one who equates price with quality and believes in buying expensive and well advertised brands to reduce cognitive dissonance. Factor 3, labeled hedonistic consumers constitute about 5.178% of variance and they regard shopping as a pleasurable and exciting experience. Factor 5 which consisted of four items and constitutes 4.624% of the variance is the quality conscious consumer. A Generation Y quality conscious consumer is one for whom quality is extremely important and who would shop to ensure to buy the best quality product. Factor 5 which describes the novelty seeking consumer, consists of four variables and accounts for 3.969% of the variance. A novelty seeking consumer is one who is likely to look for novelty in his/her purchases but at the same time, is not prepared to compromise on quality. These results are consistent with the findings of a study by Sproles & Sproles (1990) in which novelty and fashion conscious consumer resemble a perfectionist consumer. Factor 6 which consists of four variables and has a variance of 3.455% and describes a Generation Y consumer who is confused by over choice. Factor 8, which consists of just two variables and has a variance of 2.187% represents the habitual/brand loyal consumer. Factors 7 & 9 were not taken into consideration to explain the shopping styles of Generation Y consumers as the Cronbach Alpha for these two factors stood at 0.544 and 0.567 respectively, well below the desired cut off of 0.6. Factors 10 and 11 were also not considered for describing the shopping behaviour, in spite of their Eigen value bring more than 1, as each one of them consists of just one variable.

Table 4
Shopper Typology

<i>S. No.</i>	<i>Factor</i>	<i>Variables</i>	<i>Eigen value</i>	<i>%age of variance</i>	<i>Cumulative percentage</i>
F1	Fashion conscious consumers	Fashionable, attractive styling is very important for me Fashion clothing means a lot to me I am an experienced user of fashion clothing Fashion clothing is a significant part of my life I usually dress for fashion I am interested in fashion clothing I go shopping to keep up with the trends I am very familiar with fashion clothing I feel I know a lot about fashion clothing I would classify myself as an expert on fashion clothing For me fashion clothing is an important product	11.051	24.557	24.557
F2	Brand conscious consumer	The higher the price of clothing, the better the quality Nice departments and specialty stores offer the best clothing The most advertised brands are usually very good choices The well-known brands of clothing are best for me The more expensive brands of clothing are usually purchased by choice I prefer buying the best selling brands of clothing	2.935	6.521	31.079
F3	Hedonistic consumers	Shopping for clothing satisfies my sense of curiosity Shopping for clothing offers new experiences I feel like I am exploring new worlds when I shop To me, shopping is an adventure Shopping gives me pleasure	2.330	5.178	36.257
F4	Quality conscious consumer	Buying very good quality product is important to me When it comes to purchasing clothing, I try to get the best or perfect choice In general, I try to buy the best overall quality clothing I make a special effort to choose the very best quality clothing	1.911	4.264	40.250
F5	Novelty seeking consumers	I make a special effort to choose the very best quality clothing I usually have one or more outfits of the very newest style To get variety, I shop at different stores and chose different brands It's fun to buy new and exciting clothing	1.786	3.969	44.490
F6	Consumers confused by over choice	There are so many brands to choose from that I often feel confused Sometimes, it's hard to choose which store to shop The more I learn about clothing, the harder it seems to choose the best All the information I get on different products confuses me	1.555	3.455	47.944
F7	Shopping averse consumers	Shopping for clothing is not a pleasant activity for me Shopping for clothes is a waste of time	1.421	3.157	51.101
F8	Habitual/ Brand loyal consumers	I have some favorite brands I buy over and over again Once I find a brand of clothing I like, I stick to it	1.344	2.987	54.089
F9	Practical shoppers	I do my shopping quickly I don't waste my time in just shopping	1.247	2.770	56.859
F10		I keep my wardrobe, up-to-date with the changing fashion	1.125	2.499	59.358
F11		I don't consider it a waste of time to shop at stores	1.032	2.294	61.652

5.2. Impact of Age on the Shopping Behavior of Gen Y Consumer

The study was conducted taking three age groups of the Generation Y cohort into consideration. The three age groups include 16-20 years, 21-25 years and 26-30 years. One way ANOVA was conducted to assess if the three age groups exhibited significant differences in shopping behavior within a particular shopper group/typology. Significant differences were observed between the three age groups in the following shopper typologies: fashion conscious consumers ($F = 11.67, p = 0.000$), brand conscious consumers ($F = 9.815, p = 0.000$), quality conscious consumers ($F = 8.230, p = 0.000$) and novelty seeking consumers ($F = 20.793, p = 0.000$). No significant differences were observed amongst hedonistic consumers, habitual/brand loyal consumers and consumers confused by over choice. Hedonistic, habitual/brand loyal and consumers confused by over choice respectively did not exhibit too many differences within the three age groups.

Further multiple post hoc comparisons, Tukey HSD and Bonferroni tests were used to determine the between group differences. Table 5 indicates the multiple post hoc comparisons which reveal that in the four shopper groups where significant differences were observed as a result of age, the maximum difference in shopping behavior is observed between the age groups of 16 – 20 years and 26 – 30 years. Within these four groups where significant differences were observed, there is not much difference in shopping behavior between the age groups of 16 – 20 years & 21 – 25 years and 21 – 25 years and 26 – 30 years. This could probably be attributed to the fact that there exists a wider age gap between the two age groups 16 – 20 years and 26-30 years.

In case of fashion conscious consumers, the mean value between the age groups 16 – 20 years and 26 – 30 years is 0.715, which is highest compared to the mean value of the other two groups at 0.113 (16 – 20 years and 21 – 25 years) and 0.602 (21 – 25 years and 26 – 30 years) and the p value is significant at 0.000. This indicates that there is significant difference between these two age groups (16 – 20 years and 21 – 25 years) of fashion conscious consumers. In case of brand conscious, quality conscious and novelty seeking consumers, for this two age groups, 16 – 20 years and 21 – 25 years, the mean value and a significant p value at 0.000 indicates that significant differences in shopping behavior exists within these two age groups (Table 5).

Table 5
Multiple Post-Hoc Comparisons – Fashion Conscious Consumers, Brand Conscious Consumers, Quality Conscious Consumers, Novelty Seeking Consumers and Age

<i>Dependent Variable</i>	<i>Age</i>	<i>Age</i>	<i>Mean Difference</i>	<i>Std. Error</i>	<i>Sig.</i>
Factor 1 (Fashion Conscious Consumers)	1(16-20 Years)	2 (21-25 Years)	.113*	.139	.696
	1(16-20 Year)	3 (26-30 Years)	.715*	.148	.000
	2(21-25 Years)	3 (26-30 Years)	.602*	.182	.003
Factor 2 (Brand Conscious Consumers)	1(16-20 Years)	2 (21-25 Years)	.066*	.122	.849
	1(16-20 Year)	3 (26-30 Years)	.573*	.130	.000
	2(21-25 Years)	3 (26-30 Years)	.507*	.160	.005
Factor 4 (Quality Conscious consumers)	1(16-20 Years)	2 (21-25 Years)	.236	.107	.071
	1(16-20 Year)	3 (26-30 Years)	.429*	.114	.001
	2(21-25 Years)	3 (26-30 Years)	.193*	.140	.511
Factor 5 (Novelty Seeking Consumers)	1(16-20 Years)	2 (21-25 Years)	.340**	.114	.009
	1(16-20 Year)	3 (26-30 Years)	.759	.122	.000
	2(21-25 Years)	3 (26-30 Years)	.419	.150	.016

6. MANAGERIAL IMPLICATIONS

This study is essentially an attempt to understand and predict the shopping and buying behavior of Generation Y consumers which will further help marketers better understand their decision making process. An accurate understanding of buyer behavior of the Generation Y cohort may help in designing appropriate marketing strategies which will further result in maximizing customer satisfaction. As a consequence, this will have the added impact of further meeting organizational goals in terms of sales and profit maximization.

7. LIMITATIONS

The study does suffer from a few limitations. The selection of the malls in New Delhi and its suburbs only and the restricted size of the sample is a limitation of the current study in terms of generalization of the result to other regions and contexts. India is a vast country with substantial social and cultural diversity and this definitely calls for a study to take these factors into account to present a more comprehensive and inclusive picture.

Also, the study employed a non-probability sampling method to select the respondents since it was difficult to obtain a sample frame of Generation Y consumers to participate in the study. This increased the study's susceptibility to high levels of sampling bias (Whitley & Kite, 2009).

8. IMPLICATIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

This study holds considerable potential for future research. Firstly, a similar study could be replicated in other provinces to test the relevance and reliability of the scale. Further, a cross cultural study could also provide deeper insights into the diversity of consumer decision making. Secondly, the study concentrated upon the Generation Y consumer. Further research could also focus upon other generational cohorts such as Generation X which is one that has access to the highest disposable income today. Also, this study primarily focused on fashion apparel. Further studies could be conducted taking other high involvement product categories into consideration which also involve extended decision making.

References

- Ferguson, C.J. (2014). A way forward for video game violence research . *American Psychologist*, 69, 307-309. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0036357>.
- Aldlaign, A.H. & Buttle, F.A. (2002). SYSTRA-SQ: a new measure of bank service quality. *Industrial Journal of Service Industry Management*, 13, 362-381.
- Bakewell, C. & Mitchell, V.W. (2003). Generation Y female consumer decision-making styles. *International Journal of Retail & Distribution Management*, 3(2), 95-106.
- Bennett, G., & Lachowetz, T. (2004). Marketing to lifestyles: action sports and Generation Y. *Sports Marketing*, 13(4), 239-243.
- Bush, A., Martin, C., & Bush, V. (2004). Sports celebrity influence on the behavioral intentions of Generation Y. *Journal of Advertising Research*, 44, 108-118.
- Darden, W.R. and Ashton, D. (1975). Psychographic profiles of patronage preference groups. *The Journal of Retailing*, 50(Winter), 99-112.

- Firestone, O & Mitchell V.W. (2004). Generation Y attitudes toward e-ethics and internet related behaviors. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 54, 121-128.
- Hui, C.H. and Triandis, H.C. (1985). Measurement in cross-cultural psychology: a review and comparison of strategies. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 16 (June),131-52.
- Jin, B., & Kim, J.O. (2003). A typology of Korean discount shoppers: shopping motives, store attributes, and outcomes. *International Journal of Service Industry Management*, 14(4), 396-419.
- Jugessur, J., & Cohen, G. (2004). Is fashion promoting counterfeit brands. *Journal of Brand Management*, 16(5/6), 183 – 394.
- Lastovicka, J.L. (1982). On the validation of lifestyle traits: a review and illustration. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 19 (February), 126-38.
- Ma, Y.J., & Niehm, L.S. (2006). Service expectation of older generation Y customers: an examination of apparel retail setting. *Journal of Managing Service Quality*, 16(6), 620-640.
- Malhotra, N. K. (2009). *Marketing Research: An Applied Orientation*. 6th ed. Eaglewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice- Hall.
- Morton, L.P. (2002). Targeting Generation Y. *Public Relations*, 47(2), 46-48.
- Moschis, George P. (1976). Acquisition of the consumer role by adolescents. Unpublished PhD Dissertation, University of Wisconsin-Madison, 1976.
- Noble, S. M., Haytko, D. L., & Phillips, J. (2009). What drives college-age Generation Y consumers. *Journal of Business Research*, 62, 617-628.
- Pett, M. A., Lackey, N. R., & Sullivan, J. J. (2003). *Making Sense of Factor Analysis: The Use of Factor Analysis for Instrument Development in Health Care Research*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- Schewe, C.D. and Noble, S.M. (2000). Market segmentation by cohorts: The value and validity of cohorts in American and abroad. *Journal of Marketing Management*, 16, 129-42.
- Shaerer, Ellen (2002). Generation Ignored. *Am J Rev*, 24 (3), 38-9.
- Sproles, G.B. (1985). From perfectionism to fadism: measuring consumers' decision-making styles. Schnittgrund, K.P. (Ed.), *Proceedings, American Council on Consumer Interests*, ACCI, Columbia, MO, 79-85.
- Sproles, G.B., & Kendall, E.L. (1986). A methodology for profiling consumer's decision-making styles. *The Journal of Consumer Affairs*, 20(2), 267-279.
- Sproles, E.K., & Sproles, G.B. (1990). Consumer decision-making styles as a function of individual learning Styles. *The Journal of Consumer Affairs*, 24(1), 134-147.
- Strauss, W. and Howe, N. (1999). *The Fourth Turning*, Broadway Books, New York, NY.
- Van den Bergh, J., & Behrer, M. (2011). *How Cool Brands Stay Hot: Branding to Generation Y*. London: British library.
- Williams, K. C., & Page, R. A. (2011). Marketing to the generations. *Journal of Behavioral Studies in Business*, 3, 1-17.
- Wolburg, J.M. and Pokryvczynski, J. (2001). A psychographic analysis of Generation Y college students. *Journal of Advertising Research*, September/October, 33-52.
- Yarrow, K., O'Donnell, J., (2009). *Gen Buy: How Tweens, Teens, and Twenty Somethings are Revolutionizing Retail*. Jossey-Bass, San Francisco, CA.

