

# A Study on Correlation ship Among Operational Level Employees Customer Orientation - Customer Satisfaction in Selected Departmental Stores of Jaipur City

Mrs. T. Madhavi

M.B.A (Birla Inst. of Tech. - Mesra), PhD (Pursuing. JNU-Jaipur), Assistant Professor, School of Business Management, Jaipur National University, Rajasthan, India

## Article Info

Volume 82

Page Number: 14630 - 14639

Publication Issue:

January-February 2020

## Abstract

Most of the researchers have enunciated on the important part played by the workers collaboration with customer services for the successful execution of service oriented organization. Fruitful results have empowered for the service organizations, such as, user satisfaction, faith and canvassing through public address could improvise the services significantly and good correlation between customers and the employees. As such, this survey is regarded as a pursuit to examine the effect of operational level employees, customer orientation on customer satisfaction across the selected Departmental stores in Jaipur city. The intended objective of this study is of the nature of a descriptive survey. The outcome of the hypothesis on the survey clarified that customer orientation of staff has a bearing on customer satisfaction. It might lead to retention of customers and customer commitment as well. This research is aimed at influencing the customer orientation of services by employees to customer retention.

## Article History

Article Received: 18 May 2019

Revised: 14 July 2019

Accepted: 22 December 2019

Publication: 28 February 2020

**Keywords;** *customer orientation, Customer satisfaction, Operational level employees, commitment, Departmental stores*

## I. INTRODUCTION

Most of the researchers have focused special attention on the important roles played by the sales employees often interacting with the customers working for the success of the organization. Positive approach for the success could be made possible by involving an element of customer satisfaction, loyalty to their commitment, customer to be convinced, through their interaction by word of speech. These factors would, nevertheless, influence the customer-employee relations better leading to the success of the business firm. Because of the impalpable nature of services provided by the employees, the customers focus their attention on the behavior of the employees of the service provider while assessing the quality of services. As a

consequence, the customer orientation stands as a prominent binding factor for the success of the service organization. Appealing to customer requirements and customer redressal has brought forward many valuable service benefits to the customers for the services rendered by service organizations such as retail outlets, etc. Now-a-days, the customer orientation is considered an organizational factor providing market preferences to enhance customer satisfaction in and around market areas.

## II. LITERATURE REVIEW

### 1) Customer Orientation

Zeglat (2014), the authors have placed their major efforts to study the impact of psychological and structural recognition of employees. It has been noticed that both structural and psychological empowerment has brought forward positive result on customer orientation and these empowerments would be considered as the guiding factors to increase employee orientation of customers. Liao (2008) have pronounced that the study entailed the combined impact of senior leadership on customer orientation and their functional goals, its availability to external customers. Results oriented on Hierarchical linear model have clarified that employee having stabilized their contacts with customers proved more customer oriented followed by production employees and support role players. Matsuo (2007) has conducted a survey on sales people of a travel agency on service climate of employees and personality traits of customer orientation service workers. In both the cases he has reported positive climate and yield of favourable results on customer orientation. Thoreau (2004) has pronounced that the entire performance of service people focus the major thrust on the customer orientation of services which will have the final say about the overall success of the company. In his study, the author has identified four factors required to influence the customer orientation that has helped to impart better services to customers overcoming impending current deficiencies. The author has further pointed out that employee job satisfaction and job involvement could enhance the customer orientation and behavioral aspect of customer-employee correlation and its involvement. Brannback (1999) has highlighted the need for the customer - orientation to reap the benefits of the overall success of the corporate business. He has also put forward the idea that customer orientation is one of the binding factors for corporate competence development. Saxe and Weitz (1982) have

pronounced that an organized sale in a customer oriented manner is a business process attributed to the salesmen. However, the authors have articulated that in case an organization is to act as customer oriented, the sales representative must put in more efforts in regards to sales orientation, and in customer related communications. SOCO scale is a tool that measures the customer orientation.

### 2) Customer satisfaction:

Satisfaction of the customer is obtained when he is satisfied with the performance of the product and its performance. (Liang and Zhang (2012). If the products are received as per the expectations of the customer, he may be satisfied. In case goods and services received are below customer expectations might lead to annoyance. (Abdollahian and Faroozandeh, (2011) Faroooghi (2016) states that Customer Retention increases to a great extent positively due to increase in Customer Satisfaction and Customer's Emotional Commitment. Omar et al. (2015) have given an insight that retail stores are interested in offering loyalty programs which are at different levels that help in customer retention through conduct of loyalty programs with several benefits. The program provider being a member of the loyalty program needs to focus attention on the processes and the experiences of the customers rather than giving importance to economic benefits.

### Objectives

- To identify the difference in competencies of employees as regards to their orientation towards customers.
- To identify positive effect of operational level employees customer orientation on customer satisfaction.
- To identify positive effect of customers satisfaction with customer retention.

### III. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The present research paper is empirical. The primary data was collected through questionnaire and secondary data through books, journals and articles. Ten items used for customer orientation were referred from SOCO scale. Samples have been collected from eight Apparel Departmental stores of Jaipur city. Two samples are taken of which one represents the operational level employees and another for customers. The sample size for operational level employees is 262 and the sample size for customers is 311. Stratified random sampling for employees and Random sampling for customers is the sampling technique used.

### IV. ANALYSIS

The data was analyzed through SPSS software. Cronbach's alpha test was conducted to examine the reliability of the questionnaire.

**Table 1 Reliability test for customer orientation of employees**

| Reliability Statistics for customer orientation of employees |            |
|--------------------------------------------------------------|------------|
| Cronbach's Alpha                                             | N of Items |
| 0.812                                                        | 10         |

a. List wise deletion based on all variables in the procedure.

**(Source: Primary data based on questionnaire)**

The Cronbach's alpha test for customer orientation of employees is 0.812 for all the items taken which is highly reliable as shown in Table 1.

#### T Test:

H01: There is no significant difference in employee orientation towards customers as regards to the demography of employees.

Employee customer orientation of operational level employees in Departmental stores as regards to their Gender (**Table 1**)

**Table 1. Group Statistics**

|     | Gender | N   | Mean | Standard Deviation | Standard Error Mean |
|-----|--------|-----|------|--------------------|---------------------|
| C1  | Male   | 181 | 4.02 | 1.027              | 0.076               |
|     | Female | 81  | 4.00 | 1.025              | 0.114               |
| C2  | Male   | 181 | 4.25 | 0.824              | 0.061               |
|     | Female | 81  | 4.21 | 0.904              | 0.100               |
| C3  | Male   | 181 | 3.99 | 0.897              | 0.067               |
|     | Female | 81  | 4.02 | 0.908              | 0.101               |
| C4  | Male   | 181 | 3.97 | 0.872              | 0.065               |
|     | Female | 81  | 4.06 | 0.695              | 0.077               |
| C5  | Male   | 181 | 3.99 | 0.913              | 0.068               |
|     | Female | 81  | 3.99 | 0.929              | 0.103               |
| C6  | Male   | 181 | 4.03 | 0.869              | 0.065               |
|     | Female | 81  | 3.70 | 1.123              | 0.125               |
| C7  | Male   | 181 | 3.96 | 0.968              | 0.072               |
|     | Female | 81  | 4.04 | 0.843              | 0.094               |
| C8  | Male   | 181 | 4.01 | 0.928              | 0.069               |
|     | Female | 81  | 4.12 | 0.857              | 0.095               |
| C9  | Male   | 181 | 3.99 | 0.972              | 0.072               |
|     | Female | 81  | 4.00 | 0.894              | 0.099               |
| C10 | Male   | 181 | 4.08 | 0.916              | 0.068               |
|     | Female | 81  | 4.06 | 0.871              | 0.097               |

**(Source: Primary data based on questionnaire)**

Here the abbreviations in the statements of employees customer orientation are given in the form of C1-Help customers to meet their targets, C2-achieve the goals through customer satisfaction, C3- customer's priority of products, C4- Discuss the customer's requirements freely and friendly, C5- Influence a customer through awareness, C6- Offer the best product, C7- Answer all customer queries, C8- Problem solving, C9- Create an appropriate expectation on how the product could be made use of by the customer, C10- decision making.

An independent sample t-test was conducted to examine gender differences in employee customer orientation (Table1). For C1 Leven's test for equality of variance showed no violation where  $F = 0.302$  and  $p = 0.583$ . It is interpreted that the males ( $M = 4.02$ ,  $SD = 1.027$ ) has greater customer orientation than females ( $M = 4$ ,  $SD = 1.025$ ) in the selected Departmental stores,  $t(262) = 0.161$ ,  $p = 0.872$ , Cohen's  $D = 0.02$ . For C2, Leven's test for equality of variance showed no violation where  $F = 0.620$  and  $p = 0.432$ . It is interpreted that the males ( $M = 4.25$ ,  $SD = 0.824$ ) had greater customer orientation than females ( $M = 4.21$ ,  $SD = 0.904$ ) in the selected departmental stores,  $t(262) = 0.390$ ,  $p = 0.697$ , Cohen's  $D = 0.02$ . For C3, Leven's test for equality of variance showed no violation where  $F = 0.001$  and  $p = 0.974$ . It is interpreted that the males ( $M = 3.99$ ,  $SD = 0.897$ ) has less customer orientation than females ( $M = 4.02$ ,  $SD = 0.908$ ) in the selected departmental stores,  $t(262) = -0.297$ ,  $p = 0.767$ , Cohen's  $D = 0.04$ . For C4, Leven's test for equality of variance showed no violation where  $F = 5.497$  and  $p = 0.020$ . It is interpreted that the males ( $M = 3.97$ ,  $SD = 0.872$ ) had greater customer orientation than females ( $M = 4.06$ ,  $SD = 0.695$ ) in the selected departmental stores,  $t(262) = 0.161$ ,  $p = 0.872$ , Cohen's  $D = -0.1$ . For C5, Leven's test for equality of variance showed no violation where  $F = 0.130$  and  $p = 0.719$ . It is interpreted that the males ( $M = 3.99$ ,  $SD = 0.913$ ) had greater customer orientation than females ( $M = 3.99$ ,  $SD = 0.929$ ) in the selected departmental stores,  $t(262) = -0.813$ ,  $p = 0.992$ , Cohen's  $D = 0$ . For C6, Leven's test for equality of variance showed no violation where  $F = 1.694$  and  $p$

$= 0.001$ . It is interpreted that the males ( $M = 4.03$ ,  $SD = 0.869$ ) has greater customer orientation than females ( $M = 3.7$ ,  $SD = 1.123$ ) in the selected departmental stores,  $t(262) = 0.010$ ,  $p = 0.021$ , Cohen's  $D = 0.3$ . For C7, Leven's test for equality of variance showed no violation where  $F = 1.809$  and  $p = 0.180$ . It is shown that the males ( $M = 3.96$ ,  $SD = 0.968$ ) has greater customer orientation than females ( $M = 4.04$ ,  $SD = 0.843$ ) in the selected departmental stores,  $t(262) = 2.583$ ,  $p = 0.544$ , Cohen's  $D = -0.08$ . For C8, Leven's test for equality of variance showed no violation where  $F = 0.263$  and  $p = 0.608$ . It is interpreted that the males ( $M = 4.01$ ,  $SD = 0.928$ ) had greater customer orientation than females ( $M = 4.12$ ,  $SD = 0.857$ ) in the selected departmental stores,  $t(262) = -0.973$ ,  $p = 0.331$ , Cohen's  $D = 0.12$ . For C9, Leven's test for equality of variance showed no violation where  $F = 0.022$  and  $p = 0.881$ . It is interpreted that the males ( $M = 3.99$ ,  $SD = 0.972$ ) had greater customer orientation than females ( $M = 4$ ,  $SD = 0.894$ ) in the selected departmental stores,  $t(262) = -0.087$ ,  $p = 0.931$ , Cohen's  $D = 0.01$ . For C10, Leven's test for equality of variance showed no violation where  $F = 0.130$  and  $p = 0.897$ . It is interpreted that the males ( $M = 4.08$ ,  $SD = 0.916$ ) had greater customer orientation than females ( $M = 4.06$ ,  $SD = 0.871$ ) in the selected departmental stores,  $t(262) = 0.161$ ,  $p = 0.872$ , Cohen's  $D = 0.02$ .

## ANOVA TEST

Employee customer orientation of operational level employees in Departmental stores as regards to their Age (Table 2)

**Table 2. One Way ANOVA Test –Employees Customer Orientation of operational level employees and Age**

|    |                | Sum of Squares | df  | Mean Square | F     | Sig.  |
|----|----------------|----------------|-----|-------------|-------|-------|
| C1 | Between Groups | 1.841          | 4   | 0.460       | 0.435 | 0.783 |
|    | Within Groups  | 272.097        | 257 | 1.059       |       |       |
|    | Total          | 273.939        | 261 |             |       |       |

|     |                                          |                             |                 |                |       |       |
|-----|------------------------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------|----------------|-------|-------|
| C2  | Between Groups<br>Within Groups<br>Total | .550<br>187.301<br>187.851  | 4<br>257<br>261 | 0.138<br>0.729 | 0.189 | 0.944 |
| C3  | Between Groups<br>Within Groups<br>Total | 7.243<br>202.8<br>210       | 4<br>257<br>261 | 1.811<br>.792  | 2.286 | 0.061 |
| C4  | Between Groups<br>Within Groups<br>Total | 2.430<br>173.570<br>176.000 | 4<br>257<br>261 | .607<br>.675   | 0.899 | 0.465 |
| C5  | Between Groups<br>Within Groups<br>Total | 1.441<br>217.525<br>217.525 | 4<br>257<br>261 | 0.360<br>0.846 | 0.426 | 0.790 |
| C6  | Between Groups<br>Within Groups<br>Total | 4.155<br>238.608<br>242.763 | 4<br>257<br>261 | 1.039<br>0.928 | 1.119 | 0.348 |
| C7  | Between Groups<br>Within Groups<br>Total | .846<br>225.093<br>225.939  | 4<br>257<br>261 | 0.212<br>0.876 | 0.241 | 0.915 |
| C8  | Between Groups<br>Within Groups<br>Total | 1.744<br>212.794<br>214.538 | 4<br>257<br>261 | 0.436<br>0.828 | 0.527 | 0.716 |
| C9  | Between Groups<br>Within Groups<br>Total | 4.468<br>229.517<br>233.985 | 4<br>257<br>261 | 1.117<br>0.893 | 1.251 | 0.290 |
| C10 | Between Groups<br>Within Groups<br>Total | 3.834<br>207.788<br>211.622 | 4<br>257<br>261 | 0.958<br>0.809 | 1.185 | 0.318 |

(Source: Primary data based on questionnaire)

Testing the differences in the mean scores of factors regarding employee customer orientation and age was conducted by one way Anova. Table 2, reveals that p value  $>0.05$  for C1 (0.783), C2 (0.944), C3 (0.061), C4 (0.465), C5 (0.790), C6 (0.348), C7 (0.915), C8 (0.716), C9 (0.290) and C10 (0.318). Since  $P > 0.05$ , the null hypothesis is accepted at five percent level of significance.

There was no significant difference (as shown in the table 2) in the mean scores of factors regarding employee customer orientation C1 and Age in selected Departmental stores of Jaipur,  $F(4,257) = 0.435$ ,  $p = 0.783$ , in the mean scores of

factors regarding employee customer orientation C2 and Age in Departmental stores of Jaipur,  $F(4,257) = 0.189$ ,  $p = 0.944$ , in the mean scores of factors regarding employee customer orientation C3 and Age in Departmental stores of Jaipur,  $F(4,257) = 2.286$ ,  $p = 0.06$ , in the mean scores of factors regarding employee customer orientation C4 and Age in Departmental stores of Jaipur,  $F(4,257) = 0.899$ ,  $p = 0.465$ , in the mean scores of factors regarding employee customer orientation C5 and Age in Departmental stores of Jaipur,  $F(4,257) = 0.426$ ,  $p = 0.790$ , in the mean scores of factors regarding employee customer orientation C6 and Age in Departmental stores of Jaipur,  $F(4,257) = 1.119$ ,  $p = 0.348$ , in the mean scores of factors

regarding employee customer orientation C7 and Age in Departmental stores of Jaipur,  $F(4,257) = 0.241$ ,  $p = 0.915$ , in the mean scores of factors regarding employee customer orientation C8 and Age in Departmental stores of Jaipur,  $F(4,257) = 0.527$ ,  $p = 0.716$ , in the mean scores of factors regarding employee customer orientation C9 and Age in Departmental stores of Jaipur,  $F(4,257)$

$= 1.251$ ,  $p = 0.290$ , in the mean scores of factors regarding employee customer orientation C10 and Age in Departmental stores of Jaipur,  $F(4,257) = 1.185$ ,  $p = 0.318$ .

Employee customer orientation of operational level employees in Departmental stores as regards to their Education (Table 3)

**Table 3 One Way ANOVA Test –Employees Customer Orientation of Operational Level Employees and Education**

|     |                | Sum of Squares | df  | Mean Square | F     | Sig.  |
|-----|----------------|----------------|-----|-------------|-------|-------|
| C1  | Between Groups | 21.856         | 4   | 5.464       | 5.571 | 0.000 |
|     | Within Groups  | 252.083        | 257 | 0.981       |       |       |
|     | Total          | 273.939        | 261 |             |       |       |
| C2  | Between Groups | 12.805         | 4   | 3.201       | 4.700 | 0.001 |
|     | Within Groups  | 175.046        | 257 | 0.681       |       |       |
|     | Total          | 187.851        | 261 |             |       |       |
| C3  | Between Groups | 4.327          | 4   | 1.082       | 1.347 | 0.253 |
|     | Within Groups  | 205.673        | 257 | 0.803       |       |       |
|     | Total          | 210.000        | 261 |             |       |       |
| C4  | Between Groups | 5.632          | 4   | 1.408       | 2.124 | 0.078 |
|     | Within Groups  | 170.368        | 257 | 0.663       |       |       |
|     | Total          | 176.000        | 261 |             |       |       |
| C5  | Between Groups | 9.216          | 4   | 2.304       | 2.823 | 0.026 |
|     | Within Groups  | 209.750        | 257 | 0.816       |       |       |
|     | Total          | 218.966        | 261 |             |       |       |
| C6  | Between Groups | 5.561          | 4   | 1.390       | 1.506 | 0.201 |
|     | Within Groups  | 237.202        | 257 | 0.923       |       |       |
|     | Total          | 242.763        | 261 |             |       |       |
| C7  | Between Groups | 17.176         | 4   | 4.294       | 5.286 | 0.000 |
|     | Within Groups  | 208.763        | 257 | 0.812       |       |       |
|     | Total          | 225.939        | 261 |             |       |       |
| C8  | Between Groups | 9.686          | 4   | 2.422       | 3.038 | 0.018 |
|     | Within Groups  | 204.852        | 257 | 0.797       |       |       |
|     | Total          | 214.538        | 261 |             |       |       |
| C9  | Between Groups | 7.281          | 4   | 1.820       | 2.063 | 0.086 |
|     | Within Groups  | 226.704        | 257 | 0.882       |       |       |
|     | Total          | 233.985        | 261 |             |       |       |
| C10 | Between Groups | 11.100         | 4   | 2.775       | 3.557 | 0.008 |
|     | Within Groups  | 200.522        | 257 | 0.780       |       |       |
|     | Total          | 211.622        | 261 |             |       |       |

(Source: Primary data based on questionnaire)

A one-way ANOVA was done to test for difference in the mean scores of factors regarding customer orientation and Education Table 3, reveals that  $p > 0.05$  for C3 (0.253), C4 (0.078), C6 (0.201) and C9 (0.086) and  $p < 0.05$  for C1 (0.001), C2 (0.001), C5 (0.026), C7 (0.001), C8 (0.018), and C10 (0.008). From the above analysis it can be interpreted that there is difference in competencies of employees with varying educational qualifications.

### Customer Satisfaction

Customer satisfaction is the measure of how the responses and needs are correlated and delivered to excel customer expectation. The demographic descriptive are shown below.

**Table 4. Reliability test for customer satisfaction**

| Reliability Statistics for customer satisfaction |            |
|--------------------------------------------------|------------|
| Cronbach's Alpha                                 | N of Items |
| 0.756                                            | 18         |

a. List wise deletion based on all variables in the procedure.

(Source: Primary data based on questionnaire)

Table 4 shows the reliability test for customer satisfaction whose Cronbach's alpha test was 0.756 which is reliable.

H02: There is no significant difference in customer satisfaction as regards to their demography of customers

**Table 5. ANOVA Test – Customer satisfaction and Gender**

| Variables | N   | Mean  | Standard Deviation | Standard Error | 95% Confidence Interval for Mean |             | Minimum | Maximum | F     | Sig  |
|-----------|-----|-------|--------------------|----------------|----------------------------------|-------------|---------|---------|-------|------|
|           |     |       |                    |                | Lower Bound                      | Upper Bound |         |         |       |      |
| Male      | 201 | 60.61 | 7.399              | 0.522          | 59.58                            | 61.64       | 44      | 78      | 32.03 | 0.00 |
| Female    | 109 | 59.57 | 7.940              | 0.764          | 58.06                            | 61.09       | 30      | 73      |       |      |
| Total     | 310 | 60.05 | 8.320              | 0.473          | 59.12                            | 60.98       | 0       | 78      |       |      |

(Source: Primary data based on questionnaire)

Based on the Gender of customers, Male respondents were 201 and female respondents were 109 (Table 5). To test for differences in the mean scores of factors regarding customer satisfaction and gender Table 5, reveals that  $p < 0.05$  for customer

satisfaction (0.000) There was significant differences in the mean scores of factors regarding customer satisfaction and gender in Departmental stores of Jaipur,  $F(2,307) = 32.035$ ,  $p = 0.000$ .

**Table 6. ANOVA Test – Customer satisfaction and Age**

| Variable    | N   | Mean  | Standard Deviation | Standard Error | 95% Confidence Interval for Mean |             | Minimum | Maximum | F      | Sig   |
|-------------|-----|-------|--------------------|----------------|----------------------------------|-------------|---------|---------|--------|-------|
|             |     |       |                    |                | Lower Bound                      | Upper Bound |         |         |        |       |
| 15-25 years | 152 | 59.99 | 7.442              | 0.604          | 58.79                            | 61.18       | 35      | 78      | 16.781 | 0.000 |
| 25-35 years | 107 | 59.73 | 7.843              | 0.758          | 58.23                            | 61.23       | 30      | 78      |        |       |
| 35-45 years | 42  | 62.43 | 7.664              | 1.183          | 60.04                            | 64.82       | 50      | 77      |        |       |

|                |     |       |       |       |       |       |    |    |  |  |
|----------------|-----|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|----|----|--|--|
| Above 45 years | 9   | 60.63 | 5.829 | 2.061 | 55.75 | 65.50 | 53 | 69 |  |  |
| Total          | 310 | 60.05 | 8.320 | 0.473 | 59.12 | 60.98 | 0  | 78 |  |  |

(Source: Primary data based on questionnaire)

Based on the age of customers, age group of 15-25 years has 152 respondents, age group of 25-35 years has 107 respondents, age group of 35-45 years has 42 respondents and age group of above 45 years has 9 respondents. (Table 6). To test for differences in the mean scores of factors regarding customer

satisfaction and Age Table 6, reveals that  $p < 0.05$  for customer satisfaction (0.000) There was significant differences in the mean scores of factors regarding customer satisfaction and Age in Departmental stores of Jaipur,  $F(2,307) = 16.781$ ,  $p = 0.000$ .

**Table 7. ANOVA Test – Customer satisfaction and Education**

| Variables    | N   | Mean  | Standard. Deviation | Standard Error | 95%Confidence Interval for Mean |             | Minimum | Maximum | F      | sig   |
|--------------|-----|-------|---------------------|----------------|---------------------------------|-------------|---------|---------|--------|-------|
|              |     |       |                     |                | Lower Bound                     | Upper Bound |         |         |        |       |
| Matriculate  | 2   | 60.00 | 15.556              | 11.00          | -79.77                          | 199.77      | 49      | 71      | 13.613 | 0.000 |
| Intermediate | 33  | 59.94 | 7.685               | 1.338          | 57.21                           | 62.66       | 47      | 78      |        |       |
| Graduation   | 162 | 60.54 | 7.769               | 0.610          | 59.33                           | 61.74       | 30      | 78      |        |       |
| Postgraduate | 102 | 60.40 | 7.038               | 0.697          | 59.02                           | 61.78       | 42      | 73      |        |       |
| Others       | 10  | 55.00 | 8.313               | 2.629          | 49.05                           | 60.95       | 35      | 64      |        |       |
| Total        | 310 | 60.05 | 8.320               | 0.473          | 59.12                           | 60.98       | 0       | 78      |        |       |

(Source: Primary data based on questionnaire)

Based on the educational qualifications of customers, Matriculates had 2 respondents, Intermediate had 33 respondents and graduates had 162 respondents. The fourth group had a total of 102 respondents who were postgraduates and the fifth group who comes under the category others had 10 respondents (Table 7). To test for differences in the mean scores of factors regarding customer satisfaction and Education Table 7, reveals that  $p < 0.05$  for customer satisfaction (0.000) There was

significant differences in the mean scores of factors regarding customer satisfaction and Education in Departmental stores of Jaipur,  $F(2,307) = 13.613$ ,  $p = 0.000$ .

### Correlations

Correlation indicates the linear relationship between two variables.

H03: There is no significant difference as regards to Customer satisfaction and customer retention.

**Table 8. Spearman's Correlation**

| Spearman's rho | Employee Customer orientation |                         | customer orientation | customer satisfaction |
|----------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------|----------------------|-----------------------|
|                |                               | Correlation Coefficient | 1.000                | 0.172**               |
|                |                               | Sig.(2-tailed)          | .                    | 0.005                 |
|                | Customer satisfaction         | N                       | 262                  | 262                   |
|                |                               | Correlation Coefficient | 0.172**              | 1.000                 |
|                |                               | Sig.(2-tailed)          | 0.005                | .                     |
|                |                               | N                       | 262                  | 262                   |

(Source: Primary data based on questionnaire)

A spearman's correlation was done to find out the relationship between employees customer orientation and customer satisfaction. There was a weak, positive monotonic correlation between employees customer orientation and customer satisfaction (correlation=0.172,  $n=262$  and  $p < 0.005$ ). Spearman's rank correlation has been done which shows a weak positive correlation of 0.172 and the  $p$  is  $< 0.005$ . This shows that Spearman is done on the rank of the original variable.

The results of this research shows that there were no significant differences regarding employees customer orientation with respect to gender and age, but there was slight difference regarding employees customer orientation and education. The highly educated operational level employees showed significant difference when compared to other employees regarding competencies of problem solving, decision making, achieving the targets and creating awareness among the customers. Therefore, there was a positive influence of customer orientation and commitment. There were significant differences regarding customer's gender, age and education with regard to their customer satisfaction. A positive estimate value shows a positive effect of customer satisfaction with retention. The  $p$  value 0.000 indicates customer satisfaction had a significant influence on retention. The effect shows that customer satisfaction has a positive impact on customer retention. There was a weak positive correlation between customer orientation and customer satisfaction, where the correlation coefficient was 0.172 which is a weak positive correlation and  $p < 0.005$ . A positive correlation indicates positive influence while  $p$  value indicates that the customer orientation has significant influence on customer satisfaction.

## V. CONCLUSION

Organizations that take no notice of customer needs and select product centric approach may not be able to sustain in the competitive market. The customer orientation is therefore considered as the yardstick to

compete in the marketing management theory. Most of the organizations have known better their valued customers, who will help and guide for the proliferation of new customers by addition. Further, organizations that have a greater share of loyal customers increase its profitability by innovating new methods of approach to the market such as high repurchase rate, low cost of advertising, promote less desire among customers for changing service provider source etc. However, we cannot overlook the fact that the main driving force behind the organization pouring in major investments in line with the steady progress achieved are none other than customers. Furthermore, it is a genuine fact that no business concern can able to thrive better without the genuine participation of loyal customers. Organizations that are more effective in providing value based services to the customers and derive up-to-date customer satisfaction are more likely to compete in the upcoming modern market scenario. Future research can be carried out by selecting various other service sectors.

## REFERENCES

- [1] I GustiNgurahRai Surya Wibawa1,, I PutuGdeSukaatmadja., "The Effect of Customer Orientation of Service Employee in Building Customer Retention in X Company Bali",IOSR Journal of Business and Management (IOSR-JBM) e-ISSN: 2278-487X, p-ISSN: 2319-7668. Volume 20, Issue 7. Ver. I (July. 2018), PP 21-27
- [2] Farooghi, R. 2016, 'Customer Orientation of Service Employees: A Phantom Model Approach', Journal of Business Studies, Vol. 12, No. 1, PP 219-246
- [3] Omar, N. A., Suhaily, M. R., Alam, S.S., Nazri, M. A. 2015. 'Assessing the effect of loyalty program benefits in satisfaction-loyalty relationship: evidence from Malaysia', JurnalPengurusan, Vol. 43, No. 5, PP 145-159
- [4] Zeglat, D. Aljaber, M. and Alrawabdeh, W., 2014, 'Understating the Impact of Employee Empowerment on Customer Oriented Behavior', Journal of Business Studies Quarterly, Vol.6, No.1, pp.55-67.

- [5] Liang, R.D. and Zhang, J.S. (2012). The effect of service interaction orientation on customer satisfaction and behavioral intention: The moderating effect of dining frequency. *Asia Pacific Journal of Marketing and Logistics*, Vol. 24, pp. 153-170.
- [6] Abdollahian S. and Foroozandeh, K. (2011). Customer orientation and its importance for organizations. *Transport and Development*, No. 50, pp. 60-72
- [7] Liao, H. Subramony, M., 2008, 'Employee Customer Orientation in Manufacturing Organizations: Joint Influences of Customer Proximity and the Senior Leadership Team', *Journal of Applied Psychology* 2008, Vol. 93, No. 2, pp. 317-328.
- [8] Matsuo (2007), 'Determinants of Customer Orientation: Service Climate or Personality', *Book Proceedings of the 2007 Academy of Marketing Science (AMS), Annual Conference* (pp.279-282), DOI: 10.1007/978-3-319-11806-2\_118, Issn: 2363-6165
- [9] Mark E. Cross, Thomas G. Brashear, Edward E. Rigdon and Danny N. Bellenger., 2007, "Customer orientation and salesperson performance", *European Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 41 No. 7/8, pp. 821-835, DOI 10.1108/03090560710752410
- [10] Hennig-Thurau, T. (2004). Customer orientation of service employees: Its impact on Customer satisfaction, commitment, and retention", *International Journal of Service Industry Management*, Vol. 15, pp. 460-478.
- [11] Saxe, R and Weitz, B.A., (1982), "The SOCO scale: a measure of the customer orientation of salespeople", *Journal of Marketing Research*, Vol. 19, No.3:343-351.