

Ambient Lighting – A Turn On or Turn Off for Organized Retail Customers'and Employees'.

Dr. K. Rama MohanaRao, Professor
Dept. of Commerce & Management Studies
Andhra University, Visakhapatnam, India

Dr. EdukondalaRaoJetti
Faculty Member, Dept. of Business Studies,
Ibra College of Technology, Sultanate of Oman

Abstract

'Lighting' in a retail store is an important ambient factor which can make a big difference on the customers' perceptions and can impact positively or negatively on business. Having proper store lighting is a crucial aspect of highlighting products at a retail store and communicating the product values directly and indirectly the overall store brand. Lighting is an important part of "setting the stage" for the customer. Lighting needs to reflect the overall customer experience retailer is trying to establish. It must complement all of the other sensory inputs a customer's receives from being in a store. The present study is an attempt to examine the impact of ambient lighting on the customers' and employees' of selected organized retail stores. The size of the sample is 450 customers and 270 employees of the selected retail stores. Likert scale has been used to collect opinions. Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) is applied using SPSS 16.0. The study revealed that lighting is having positive impact on the behavior of customers in organized retail stores. Lighting enhances the visibility of products on the shelves and is certainly a turn on for customers. However, ambient lighting is not found to be contributing much towards employee's loyalty towards the store.

Keywords –

Ambient Lighting, Consumer Behavior, Retail Store, Shopping Environment, Store Brand.

Introduction:

India has been a nation of 'dukandars' – around 12 million retailers – consisting of more retail shops than those in the rest of world put together. Retailing has been in our blood - as shopkeepers or as shoppers. But things are changing in the country in the way shopping is done, the way retailing is getting modernized and organized, and the way people are viewing this industry – as students, as shoppers and as academicians.

--- Kishore Biyani

India may or may not be the largest democracy in the world but it can safely be described as the leading retail democracy (Chetan Choithani 2009)¹. The Indian retail sector is witnessing tremendous growth with the changing demographics and an increase in the quality of life of urban people. The modern Indian consumer is seeking more value in terms of improved availability and quality, pleasant shopping environment, financing options, trial rooms for clothing products, return and exchange policies, service quality and competitive prices. This has created a rapid growing opportunity for organized, modern retail formats to emerge in recent years and grow at a fast pace.

The retail sector is expanding and modernizing rapidly in line with India's economic growth and the recent Government of India's initiatives (Gupta, Urvashi 2012)². Indian consumers are rapidly evolving and accepting modern retail formats. The shift in consumer spending over the last decade has been gigantic, resulting in a change of priorities for many retailers (Euromonitor International)³. Store designs have become a competitive tool for attracting customers and enabling retailers to communicate a clear identity which further results in customer loyalty and increased profitability. As customers evaluate the total product offer, as a combination of product factors, merchandising and the store environment, the setting in which it is sold will influence customers' perception of a brand. Also, the retail environment creates an atmosphere or 'mood' that drives the customer into purchasing. Henceforth, store design has become an essential part of the business strategy to optimize profit potential by attracting new, while retaining the existing customers. Store design has been playing a vital role in bringing added value to the customers overall shopping experience (Margaret Bruce, et.al, 2004)⁴.

The store's environmental dimensions mediate customer and employee responses leading to behavioral outcomes like approach or avoidance. The store lighting is one of the important factors of the store environment that influences both customers and employees of organized retail stores. According to Ramana Reddy, N.R.V, et.al., (2011)⁵ lighting contributes to attractive retail design further resulting in store satisfaction of shopper's. Quartier, Katelijin, et.al, (2008)⁶ underlined the role of lighting in adding an incremental value to the retail store, store branding and as well customer binding. Their study revealed that under 'bright lighting' conditions products are more often examined, touched and picked than under 'dim lighting conditions. Nam-Kyu Park and Cheryl A. Farr (2007)⁷ conducted an experiment to investigate the impact of color of light on overall room-light evaluation, readability by figure to background value contrast and color perception between the younger and older retail shoppers' and found that providing 'best' lighting would help to achieve more sales with increased efficiency of the employees of the store. Deepika, J and Neeraja, T (2014)⁸ found that the impact of store lighting was only moderate on the consumer's impulsive buying as well as time and money spent at the store. Elena Horska and Jakub Bercik (2014)⁹ found that various types of lighting influences the brain activity and will affect conscious or subconscious consumer reactions thereby affecting their purchase decisions.

Against this backdrop the present study has been taken up with an objective of analyzing the impact of lighting on customers' shopping experience and employees' behavior at organized retail stores. The following null hypothesis has been formulated for the study

Hypothesis I

H₀ - Lighting in the retail store is not having positive impact on shopping behavior of the Customers.

Hypothesis II

H₀-Lighting in the retail store is not having positive impact on the behavior of store employees.

The study covers two retail organizations i.e. Big Bazaar and Spencer which are having a large retail network in India. The survey was conducted in Vijayawada, Visakhapatnam and Hyderabad cities of Andhra Pradesh and Telangana States. Since the universe of the organized retailing is large, convenience sampling technique is used to select the sample units. The size of the sample is 450 customers and 270 employees of the selected retail stores. Likert scale has been used to collect opinions. Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) is applied using SPSS 16.0.

1. Impact of Lighting on Customer Shopping Behavior

H_0 - Lighting in the retail store is not having positive impact on shopping behavior of the customers.

The impact of lighting on their shopping behavior of customers at organized retail stores is measured based on the opinion of the respondents on eleven parameters (Table 1). The mean values of the statements varied between 2.60 and 3.47. The statement 'I am often stimulated to the modern track lighting and chandeliers' secured the highest rating with a mean value of 3.47 and 69.42 per cent score. The statement 'Lighting plays an important role in my store choice' secured second position with a mean value of 3.20 and 63.96 per cent score. The third preference has been given to the statement 'fluorescent lighting makes the store look elegant' with a mean value of 3.14 and 62.84 per cent score. The statement 'Lighting makes the merchandise in the display look attractive' secured the least mean value 2.60 and 51.91 per cent score. The standard deviation of 0.24 signifies the consistency in respondents' opinion for the statements used in the question.

Table - 1: Impact of lighting on the Behavior of Customers

Lighting	Score	Mean	% to Max. Score
Lighting plays an important role in my store choice	1439	3.20	63.96
Lighting makes a store appear to be inviting	1246	2.77	55.38
Lighting makes the products in the store seem appealing and desirable	1284	2.85	57.07
Lighting makes the store displays eye-catching	1342	2.98	59.64
Lighting makes the merchandise in the display look attractive	1168	2.60	51.91
fluorescent lighting makes the store look elegant	1414	3.14	62.84
I am often stimulated to the modern track lighting and chandeliers	1562	3.47	69.42
Spot lights increases the desire to purchase the products	1340	2.98	59.56
I get excited when exposed to the store designer lighting systems	1332	2.96	59.20
lighting enhances the perceived value of the store	1309	2.91	58.18
Attractive lighting provokes me to spread positive word-of-mouth about the store.	1266	2.81	56.27
	Group Mean	2.97	59.40
	SD	0.24	

Source: primary data

1.1 Comparison of Impact of Lighting on customer shopping experience between Male and Female shoppers.

The mean scores of gender wise responses on impact of Lighting on customer shopping experience are given in the Table 2. The mean scores of the sample respondents are found to be 60.59 indicating that the respondents have given fair importance to Lighting. Further, the average scores for Male and Female are 64.95 and 53.93 respectively. The calculated F value (129.38) was found to be significant at 5% level. The results indicated that there exists a significant variation in the perception of Male and Female respondents towards impact of Lighting on shopping.

Table-2: Lighting Impact across Gender

Gender	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Male	272	64.9599	9.85508
Female	178	53.9326	10.35556
Total	450	60.5980	11.40317

Source: primary data

Comparison of Impact of Lighting on Shopping between Male and Female Shoppers (ANOVA)

Gender	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	13083.245	1	13083.245	129.385	.000
Within Groups	45301.299	448	101.119		
Total	58384.544	449			

Source: primary data

1.2 Comparison of Impact of Lighting on customer shopping experience on Age of respondents

The mean scores of age wise responses on impact of Lighting on customer shopping experience is given in the Table 3. The mean scores of the sample respondents were found to be 60.59 indicating that respondents have given fair importance to Lighting. The average scores for respondents of age group 20-30 years is 62.44, for the age group 31-45years is 61.25, and for the age group 45years and above, the average score is 54.72. The calculated F value (14.42) was found to be significant at 5% level. The results indicated that there exists a significant variation among respondents of different age groups in their average scores on impact of Lighting on shopping.

Table-3: Lighting Impact among different age groups of Customers

Age	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
20-30	196	62.4490	10.86269
31-45	173	61.2507	11.97501
>45	81	54.7250	9.46767
Total	450	60.5980	11.40317

Source: primary data

Comparison of Impact of Lighting on Shopping among different age groups of Shoppers (ANOVA)

Age	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	3539.048	2	1769.524	14.422	.000
Within Groups	54845.496	447	122.697		
Total	58384.544	449			

Source: primary data

1.3 Comparison of Impact of Lighting on customer shopping experience on Educational qualification of respondents

The mean scores of Educational qualification wise responses on impact of lighting on customer shopping experience is given in the Table 4. The mean scores of sample respondents were found to be 60.59 indicating that the respondents have given fair importance to Lighting. The average scores for respondents having SSC/Inter qualification is 61.08, for respondents of degree qualification the average score is 64.64, and for respondents having post-graduation and above, the average score is 54.89. The calculated F value (35.46) was found to be significant at 5% level. The results indicated that there exists a significant variation among respondents of different educational groups in their average scores on impact of lighting on shopping.

Table-4: Lighting Impact among different Educational groups of Customers

Education	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
SSC/Inter	109	61.0842	10.86444
Degree	194	64.6485	10.80170
PG&above	147	54.8918	10.17749
Total	450	60.5980	11.40317

Source: primary data

Comparison of Impact of Lighting on Shopping among different Educational groups of Shoppers (ANOVA)

Education	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	7995.183	2	3997.592	35.462	.000
Within Groups	50389.360	447	112.728		
Total	58384.544	449			

Source: primary data

1.4 Comparison of Impact of lighting on customer shopping experience on Occupation of respondents

The mean scores of Occupation wise responses on impact of lighting on customer shopping experience is given in the Table 5. The mean scores of the sample respondents were found to be 60.59 indicating that the respondents have given fair importance to lighting. The average score for student was 59.39, for homemakers the average score is 62.18, for employees the average score is 64.91, and for self-employed the average score is 55.36. The calculated F value (15.85) was found to be significant at 5% level. The results indicated that there exists a significant variation among respondents of different occupational groups in their average scores on impact of lighting on shopping.

Table-5: Lighting Impact among different Occupational groups of Customers

Occupation	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Student	126	59.3939	11.73594
Homemaker	93	62.1896	10.38448
Employee	127	64.9105	11.17360
Self-employed	104	55.3671	9.79901
Total	450	60.5980	11.40317

Source: primary data

Comparison of Impact of Lighting on Shopping among different Occupational groups of Shoppers (ANOVA)

Occupation	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	5625.840	3	1875.280	15.853	.000
Within Groups	52758.704	446	118.293		
Total	58384.544	449			

Source: primary data

1.5 Comparison of Impact of Lighting on customer shopping experience on Monthly Income of respondents

The mean scores of Monthly Income wise responses on impact of lighting on customer shopping experience is given in the Table 6. The mean scores of the sample respondents were found to be 60.59 indicating that the respondents have given fair importance to lighting. The average score for respondents having less than Rs. 20,000 income is 57.11, for respondents having income of more than Rs.20000 but less than Rs.35000 is 61.50, for respondents having income more than Rs. 35000 but less than Rs.50000 is 67.22, and for respondents having more than Rs. 50000 is 62.37. The calculated F value (17.07) was found to be significant at 5% level. The results indicated that there exists a significant variation among respondents of different income groups in their average scores on impact of lighting on shopping.

Table-6: Lighting Impact among different Income groups of Customers

Income	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
<20000	204	57.1123	11.21486
20001-35000	92	61.5020	10.99404
35001-50000	73	67.2229	9.48622
>50000	81	62.3793	10.81643
Total	450	60.5980	11.40317

Source: primary data

Comparison of Impact of Lighting on Shopping among different Income groups of Shoppers (ANOVA)

Income	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	6014.764	3	2004.921	17.075	.000
Within Groups	52369.780	446	117.421		
Total	58384.544	449			

Source: primary data

As the findings of the study revealed significant differences on the identified categorical variables such as gender, age, education, occupation and income of the respondents, the null hypothesis is rejected.

1.6 Comparison of Impact of Lighting on Customer Shopping Experience between stores and Cities.

The mean scores of store wise responses with respect to region on impact of lighting on customer shopping experience are given in Table 7. The impact of lighting on customers at Big Bazaar is found to be more intense in Hyderabad followed by Visakhapatnam and Vijayawada with average scores 67.20, 66.64 and 65.38 respectively. The impact of lighting on customers at Spencer's is found to be more intense in Hyderabad followed by Visakhapatnam and Vijayawada with average scores 58.71, 55.66 and 49.98 respectively. Store Big Bazaar and City Hyderabad achieve the highest mean score (67.20). Significance value of **Store** (0.00) is less than the threshold value (0.05), it can be concluded that **Store** factor alone do affect consumer opinion on lighting. The significance value of **City** (0.00) and interaction between the two factors **Store and City** (0.00) are less than the threshold value (0.05). These are leading to the conclusion that **Store, City, Store and City** does make a difference in consumer opinion on lighting.

Table-7: Lighting Impact on Customer Behavior across Stores and Cities

Store	City	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
BigBazar	Hyderabad	67.2000	9.50149	75
	Vijayawada	65.3818	8.64478	75
	Visakhapatnam	66.6424	10.16941	75
	Total	66.4081	9.44764	225
Spencer's	Hyderabad	58.7152	10.27986	75
	Vijayawada	49.9879	10.19748	75
	Visakhapatnam	55.6606	8.00588	75
	Total	54.7879	10.17700	225
Total	Hyderabad	62.0485	10.41658	150
	Vijayawada	58.3152	11.05774	150
	Visakhapatnam	61.4303	12.36941	150
	Total	60.5980	11.40317	450

Source: primary data

Comparison of Impact of Lighting on Customer Behavior across Stores and Cities (ANOVA)

Source	Type III Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Corrected Model	18262.803 ^a	5	3652.561	40.420	.000
Intercept	1652451.820	1	1652451.820	1.829E4	.000
Store	15190.773	1	15190.773	168.106	.000
City	1201.205	2	600.602	6.646	.001
Store and City	1870.825	2	935.412	10.352	.000
Error	40121.741	444	90.364		
Total	1710836.364	450			
Corrected Total	58384.544	449			

a. R Squared = .313 (Adjusted R Squared = .305)

Source: primary data

2. Impact of Lighting on Store Employee Behavior

H₀ - Lighting in the retail store is not having positive impact on the store employee behavior

Table - 8: Impact of lighting on the Behavior of Store Employees

Lighting	Score	Mean	% to Max. Score
Proper lighting contributes to pleasant work environment	896	3.32	66.37
Designer lighting systems of the store stimulates my passion to serve customer better	958	3.55	70.96
Store lighting has a positive influence on my performance as a sales person.	859	3.18	63.63
Proper lighting of the store associates me for a longer time with the store	917	3.40	67.93
	Group Mean	3.36	67.22
	SD	0.15	

Source: primary data

The opinion of the store employees about the impact of lighting on their behavior at organized retail stores has been ascertained based on four perimeters about lighting that normally influences behavior of employees (Table 8). The mean values of the statements varied between 3.18 and 3.55. The statement 'Designer lighting systems of the store stimulates my passion to serve customer better' secured the highest rating with a mean value of 3.55 and 70.96 per cent score. The statement 'Proper lighting of the store associates me for a longer time with the store' secured second position with a mean value of 3.40 and 67.93 per cent score. The third preference has been given to the statement 'Proper lighting contributes to pleasant work environment' with a mean value of 3.32 and 66.37 per cent score. The statement 'Store lighting has a positive influence on my performance as a sales person.' secured the least mean value 3.18 and 63.63 per cent score. The standard deviation 0.15 signifies the consistency in respondents' opinion for the statements.

2.1 Comparison of Impact of Lighting on Employee Behavior between Male and Female

The mean scores of the sample respondents are found to be 52.77 indicating that the respondents have given comparatively less importance to Lighting. Further, the average scores for Male and Female are 54.62 and 48.69 respectively (Table 9). The calculated F value (8.71) was found to be significant at 5% level. The results indicated that there exists a significant variation in the perception of Male and Female employees towards impact of Lighting on their behavior.

Table-9: Lighting Impact across Gender of Employees

Gender	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Male	186	54.6237	16.33660
Female	84	48.6905	12.66146
Total	270	52.7778	15.51072

Source: primary data

Comparison of Impact of Lighting on Employee Behavior between Male and Female (ANOVA)

Gender	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	2037.058	1	2037.058	8.710	.003
Within Groups	62679.608	268	233.879		
Total	64716.667	269			

Source: primary data

2.2 Comparison of Impact of Lighting on Employee Behavior with respect to Age

The mean scores of age wise responses on impact of Lighting on employee behavior is given in the Table 10. The mean scores of the sample respondents were found to be 52.77 indicating that respondents have given comparatively less importance to Lighting. The mean scores of Impact of lighting on employee behavior were given in Table 10 for identified age groups such as 20-30 years, 31-45 years and 45 years and above. The average scores for respondents of age group 20-30 years is 51.33, for the age group 31-45 years is 53.44, and for the age group 45 years and above, the average score is 54.77. The calculated F value (1.16) was found to be not significant at 5% level. The results indicated that there exists no significant variation among employees of different age groups in their average scores on impact of Lighting on their behavior.

Table-10: Lighting Impact on employees of different age groups

Age	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
20-30	127	51.3386	14.04992
31-45	77	53.4416	16.12573
>45	66	54.7727	17.33009
Total	270	52.7778	15.51072

Source: primary data

Comparison of Impact of Lighting on Employee Behavior among different age groups (ANOVA)

Age	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	559.648	2	279.824	1.165	.314
Within Groups	64157.019	267	240.288		
Total	64716.667	269			

Source: primary data

2.3 Comparison of Impact of Lighting on Employee Behavior with respect to Educational qualification

The mean scores of Educational qualification wise responses on impact of lighting on employee behavior is given in the Table 11. The mean scores of sample respondents were found to be 52.77 indicating that the respondents have given comparatively less importance to Lighting. The average scores for respondents having SSC/Inter qualification is 53.93, for respondents of degree qualification the average score is 54.72, and for respondents having post-graduation and above the average score is 50.43. The F value (2.30) was found to be not significant at 5% level. The results indicated that there exists no significant variation among employees of different educational groups in their average scores on impact of lighting on their behavior.

Table-11: Lighting Impact on Employee Behavior based on Educational Qualification

Education	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
ssc/inter	47	53.9362	14.63083
Degree	109	54.7248	15.57293
pg&above	114	50.4386	15.62222
Total	270	52.7778	15.51072

Source: primary data

Comparison of Impact of Lighting on Employee Behavior based Educational Qualification (ANOVA)

Education	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	1100.045	2	550.022	2.308	.101
Within Groups	63616.622	267	238.265		
Total	64716.667	269			

Source: primary data

2.4 Comparison of Impact of lighting on Employee Behavior with respect to Designation

The mean scores of designation wise responses on impact of lighting on employee behavior are given in the Table 12. The mean scores of the sample respondents were found to be 52.77 indicating that the respondents have given comparatively less importance to lighting. The average score for sales person was 53.90, for floor manager the average score is 50.40, for mall manager the average score is 47.94, and for employees with other designations the average score is 57.09.

Table-12: Lighting Impact on Employee Behavior based on Designation

Designation	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Salesperson	151	53.9073	16.80173
Floor manager	49	50.4082	12.90336
Mall manager	39	47.9487	11.28098
Others	31	57.0968	15.90462
Total	270	52.7778	15.51072

Source: primary data

Comparison of Impact of Lighting on Employee Behavior based on Designation (ANOVA)

Designation	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	1955.521	3	651.840	2.763	.042
Within Groups	62761.146	266	235.944		
Total	64716.667	269			

Source: primary data

The F value (2.76) was found to be significant at 5% level. The results indicated that there exists a significant variation among respondents with different designations in their average scores on impact of lighting on their behavior.

2.5 Comparison of Impact of Lighting on Employee Behavior with respect to Experience

The mean scores of experience wise responses on impact of lighting on customer shopping experience is given in the Table 13. The mean scores of the sample respondents were found to be 52.77 indicating that the respondents have given comparatively less importance to lighting. The average score for respondents having less than 2 years' experience is 53.13, for respondents having experience more than 2 and less than 5 years is 54.23, and for respondents having experience more than 5 years is 48.38.

Table-13: Lighting Impact on Employee Behavior based on Experience

Overall Experience	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
1-2 years	177	53.1356	15.33429
2.1 – 5 years	59	54.2373	16.42154
>5 years	34	48.3824	14.44533
Total	270	52.7778	15.51072

Source: primary data

Comparison of Impact of Lighting on Employee Behavior based on Experience (ANOVA)

Overall Experience	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	805.214	2	402.607	1.682	.188
Within Groups	63911.453	267	239.369		
Total	64716.667	269			

Source: primary data

The F value (1.68) was found to be not significant at 5% level. The results indicated that there exists no significant variation among employees with different experience in their average scores on impact of lighting on their behavior.

Though the findings of the study revealed significant differences on the identified categorical variables such as gender and designation of the employees, no significant differences were identified across variables like age, education and experience of the respondents. Hence, we accept the null hypothesis.

2.6 Comparison of Impact of Lighting on the Behavior of Store Personnel between stores and Cities.

The mean scores of store wise responses with respect to region on impact of lighting on store employees is given in Table 14. The impact of lighting on employees at Big Bazaar is found to be more intense in Visakhapatnam followed by Hyderabad and Vijayawada with average scores 62.55, 57.11 and 49.11 respectively. The impact of lighting on employees at Spencer's is found to be more intense in Vijayawada followed by Hyderabad and Visakhapatnam with average scores 51.44, 50.55 and 45.88 respectively.

Table-14: Lighting Impact on the Behavior of Store Personnel across Stores and Cities

Store	City	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
Big Bazaar	Hyderabad	57.1111	16.42783	45
	Vijayawada	49.1111	12.67105	45
	Visakhapatnam	62.5556	18.63593	45
	Total	56.2593	16.91417	135
Spencer's	Hyderabad	50.5556	14.31076	45
	Vijayawada	51.4444	13.88353	45
	Visakhapatnam	45.8889	10.46036	45
	Total	49.2963	13.13198	135
Total	Hyderabad	53.8333	15.66952	90
	Vijayawada	50.2778	13.26822	90
	Visakhapatnam	54.2222	17.20516	90
	Total	52.7778	15.51072	270

Source: primary data

Comparison of Impact of Lighting on the Behavior of Store Personnel across Stores and Cities (ANOVA)

Source	Type III Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Corrected Model	8190.000 ^a	5	1638.000	7.650	.000
Intercept	752083.333	1	752083.333	3.513E3	.000
Store	3272.593	1	3272.593	15.284	.000
City	850.556	2	425.278	1.986	.139
Store and City	4066.852	2	2033.426	9.497	.000
Error	56526.667	264	214.116		
Total	816800.000	270			
Corrected Total	64716.667	269			

a. R Squared = .127 (Adjusted R Squared = .110)

Source: primary data

Store Big Bazaar and City Visakhapatnam achieve the highest mean score (62.55). Significance value of **Store** (0.00) is less than the threshold value (0.05), it can be concluded that **Store** factor alone do affect consumer opinion on lighting. The significance value of **City** (0.13) is greater than the threshold value (0.05) and interaction between the two factors Store and **City** (0.00) is less than the threshold value (0.05). These are leading to the conclusion that **Store, City, Store and City** does not make a difference in employees' opinion on lighting.

Implications and Conclusion:

The Indian retail environment is going through a sea change due to the introduction of new formats and opening up of retail industry, making it important for retailers to understand the store experience perceptions of customers and employees. The present study is an attempt to find out the impact of ambient lighting on the behavior of customers' and employees' in an organized retail store setting. The study revealed that lighting is having positive impact on the behavior of customers in organized retail stores. Lighting enhances the visibility of products on the shelves and is certainly a turn on for customers. The impact of lighting at Big Bazaar and Spencer's is more dominant on the customers of Hyderabad followed by Visakhapatnam and Vijayawada respectively. The impact of lighting is found significant in influencing the shopping behavior and experience of customers in organized retail stores. However, ambient lighting is not found to be contributing much towards employee's loyalty towards the store. Retailers are advised not to use flashy lights that cause inconvenience to sales personnel who stay for long hours with the store. The study emphasized on the need for retailers to realize the benefits, high quality lighting can offer them and to reinforce the fact that quality lighting enhances the perception of value of both merchandise and the retail environments. Hence, retailers need to focus on lighting as an important tool to improve store ambience and store patronage.

References:

1. ChetanChoithani., *Entry of corporate retail: Impact on hawkers & small retailers-A case study from Mumbai, A Report for Focus on the Global South, December 2009.*
2. Urvashi Gupta., *Changing consumer preferences from unorganized retailing towards organized retailing: A study in Jammu, Journal of Emerging Knowledge on Emerging Markets, Vol.4, pp.1-20, November 2012.*
3. *Euromonitor International, The internationalisation of retailing Success, failure and the importance of adapting to the market. (www.euromonitor.com)*
4. Margaret Bruce, et.al, *International Retail Marketing: A Case Study Approach, Burlington: Elsevier Butterworth-Heinemann, pp.198-199, 2004.*
5. Ramana Reddy, N.R.V, et.al., *Role of in-store lighting in store satisfaction, International Journal of Business and Management Tomorrow, Vol.1, No.3, pp.1-8, 2011.*
6. Quartier, Katelijin, et.al., *Research design: Lighting as an atmospheric tool, creating experiences which influence consumers' mood and behavior in commercial spaces, Design Research Society Conference Proceedings, pp. 216/1-16, Sheffield, UK, 16-19 July 2008.*
7. Nam-Kyu Park and Cheryl A. Farr., *Retail store lighting for elderly consumers: An experimental approach, Family and Consumer Sciences Research Journal, Vol.35, pp.316-337, 2007.*
8. Deepika, J and Neeraja, T., *Lighting Impact on Consumer's Shopping Behaviour in Retail Cloth Stores, International Journal of Science and Research, Vol. 3, No.11, pp.933-938, November 2014.*
9. Elena Horska and JakubBercik., *The Influence of Light on Consumer Behavior at the Food Market, Journal of Food Products Marketing, Vol. 20, No.4, 2014.*