



---

***ANALYSIS OF DEMOGRAPHIC FACTOR WISE CUSTOMERS  
SATISFACTION LEVEL TOWARDS ATTRIBUTES OF HATCHBACK CAR***

**Dr. Chanpreet**

Department of Commerce, University College  
Chaudhary Devi Lal University, Sirsa  
e-mail id: chanpreetriar@gmail.com

***Abstract***

*The paper is an effort to analyse the demographic wise customer satisfaction towards attributes of hatchback car in Haryana. The present study used exploratory research design. The study conducted on 536 respondents from Haryana. The primary data collected through structured questionnaire with help of likert scale. Secondary data also collected from different previous research studies, including several journals, articles, books, etc. Further, the data analysed through ANOVA and t-test. The study revealed that demographic factor wise customers satisfaction do not differ significant towards point of purchase service quality, design of car, engine performance, comfort and functionality and safety of car as attributes of the hatchback car. The study suggested that manufacturers should also focus on specific attributes of car with respect to demographic factor. For the growth of the country, India should try to step forward, reduce taxes, and restructuring the tariff structure for e-vehicles, which have less pollution, advanced fuel efficiency, and are safer to drive.*

**Keyword:** hatchback car, design, gender, income, and safety, etc.

**1. INTRODUCTION**

The Indian automobile sector is by far the world's fastest developing sector. It has played a significant role in the country's economic growth during the past three decades, owing to its exponential expansion. (Truebil, 2020). Today, the consumers have a number of brands and variants of car from which they can select a particular brand with the hope of drawing more satisfaction from the choice. But, before making the final choice, they have to consider a number of factors. An identification analysis of various factors influencing the consumers' decision towards the purchase of particular brand of car. The manufacturers or sellers must fully understand the factors, which influence the consumers' choice towards a particular brand of car (Rajasekar & Kumar, 2015). Purchasing behaviour of Consumer influenced by economic, technological, political, cultural, demographic factors, as well as customer aspects such as attitude, motivation, perception, personality, knowledge, and lifestyle (Shende, 2014). Customer satisfaction is the most important aspect that companies must understand in order to remain competitive and grow. In today's competitive environment delivering high quality

service is the key for a sustainable competitive advantage. Satisfied customer form the foundation of any successful business as it leads to repeated purchase and positive word of mouth. A customer who has a good experience with the concerned dealer may probably use the same brand again. The core activity of any company is to attract and retain consumers. For this reason improving quality is important for existing customer and also for attracting the new customers (**Hemlata & Singh, 2017**).

## **2. LITERATURE REVIEW**

**Srivastava and Tiwari (2011)** studied the consumer behavior towards A3 segment vehicles such as Honda City and SX4 in Jaipur. The study also considered the price, safety, comfort, power and pickup, mileage, max speed, styling, after sales service, brand name and spare parts cost. It revealed that while purchasing A3 segment car customer give much importance to safety, brand name and seating and driving comfort. It also found that word of mouth publicity and advertisements in car magazines are more effective communication medium for the promotion of Cars. **Ahmed, Zaman, and Irfan, (2013)** concluded that safety was the main priority in all attributes pursued by quality, value performance, design, technology and environment. **Prieto and Caemmerer (2013)** investigated the impact of socio-demographic factor on consumers' decision to buy used or new cars across different automobile segments in Europe and France. It observed that economic, individual, household factors impact on car segment choice, as well as the decision of whether to buy a new or a used car. **Girdhar, Ghalawat and Kavitha (2015)** studied the various attributes of a car regarding consumer buying behaviour and revealed that consumer more influenced by product strategies, technology advancement and level of satisfaction, workshop features and service orientation. **Doshi and Parmar (2016)** found that consumers purchase decision considered safety, performance, aesthetic and value which are the factors affecting consumer's brand preference for hatchback cars. The buying behavior of customer studied by knowing their perception about the cars in the market. When a customer is satisfied with the product or service, he recommends that product and service to another prospective customer. **Hemlata and Singh (2017)** analyzed consumer level of satisfaction towards environment of the showrooms and the design of car, engine performance and the safety of car. The author found that all selected demographic factors affected to selected attributes. **Dhanabalan, et. al. (2018)** examined the attributes which mostly affecting the purchase decision of the automobile consumer in Tamilnadu. It found that the customer perceived value was positively influenced by brand, price, quality, design, utility, technical consideration. **Chanpreet (2020)** analysed the customer preference towards marketing attributes of hatchback car in Haryana. The study revealed that there is no significant difference of customers' preference towards price, place, promotion and post purchase related marketing attributes of the hatchback car. **Janoskova, et. al. (2021)** analysed the impact of selected socio-demographic characteristics on the purchasing behaviour of Slovak consumers. The study conducted on 2002 respondents from Slovak republic. The study confirmed that the main reason are the expected quality, the fact that the preferred brand car making respondents happier and increase their social status.

After the

### 3. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The purpose of the study is to analyse the demographic factor wise customers' satisfaction towards attributes of hatchback car. The present study is used exploratory research design. Hypothesis of the study: The demographic profile wise customers' satisfaction does not differ significantly towards attributes of hatchback car. Convenience sampling has been used. The study is selected the 536 respondents from Haryana as a sample. Data is collected with help of structured questionnaire at likert scale. Further, the data is analyzed with the help of statistical techniques such as ANOVA and t-test.

### 4. ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION

This section covers the demographic profile of sample and analysis of customer satisfaction level at the time of purchase of hatchback car in term of following parameters *i.e.*, the point of purchase service quality criterion, design of the car, engine performance, comfort and functionality of the car and the safety. The analysis also covers the gender-wise, age-wise, qualification-wise, occupation-wise, marital status-wise and income-wise analysis of level of satisfaction at the time of purchase of car.

Table 1 depicts the demographic profile of the respondents; in which 81.5 percent are male and only 18.5 percent are female. Likewise, 56.7 percent belong to the 35-45 yr. age group and only 10.1 percent from more than 45 yr. age group. Whereas, 71.1 percent are graduate and only 4.5 percent are diploma holder. 65.1 percent are employees or in service, whereas 6.2 percent respondents are retired employees or serviceman. 72.8 percent are married only 27.2 percent are single or unmarried. Out of total, 93.5 percent are having the income less than 7 lakh and 6.5 percent having the 7-15 lakh income.

Table 2 showed the analysis of point of purchase service quality criterion, in which gender-wise t-test shows that there is no significance difference between the male and female customers' level of satisfaction towards professionalism of the sales representative ( $p=0.301$ ), kindness and good manners of the sales representative ( $p=0.126$ ), sales representative willingness to inform customer ( $p=0.577$ ), ease of contact with the sales representative ( $p=0.128$ ), atmosphere in the showroom ( $p=0.631$ ), wide range of product offer ( $p=0.754$ ), availability of additional services (financing, test drives etc.) ( $p=0.848$ ), promptitude of service realization ( $p=0.113$ ) and abidance of timing of the service ( $p=0.301$ ) as point of purchase service quality criterion attributes. Therefore, the null hypothesis is accepted. Age-wise the results of the ANOVA showed that there is no significance difference among the age-wise customers level of satisfaction towards professionalism of the sales representative ( $p=0.064$ ), sales representative willingness to inform customer ( $p=0.417$ ), ease of contact with the sales representative ( $p=0.250$ ), atmosphere in the showroom ( $p=0.061$ ), wide range of product offer ( $p=0.096$ ), availability of additional services (financing, test drives etc.) ( $p=0.297$ ) and abidance of timing of the service ( $p=0.017$ ) as point of purchase service quality criterion. Therefore, the null hypothesis is accepted.

As per table 2, qualification-wise ANOVA results depicted that there is no significant difference among qualification-wise customers level of satisfaction towards professionalism of the sales representative ( $p=0.133$ ), kindness and good manners of the sales representative ( $p=0.621$ ), sales representative willingness to inform customer ( $p=0.129$ ), ease of contact with the sales representative ( $p=0.662$ ), atmosphere in the showroom ( $p=0.178$ ), availability of additional services (financing, test

drives etc.) ( $p=0.687$ ), promptitude of service realization ( $p=0.675$ ), and abundance of timing of the service ( $p=0.052$ ) as point of purchase service quality criterion. Therefore, the null hypothesis is accepted.

Occupation-wise ANOVA resulted that there is no significant difference among occupation-wise customers level of satisfaction towards ease of contact with the sales representative ( $p=0.544$ ), atmosphere in the showroom ( $p=0.112$ ), wide range of product offer ( $p=0.200$ ), availability of additional services (financing, test drives etc.) ( $p=0.073$ ), and promptitude of service realization ( $p=0.138$ ) as point of purchase service quality criterion. Therefore, the null hypothesis is accepted. Marital Status-wise the results of the t-test showed that there is no significant difference between single and married customers level of satisfaction towards professionalism of the sales representative ( $p=0.870$ ), sales representative willingness to inform customer ( $p=0.824$ ), ease of contact with the sales representative ( $p=0.079$ ), availability of additional services (financing, test drives etc.) ( $p=0.306$ ), and abundance of timing of the service ( $p=0.086$ ) as point of purchase service quality criterion. Therefore, the null hypothesis is accepted. Income-wise ANOVA results showed that there is no significant difference among the income-wise customers level of satisfaction towards professionalism of the sales representative ( $p=0.138$ ), kindness and good manners of the sales representative ( $p=0.188$ ), sales representative willingness to inform customer ( $p=0.870$ ), ease of contact with the sales representative ( $p=0.763$ ), wide range of product offer ( $p=0.374$ ), availability of additional services (financing, test drives etc.) ( $p=0.622$ ), promptitude of service realization ( $p=0.856$ ) and abundance of timing of the service ( $p=0.839$ ) as point of purchase service quality criterion. Therefore, the null hypothesis is accepted.

Table 3 showed the analysis of customer satisfaction towards the design of car, in which gender-wise t-test results depicted that there is no significant difference between the male and female customers level of satisfaction towards exterior styling ( $p=0.281$ ), quality of workmanship ( $p=0.591$ ), leg room ( $p=0.159$ ), dash board ( $p=0.334$ ), interior color ( $p=0.245$ ), music system ( $p=0.132$ ), adjustable front seat headrest ( $p=0.235$ ), modernity of design ( $p=0.055$ ), and uniqueness of design ( $p=0.273$ ) as the design of car. Therefore, the null hypothesis is accepted. The results of age-wise ANOVA showed that there is no significant difference among the age-wise customers level of satisfaction towards exterior styling ( $p=0.499$ ), quality of workmanship ( $p=0.356$ ), shininess or smoothness ( $p=0.260$ ), seats design ( $p=0.971$ ), leg room ( $p=0.842$ ), dash board ( $p=0.471$ ), interior color ( $p=0.218$ ), adjustable front seat headrest ( $p=0.179$ ) and uniqueness of design ( $p=0.906$ ) as the design of car who influence purchasing of hatchback car. Therefore, the null hypothesis is accepted. Qualification-wise analysis ANOVA resulted that there is no significant difference among qualification-wise customers level of satisfaction towards exterior styling ( $p=0.121$ ), quality of workmanship ( $p=0.201$ ), seats design ( $p=0.823$ ), leg room ( $p=0.688$ ), dash board ( $p=0.724$ ), interior color ( $p=0.272$ ), music system ( $p=0.406$ ), adjustable front seat headrest ( $p=0.085$ ), modernity of design ( $p=0.415$ ) and uniqueness of design ( $p=0.846$ ) as the design of car. Therefore, the null hypothesis is accepted. Occupation-wise ANOVA resulted that there is no significant difference among occupation-wise customers level of satisfaction towards quality of

workmanship ( $p=0.424$ ), seats design ( $p=0.102$ ), leg room ( $p=0.698$ ), dash board ( $p=0.294$ ), interior color ( $p=0.948$ ), music system ( $p=0.111$ ) and adjustable front seat headrest ( $p=0.888$ ) as the design of car. Therefore, the null hypothesis is accepted. The results of marital status-wise t-test showed that there is no significant difference between single and married customers level of satisfaction towards exterior styling ( $p=0.584$ ), quality of workmanship ( $p=0.058$ ), shininess or smoothness ( $p=0.807$ ), seats design ( $p=0.836$ ), leg room ( $p=0.490$ ), interior color ( $p=0.398$ ), music system ( $p=0.932$ ), adjustable front seat headrest ( $p=0.279$ ), modernity of design ( $p=0.083$ ) and uniqueness of design ( $p=0.638$ ) as the design of car. Therefore, the null hypothesis is accepted. Income-wise ANOVA results showed that there is no significant difference among the income-wise customers level of satisfaction towards exterior styling ( $p=0.063$ ), quality of workmanship ( $p=0.822$ ), shininess or smoothness ( $p=0.857$ ), seats design ( $p=0.704$ ), leg room ( $p=0.109$ ), dash board ( $p=0.662$ ), interior color ( $p=0.406$ ), music system ( $p=0.095$ ), adjustable front seat headrest ( $p=0.941$ ), modernity of design ( $p=0.223$ ) and uniqueness of design ( $p=0.588$ ) as the design of car. Therefore, the null hypothesis is accepted.

Table 4 elaborated the analysis of engine performance, in which gender-wise the results of the t-test showed that there is no significant difference between the male and female customers level of satisfaction towards fuel consumption ( $p=0.511$ ), mileage ( $p=0.825$ ), pickup ( $p=0.163$ ) and top speed ( $p=0.055$ ) as engine performance of the car. Therefore, the null hypothesis is accepted. The results of age-wise ANOVA depicted that there is no significance difference among the age-wise customers level of satisfaction towards fuel consumption ( $p=0.851$ ), mileage ( $p=0.656$ ), pickup ( $p=0.539$ ) and top speed ( $p=0.837$ ) as engine performance of the car. Therefore, the null hypothesis is accepted. Qualification-wise ANOVA results showed that there is no significant difference among qualification-wise customers level of satisfaction towards fuel consumption ( $p=0.497$ ), mileage ( $p=0.113$ ), pickup ( $p=0.814$ ), stability at higher speed ( $p=0.210$ ) and top speed ( $p=0.291$ ) as engine performance of the car. Therefore, the null hypothesis is accepted. Occupation-wise ANOVA resulted that there is a significant difference among occupation-wise customers level of satisfaction towards fuel consumption ( $p=0.001$ ), pickup ( $p=0.043$ ), stability at higher speed ( $p=0.004$ ) and top speed ( $p=0.000$ ) as engine performance of the car. Therefore, the null hypothesis is rejected. The results of Marital Status-wise t-test showed that there is no significant difference between single and married customers level of satisfaction towards fuel consumption ( $p=0.367$ ), mileage ( $p=0.990$ ), pickup ( $p=0.276$ ), stability at higher speed ( $p=0.084$ ) and top speed ( $p=0.649$ ) as engine performance of the car as attribute who influence purchasing of hatchback car. Therefore, the null hypothesis is accepted. Income-wise ANOVA results depicted that there is no significant difference among the income-wise customers level of satisfaction towards fuel consumption ( $p=0.257$ ), mileage ( $p=0.168$ ), pickup ( $p=0.581$ ), stability at higher speed ( $p=0.505$ ) and top speed ( $p=0.592$ ) as engine performance of the car who influence purchasing of car. Therefore, the null hypothesis is accepted.

Table 5 presented the analysis of comfort and functionality of the car, in which gender-wise results of the t-test showed that there is no significant difference between the male and female customers level of satisfaction towards seats comfort ( $p=0.896$ ), visibility from driver's seat ( $p=0.395$ ),

functionality of steering elements ( $p=0.506$ ), interior space ( $p=0.132$ ), possibilities of interior space management ( $p=0.200$ ), boot capacity ( $p=0.729$ ), and air-conditioning/ventilating systems ( $p=0.931$ ) as comfort and functionality of the car who influence purchasing of car. Therefore, the null hypothesis is accepted. The results of age-wise ANOVA depicted that there is no significant difference among the age-wise customers level of satisfaction towards visibility from driver's seat ( $p=0.587$ ), interior space ( $p=0.319$ ), boot capacity ( $p=0.840$ ), and air-conditioning/ventilating systems ( $p=0.500$ ) as comfort and functionality of the car who influence purchasing of hatchback car. Therefore, the null hypothesis is accepted. Qualification-wise ANOVA resulted that there is no significant difference among qualification-wise customers level of satisfaction towards visibility from driver's seat ( $p=0.225$ ), interior space ( $p=0.211$ ), possibilities of interior space management ( $p=0.346$ ), boot capacity ( $p=0.603$ ) and communication systems like radio, navigation etc. ( $p=0.981$ ) as comfort and functionality of the car who influence purchasing of car. Therefore, the null hypothesis is accepted. The results of occupation-wise ANOVA showed that there is no significant difference among occupation-wise customers level of satisfaction towards visibility from driver's seat ( $p=0.167$ ), functionality of steering elements ( $p=0.053$ ), interior space ( $p=0.926$ ), boot capacity ( $p=0.440$ ) and air-conditioning/ventilating systems ( $p=0.103$ ) as comfort and functionality of the car. Therefore, the null hypothesis is accepted. Marital status-wise t-test presented that there is no significant difference between single and married customers level of satisfaction towards seats comfort ( $p=0.477$ ), visibility from driver's seat ( $p=0.234$ ), functionality of steering elements ( $p=0.541$ ), interior space ( $p=0.058$ ), boot capacity ( $p=0.979$ ), communication systems like radio, navigation etc. ( $p=0.114$ ) and air-conditioning/ventilating systems ( $p=0.173$ ) as comfort and functionality of the car. Therefore, the null hypothesis is accepted. Income-wise ANOVA results showed that there is no significant difference among the income-wise customers level of satisfaction towards seats comfort ( $p=0.398$ ), visibility from driver's seat ( $p=0.886$ ), functionality of steering elements ( $p=0.676$ ), interior space ( $p=0.066$ ), possibilities of interior space management ( $p=0.900$ ), boot capacity ( $p=0.951$ ), communication systems like radio, navigation etc. ( $p=0.899$ ) and air-conditioning/ventilating systems ( $p=0.405$ ) as comfort and functionality of the car. Therefore, the null hypothesis is accepted.

Table 6 presented the analysis of customers level of satisfaction towards the safety of hatchback car, in which gender-wise the results of the t-test showed that there is no significant difference between the male and female customers level of satisfaction towards air bags for driver safety ( $p=0.298$ ), anti-lock breaking system ( $p=0.299$ ), aerodynamic shape ( $p=0.285$ ), intensity of front lights ( $p=0.061$ ), anti theft system ( $p=0.173$ ), seat belts ( $p=0.851$ ), pulling forward safety brakes during severe accidents ( $p=0.171$ ), and fog lights ( $p=0.443$ ) as the safety of car. Therefore, the null hypothesis is accepted. Age-wise the results of the ANOVA showed that there is no significant difference among the age-wise customers level of satisfaction towards crossbar under dashboard ( $p=0.477$ ), air bags for driver safety ( $p=0.452$ ), anti-lock breaking system ( $p=0.203$ ), aerodynamic shape ( $p=0.810$ ), intensity of front lights ( $p=0.291$ ), anti theft system ( $p=0.069$ ), seat belts ( $p=0.542$ ), pulling forward safety brakes during severe accidents ( $p=0.242$ ), reverse warning system (reverse sensor) ( $p=0.362$ ), and fog lights ( $p=0.147$ ) as the

safety of car. Therefore, the null hypothesis is accepted. The results of qualification-wise ANOVA depicted that there is no significant difference among qualification-wise customers level of satisfaction towards crossbar under dashboard ( $p=0.194$ ), air bags for driver safety ( $p=0.294$ ), anti-lock breaking system ( $p=0.244$ ), intensity of front lights ( $p=0.894$ ), anti theft system ( $p=0.272$ ), seat belts ( $p=0.294$ ), pulling forward safety brakes during severe accidents ( $p=0.555$ ) and fog lights ( $p=0.545$ ) as the safety of car. Therefore, the null hypothesis is accepted. Occupation-wise ANOVA resulted that there is a significant difference among occupation-wise customers level of satisfaction towards crossbar under dashboard ( $p=0.359$ ), air bags for driver safety ( $p=0.984$ ), anti-lock breaking system ( $p=0.426$ ), aerodynamic shape ( $p=0.052$ ), anti theft system ( $p=0.063$ ) and pulling forward safety brakes during severe accidents ( $p=0.121$ ) as the safety of the car. Therefore, the null hypothesis is accepted. Marital status-wise the results of the t-test showed that there is no significant difference among single and married customers level of satisfaction towards crossbar under dashboard ( $p=0.666$ ), air bags for driver safety ( $p=0.082$ ), anti-lock breaking system ( $p=0.138$ ), aerodynamic shape ( $p=0.409$ ), intensity of front lights ( $p=0.092$ ), anti theft system ( $p=0.345$ ), seat belts ( $p=0.119$ ), pulling forward safety brakes during severe accidents ( $p=0.101$ ) and fog lights ( $p=0.265$ ) as the safety *i.e.*, attribute of car. Therefore, the null hypothesis is accepted. Income-wise ANOVA results showed that there is no significant difference among the income-wise customers level of satisfaction towards crossbar under dashboard ( $p=0.968$ ), air bags for driver safety ( $p=0.213$ ), anti-lock breaking system ( $p=0.302$ ), aerodynamic shape ( $p=0.292$ ), intensity of front lights ( $p=0.871$ ), anti theft system ( $p=0.160$ ), seat belts ( $p=0.733$ ), pulling forward safety brakes during severe accidents ( $p=0.539$ ), reverse warning system (reverse sensor) ( $p=0.158$ ) and fog lights ( $p=0.284$ ) as the safety of car. Therefore, the null hypothesis is accepted.

## 5. CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTION OF THE STUDY

India is the world's fifth largest manufacturer of cars and seventh largest manufacturer of commercial vehicles. India is expected to become the world 3rd largest automobile market by 2030. This is based on high level economic growth, government investment in infrastructure and increasing the upwardly mobile middle class. Therefore, this study is very useful for automobile industrial growth. The study found that there is no significant difference between demographic factor wise customers level of satisfaction towards point of purchase service quality, the design of car, engine performance, comfort and functionality and the safety of car as the attributes of hatchback car which influence the purchase decision. Gender, age, occupation, marital status, qualification and income of the customer play an important role in the purchase decision; therefore, industry should try to focus the attributes of car with respect to the socio-demographic factor.

## REFERENCES:

- Ahmed, M; Zaman, F. & Irfan, M.S. (2013). Consumer's brand choice behavior for car. *Kuwait Chapter of Arabian Journal of Business and Management Review*, 2 (5), 198-205.
- Chanpreet (2020). Analysis of customer preference towards marketing attributes of hatchback car in Haryana. *International Journal of Research in Economics and Social Sciences*, 10 (12), 204-213.
- Dangi, A. (2017). Exploring determinants affecting purchase behaviour: Opinion of passenger car users. *IOSR Journal of Business and Management (IOSR-JBM)*, 19 (09), 01-08.
- Dhanabalan, T.; Subha, K.; Shanthi, R. & Sathish, A. (2018). Factors influencing consumers' car purchasing decision in Indian automobile industry. *International Journal of Mechanical Engineering and Technology*, 9(10), 53–63.
- Doshi, V. & Parmar, C. (2016). Factors affecting buyer's decision while purchasing hatchback Car. *International Journal of Advance Research in Computer Science and Management Studies*, 4 (7), 1-7.
- Girdhar, A.; Ghalawat, S. & Kavitha, C. (2015). A study of consumer behavior considering various attributes towards purchasing a car. *International Journal of Science technology and Management*, 4 (11), 175-184.
- Gupta, V.; Syed, A. A. & Chaturvedi, M. (2017). A Study on the purchase behaviour of customers of hatchback cars in Delhi/NCR Region. *Pacific Business Review International*, 9 (10). Accessed from [www.pbr.co.in](http://www.pbr.co.in).
- Hemlata & Singh, A. (2017). Customer satisfaction towards maruti suzuki cars: a case study of Solan city, Himachal Pradesh. *International Journal of Advance Research and Innovative Ideas in Education*, 3 (4).
- Janoskova, K.; Kral, P.; Popescu, G. H.; Rowland, Z.; & Kramarova, K. (2021). Perception of car brands with an emphasis on expected benefits and features as prerequisites for customer satisfaction. *Management & Marketing. Challenges for the Knowledge Society*, 16 (3), 300-315.
- Malhotra, N. K. & Dash, S. (2010). *Marketing Research - An Applied Orientation*. 6<sup>th</sup> Edition, New Delhi, Pearson Education, Inc.
- Prieto, M. & Caemmerer, B. (2013). An exploration of factors influencing car purchasing decisions. *International Journal of Retail & Distribution Management*, 41(10), 738-764, accessed from <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJRDM-02-2012-0017>.
- Rajasekar, T & Kumar, R. S. (2015). Determinants of preference towards passenger cars – the case of Madurai city in Tamilnadu. *IOSR Journal of Business and Management*, 17 (7), accessed from <http://iosrjournals.org/iosr-jbm/papers/Vol17-issue7/Version-3/M017738488.pdf> on 20/08/2018
- Roy, P. & Loomba, A. (2019). Impact of post-liberalization and its impact on buying behavior and attitudes of consumer behavior towards premium car segments- A detailed investigation in Madhya Pradesh State. *Journal of Advances in Science and Technology*. 16 (1), 134-139.
- Shende, V. (2014). Analysis of research in consumer behavior of automobile passenger car customer. *International Journal of Scientific and Research Publications*, 4 (2), 1-8, February.
- Srinivastava, T. N. & Rego, S. (2011). *Business Research Methodology*. 1<sup>st</sup> Edition, New Delhi, Tata McGraw Hill Education Private Limited.



- Truebil Blog (2020). 5 Factors Affecting Car Purchase in India. Accessed from <https://www.truebil.com/blog/5-factors-affecting-car-purchase-in-india>.

**Table 1: Demographic profile of sample**

<b>Gender</b>	<b>No. of respondents</b>	<b>Percent</b>
Male	437	81.5
Female	99	18.5
<b>Age (in years)</b>		
Less than 35 yr.	178	33.2
35-45 yr.	304	56.7
More than 45 yr	54	10.1
<b>Qualification</b>		
Diploma	24	4.5
Graduate	381	71.1
Post graduate and other	131	24.4
<b>Occupation</b>		
Employees/Service	349	65.1
Self Employees	154	28.7
Retired	33	6.2
<b>Marital Status</b>		
Single	146	27.2
Married	390	72.8
<b>Income (in ₹)</b>		
Less than 7 lakh	501	93.5
7-15 Lakh	35	6.5
<b>Total</b>	<b>536</b>	<b>100.0</b>

Source: Survey. Data Processed through PASW (18.0 version).

**Table 2: Inferential Statistics of Point of purchase service quality Criterion**

Sr. No.	Criterion	Gender		Age		Qualification		Occupation		Marital Status		Income	
		t	sign	F	sign	F	sign	F	sign	t	sign	F	sign
1	Professionalism of the sales representative	1.037	0.301	2.759	0.064	2.025	0.133	4.811	0.008*	0.164	0.870	2.202	0.138
2	Kindness and good manners of the sales representative	1.536	0.126	5.276	0.005*	0.477	0.621	4.969	0.007*	3.303	0.001*	1.737	0.188
3	Sales representative willingness to inform customer	0.558	0.577	0.877	0.417	2.053	0.129	5.986	0.003*	0.223	0.824	0.027	0.870
4	Ease of contact with the sales representative	1.525	0.128	1.389	0.250	0.412	0.662	0.609	0.544	1.761	0.079	0.091	0.763
5	Atmosphere in the showroom	0.481	0.631	2.805	0.061	1.734	0.178	2.198	0.112	4.068	0.000*	3.945	0.048*
6	Wide range of product offer	0.313	0.754	2.349	0.096	6.624	0.001*	1.612	0.200	2.187	0.029*	0.793	0.374
7	Availability of additional services (financing, test drives etc.)	0.193	0.848	1.218	0.297	0.375	0.687	2.637	0.073	1.026	0.306	0.244	0.622
8	Promptitude of service realization	1.595	0.113	4.117	0.017*	0.393	0.675	1.990	0.138	2.962	0.003*	0.033	0.856
9	Abundance of timing of the service	1.037	0.301	0.698	0.498	2.972	0.052	6.079	0.002*	1.720	0.086	0.041	0.839

Source: Survey, Note: \*Significant at 5 percent level of significance. Data Processed through PASW (18.0 version).

**Table 3: Inferential Statistics of Design of the car**

Sr. No.	Design of the car	Gender		Age		Qualification		Occupation		Marital Status		Income	
		t	sign	F	sign	F	sign	F	sign	T	sign	F	sign
1	Exterior styling	1.079	0.281	0.695	0.499	2.117	0.121	8.947	0.000*	0.548	0.584	3.464	0.063
2	Quality of workmanship	0.537	0.591	1.035	0.356	1.608	0.201	0.859	0.424	1.904	0.058	0.050	0.822
3	Shininess or smoothness	2.795	0.005*	1.352	0.260	6.165	0.002*	12.274	0.000*	0.244	0.807	0.033	0.857
4	Seats design	2.166	0.031*	0.030	0.971	0.195	0.823	2.288	0.102	0.207	0.836	0.145	0.704
5	Leg Room	1.415	0.159	0.172	0.842	0.374	0.688	0.360	0.698	0.692	0.490	2.571	0.109
6	Dash Board	0.970	0.334	0.755	0.471	0.323	0.724	1.226	0.294	2.156	0.032*	0.192	0.662
7	Interior Color	1.166	0.245	1.527	0.218	1.307	0.272	0.054	0.948	0.846	0.398	0.693	0.406
8	Music System	1.515	0.132	4.693	0.010*	0.902	0.406	2.209	0.111	0.085	0.932	2.801	0.095
9	Adjustable Front seat Headrest	1.193	0.235	1.726	0.179	2.475	0.085	0.118	0.888	1.085	0.279	0.006	0.941
10	Modernity of design	1.934	0.055	4.409	0.013*	0.880	0.415	4.754	0.009*	1.741	0.083	1.491	0.223
11	Uniqueness of design	1.096	0.273	0.098	0.906	0.167	0.846	7.874	0.000*	0.471	0.638	0.293	0.588

**Source:** Survey, **Note:** \* Significant at 5 percent level of significance. Data Processed through PASW (18.0 version).

**Table 4: Inferential Statistics of Engine performance**

Sr. No.	Engine performance	Gender		Age		Qualification		Occupation		Marital Status		Income	
		t	sign	F	sign	F	sign	F	sign	t	sign	F	Sign
1	Fuel Consumption	0.659	0.511	0.161	0.851	0.700	0.497	7.639	0.001*	0.904	0.367	1.285	0.257
2	Mileage (Km/liter)	0.221	0.825	0.422	0.656	2.192	0.113	2.507	0.082	0.012	0.990	1.902	0.168
3	Pick Up	1.401	0.163	0.618	0.539	0.206	0.814	3.175	0.043*	1.090	0.276	0.304	0.581
4	Stability at higher speed	2.116	0.036*	3.682	0.026*	1.567	0.210	5.663	0.004*	1.732	0.084	0.445	0.505
5	Top speed	1.937	0.055	0.178	0.837	1.237	0.291	12.831	0.000*	0.456	0.649	0.288	0.592

**Source:** Survey, **Note:** \* Significant at 5 percent level of significance. Data Processed through PASW (18.0 version).

**Table 5: Inferential Statistics of Comfort and functionality of the car**

Sr. No.	Comfort and functionality	Gender		Age		Qualification		Occupation		Marital Status		Income	
		t	sign	F	sign	F	sign	F	sign	t	sign	F	sign
1	Seats comfort	0.131	0.896	3.665	0.026*	3.391	0.034*	4.099	0.017*	0.713	0.477	0.714	0.398
2	Visibility from driver's seat	0.852	0.395	0.533	0.587	1.495	0.225	1.798	0.167	1.193	0.234	0.021	0.886
3	Functionality of steering elements	0.666	0.506	3.354	0.036*	3.654	0.027*	2.958	0.053	0.612	0.541	0.174	0.676
4	Interior space	1.508	0.132	1.146	0.319	1.560	0.211	0.077	0.926	1.903	0.058	3.399	0.066
5	Possibilities of interior space management (folding, removing seats etc.)	1.284	0.200	3.290	0.038*	1.065	0.346	4.598	0.010*	2.237	0.026*	0.016	0.900
6	Boot capacity	0.347	0.729	0.175	0.840	0.507	0.603	0.823	0.440	0.027	0.979	0.004	0.951
7	Communication systems (radio, navigation etc.)	2.034	0.043*	4.847	0.008*	0.019	0.981	8.307	0.000*	1.587	0.114	0.016	0.899
8	Air-conditioning/ventilating systems	0.087	0.931	0.694	0.500	4.304	0.014*	2.287	0.103	1.366	0.173	0.694	0.405

**Source:** Survey, **Note:** \*Significant at 5 percent level of significance. Data Processed through PASW (18.0 version).

**Table 6: Inferential Statistics of Safety of Car**

Sr. No.	Safety	Gender		Age		Qualification		Occupation		Marital Status		Income	
		t	sign	F	sign	F	sign	F	sign	t	sign	F	sign
1	Crossbar under Dashboard	2.363	0.018*	0.741	0.477	1.644	0.194	1.025	0.359	0.432	0.666	0.002	0.968
2	Air Bags for driver safety	1.044	0.298	0.796	0.452	1.227	0.294	0.016	0.984	1.747	0.082	1.556	0.213
3	Anti-Lock Breaking System	1.042	0.299	1.597	0.203	1.413	0.244	0.855	0.426	1.490	0.138	1.066	0.302
4	Aerodynamic Shape	1.073	0.285	0.210	0.810	4.687	0.010*	2.971	0.052	0.827	0.409	1.113	0.292
5	Intensity of front lights	1.876	0.061	1.237	0.291	0.112	0.894	3.356	0.036*	1.689	0.092	0.026	0.871
6	Anti theft system	1.368	0.173	2.686	0.069	1.306	0.272	2.773	0.063	0.946	0.345	1.980	0.160
7	Seat belts	0.189	0.851	0.612	0.542	1.229	0.294	6.274	0.002*	1.562	0.119	0.116	0.733
8	Pulling forward safety brakes during severe accidents	1.374	0.171	1.421	0.242	0.589	0.555	2.121	0.121	1.644	0.101	0.377	0.539
9	Reverse warning system (reverse sensor)	2.003	0.047*	1.017	0.362	3.591	0.028*	5.122	0.006*	2.445	0.015*	2.003	0.158
10	Fog lights	0.768	0.443	1.928	0.147	0.609	0.545	5.251	0.006*	1.119	0.265	1.148	0.284

**Source:** Survey, **Note:** \* Significant at 5 percent level of significance. Data Processed through PASW (18.0 version).