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#### Abstract

Automobile industry was supported with the latest technologies, skilled workforce significant investment of direct and indirect all these had shown the considerable growth in the Indian Car consumer market. The automobile industry got its new regime and boom. With the increase of middle class group people's income level, the car purchases knocked the market with more customers joining together in India's ordinary car segment. In India, we have more ordinary customers purchasing these people choose the cars like Maruti Suzuki, Hyundai, Tata, etc.; based on an extensive review of the Literature, the questionnaire was designed by taking the various outcomes of the study. Google sheets and schedules were both distributed to the identified customers in the Car market. Mostly the study focussed on the buying preferences of the customers. The study also concentrated on the various segments in the Car market.
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## A. INTRODUCTION

A few decades back, Car was a Luxury product, but today Car is not a luxury but a necessity. The first Car was rolled out in India in 1897, and till the year 1930, all the cars were imported from foreign countries. The automobile industry mainly emerged in India in 1940. Hindustan Motors Limited (HML) by Birlas collaborated with Lord Nuffield of Morris motors launched the first Car. Premier company (Premier automobile Limited) Walchand Hirachand, who were founders of the car company in India, started in Mumbai and competed with HML. Gradually lots of the companies entered India and established their plants here, and grabbed the most significant market. Earlier the long and big cars were the passion for the luxury consumers. Because of the increased traffic and number of car owners, it was also perceived and preferred that a small car is most desirable for Indian roads and traffic conditions. In India, there are few top brands in the car segment Maruti Suzuki, Hyundai, Toyota, Mahindra, and Tata Motors. The majority of the cars sale in India is bagged with Maruti Suzuki, again Maruti Suzuki Swift stood as larges selling Car in 2020 with 18.498 cars were sold in last 2020. The Indian Car market is one of the important market and trading areas globally, with the third power purchasing parity in the world. No the cars like BMW, Mercedes Benz, Volvo, Audi also launching the cars between 30 to 50 lacks for Indian consumers. This shows the necessity rather than brand preference. There are three types of Cars like Luxury, Semi Luxury, and Ordinary. Because of LPG (liberalization, Privatisation, and globalization), in 1991 Automobile industry got its new regime and boom. With the growth of middle-class group people's income level, the car purchases knocked the market with more customers joining together in India's ordinary car segment.

In India, we have more ordinary customers purchasing these people choose the cars like Maruti Suzuki, Hyundai, Tata, etc., Generally, the companies like Maruti Suzuki and Hyundai have more loyal customers. Here this study is focussing on the preference of the types of cars in the ordinary car segment. The study was conducted only for customers belongs the everyday car segment in India. Only selected brands were taken for the task.

## 1 REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Joseph Camble (2011) in present study, the data was collected from more than 500 customers connected in Karnataka state and found that one of the most significant areas is the financial aspects to purchase the Car. In this study, Sharma (2006) believed that the internet revolution, which provided all the information and increased
the interest of the customer to know and compare various aspects of the car segment, automatically enhanced the Car's purchases in India. Becker (2013) studied the supportive and encouraging environment for car production and car market growth. Likewise, Beltch and Beltch(2007) point out that it encompasses the people's activities and processes when selecting, searching for, buying, using, disposing, and evaluating products and services to fulfill their desires and needs. Hoyer and Maclnnis (2008) explain consumer behavior as the totality of decisions made by the consumers concerning consumption, acquisition, and disposition of time, services, goods, people, activities, ideas, and experiences by (human) units of decision-making. Vijay Bhaskar (2013), in his study related to the Car market growth in India, perceived that India is one of the largest and significant markets for ordinary cars, the increase of FDI substantially developed the car market in India. Cars Purohit (2009) identified that the most significant factors are the brand, driving comfort, spare parts availability, etc., Salvi and Prajapati (2015) reviewed that models, external and internal features satisfaction levels are the significant components of the buying the Car in Indian car consumer scenario. Thomas (2018) apart from all other factors that influence the buying or purchasing of the car finance is one of the essential factors that influence the purchase in India, especially the middle class and mid-range cars in India. Goyal (2016), in study, it was identified that the cost-effectiveness of the fuel alternative like CNG and LPG tends the consumers to buy the gas driven vehicles which perceive as one of the affordable and alternative for both petrol and diesel.

## 2 OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

- To study the various indicators which are supporting the Indian Car market.
- To study the reasons for the slowdown in the automobile Industry in India
- To study the preferences of the auto Mobile customers related to ordinary cars in India.
- To study the consumer behavioral pattern and choices while purchasing the Car in India.


## 3 RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Based on extensive review of the Literature, the questionnaire was designed by taking the study's various outcomes. Google sheets and schedules were both distributed to the identified customers in the Car market. Primarily the study focussed on the buying preferences of the customers. The study on Consumer preferences of a car with selected brands and selected cities from Andhra Pradesh and Telangana. The total sample chosen from the three districts- Hyderabad, Vijayawada, and Visakhapatnam, was 900.

## 4 DATA ANALYSIS

i. District-wise respondents:

| Age | No of respondents | Percent |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Hyderabad | 385 | 46.0 |
| Vijayawada | 210 | 25.0 |
| Visakhapatnam | 242 | 29.0 |
| Total | $\mathbf{8 3 7}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ |

ii. Age-wise classification:

| Age | Respondents | Percent |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Below 18 years | 51 | 6.1 |
| $18-24$ years | 114 | 13.6 |
| $25-34$ years | 179 | 21.4 |
| $35-40$ years | 250 | 29.9 |
| 41-60 years | 222 | 26.5 |
| Above 60 years | 21 | 2.5 |
| Total | $\mathbf{8 3 7}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ |

iii. Marital Status:

| Marital Status | Respondents | Percent |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Single/Unmarried | 267 | 31.9 |
| Married | 570 | 68.1 |
| Total | $\mathbf{8 3 7}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ |

Source: Primary Data
iv. Income wise:

| Household Income (in rupees) | Respondents | Percent |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Below 30000 | 129 | 15.4 |
| $30001-60000$ | 144 | 17.2 |
| $60001-90000$ | 217 | 25.9 |
| Above 90000 | 347 | 41.5 |
| Total | $\mathbf{8 3 7}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ |

Occupation wise classification of Respondents:

| Occupation | Respondents | Percent |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Government employee | 193 | 23.1 |
| Industrialist | 151 | 18.0 |
| Private employee | 170 | 20.3 |
| Self-employed | 183 | 21.9 |
| Professional | 78 | 9.3 |
| Agriculture | 50 | 6.0 |
| Others | 12 | 1.4 |
| Total | $\mathbf{8 3 7}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ |

Nature of family-wise classification of Respondents:

| Nature of Family | Respondents | Percent |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Nuclear | 694 | 82.9 |
| Joint | 143 | 17.1 |
| Total | $\mathbf{8 3 7}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ |

v. The opinion of respondents about media through which they came to know about cars:

| Media Source | Respondents | Percent |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Television | 526 | 62.8 |
| Radio | 17 | 2.0 |
| Newspaper | 52 | 6.2 |
| Pamphlet | 26 | 3.1 |
| Magazine | 26 | 3.1 |
| Friends/Neighbours | 69 | 8.2 |
| Shop Display | 91 | 10.9 |
| Any other | 30 | 3.6 |
| Total | $\mathbf{8 3 7}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ |

Factors influencing the buying decision of cars.

| Factors | $\mathbf{1}$ | $\mathbf{2}$ | $\mathbf{3}$ | $\mathbf{4}$ | $\mathbf{5}$ | $\mathbf{6}$ | $\mathbf{7}$ | $\mathbf{8}$ | $\mathbf{9}$ | Total | Total <br> Score | Mean <br> Score |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Colour | 184 | 420 | 11 | 8 | 88 | 8 | 25 | 67 | 26 | $\mathbf{8 3 7}$ | $\mathbf{5 8 4 8}$ | $\mathbf{6 . 9 9}$ |
| Range | 485 | 181 | 9 | 16 | 24 | 84 | 8 | 7 | 23 | $\mathbf{8 3 7}$ | $\mathbf{6 4 8 9}$ | $\mathbf{7 . 7 5}$ |
| Credit Facility | 33 | 93 | 407 | 186 | 8 | 6 | 86 | 10 | 8 | $\mathbf{8 3 7}$ | $\mathbf{5 3 5 6}$ | $\mathbf{6 . 4 0}$ |
| Dealer | 7 | 27 | 274 | 8 | 76 | 424 | 7 | 5 | 9 | $\mathbf{8 3 7}$ | $\mathbf{4 3 6 1}$ | $\mathbf{5 . 2 1}$ |
| Price and quality | 13 | 88 | 56 | 420 | 8 | 204 | 16 | 17 | 15 | $\mathbf{8 3 7}$ | $\mathbf{4 6 8 6}$ | $\mathbf{5 . 6 0}$ |
| Popularity | 78 | 4 | 56 | 5 | 433 | 8 | 238 | 10 | 5 | $\mathbf{8 3 7}$ | $\mathbf{4 0 9 2}$ | $\mathbf{4 . 8 9}$ |
| Warranty | 7 | 5 | 8 | 90 | 7 | 13 | 30 | 672 | 5 | $\mathbf{8 3 7}$ | $\mathbf{2 2 2 5}$ | $\mathbf{2 . 6 6}$ |
| Discount | 21 | 9 | 8 | 97 | 192 | 10 | 19 | 27 | 454 | $\mathbf{8 3 7}$ | $\mathbf{2 4 6 4}$ | $\mathbf{2 . 9 4}$ |
| Bundled schemes | 8 | 13 | 11 | 7 | 8 | 80 | 396 | 21 | 293 | $\mathbf{8 3 7}$ | $\mathbf{2 1 7 8}$ | $\mathbf{2 . 6 0}$ |

vi. Promotional offer preferences of respondents (Rank Order)

| Type of discount | $\mathbf{1}$ | $\mathbf{2}$ | $\mathbf{3}$ | $\mathbf{4}$ | Total | Total <br> Score | Mean <br> Score |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Price Discount | $335(40.0)$ | $244(29.2)$ | $247(29.5)$ | $11(1.3)$ | $\mathbf{8 3 7}(\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0})$ | $\mathbf{2 5 7 7}$ | $\mathbf{3 . 0 8}$ |
| Free Accessories | $422(50.4)$ | $262(31.3)$ | $85(10.2)$ | $68(8.1)$ | $\mathbf{8 3 7}(\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0})$ | $\mathbf{2 7 1 2}$ | $\mathbf{3 . 2 4}$ |
| Bundled offer with extended <br> Warranty | $20(2.4)$ | $165(19.7)$ | $460(55.0)$ | $192(22.9)$ | $\mathbf{8 3 7}(\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0})$ | $\mathbf{1 6 8 7}$ | $\mathbf{2 . 0 2}$ |
| Free Gift | $61(7.3)$ | $167(20.0)$ | $51(6.1)$ | $558(66.7)$ | $\mathbf{8 3 7 ( 1 0 0 . 0 )}$ | $\mathbf{1 4 0 5}$ | $\mathbf{1 . 6 8}$ |

vii. Factors influencing buying decisions of Cars

| Factors | Strongly <br> disagree | Disagree | Neither agree <br> nor disagree | Agree | Strongly <br> agree | Total |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Changing financial <br> position | $148(17.7)$ | $225(26.9)$ | $227(27.1)$ | $165(19.7)$ | $72(8.6)$ | $\mathbf{8 3 7}(\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0})$ |
| Social Status | $161(19.2)$ | $162(19.4)$ | $113(13.5)$ | $310(37.0)$ | $91(10.9)$ | $\mathbf{8 3 7 ( 1 0 0 . 0 )}$ |
| Comfort Transport | $95(11.4)$ | $30(3.6)$ | $73(8.7)$ | $316(37.8)$ | $323(38.6)$ | $\mathbf{8 3 7 ( 1 0 0 . 0 )}$ |
| New Model Passion | 63 <br> $(7.5)$ | $87(10.4)$ | $116(13.9)$ | $399(47.7)$ | $172(20.5)$ | $\mathbf{8 3 7 ( 1 0 0 . 0 )}$ |
| Colour and Range | $84(10.0)$ | $24(2.9)$ | $73(8.7)$ | $267(31.9)$ | $389(46.5)$ | $\mathbf{8 3 7 ( 1 0 0 . 0 )}$ |
| Eco Friendly | $53(6.3)$ | $143(17.1)$ | $90(10.8)$ | $330(39.4)$ | $221(26.4)$ | $\mathbf{8 3 7 ( 1 0 0 . 0 )}$ |
| Family Pressure | $107(12.8)$ | $96(11.5)$ | $133(15.9)$ | $341(40.7)$ | $160(19.1)$ | $\mathbf{8 3 7 ( 1 0 0 . 0 )}$ |
| Sales and promotional <br> activities | $76(9.1)$ | $209(25.0)$ | $255(30.5)$ | $191(22.8)$ | $106(12.7)$ | $\mathbf{8 3 7 ( 1 0 0 . 0 )}$ |
| Low-unit price | 88 |  |  |  |  |  |
| $(10.5)$ | $186(22.2)$ | $238(28.4)$ | $183(21.9)$ | $142(17.0)$ | $\mathbf{8 3 7 ( 1 0 0 . 0 )}$ |  |
| Impressed by <br> advertisements | $66(7.9)$ | $193(23.1)$ | $274(32.7)$ | $253(30.2)$ | $51(6.1)$ | $\mathbf{8 3 7 ( 1 0 0 . 0 )}$ |
| To attain attention <br> friends | 139 <br> Impress others | $163(15.9)$ | $283(33.8)$ | $194(23.2)$ | $88(10.5)$ | $\mathbf{8 3 7}(\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0 )}$ |
| Inherent features and <br> attributes | $190(22.7)$ | $186(22.2)$ | $225(26.9)$ | $186(22.2)$ | $50(6.0)$ | $\mathbf{8 3 7 ( 1 0 0 . 0 )}$ |

viii. Influence of Branding Decisions in the process of buying a Car

| Brand Decision maker | Respondents | Percent |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Father/Father-in-law | 353 | 42.2 |
| Mother/Mother-in-law | 232 | 27.7 |
| Husband | 68 | 8.1 |
| Wife | 53 | 6.3 |
| Children | 30 | 3.6 |
| All the above | 101 | 12.1 |
| Total | $\mathbf{8 3 7}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ |

Source: Primary Data
ix. $\quad$ Factors influencing brand decision while purchasing Cars at Showroom

| Factors | SDA | $\mathbf{D}$ | $\mathbf{N}$ | $\mathbf{A}$ | $\mathbf{S A}$ | Total | Total <br> score | Mean score |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Car Display | $158(18.9)$ | $166(19.8)$ | $168(20.1)$ | $192(22.9)$ | $153(18.3)$ | $\mathbf{8 3 7 ( 1 0 0 . 0 )}$ | $\mathbf{2 5 2 7}$ | $\mathbf{3 . 0 2}$ |
| Car Endorsed | $145(17.3)$ | $238(28.4)$ | $279(33.3)$ | $99(11.8)$ | $76(9.1)$ | $\mathbf{8 3 7 ( 1 0 0 . 0 )}$ | $\mathbf{2 2 3 4}$ | $\mathbf{2 . 6 7}$ |
| Car Range | $114(13.6)$ | $93(11.1)$ | $233(27.8)$ | $294(35.1)$ | $103(12.3)$ | $\mathbf{8 3 7 ( 1 0 0 . 0 )}$ | $\mathbf{2 6 9 0}$ | $\mathbf{3 . 2 1}$ |
| Recommended <br> Dealer | $82(9.8)$ | $264(31.5)$ | $206(24.6)$ | $231(27.6)$ | $54(6.5)$ | $\mathbf{8 3 7 ( 1 0 0 . 0 )}$ | $\mathbf{2 4 2 2}$ | $\mathbf{2 . 8 9}$ |
| Advertisement | $70(8.4)$ | $151(18.0)$ | $304(36.3)$ | $233(27.8)$ | $79(9.4)$ | $\mathbf{8 3 7 ( 1 0 0 . 0 )}$ | $\mathbf{2 6 1 1}$ | $\mathbf{3 . 1 2}$ |
| Views of other <br> customers | $63(7.5)$ | $207(24.7)$ | $239(28.6)$ | $216(25.8)$ | $112(13.4)$ | $\mathbf{8 3 7 ( 1 0 0 . 0 )}$ | $\mathbf{2 6 1 8}$ | $\mathbf{3 . 1 3}$ |
| Car availability | $86(10.3)$ | $110(13.1)$ | $135(16.1)$ | $380(45.4)$ | $126(15.1)$ | $\mathbf{8 3 7 ( 1 0 0 . 0 )}$ | $\mathbf{2 8 6 1}$ | $\mathbf{3 . 4 2}$ |
| Reviews | $70(8.4)$ | $205(24.5)$ | $228(27.2)$ | $255(30.5)$ | $79(9.4)$ | $\mathbf{8 3 7 ( 1 0 0 . 0 )}$ | $\mathbf{2 5 7 9}$ | $\mathbf{3 . 0 8}$ |
| Discount | $10212.2)$ | $147(17.6)$ | $229(27.4)$ | $268(32.0)$ | $91(10.9)$ | $\mathbf{8 3 7} \mathbf{1 0 0 . 0 )}$ | $\mathbf{2 6 1 0}$ | $\mathbf{3 . 1 2}$ |


| Response | Very important | Important | Neutral | To some extent, important | Unimportant | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Look | 576 (68.8) | 181 (21.6) | 39 (4.7) | 11 (1.3) | 30 (3.6) | 837 (100.0) |
| Style | 633 (75.6) | 115 (13.7) | 20 (2.4) | 21 (2.5) | 48 (5.7) | 837 (100.0) |
| Preferred Colour | 279 (33.3) | 260 (33.3) | 185 (22.1) | 68 (8.1) | 45 (5.4) | 837 (100.0) |
| Speed | 272 (32.5) | 193 (23.1) | 219 (26.2) | 58 (6.9) | 95 (11.4) | 837 (100.0) |
| Milage | 571 (68.2) | 126 (15.1) | 26 (3.1) | 67 (8.0) | 47 (5.6) | 837 (100.0) |
| Internal Look | 501 (59.9) | 159 (19.0) | 115 (13.7) | 21 (2.5) | 41 (4.9) | 837 (100.0) |
| External Look | 325 (38.8) | 239 (28.6) | 111 (13.3) | 110 (13.1) | 52 (6.2) | 837 (100.0) |
| comfort | 191 (22.8) | 156 (18.6) | 177 (21.1) | 114 (13.6) | 199 (23.8) | 837 (100.0) |
| Safety | 163 (19.5) | 151 (18.0) | 136 (16.2) | 165 (19.7) | 222 (26.5) | 837 (100.0) |
| Influenced by <br> Advertisement | 122 (14.6) | 150 (17.9) | 153 (18.3) | 196 (23.4) | 216 (25.8) | 837 (100.0) |
| Bundle of others | 187 (22.3) | 131 (15.7) | 262 (31.3) | 103 (12.3) | 154 (18.4) | 837 (100.0) |

xi. Marital status based brand preferences of Car

| Bathing soap | Marital status |  | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Single/Unmarried | Married |  |
| Jazz | 20 (7.5) | 45 (7.9) | 65 (7.8) |
| Dettol | 9 (3.4) | 23 (4.0) | 32 (3.8) |
| Honda Amaze | 7 (2.6) | 16 (2.8) | 23 (2.7) |
| Honda City | 31 (11.6) | 80 (14.0) | 111 (13.3) |
| Hyundai Santro | 37 (13.9) | 67 (11.8) | 104 (12.4) |
| Tata Tigor | 2 (0.7) | 11 (1.9) | 13 (1.6) |
| Maruti Swift | 37 (13.9) | 88 (15.4) | 125 (14.9) |
| Hyundai 120 | 14 (5.2) | 33 (5.8) | 47 (5.6) |
| Nissan Micra | 10 (3.7) | 30 (5.3) | 40 (4.8) |
| Renault Kwid | 40 (15.0) | 78 (13.7) | 118 (14.1) |
| Maruti Alto 800 | 60 (22.5) | 99 (17.4) | 159 (19.0) |
| Total | 267 (100.0) | 570 (100.0) | 837 (100.0) |
| Chi-square value | 7.34, df $=10$, Table Value $=18.3$ |  |  |

xii. Income based preferences

| Car | Household income |  |  |  | Total |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Below 30000 | $\mathbf{3 0 0 0 0 - 6 0 0 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{6 0 0 0 1 - 9 0 0 0 0}$ | Above 90000 |  |
| Maruti Alto 800 | $67(51.9)$ | $111(77.1)$ | $128(59.0)$ | $230(66.3)$ | $\mathbf{5 3 6}(64.0)$ |
| Hyundai I 10 | $13(10.1)$ | $5(3.5)$ | $24(11.1)$ | $21(6.1)$ | $\mathbf{6 3}(7.5)$ |
| Honda Amaze | $16(12.4)$ | $11(7.6)$ | $6(2.8)$ | $14(4.0)$ | $\mathbf{4 7}(\mathbf{5 . 6})$ |
| Maruti Swift | $15(11.6)$ | $2(1.4)$ | $24(11.1)$ | $26(7.5)$ | $\mathbf{6 7}(8.0)$ |
| Honda City | $10(7.8)$ | 0 | $13(6.0)$ | $10(2.9)$ | $\mathbf{3 3}(\mathbf{3 . 9 )}$ |


| Tata Tigor | 1 (0.8) | 1 (0.7) | 4 (1.8) | 16 (4.6) | 22 (2.6) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Nissan Micra | 0 | 2 (1.4) | 5 (2.3) | 9 (2.6) | 16 (1.9) |
| Any other | 7 (5.4) | 12 (8.3) | 13 (6.0) | 21 (6.1) | 53 (6.3) |
| Total | 129 (100.0) | 144 (100.0) | 217 (100.0) | 347 (100.0) | 837 (100.0) |
| Chi-square value | 73.74**, df = 21, Table Value = 38.9 |  |  |  |  |

** Significant at $1 \%$ level.
xiii. Occupation wise brand preferences of Car

| Brand Car | Occupation |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Government employee | Industrialist | Private employee | Selfemployed | Professional | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Agricultu } \\ & \text { re } \end{aligned}$ | Others |  |
| Maruti Swift | 28 (14.5) | 16 (10.6) | 16 (9.4) | 15 (8.2) | 9 (11.5) | $\begin{gathered} 4 \\ (8.0) \end{gathered}$ | 3 (25.0) | 91 (10.9) |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Maruti Alto } \\ & 800 \end{aligned}$ | 49 (25.4) | 44 (29.1) | 40 (23.5) | 44 (24.0) | 18 (23.1) | $\begin{gathered} 13 \\ (26.0) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 6 (50.0) | 214 (25.6) |
| Hyundai Santro | 14 (7.3) | 18 (11.9) | 16 (9.4) | 14 (7.7) | 10 (12.8) | $\begin{gathered} 5 \\ (10.0) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 0 | 77 (9.2) |
| Tata tigor | 5 (2.6) | ${ }^{-}$ | 8 (4.7) | 7 (3.8) | 4 (5.1) | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ (4.0) \end{gathered}$ | 0 | 26 (3.1) |
| Nissan micra | 0 | 2 (1.3) | 2 (1.2) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 (.5) |
| Hyundai I 20 | 18 (9.3) | 10 (6.6) | 5 (2.9) | 11 (6.0) | 3 (3.8) | $\begin{gathered} 3 \\ (6.0) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 0 | 50 (6.0) |
| Renault Kwid | 6 (3.1) | 6 (4.0) | 2 (1.2) | 11 (6.0) | 0 | 10 | 1 (8.3) | 26 (3.1) |
| Renault Triber | 9 (4.7) | 7 (4.6) | 14 (8.2) | 6 (3.3) | 6 (7.7) | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ (4.0) \end{gathered}$ | 0 | 44 (5.3) |
| Maruti Brezza | 9 (4.7) | 7 (4.6) | 14 (8.2) | 6 (3.3) | 6 (7.7) | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ (4.0) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 0 | 44 (5.3) |
| Maruti Baleno | 20 (10.4) | 9 (6.0) | 27 (15.9) | 26 (14.2) | $\begin{gathered} 13 \\ (16.7) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 8 \\ (16.0) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 2 (16.7) | 105 (12.5) |
| Any other | 38 (19.7) | 26 (17.2) | 31 (18.2) | 39 (21.3) | 13 (16.7) | $\begin{gathered} 10 \\ (20.0) \end{gathered}$ | 0 | 157 (18.8) |
| Total | 193 (100.0) | 151 100.0) | 170 100.0) | 183 (100.0) | 78 (100.0) | $\begin{gathered} 50 \\ (100.0) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 12 (100.0) | 837 (100.0) |
| Chi-square value |  |  | 76.00, df $=60$, Table Value $=79.1$ |  |  |  |  |  |

xiv. Nature of Family and Brand Preferences of Car

| Bathing soap | Nature of family |  | Total |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Nuclear | Joint |  |
| Renault Triber | $48(6.9)$ | $17(11.9)$ | $\mathbf{3 2}(\mathbf{3 . 8})$ |
| Nissan Micra | $18(2.6)$ | $14(9.8)$ | $\mathbf{2 3}(\mathbf{2 . 7})$ |
| Hyundai i10 | $16(2.3)$ | $7(4.9)$ | $\mathbf{1 1 1}(\mathbf{1 3 . 3})$ |
| Maruti Baleno | $103(14.8)$ | $8(5.6)$ | $\mathbf{1 0 4}(\mathbf{1 2 . 4})$ |
| Hyundai i 20 | $73(10.5)$ | $31(21.7)$ | $\mathbf{1 3}(\mathbf{1 . 6})$ |
| Renault Triber | $13(1.9)$ | - | $\mathbf{1 2 5}(\mathbf{1 4 . 9 )}$ |
| Hyundai Creta | $118(17.0)$ | $7(4.9)$ | $\mathbf{4 7}(\mathbf{5 . 6})$ |
| Tata Tigor | $29(4.2)$ | $18(12.6)$ | $\mathbf{4 0}(\mathbf{4 . 8})$ |
| Honda Jazz | $35(5.0)$ | $5(3.5)$ | $\mathbf{1 1 8}(\mathbf{1 4 . 1 )}$ |
| Maruti Brezza | $114(16.4)$ | $4(2.8)$ | $\mathbf{1 5 9}(\mathbf{1 9 . 0})$ |
| Any other | $127(18.3)$ | $32(22.4)$ | $\mathbf{8 3 7}(\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0})$ |
| Total | $\mathbf{6 9 4}(\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0})$ | $\mathbf{1 4 3}(\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0})$ |  |
| Chi-square value | $\mathbf{8 8 . 7 6} *, \mathbf{d f}=\mathbf{1 0}$, Table Value $=\mathbf{2 3 . 2}$ |  |  |

Income and Product attributes of select FMCG products

| Car | income (in Rs) | N | Mean | Std. Devi. | Std. Error | f-value | p-value |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Hatchback | Below 10000 | 129 | 42.11 | 6.676 | 0.587 | 3.674* | 0.012 |
|  | 10001-25000 | 144 | 40.33 | 7.621 | 0.635 |  |  |
|  | 25001-50000 | 217 | 41.22 | 9.580 | 0.650 |  |  |
|  | Above 50001 | 347 | 39.48 | 8.887 | 0.477 |  |  |
|  | Total | 837 | 40.48 | 8.610 | 0.297 |  |  |
| Sedan | Below 10000 | 129 | 43.04 | 6.124 | 0.539 | 14.579** | 0.000 |
|  | 10001-25000 | 144 | 45.36 | 6.759 | 0.563 |  |  |
|  | 25001-50000 | 217 | 44.41 | 8.297 | 0.563 |  |  |
|  | Above 50001 | 347 | 40.38 | 10.893 | 0.584 |  |  |
|  | Total | 837 | 42.69 | 9.202 | 0.318 |  |  |
| Manual | Below 10000 | 129 | 38.13 | 7.351 | 0.647 | 3.259* | 0.021 |
|  | 10001-25000 | 144 | 39.79 | 7.002 | 0.583 |  |  |
|  | 25001-50000 | 217 | 37.12 | 9.108 | 0.618 |  |  |
|  | Above 50001 | 347 | 37.25 | 10.063 | 0.540 |  |  |
|  | Total | 837 | 37.79 | 8.997 | 0.310 |  |  |
| Automatic | Below 10000 | 129 | 39.52 | 7.267 | 0.639 | 12.935** | 0.000 |
|  | 10001-25000 | 144 | 41.59 | 4.976 | 0.414 |  |  |
|  | 25001-50000 | 217 | 40.31 | 7.300 | 0.495 |  |  |
|  | Above 50001 | 347 | 36.83 | 11.108 | 0.596 |  |  |
|  | Total | 837 | 38.96 | 8.986 | 0.310 |  |  |
| SUZ | Below 10000 | 129 | 18.68 | 4.703 | 0.414 | 12.850** | 0.000 |
|  | 10001-25000 | 144 | 20.18 | 3.841 | 0.320 |  |  |
|  | 25001-50000 | 217 | 19.82 | 3.444 | 0.233 |  |  |
|  | Above 50001 | 347 | 17.76 | 5.773 | 0.309 |  |  |
|  | Total | 837 | 18.85 | 4.881 | 0.168 |  |  |

xv. Occupation and Product attributes of select FMCG products

| Car | Occupation | N | Mean | Std. Devi. | Std. Error | f-value | p-value |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Hatchback | Government employee | 193 | 40.62 | 8.409 | 0.605 | 0.377 | 0.894 |
|  | Industrialist | 151 | 40.84 | 9.071 | 0.738 |  |  |
|  | Private employee | 170 | 40.25 | 8.262 | 0.633 |  |  |
|  | Self-employed | 183 | 40.66 | 8.231 | 0.608 |  |  |
|  | Professional | 78 | 40.62 | 9.523 | 1.078 |  |  |
|  | Agriculture | 50 | 39.40 | 9.802 | 1.386 |  |  |
|  | Others | 12 | 38.08 | 5.468 | 1.578 |  |  |
|  | Total | 837 | 40.48 | 8.610 | 0.297 |  |  |
| Sedan | Government employee | 193 | 42.51 | 8.862 | 0.637 | 0.444 | 0.850 |
|  | Industrialist | 151 | 43.03 | 9.237 | 0.751 |  |  |
|  | Private employee | 170 | 42.24 | 9.476 | 0.726 |  |  |
|  | Self-employed | 183 | 42.52 | 8.462 | 0.625 |  |  |
|  | Professional | 78 | 44.10 | 9.746 | 1.103 |  |  |
|  | Agriculture | 50 | 42.54 | 11.546 | 1.632 |  |  |
|  | Others | 12 | 41.91 | 7.597 | 2.193 |  |  |
|  | Total | 837 | 42.69 | 9.202 | 0.318 |  |  |
| Manual | Government employee | 193 | 37.34 | 8.663 | 0.623 | 0.168 | 0.985 |
|  | Industrialist | 151 | 38.23 | 8.883 | 0.722 |  |  |
|  | Private employee | 170 | 37.98 | 9.298 | 0.713 |  |  |
|  | Self-employed | 183 | 37.65 | 8.871 | 0.655 |  |  |
|  | Professional | 78 | 38.00 | 9.426 | 1.067 |  |  |
|  | Agriculture <br> Others | 50 12 | 37.78 37.83 | 10.214 6.407 | 1.444 |  |  |


|  | Total | 837 | 37.79 | 8.997 | 0.310 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Automatic | Government employee | 193 | 38.46 | 8.980 | 0.646 | 0.340 | 0.916 |
|  | Industrialist | 151 | 39.26 | 9.013 | 0.733 |  |  |
|  | Private employee | 170 | 38.58 | 9.312 | 0.714 |  |  |
|  | Self-employed | 183 | 39.31 | 8.599 | 0.635 |  |  |
|  | Professional | 78 | 39.75 | 8.703 | 0.985 |  |  |
|  | Agriculture | 50 | 38.70 | 10.544 | 1.491 |  |  |
|  | Others | 12 | 39.58 | 5.053 | 1.458 |  |  |
|  | Total | 837 | 38.96 | 8.986 | 0.310 |  |  |
| SUV | Government employee | 193 | 18.44 | 4.820 | 0.346 | 0.726 | 0.628 |
|  | Industrialist | 151 | 19.03 | 4.951 | 0.402 |  |  |
|  | Private employee | 170 | 19.01 | 5.018 | 0.384 |  |  |
|  | Self-employed | 183 | 19.03 | 4.803 | 0.355 |  |  |
|  | Professional | 78 | 19.19 | 4.693 | 0.531 |  |  |
|  | Agriculture | 50 | 18.64 | 5.216 | 0.737 |  |  |
|  | Others | 12 | 16.91 | 4.144 | 1.196 |  |  |
|  | Total | 837 | 18.85 | 4.881 | 0.168 |  |  |

Null Hypothesis: $\mathrm{H}_{0}$ There is no significant difference between Income and Product attributes of select Cars.

| Comp onent | Initial latent value |  |  | Extraction Sums of tetragonal Loadings |  |  | Rotation Sums of tetragonal Loadings |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Total | \% of Variance | $\begin{gathered} \text { Cumulative } \\ \% \end{gathered}$ | Total | \% of Variance | $\begin{gathered} \text { Cumulative } \\ \% \end{gathered}$ | Total | \% of Variance | $\begin{gathered} \text { Cumulative } \\ \% \end{gathered}$ |
| 1 | 5.995 | 42.821 | 42.821 | 5.995 | 42.821 | 42.821 | 3.024 | 21.600 | 21.600 |
| 2 | 1.772 | 12.658 | 55.479 | 1.772 | 12.658 | 55.479 | 2.623 | 18.736 | 40.336 |
| 3 | 1.175 | 8.392 | 63.872 | 1.175 | 8.392 | 63.872 | 1.904 | 13.601 | 53.937 |
| 4 | 0.907 | 6.480 | 70.352 | 0.907 | 6.480 | 70.352 | 1.893 | 13.520 | 67.456 |
| 5 | 0.778 | 5.558 | 75.909 | 0.778 | 5.558 | 75.909 | 1.183 | 8.453 | 75.909 |
| 6 | 0.614 | 4.382 | 80.292 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 7 | 0.588 | 4.199 | 84.491 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 8 | 0.477 | 3.406 | 87.897 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 9 | 0.434 | 3.097 | 90.994 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 10 | 0.398 | 2.842 | 93.836 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 11 | 0.287 | 2.050 | 95.886 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 12 | 0.228 | 1.630 | 97.515 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 13 | 0.194 | 1.388 | 98.904 |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

## 5 MAJOR FINDINGS

- The study revealed that Maruti is the most popular Cars brand and it has the highest percentage of consumers who prefer the brand, followed by Hyundai and Renault.
- It has been depicted that Maruti enjoys more loyalty among respondents as its overall consumption is high, i.e., $64 \%$, as compared to other brands.
- The study revealed a significant difference between demographic variables (age, gender, education, income, occupation, family size, and nature of family) and brand preferences of Hatchback, Sedan, Manual, Automatic, and SUV.
- It has been observed that there is no meaningful relationship between occupation and brand preferences of cars.
- It has been observed that gender, education, income, family size, and family nature are associated with the sources of media through which they have come to know about Cars.
- It was depicted that most of the respondents felt that promotional offers influence the buying of the Car.
- It has been shown that product availability, product range are the factors influencing brand decisions while purchasing the Car, followed by discounts, reviews of other customers, endorsed by celebrity/famous personalities, and Car recommended by the Dealer.
- It has been revealed that the majority of the respondents felt that price is an essential factor which they consider while purchasing the Car.
- The study showed that the majority of the respondents agree that car quality is regarded as an essential factor while buying brands.
- It has been depicted that the consumers of cars strongly agreed that attributes they would consider while buying the Car are color, Range, Mileage, speed, etc.,
- Most of the respondents prefer branded products and felt that the product's price and quality are given the highest priority. It is also found that there is a shift from using not-so-popular brands to popular brands, and thus branding is gaining importance.
6 Suggestions:
- The manufacturers should establish their brands and penetrate all markets to come through the implementation of effective marketing strategies.
- Rural markets are growing in India with diminishing differences between rural and urban India. With the rise in literacy levels and increasing disposable income, the demand for cars is rising. The companies' responsibility is to properly service all the retailers through proper supplies of all its vehicles and provide the critical support system.
- Consumers in rural and urban areas are more inclined towards the quality of the cars which they purchase. Therefore, it is recommended that manufacturers take care of the entire process to produce a good quality product to retain its image in the long term.


## 7 CONCLUSION

Car production increased in various capacities by market observations, which tend to prepare for new car segment models. Many buying behaviors reference groups influenced the purchase of the cars by a cycle of decision making. The automobile industry was supported with the latest technologies, skilled workforce, excellent direct and indirect investment, and significant growth in the Indian Car consumer market. 1991, 2009, 2011, 2013, 2018, 2020 are critical years in the Indian car market and industry-wise by growing or decreasing due to various direct and indirect factors that influenced the Indian Car market and consumer. The research concludes that consumer awareness about cars has increased, and they can make decisions about which brand to buy and what type of promotions are available in various categories. They make planned purchases of quality cars that are branded from renowned brands. They can collect full information about the Car through television advertisements and shift to other vehicles if not satisfied.
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