## CHAPTER—III

ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION OF
DATA

## PROELLE OF TE CONSUMERS

The background infomation of 80 households included in the sample is presented below. The basic attributes of the respondents studied are monthly income, size of the family, occupation, residence status and choice of television set.

1) Incomo Distribution: The respondents were dividad into two income caregories $-I_{1}($ upto 0.2500$)$ and $I_{2}$ (above 8.2500 ), on the basis of their household monthly income. Table 3.1 shows the frequency distribution of households among different income groups.

TABLE 3.1
HEOME WTSE DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONDEITS AND SELLCTION
OF TELEVISION SETS

| Type of TV | $\begin{gathered} I_{1} \text { monthly } \\ \text { Income upto } 852500 \end{gathered}$ | $I_{2}$ Monthly Income above 85.2500 | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| CTV Holders | 17(47.20\%) | 19(59.78\%) | 36 |
| 20' 384 TV Holder | $21(77.77 \%)$ | 6(22.23\%) | 27 |
| $14^{\prime \prime}$ Bati IV Holder | 13(76.47\%) | 4(23.53\%) | 17 |
| Total | $51(63.75 \%)$ | 29(36.25\%) | 80 |

$$
r=0.01
$$

It indicates that about 64 percent respondents fall in the first incone group i.e.b.below $\mathbb{E} .2500$ per month. About 36 percent respondents are having income above is. 2500pper month.

Biest of tho CTV Holders belongs to second income group (about 53 percent) while most of the 20 "Bew TV holdexs (about 78 percent) and $14^{\prime \prime}$ B8k TV holders (about 77 percent) belongs to first income group i.e. incone upto 促, 2500 p.m.

It means most of the respondents belongs to first income group.

The result of comolation test show that there is slight comrelation between the income of respondent and his selection of television.
2) Residence status of households : Table 3.2 shows the distribution of households on the basis of their residence in kolhapur city.

TABLE 10.3 .2
DISTRIBUTION OF BESPONOANTS OH THE BASIS OF GEOGR-
AFHICAL AREA IN BHICH THEY LIVE

| Muncipal <br> waxds | CTV Holdere <br> holders | 14:B8R TV <br> hoiders | Total |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| A | 18 | 11 | 12 | $(51.25 \%)$ |
| B | 3 | 4 | 0 | $(8.75 \%)$ |
| C | 2 | 2 | 1 | $(6.256)$ |


| (contd....Table No. 3.2) |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $=1$ | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| D | 3 | 1 | 1 | $(6.25 \%)$ |
| E | 10 | 9 | 3 | 52 <br> $(27.50 \%)$ |

It indicates that out of 80 respondents supveyed 41 (about 51\%) ilves in 'A'ward of Kolhapur Muncipal Corporation. About 9 percent respondents lives in ' B ' ward, $6.25 \%$ respondents lives in ' $C$ ' and ' $D$ ' wards each. About 27 percent respondents lives in 'E'ward. It means most of the respondents are from 'A' ward, the heart of the citiy.
3) Occupation of the respondents : The respondents were categorised on the basis of their occupation or occupation of the family. They are distributed among the three main occupations i.e. service, business and proeession and agriculture.

| 54/- |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Occupation wise distribution of respondents and selection |  |  |  |  |
| of TV sets. |  |  |  |  |
| Occupation | CTV Holders | $\begin{aligned} & 20^{\prime \prime} \mathrm{B} \\ & \mathrm{w} \text { TV } \\ & \text { Holders } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 14^{18} \text { B } \\ & \text { 时 TV } \\ & \text { Holders } \end{aligned}$ | Total |
| Service | 22 | 25 | 14 | $\begin{gathered} 61 \\ (76.25 \%) \end{gathered}$ |
| Business \& Profession | $12$ | 02 | 03 | $\begin{gathered} 17 \\ (21.25 \%) \end{gathered}$ |
| Agriculture | 02 | -- | - | $\begin{gathered} 0 \% \\ (2.50 \%) \end{gathered}$ |
|  | 36 | 27 | 17 | 80 |

It indicates that about 76 percent respondents are servicemen, 21.25 percents are from business and profession and only 2.50 percent from agriculture.

In the colour segment 61 percent responcients are servicemen, 33 percent from business and profession and only 5.56 percent from agriculture. While in B \& Wegment about 80 percent respondent are servicemen and about 11 percent we respondents are from business and profession. Summing up it can be said that most of the respondents are
servicamen.

The comelation test shows that there is no comrelation between tho occupation and solection of TV es ' $x$ ' is grester' than one.
4) Size of Houscholds : Tabie 3.4 depacts the number of families having diaferont number of members fin the family.

## MBEL 3.4

Family hembers wise distribution of Responeents and Selection of TV sets.

| Number of | CTV Holders | $20^{\text {\% }}$ B8 ${ }^{\text {d }}$ |  | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| family |  | TV Holders | TV Holders |  |
| members |  |  |  |  |


| 1 | $\sim$ | - | - | - |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 5 (6.25\%) |
| 3 | - | 2 | 4 | 6 (7.50\%) |
| 4 | 13 | 6 | 3 | $22(97.5 \%)$ |
| 5 | 18 | 12 | 4 | 34 (42.5\%) |
| 6 | 3 | 2 | 5 | $10(12.5 \%)$ |
| 78 | 1 | 2 | $\cdots$ | 3 (3.75\%) |
|  | 36 | 27 | 17 | 80 |

The table shows that 35 pexcent families have 3 to 4 and 55 percent families have 5 to 6 fanily members in a family.

Families consisting two family members are 6.25 percent and just 3.75 percent of the families have 7 or more members.

In all, the television holders, majority of families have 4 to 5 family members.
5) Choice of television : The break up of television holders according to their TV brands appears in Table 3.5 It points out that there'were abodt 25 brands in the market.

$$
\text { TADLE } 10.3 .5
$$

COMPANY /BRAND WISE DISTHIBUTION OF RESPONDENIS OF
THETR PURCDGSE.

| Company/Brand | CTV | $\frac{20^{\circ \prime}}{T Y} \mathrm{BEN}$ | $\frac{14}{T V}{ }^{3}$ | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1. Orson | 3 | 1 | 3 | 7 |
| 2. Digichrome | 4 | 1 | - | 5 |
| 3. Videocon | 1 | 1 | $\cdots$ | 2 |
| 4. Mikado | 3 | 2 | 2 | 5 |
| 5. Grown | 1. | 13 | 2 | 15 |
| 6. Pyramid: | 2 | - | - | 2 |
| 7. Bush | 2 | 3 | 3 | 8 |
| 8. Salora | 1 | 1 | $\cdots$ | 2 |
| 9. Sony | 1 | - | - | $\pm$ |
| 10. BPL | 4 | - | - | 4 |
| 11. Phillips | 1 | - | 1 | 2 |
| 12. Commic | 1 | - | - | 1 |
| 13. Optonica | 2 | $\cdots$ | - | 2 |
| 14. Keltron | 1 | 1 | - | 2 |
| 15. EC | 2 | 2 | - | 4 |


| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 16. ET E T | - | - | 1 | 1 |
| 27. Dynoxa | 3 | 3 | $\pm$ | 6 |
| 18. Solidaire | $\sim$ | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| 19. Seleo | - | - | 2 | 2 |
| 20. Lotus | * | - | 1 | 1 |
| 21. Onida | 2 | - | $\cdots$ | 2 |
| 22. GEL | 2 | - | 1 | 3 |
|  | 36 | 27 | 17 | 80 |

It seems that, there were about 22 brands in the market 15 respondents have purchased 'Crown' TV thile 8 respondents purchased "Buch". In the third rank 'Orson', was purchased by 7 respendents.

## ANALYSIS AND INTERTRETATION OF DATA

This chapter deals with the profile of television consumers. Income of the household, occupation, and residence are considered as variables to analyse the consumers. But type of television purchased by the respon dent is considered as main variable to examine consumer behaviour. The data is analysed under the three deteminants viz; colour television holder; $20^{10}$ Bow TV holders and $14^{\circ}$ Baxi TV holders.

The responses of the houschoid has been presented in all the tablee in the terms of both the numbers and percentages. Figures in tables within parenthesis represent pexcentage while these without paranthesis are simple frequencies.


TABLE NO. 3.6
FREQUENCX DISTRIEUTION OF RESP ONDENTR REGARDING
THE INIT IATOR OF PURCHASE OE TV SET

| Initiator | CTV <br> Holders | $90^{\circ} \mathrm{B}$ B Holdore | 14" BES Holders | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Spouce | 5 | 7 | 2 | $\begin{gathered} 14 \\ (17.5 \%) \end{gathered}$ |
| Elder | 4 | 3 | 2 | $\begin{gathered} 9 \\ (11.25 \%) \end{gathered}$ |
| Children | 16 | 3 | 7 | $\begin{gathered} 36 \\ (45 \%) \end{gathered}$ |
| Selt | 11 | 4 | 6 | $(26.25 \%)$ |
|  | 36 | 27 | 17 | 80 |

Here, the frest point of interest was to examine the role of doninance in purchase of a TV sets. Respondents were asked to report by whone the idea of purchasing television set is generated.

14 out of 80 respondents ( 17.5 porcent) told that the initiators are spouce. But in most cases the initiators are childrens i.e. 36 (45\%) television buying, and elders in 9 (11. 25 percent) families. 21 ( 26.25 percent) respondents told that they are the initiators in $T V$ purchasers.

Which means in moet television purchasers, thildrens are initiators.

## TABLE NO. 3.7

FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONDENTS GEGARDING THE
HEACIION OF OTHER FAMIAY MEMBERS ON PURCHASING CONCEPT
OF TELEVISION

| Reaction | CTV Holders | $20^{\circ} \mathrm{BEW}$ TV Holders | 14* 日8, TV Holders | Totas |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Negative | 31. | 18 | 10 | $\begin{gathered} 59 \\ (73.75 \%) \end{gathered}$ |
| Positive | 5 | 9 | 7 | $(25.25 \%)$ |
|  | 36 | 27 | 17 | 80 |

It indicates that most of the reactions of other family rembers on the idea of purchasirg a television are positive. 59 ( $73.75 \%$ ) agreed with the oncept while 21 ( $\% .25 \%$ ) family members were against the idea. Over-all other family menbers were agreed with the concept of purchasing television.

TRBIE NO, 3.8
DISTIIBUTION GF RESPONDENES REQARDING THE TYPE OF
NEGATIVE REACT TOLG $\alpha$ OTHER MEABEES ON PURGHASING CONGEFT OF TV SETS

| Type of reaction | CTV <br> Holders | $\begin{aligned} & 70^{\mathrm{n}} \mathrm{BEW} \\ & \mathrm{TV} \\ & \text { Holders } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \frac{34}{\text { TV }} \text { Buw } \\ & \text { Holders } \end{aligned}$ | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Time Spending | 2 | 1 | 6 | 9 (42.85\%) |
| New culture | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 (9.52\%) |
| Idiat Bon | 1 | 5 | 0 | 6 (28.59\%) |
| Harmeul to eyes | 2 | 2 | 0 | 4 (19.04\%) |

The negative reactions to the purchase of television sets are uf various types 9 (42. $85 \%$ ) reactions are negative as the family members thinks that heving a TV sets is only a ti me spending activity. $2(9.52 \%)$ family members fear about the new culture i.e. 'T.V. Culture'. While 6 ( $20.59 \%$ ) family members thinks that TV is only an 'idict box.' A (19.04) family members thinks that television is hamfultto eyes and reacts negatively. TABLE PD. 3.9
TIME LAG BETUEEN HEED RECOGNTTION AND ACTUAL PURCHASE
OF TELEVISION SET (FBELUENCY OISTPIBUTION OE RESPONDENTS)

| Time lag | CTV <br> Holders | $20^{91}$ BEW TV Holders | $14^{45}$ 3先析TV Holders | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 3 months | 11 | 9 | 3 | $\begin{gathered} 23 \\ (78.75 \%) \end{gathered}$ |
| 6 months | 6 | 3 | 4 | $\begin{gathered} 13 \\ (16.25 \%) \end{gathered}$ |
| 1 Yeas | 12 | 8 | 5 | $\begin{gathered} 25 \\ (3 \pm .25 \%) \end{gathered}$ |
| More than one year | 1 | 4 | 4 | $\left(11^{9} .25 \%\right)$ |
| Inmidiate | 6 | 3 | 1 | $\begin{gathered} 10 \\ (12.5 \%) \end{gathered}$ |
|  | 36 | 27 | 17 | 80 |

Table 3.9 indicates that time lag between nead recognition and actual purchase of $N$ set. For this five options are given in questionnaire. About 28 percent respondents purchased TV sets within 3 months after they recognised the need. 13 respon-
dents purshased within 6 months after need recogrdtion while 25 respondents purchased within a year. About 11 percent respondents purchased their TV set arter a year.

Ongy 10 ( 12.5 percent) respondents purchased television Ammediately when they recognized the need.

To sum up, it can be said that there is a time lag a about 3 months to 1 year between actual purchase and problem recognition.

TABEE NO. 3.10
REASONS OF DELAY IN PURCH/STHG TELEVIS TON AFTER NEED
BECOONTT TON
( DISTRTEUTION OF RESPONDLNTE)

| Reasons of deley | CTV <br> Holders | $20^{82} \operatorname{Ben} T V$ Helders | $\begin{aligned} & 14^{\text {min }} \text { Bew TV } \\ & \text { Holders } \end{aligned}$ | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Financial <br> probiem | 15 | 9 | 5 | $(49.92)$ |
| ```Credit facili= ties not available``` | 6 | 4 | 4 | $\begin{gathered} 14 \\ (20.00) \end{gathered}$ |
| Lazyness | 6 | 11 |  | $\stackrel{24}{(34.28)}$ |
| Other than above | 3 | - | $\cdots$ | $(4.30)$ |
|  | 30 | 24 | 16 | 70 |

It indicates that.financial problem is the main reason for the delay of purchasing televisionsaftier need recognition. About 41 percent resondents delayed their purchases due tif financial problems. While 20 percent respondents postponed their putchases as credit facisities were not available. Due to lazyness about 34 percent respondents delatyed the purchases. Only 3 respondents answered than above.
it means, financial problem and lazyness of respondents are matin reasons of delay in purchase of television. TABLE.NO.3.11

DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONDENTS WHO HAVE TEIEVISTON SETS
IN THE NEIGHBOURS HOUSE

| Have/have | Not | CTV <br> Holders | 20"B8* TV Holders | $14^{\prime \prime} \mathrm{BEW}$ TV Holders | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Yes |  | 32 | 25 | 14 | $\begin{gathered} 71 \\ (88,75) \end{gathered}$ |
| No |  | 4 | 2 | 3 | $\left(11^{9} .25\right)$ |
|  |  | 36 | 27 | 17 | 80 |

Generally television is purchased as a efmercial media and an entertainment tool. Neighbours purchase affect on the purchase of a consumer. The data shows that most of the respondents (about 88 percent) told that their
neighbour has television set while only 9 respondents told that there is no television in neighbours house. Which means television became a common ctentertainment tool.

TABLE NO. 3.12
INFLUENCE OF NEIGHBOURS TELEVISION ON THE PURCHASE
OF RESPONDENTS TELEVISION

| Influence / No Influence | CTV <br> Holders | 20"Ben TV <br> Molders | $14^{\text {n }} \mathrm{BEW}$ TV Holders | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Yes | 17 | 12 | 6 | $\begin{gathered} 37 \\ (52.12) \end{gathered}$ |
| No | 15 | 13 | 6 | $(47.48)$ |
|  | 32 | 25 | 12 | 71 |

Most of the speciality goods are purchased as a status symbol. Influence of other members' purchase on the respondents purchase is a common thing. It was asked whether. respondents purchased their TV sets as a reactipn of neighbours TV ? The data shows that about 52 percent responfents agreed with the question while $34(47.88 \%)$ disagreed with the statement.

TABLE NO. 3.13
DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONDENTS WHO HAD INFOMATION ABOUT BRANDS AND MODELS AT THE TIME OF PURCHASE

OF TELEVISION

| Have Information <br> No Information | CTV <br> Holders | 20"B8w TV <br> Holders | 14"B8w TV <br> Holders | Total |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Have | 30 | 24 | 12 | 66 <br> $(82.5 \%)$ <br> Have Not | 6 |
|  | 36 | 3 | 5 | 14 |  |

It indicates that about 82 percent respondents knows about the televisions; various brands, models . While 17 respondents does not know anything about brands and models of television. Getting information about the product is first step in buying process and overall all the consuders have adopted it.

TABLE NO. 3.14
BRAND RECOGNITION WHILE PURCHASING THF TELEVISION SET
(DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONDENTS)

| Brands Known <br> 1 | CTV Holders | 20"B8W TV <br> Holders | 14"B8w TV <br> Holders | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2 | 9 | 4 | 2 | 15 |
| 4 | 6 | 10 | 1 | 17 |
| 6 | 6 | 6 | 5 | 17 |

(Contd..... Table No. 3.14)

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 5 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Seven brands <br> and above | 9 | 4 | 4 | 17 |
|  | 30 | 24 | 12 | 66 |

Consumer awarness about various brands plays major role while any perchase. Out of 66 respondents who have information about TV, 15 have information about two brands. While 17 respondents recognize 4 brands, 6brands and more than 6 brands each. Summing up it can be said that TV consumers recognize $2 \mathbf{- 6}$ brands of television available.

TABLE NO.3.15
InFluence /advice from other members vhile selecting
PARTICULAR BLAND AND MODEL
(DIATRIBUTTON OF RESPONDENTS)

| Advice from | CTV <br> Holders | 20"1884TV Holders | 14"BEW TV Holders | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Family Members | 11 | 3 | 3 | 17(21.25) |
| Friends | 6 | 5 | 5 | 16(16.00) |
| Relatives | 4 | 5 | 5 | 14(17.50) |
| Collegues | 4 | 10 | 1 | 15(18.75) |
| Dealers | 9 | 2 | 3 | 14(17.50) |
| No Advice | 2 | 2 | - | 4(05.00) |
|  | 36 | 27 | 17 | 80 |

It was found that while selecting patticuler brand influence of other members than the actual purchaser plays a vital role. From the above data, it is seen that in 37 (21.25\% purchases family members adviced the respondents. Advice from friends is prefered in 16 purchases. About 17 percent respondents are adviced by relatives. The dealers also adviced to 14 respondents while selection of TV. .

Onily 4 ( $5 \%$ ) respondents selected their televisions without anyone's advice.

To sum up, it can be said that consumer generally purchases a particular brand of television with the help of others. Personal selection is rare.

TABLE NO. 3.16
SOURCES OF INFORMATION ABOUT TELEVISIOR SET BEFORE

## (FRECUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONDENTS)

| Sources of Information | cTV <br> Holders | 20"BaW TV <br> Holders | 14"BRNTV <br> Holders | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ! | ! |  |  |  |
| Dealers | 17 | 8 | 6 | $\begin{aligned} & 31 \\ & (50.00) \end{aligned}$ |
| Commercial Media | Ho | 5 | 5 | $(32.25)$ |
| Personal Inquiry | 4 | 5 | 2 | $\left(\frac{11}{17.25)}\right.$ |
|  | 731 | 18 | 13 | 80 |

It was found that 62 ( $77.5 \%$ ) respondents have bathered information from various sources. As indicated in the table no.3.16, about 50 percent respondents gathered information from the dealer. While 20 respondents gathered information from commercial media like television, newspapers, magazines etc. Only 11 ( $17.25 \%$ ) respondents gathered information through personal inquiry.

In other wards, many consumers depends upon the dealers for getting information.

TABLE NO. 3.17
CONTACT OF DEALER WITH HESPORDENT BEFORE PURCHASE OF
TELEVISION SET
(FREqUENCY DISTRIBUTION)

| Xes/No | $\begin{aligned} & \text { CTV } \\ & \text { Holders } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 20^{n \mathrm{~B}} \\ & \text { Hold } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 14^{\prime \prime E} \\ & \text { Hold } \end{aligned}$ | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Yes(Contacted) | 8 | 6 | 7 | 16(20\%) |
| No(Not Contacted | )28 | 21 | 15 | 64(80\%) |
|  | 36 | 27 | 17 | 80 |

Personal selling, contacting customers is a $m_{7} j o r$ aspect of todays marketing system. Table 3.17 gives the data regarding the contact of a dealer and consumer. It indicates that only in $20 \%$ purchases, dealers contacter the consumers, while in $80 \%$ purchases respondents have not been contacted by the dealers. It means dealers are not conscious about their sales.

TABLE NO. 3.18
PURCHASE OF TELEVISION FROM THE GAME DEALER CONTACTED
WITH THE RESPONDFNT

| Yes/No | CTV <br> Holders | 20"B8M TV Holders | 14"BRUV TV Holders | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Yeg (Purchased) | 7 | 6 | 1 | 14(87.5) |
| No(Not Purchased) | 1 | - | 1 | 2(12.5) |
|  | 8 | 6 | 2 | 16 |

Table No. 3.18 gives the data regarding the sales promotion efforts of the dealers and their suecess. Dealers contacted only 16 ( $20 \%$ respondents. Out of them 14 ( 87.5 percent) respondents had purchased from the same dealer contacted. Bemaining $?$ respondents purchased from others.

It means sales promotion efforts plays a vital role in selling of television set.

TABLE NO. 3.19
RELATIONSHIP OF RESFONDENT UITH THE DEALERS

| Relationship | CTV <br> Holders | 20"B2日 TV Holders | 34 $4^{\prime \prime}$ BEY TV holders | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Relative | 7 | 1 | 1 | $\begin{aligned} & (11.25) \\ & (26.00) \end{aligned}$ |
| Friend | 9 | 4 | 3 |  |
|  |  | 4 | 3 |  |

(Contd....... Table No. 3.19)

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 5 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Regular Dealer | 14 | 14 | 8 | 36 <br> $(45.0)$ <br> Friends/Neighbours <br> Dealer <br> No Relation |
|  | 5 | 2 | 2 | $(11.25)$ |
|  | 1 | 6 | 3 | 10 <br> $(17.50)$ |
|  | 36 | 27 | 17 | 80 |

Generally consumers purchase from the regular shons or known dealers, Knowing the relations of the dealers and respondents is an important factor of testing the shopping behavior and shop loyalty of a consumer.

Table 3.19 shows that about 11 percent respondents had purchased their televisions from their relatives who were dealers of TV . While 20 percent respondents had purchased from their friends. Most of the consumers ( $45 \%$ ) purchased their televisions from regular dealer i.e. dealer of radio, tapemecorder and other electric and electronic compenents. Only about 12 percent respondents purchased telcvisions from unknown dealers.

Overall all the consumers purchased their televisions from the dealers who were in contact personlly or formally.

TABLE NO. 3.20
DIETRIBUTION UF GESPONUENTS ON THE BAGIS OF BBAND
AVAILABLE IN THE SHOP

| Available Brands | CTV <br> Holders | $20^{\circ 188 W}$ TV Holders | $14^{27} \mathrm{BRM}_{3}$ TV Holders | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 1 | - | - | $1(1.25)$ |
| 2 - | 1 | 2 | 5 | $8(10.00)$ |
| 3 | 7 | 12 | 9 | 28(35.00) |
| 4 | 13 | 7 | $?$ | $22(27.50)$ |
| 5 Brands and above | 14. | 6 | 1 | $21(26.25)$ |
|  | 36 | 27 | 17 | 80 |

Table 3.20 indicates that most of the respondents have choice of selection of atelovision. In most of the shops more than 2 brands were there for selection. 28 respondents told that 3 brands were available in the shop.

TABLE NO. 3.21
STEESG GIVEN BY DEALER ON A PARTICULAR BRAND wHILE
SELLCTING TELIVISION FROM THL AVALLABLE BLANDS
(EREQUERCY DISTHIBUTION OF RESPONDENTS)

| Stressed/ <br> Not Stressed | CTV <br> Holders Holders | 20"B8W TV <br> Holders | Total |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :--- |
| Stressed | 20 | 14 | 11 | $45(56.25)$ |
| Not stressed | 16 | 13 | 6 | $35(47.75)$ |
|  | 36 | 27 | 17 | 80 |

Table No. 3.21 indicates the impact of the dealers opinion while selection of a television set. In 45 purchases ( $56.25 \%$ ), dealers stresside on a particular brand, while in 35 purchases ( $43.75 \%$ ), dealers had not stressed on the brand.

It means dealers generally stresses on a particulax brand etren though he have more than one brands in his shop.

TABLE NO. 3.22
FACTORG CONS IDERED BY RESPONDENTS FOR SELECTION OF COLOUR TELEVISION
(DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONDENTS)

| Reasons of Selection | CTV Holders | Percentage |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Good Economic Condition | 7 | 19.45 |
| For Not Replacing | 7 | 19.45 |
| As a Keplacement | 5 | 13.88 |
| Good Picture Guality | 17 | 47.72 |

17 out of 36 respondents ( $47.22 \%$ ) selected colout TV sets with the attribute 'Picture Quality'. 7 of them ( $19.45 \%$ ) had selected it for not replacing television again and again. Many consumers firstly purchasef BSb: televisions, then fade up with it, sellit at very few price and then again purchase a colour television.

These 7 respondents purchased colour televisions td avoid this type of practice. While 5 respondents (13.89\%) gone through this practice and selected colour television as a replacement. 7 ( $19.45 \%$ ) respondents selected colour television as their economic condition is sound.

It means, good picture quality is a major attribute while selecting colour television sets.

TABLE MO. 3.23
FACTOHS CONSIDERED BY RESPONDENTS FOR BRAND CHOICE
IN COLOUR TELEVISION PUFCHASHS
(FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTTON OF HESPONDENTS)

| Factors considered | CTV Holders | Percentage |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Price | 3 | 8.33 |
| Quality | 29 | 80.55 |
| Credit Facilities | 1 | 2.78 |
| Hire Purchase | 1 | 2.78 |
| Brand Name | 1 | 2.78 |
| After Sales Services | 1 | 2.78 |
|  | 36 | 100.00 |

It is indicated that quality of television is major attribute while selecting particular brand. 29 respondents prefered quality while 3 respondents prefered price while selection of CTV brand. Other attributes like credit facilities avajlable, hire purchase facilities, brand name, and after sales services were mprefered by one respondent each. Overall all the consumers prefers 'quality' for selection of CTV.

TABLE NO. 3.24
PRERERENCES TOKARDS PRICE AND QUALITY IN PUHCHASING
COLOUR TELEVISIONS
(DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONDENTS)

| Preference | CTV Holders | Percentage |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Prefer Cuality | 30 | 83.34 |
| Prefer Price | 6 | 16.66 |
|  | 36 | 100.00 |

This table shows that 30 respondents (about $83 \%$ ) prefers quality while selection of CTV. Only 6 respondents (about $17 \%$ ) prefers price of CTV and selected particular model.

Thus the researchers bypothesis, "Consumers are price sensitive in BEw models and quality/efforts sensitive in colour models ${ }^{\text {n }}$ tested positively.

TABLE NO. 3.25
FACTOHS CONSIDERED BY RESPONDATS FOF SELECTION OF 20" B8W TV SETS

| Reasons of Selection | 201 Bev/ TV Set <br> Holders | Percentage |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Good Model | 12 | 44.44 |
| CTV's are costly | 6 | 22.22 |
| Moderate Price | 6 | 22.22 |
| Only as a conmencial Media | 3 | 11.12 |
|  | 27 | 100.00 |

This table shows thatwhile selecting a television set ( $20^{\prime \prime}$ Bsii) respondents look after the quality of the televm ision. About 44 percent respondents selected $20^{12}$ black and white televisions as they were good models from their view. While 6 respondents selected it as colour televisions are costily and beyond their economic capasity. 6 respondents (22.22 \%) purchased $20^{\prime \prime}$ B8 models with the incentive 'moderate price'. 3 respondents (about 11 percent) does not give importance to the price, quality etc. They purchased it only as a commercial media.

In other wards model and characterstics related to quality was main reason of selection of a $20^{\circ} \mathrm{BE}$ IV .

TABLE NO. 3.26
FACTORS COISIDERED BY RESPONDENTS FOR SELECTION OF
14"B \& W TELEVISIONS

| Heasons of Selection | 14"Bew | TV Holders |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Easy to use | 5 | 29.41 |
| Time being | 2 | 11.76 |
| Economically good | 9 | 52.94 |
| Good model | 1 | 5.89 |
|  | 17 | 100.00 |

This table shows that most of the respondents purchased B \& colour televisions. 9 television holders (about 52 percent)
selected their 14"B8W TV with the attribute 'economically good'. While 5 respondents ( 29.41 \%o selected their telem visions with the attribute 'easy to use'. Two respondents selected $14^{\text {"BRW TV }}$ f for tine being as they want to purchase colour television in future. Oniy one respondentsselected his television as the model is good Erom his view.

Overall all the factors except 'good model' considered while selection of a $14^{\prime \prime} \mathrm{B}$ \& W TV.

TABLE NO. 3.27
FACTOKS CONSIOERED BY RESPONDENTS FQR BRAND CHOICE OF $20^{11} 814^{11}$ BEH TELEVISTONS (FRECUEMCY DISTKIDUTION OF HESPONDENTS)

| Factors considered | 20"BEN TV Holders | 14"B8i. TV Holders | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Price | 8 | 9 | $\begin{gathered} 37 \\ (38.75) \end{gathered}$ |
| Guality | 8 | 2 | $\begin{gathered} 10 \\ (22.71) \end{gathered}$ |
| Credit facilities | $?$ | 2 | $(09.09)$ |
| Hire purchase facilities |  | 2 | $(04.50)$ |
| After sales services | 1 | $\cdots$ | $\left(00^{1} .25\right)$ |
| Brand | 8 | 2 | $\left(22_{0}^{10} 70\right)$ |
|  | 27 | 17 | 100.00 |

It is indicated that price is major attribute while selecting a particular brand of $\mathrm{B} \& \%$ television. 17 out
of 44 respondents prefered price in the place of other attributes given. 10 respondents ( $22.75 \%$ ) prefered quality and the same number of respondents had prefered brand name. Credit facilities and hire purchase facilities are not major factors while selecting particular BeN TV brand. Omly one respondent considered 'after sales services' as an attribute of selection of a particular brand.

Which means price, quality and brand name are major attributes while selecting B8N televisions.

TABLE RO. 3.28
PREFERENCES TOWARDS PRICE AND GUAITTY IN TIE PURCHASE
OF B \& W TELEVISIONS
(DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONDENTS)

| Preferences | $20^{* B 8 \%}$ TV Holders | $14^{\text {"Bem TV }}$ Holders | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Cuality | 16 | 7 | 23 |
| Price | 11 | 10 | 21 |
|  | 27 | 17 | 44 |

This table shows that 23 respondents (about 52 \%) prefers quality while selecting a BR: TV set. Vihile 21 respondents prefered price while selection.

Thus the researchers hypothesis "consumers are price sensitave in BeW TV models and quality/efforts sensitive in CTV models." tested negatively as more than half of the respondents prefered price.

TABLE NO. 3.29
MARRANTEE OF TELEVISION SET GIVEN BY THE DEALER TO
THE RLSPONEETS
(DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONDENTS)

| Warrantee Period | CTV Holders | 20"B8M TV Holders | 14"1884 TV Holders | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| One year | 30 | 19 | 13 | $(77.5)$ |
| Two Years | 6 | 8 | 4 | $\begin{gathered} 18 \\ (22.5) \end{gathered}$ |
| ! | 36 | 27 | 17 | 90 |

Table 3.29 shows that most of the dealers had given one year warrantee to the purchasers. 62 respondents had been given one year warrantee to their televisions from the dealer while 18 respondents had given two year warrantee. It means 'one year'is a standard warrantee period for the televisions.

TABLE WO. 3.30
DIETRIBUTION OF RESPONDENTS AS PER THEIR OPINION
ABOUT THE DEALERS

| Opinion | CTV Holders | 20"B\& TV Holders | 14mben TV Holders | Tota 1 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Good | 32 | 22 | 12 | $\begin{aligned} & 66 \\ & (82.5) \end{aligned}$ |
| Not so good | 4 | 5 | 5 | $(17.5)$ |
| Bad | -- | -m | $\cdots$ | $\cdots$ |
|  | 36 | 27 | 17 | 80 |

This table shows that most of the respondents (about $82 \%$ ) have a good opinion about the dealer, while 14 respondents are quite unsatisfied about the dealer. They had given negative remark about the dealer. Nobody had given the opinion 'bad' about the dealer.

TABLE NO. 3.3.1
DISTIIEUTTON UF RESPONDENTS AS PER THETR OPINION ABOUT THE TELEVISION PURCHASED

| Opinion about Television | CTV <br> Holders | $20^{\prime \prime} \mathrm{BE}$ : TV Hiders | 14"BRE TV <br> Holders | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Good | 34 | 25 | 17 | $\begin{gathered} 76 \\ (95 \%) \end{gathered}$ |
| Not so good | 2 | 2 | -- | $(50)^{4}$ |
| Bad | -- | -- | -- | -- |
|  | 36 | 27 | 17 | 80 |

The table shows that 95 per cent respondents have good opinion about their televisions. Wihile 4 respondents answered that their televisions are not so good. No one elained that their television is bad.

Overall all the consumers surveyed, were happy with their televisions.

TABLE NO. 3.32
SATIEFALTION OF THE REEPONDENTS AS EXPECTED BEFORE
PURCHAS ING TELEVISTON SET
(DIS TRIBUTION OF RESPONDENTS )

| Satisfiod/Not Satisfied | CTV <br> Holders | 20"B8N TV 14"Ben TV Holders Holders | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Satisfied | 25 | 2112 | $\begin{gathered} 58 \\ (72.5) \end{gathered}$ |
| Not Satisfied | 11 | 65 | $(27.5)$ |
|  | 36 | $27 \quad 17$ | 80 |

Every consumer expects certain satisfaction from the product before purchase. It is necossary to know the pre-purchase expectation about the product and post purchase satisfaction. This table shows that 58 consumers (about 72 per cent) are satisfied, they get the product attributes as they expected. While 22 responcients (27.5\%) are not satisfied as expected.

TABLE NO. 3.33
DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONDENS AS PEA THE IR POST: PURCHASE Bl:HavTOE

| Post Purchase Behovior | CTV <br> Holders | 20"BENTTV Holders | 14B84 TV Holders | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Choose the samo brand while replacing | 17 | 12 | 11 | $\begin{gathered} 40 \\ (50 \%) \end{gathered}$ |
| Change the brand | 18 | 12 | 5 | $\stackrel{35}{(43.75 \%)}$ |

(Contd.......Table No. 3.33)

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| No conment | 1 | 3 | 1 | 5 |
|  | 36 | 27 | 17 | 80 |

This table shows that 40 ( 50 percent) respondents will choose the same brand in case of replacement of a television set. 35 respondents ( $43.75 \%$ ) wants to change the brand in future while replacing the television. Only five respondents keep mum on this question of changing the brand in future.

It means only halif of the respondents are loyal with the brand they purchased.

TABIE NO. 3.34
PUECHASE OF TELEVISION AND INCREASE IN SOCIAL STATUS
(DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONDENTS)

| Increase/ No Increase | CTV <br> Holders | 20"B3Y: TV <br> Holders | 14"BRam TV Holders | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Increase in sbcial Status | 10 | 6 | 8 | $(34 \%)$ |
| No increase in | 26 | 21 | 9 | $\left.\frac{56}{70} \%\right)$ |
|  | 36 | 27 | 17 | 80 |

Table 3.34 indicates the psychological ef fect of TV purchase. As a speciality product, many people purchases IV as a social status symbol. It was asked the respondents whether there is any increase in their status after purchasing television set. 70 percent respondents answered negatively. while 30 percent respondents told that their social status increased after purchasing television.

It means television set is no more a social
status symbol but a necessity.

TABLE NO. 3.35
PURCHASE OF ACCESSORILS AND EQUTPRENTS : ITH THE TELEVISTON SET FROA THE SAUE DEALER (DISTRIBUTION OF RESYONDUNTS)


[^0]
[^0]:    This table shows the purchase of equipments, accessories with the TV set. Accessories like antena and stabilizer is purchased by majority of the respondents from the same dealex from whom they purchased TV set. Booster is not required in kolhapur city as there is a relay centra. Other equipments like IV stand. Cover, glass, case were purchased by very Few respondents from the same dealer.

