CHAPTER 5

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS, SUGGESTIONS AND CONCLUSION

5.1 INTRODUCTION

In the new emerging business scenario, brands are becoming the most valuable assets that businesses can possess. The marketers are facing lot of challenges: how to differentiate the values of the customers. Brands in this context are new business warriors. Brands are wealth generators in the twenty first century. When products are not differentiated in the factories, but brands are differentiated in the customers’ mind. Brands are capable of transforming mundane products into objects of desire. Accordingly, the market value of a business is determined by the number and types of brands it holds. Building and managing strong brand is key to gaining competitive advantage and long term profitability for product, services, corporations and organizations. So, the marketers should have in-depth and research-based knowledge on marketing, consumer behaviour and brand management.

Brands play a significant role in affecting consumers’ choice behaviour. Among the competitive products consumers face uncertainty and risk about product quality during the purchase time and it is closely related to highly useful products like television, refrigerator, washing machine, mixer-grinder, digital camera and CD/DVD player. This uncertainty arises from the imperfect and asymmetric information among the product attributes over the
competitive products. In such situation, brands play key roles to consumers to pick up the right choice among the alternative products.

Understanding the content and structure of brand knowledge is important because they influence what comes to mind when a consumer thinks about a brand for response to marketing activity for that brand. However, brand familiarity among the competitive brands affects the consumers purchase decision. And higher levels of experiences with a brand (brand familiarity) may lead to retention of a more developed schema (the hierarchical network of associations to the brand), involving retention of stronger links between the product class and brand and between the brand and its attributes. These links should make attribute information easier to retrieve and may reduce susceptibility to competitive interference. Familiarity also guides the consumers’ attention to specific brand. On the other hand, consumers may receive multiple exposures to advertisement for brands they have never seen or tried. Thus, familiar brand dominate over the unfamiliar brand.

Brand equity from the consumer’s perspective is useful because it suggests both specific guidelines for marketing strategies and tactics and areas where research can be useful in assisting managerial decision making. Two important points emerge from this conceptualisation. First, marketers should take a broad view of marketing activity for a brand and recognise the various effects it has on brand knowledge, as well as how changes in brand knowledge affect more traditional outcome measures such as sales. Second, marketers must realize that the long-term success of all future marketing programmes for a brand is greatly affected by the knowledge about the brand in memory that has been established by the firm’s short term marketing efforts (Keller 1993).
Brand equity is a multidimensional concept and a complex phenomenon. Keller (2002) separated it into two components: awareness and association. Aaker (1991, 1996) grouped it into five categories: perceived quality, brand loyalty, brand awareness, brand association, and other proprietary brand assets such as patents, trademarks, and channel relationships.

Several firms had been offering products in a consumer durable market. Hence, the consumers had greater options to choose from many. The firms have to build strong brand equity on their products to compete others. Understanding the consumer behaviour would help the firms in formulating strategies to cater brand equity to the consumer and thereby increase their market share. Consumer’s brand preferences were found to change rapidly, especially in a dynamic environment. It hoped that such a study will help to gain knowledge on issues such as the prime factors Brand, Brand equity, consumer behaviour, purchase opinion, idea of consumers about the brand so on.

With this background, the general objective of the present research is to, “Study the Impact of Consumer Buying Behaviour and Brand Equity on Durable Products- With Special Reference to Bangalore District with the following specific objectives i). analyse the consumer buying behaviour on selected durable products. ii). study demographic factors influencing purchase decision of consumers with regard to durable products. iii).analyse the key dimensions of brand equity in influencing purchase decisions. iv).study the relationship between various dimensions of customer based brand equity. v).draw out managerial implications of the findings of the study.
The Bangalore district has been purposively selected for the present study. The consumers of durable goods have been selected by adopting convenient sampling technique. The data and information have been collected from 500 consumers of durable goods through pre-tested, structured questionnaire.

In order to understand the socio economic characteristics of consumers and purchase of durable goods, the percentage analysis and frequency distribution are worked out. In order to study difference between dimensions of consumer based brand equity on durable goods, t-test has been applied.

In order to study the difference among the purchase value of durable goods, consumer’s buying behaviour of durable goods, brand awareness, brand image, perceived quality, brand association and brand loyalty the analysis of variance (ANOVA) has been employed. In order to study the differences between socio economic characteristics of consumers of durable goods and brands of durable goods, the Chi-Square Test has been employed.

In order to study the relationship between dimensions of buying behaviour of durable goods and the relationship between dimensions of brand equity on durable goods the Person’s correlation coefficient is worked out. In order to identify the factors affecting the brand equity, the confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) has been employed. In order to discriminate the consumers of urban, semi-urban and rural areas based on the dimensions of brand equity on durable goods, the discriminant analysis has been employed.

In order to assess the influence of demographic factors on consumers purchase decisions of durable products, the impact of brand equity dominions on overall brand equity of durable products and the impact of
brand equity dominions on consumer’s buying behaviour of durable products, the multiple linear regression analysis by Ordinary Least Square (OLS) estimation has been applied. In order to measure the customer based brand equity on durable products, a Structural Equation Model (SEM) was developed.

5.2 SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

5.2.1 Socio-Economic Characteristics of Consumers of Durable Products

Gender and age of the respondents. The results indicate that about 72.20 per cent of the consumers of durable goods are males and the rest of 27.80 per cent of the consumers of durable goods are females. The results show that about 32.00 per cent of the consumers of durable goods belong to the age group of 31-40 years followed by 41-50 years (28.20 per cent), 21-30 years (23.20 per cent), more than 50 years (12.40 per cent) and less than 20 years (4.20 per cent).

Education and occupation of the respondents. The results indicate that about 45.40 per cent of the consumers of durable goods are educated up to graduate level followed by school level (27.80 per cent), post graduate level (16.80 per cent) and professional (10.00 per cent). It is very clear that about 45.40 per cent of the consumers of durable goods are salaried followed by self- employed (29.80 per cent), housewife (12.40 per cent), professional (7.20 per cent) and student (5.60 per cent).

Income and marital status of the respondents. The results show that about 30.40 per cent of the consumers of durable goods belong to the income group of `10001-20000 followed by more than `30000 (29.60 per cent), `20001-30000 (24.20 per cent) and less than `10000 (15.80 per cent). The results show that about 81.60 per cent of the consumers
of durable goods are married, while, the rest of 18.40 per cent of the consumers of durable goods are unmarried.

**Family size and residence of respondents.** It is clear that about 33.40 per cent of the consumers of durable goods belong to the joint family and the rest of 66.60 per cent of the consumers of durable goods belong to the nuclear family. It is apparent that about 48.40 per cent of the consumers of durable goods have the family size of 4-6 followed by 1-3 (37.40 per cent) and more than six (14.20 per cent). It is observed that about 44.60 per cent of the consumers of durable goods reside in urban area followed by semi-urban area (29.20 per cent) and rural area (26.20 per cent).

### 5.2.2 Purchase of Durable Goods

**Purchase of Television.** The results indicate that about 18.80 per cent of the consumers of durable goods purchase SONY brand of television followed by SAMSUNG (18.02 per cent), LG (17.80 per cent), ONIDA (10.00 per cent), VIDEOCON (6.20 per cent), AKAI (4.80 per cent), PHILIPS (4.20 per cent), PANASONIC (4.00 per cent), BPL (3.80 per cent), SANSUI (3.40 per cent), SHARP (2.40 per cent), THOMSON (2.20 per cent), TCL (2.00 per cent), HAIER (1.40 per cent) and THOSHIBA (0.80 per cent).

**Purchase of refrigerator.** The results show that about 31.60 per cent of the consumers of durable goods purchase LG brand of refrigerator followed by SAMSUNG (19.00 per cent), WHIRLPOOL (17.40 per cent), GODREJ (15.40 per cent), VIDEOCON (8.00 per cent), KELVINATOR (6.60 per cent), HAIER and ELECTROLUX (1.00 per cent).

**Purchase of Washing machine.** The results indicate that about 32.20 per cent of the consumers of durable goods purchase LG brand of washing machine followed by SAMSUNG (19.60 per cent), WHIRLPOOL
(17.60 per cent), IFB (10.80 per cent), VIDEOCON (7.40 per cent), GODREJ (6.40 per cent), ONDIA (3.20 per cent), EEELECTROLUX (2.40 per cent) and HAIER (0.40 per cent).

**Purchase of mixer-grinder.** The results show that about 13.40 per cent of the consumers of durable goods purchase PREETHI brand of mixer-grinder followed by MAHARAJA (12.40 per cent), BUTTERFLY (12.00 per cent), PHILIPS and PRESTIGE (10.60 per cent), KENSTAR (6.80 per cent) and BAJAJ (6.60 per cent). The results also show that 5.20 per cent of the consumers of durable goods purchase SUMEET brand of mixer-grinder followed by PIEGON and PANASONIC (4.20 per cent), KANCHAN (3.20 per cent), LEXUS (2.80 per cent), KAILASH (2.20 per cent), GANGA (1.40 per cent), AJANTA and USHA (1.00 per cent), LAXMI and VIJAY (0.80 per cent), APIX and MORPHY (0.40 per cent).

**Purchase of digital Camera.** The results indicate that about 35.00 per cent of the consumers of durable goods purchase CANON brand of digital camera followed by SONY (21.20 per cent), CASIO (12.20 per cent), NIKON (6.80 per cent), FUJI and SAMSUNG (6.00 per cent), KODAK (5.80 per cent), PANASONIC (3.60 per cent) and OLYMBUS (3.40 per cent).

**Purchase of CD / DVD player.** The results show that about 35.40 per cent of the consumers of durable goods purchase SONY brand of CD / DVD player followed by VIDEOCON (19.80 per cent), PHILIPS (8.60 per cent), LG (8.40 per cent), SAMSUNG (6.40 per cent) and ONIDA (6.00 per cent). The results further indicate that about 2.60 per cent of the consumers of durable goods purchase JVC brand of CD / DVD player followed by OMKAR (2.40 per cent), AKAI (2.20 per cent), INTEX (2.00 per cent), HAIER and SAMSUI (1.60 per cent), PIONEER (1.40 per cent), MITASI (1.20 per cent) and SHARP (0.40 per cent).
**Purchase Value of television** It is apparent that out of `10061747 spend for purchasing the television by the consumers, about 31.40 per cent of money spend for purchase of SONY brand of television followed by LG (23.29 per cent), SAMSUNG (18.44 per cent), ONIDA (6.34 per cent), VIDEOCON (3.92 per cent), PANASONIC (2.76 per cent), SANSUI (2.46 per cent), AKAI (2.20 per cent), PHILIPS (2.18 per cent), BPL (1.78 per cent), SHARP (1.48 per cent), THAMSON (1.30 per cent), TCL (1.03 per cent), THOSHIBA (0.75 per cent) and HAIER (0.67 per cent).

The F-value of 2.931 is significant at one per cent level indicating that there is a significant difference in purchase value of brand names of the televisions among the consumers of durable goods. Hence, the null hypothesis of there is no significant difference in purchase value of television brands by the consumers is rejected.

**Purchase Value of refrigerator.** The results indicate that out of `7276590 spend for purchasing the refrigerator by the consumers, about 33.80 per cent of money spend for purchase of LG brand of refrigerator followed by SAMSUNG (19.63 per cent), WHIRLPOOL (17.66 per cent), GODREJ (14.18 per cent), VIDEOCON (7.72 per cent), KELVINATOR (5.15 per cent), HAIER (1.04 per cent) and ELECTROLUX (0.82 per cent).

The F-value of 4.160 is significant at one per cent level. Hence, the null hypothesis of there is no significant difference in purchase value of refrigerator brands by the consumers is rejected. Therefore it can be concluded that there is a significant difference in purchase value of brand names of the refrigerator among the consumers of durable goods.

**Purchase Value of washing machine.** The results show that out of `7736750 spend for purchasing the washing machine by the consumers, about 32.85 per cent of money spend for purchase of LG brand of washing
machine followed by SAMSUNG (19.54 per cent), WHIRLPOOL (16.41 per cent), IFB (15.94 per cent), VIDEOCON (6.04 per cent), GODREJ (5.51 per cent), ONIDA (2.08 per cent), ELECTROLUX (1.31 per cent) and HAIER (0.32 per cent).

The F-value of 6.845 is significant at one per cent level. Hence, the null hypothesis of there is no significant difference in purchase value of washing machine brands by the consumers is rejected. Therefore it can be concluded that there is a significant difference in purchase value of brand names of the washing machine among the consumers of durable goods.

**Purchase Value of mixer-grinder.** It is observed that out of `1856600 spend for purchasing the mixer-grinder by the consumers, about 14.51 per cent of money spend for purchase of PREETHI brand of mixer-grinder followed by BUTTERFLY (12.10 per cent), PHILIPS (11.62 per cent), PRESTIGE (11.53 per cent), MAHARAJA (11.41 per cent), KENSTAR (7.06 per cent), BAJAJ (5.78 per cent), SUMEET (4.87 per cent), PANASONIC (4.66 per cent), PIEGON (3.88 per cent), LEXUS (2.84 per cent), KANCHAN (2.65 per cent), KAILASH (1.67 per cent), GANGA (1.47 per cent), AJANTA (0.89 per cent), USHA (0.82 per cent), VIJAY (0.70 per cent), LAXMI (0.57 per cent), APIX (0.54 per cent) and MORPHY (0.43 per cent).

The F-value of 3.794 is significant at one per cent level. Hence, the null hypothesis of there is no significant difference in purchase value of mixer-grinder brands by the consumers is rejected. Therefore it can be concluded that there is a significant difference in purchase value of brand names of the mixer-grinder among the consumers of durable goods.

**Purchase value of digital camera.** It is apparent that out of `3769698 spend for purchasing the digital camera by the consumers, about 33.59 per cent of money spend for purchase of CANON brand of digital
camera followed by SONY (32.60 per cent), NIKON (5.78 per cent), CASIO (5.57 per cent), KODAK (5.17 per cent), PANASONIC (5.11 per cent), SAMSUNG (4.99 per cent), FUJI (4.53 per cent) and OLYMBUS (2.66 per cent).

The F-value of 3.429 is significant at one per cent level. Hence, the null hypothesis of there is no significant difference in purchase value of digital camera brands by the consumers is rejected. Therefore it can be concluded that there is a significant difference in purchase value of brand names of the digital camera among the consumers of durable goods.

**Purchase value of CD/ DVD player.** The results indicate that out of ` 2044680 spend for purchasing the CD/ DVD player by the consumers, about 40.10 per cent of money spend for purchase of SONY brand of CD/ DVD player followed by VIDEOCON (22.52 per cent), LG (8.80 per cent), PHILIPS (7.29 per cent), SAMSUNG (5.87 per cent), ONIDA (3.67 per cent), JVC (2.71 per cent), AKAI (1.55 per cent), INTEX (1.52 per cent), PIONEER (1.44 per cent), SAMSUI (1.40 per cent), OMKAR (1.10 per cent), HAIER (1.08 per cent), MITASI (0.68 per cent) and SHARP (0.26 per cent).

The F-value of 10.626 is significant at one per cent level. Therefore, the null hypothesis of there is no significant difference in purchase value of CD/DVD player brands by the consumers is rejected. Therefore it can be concluded that there is a significant difference in purchase value of brand names of the CD/ DVD player among the consumers of durable goods.

**Purchase value of consumer durable products.** The results show that out of ` 32746065 spend for purchasing the durable goods by the consumers, about 30.73 per cent of money spend for purchase of television followed by washing machine (23.63 per cent), refrigerator (22.22 per cent),
digital camera (11.51 per cent), CD/DVD player (6.24 per cent) and mixer-grinder (5.67 per cent).

The F-value of 44.574 is significant at one per cent level. Hence, the null hypothesis of there is no significant difference in purchase value of durable goods by the consumers is rejected. Therefore it can be concluded that there is a significant difference in purchase value of durable goods among the consumers of durable goods

**Purchase value of television brands among the age groups.** The results indicate that among the age group of less than 20 years, about 52.38 per cent of the consumers of durable goods purchase LG brand of television followed by SAMSUNG (38.10 per cent) and SONY (9.52 per cent). Among the age group of 21-30 years, about 18.97 per cent of the consumers of durable goods purchase SONY brand of television followed by SAMSUNG (17.24 per cent) and LG (10.34 per cent). Besides, the purchase of television by the consumers of durable goods is varying from ONIDA (9.48 per cent) to HAIER (0.00 per cent).

Among the age group of 31-40 years, about 25.00 per cent of the consumers of durable goods purchase SAMSUNG brand of television followed by SONY and LG (14.38 per cent). Besides, the purchase of television by the consumers of durable goods is ranging from VIDEOCON (7.50 per cent) to SHARP (0.00 per cent). Among the age group of 41-50 years, about 23.40 per cent of the consumers of durable goods purchase SONY brand of television followed by LG and ONIDA (15.60 per cent) and SAMSUNG (13.48 per cent). Besides, the purchase of television by the consumers of durable goods is varying from AKAI (6.38 per cent) to THOSHIBA (0.00 per cent).
Among the age group of more than 50 years, about 33.87 per cent of the consumers of durable goods purchase LG brand of television followed by SONY (22.58 per cent). Besides, the purchase of television by the consumers of durable goods is ranging from ONIDA (9.68 per cent) to THOSHIBA (0.00 per cent).

The Chi-Square value of 70.063 is significant at five per cent level. Hence, the null hypothesis of there is no significant difference in purchase value of television brands among the age groups of the consumers of durable goods is rejected. Therefore it can be concluded that there is a significant difference in purchase of television brands among the age groups of the consumers of durable goods.

Purchase value of television brands among the educational qualifications. The results show that among the consumers of school level education, about 21.58 per cent of the consumers of durable goods purchase LG and SONY brands of television followed by SAMSUNG (16.55 per cent) and ONIDA (12.23 per cent). Besides, the purchase of television by the consumers of durable goods is varying from BPL (5.04 per cent) to TCL and THOSHIBA (0.00 per cent).

Among consumers of graduate level education, about 18.94 per cent of the consumers of durable goods purchase SAMSUNG and SONY brands of television followed by LG (17.62 per cent) and ONIDA (10.57 per cent). Besides, the purchase of television by the consumers of durable goods is ranging from VIDEOCON (5.73 per cent) to HAIER, THAMSON and THOSHIBA (1.32 per cent).

Among the consumers of post graduate level education, about 21.43 per cent of the consumers of durable goods purchase SAMSUNG brand of television followed by LG (16.67 per cent), SONY (11.90 per cent) and
AKAI and VIDEOCON (10.71 per cent). Besides, the purchase of television by the consumers of durable goods is varying from PHILIPS (8.33 per cent) to HAIER and THAMSON (0.00 per cent).

Among the consumers of professionals, about 22.00 per cent of the consumers of durable goods purchase SONY brand of television followed by SAMSUNG (14.00 per cent), LG, ONIDA and SANSUI (10.00 per cent). Besides, the purchase of television by the consumers of durable goods is ranging from PANASONIC, THAMSON and VIDEOCON (6.00 per cent) to SHARP and THOSHIBA (0.00 per cent).

The Chi-Square value of 59.710 is significant at five per cent level. Hence, the null hypothesis of there is no significant difference in purchase value of television brands among the educational qualifications of the consumers of durable goods is rejected. Therefore it can be concluded that there is a significant difference in purchase of television brands among the educational qualifications of the consumers of durable goods.

**Purchase value of television brands among the monthly income.**

It is observed that among the monthly income group of `less than 10000, about 26.58 per cent of the consumers of durable goods purchase LG brand of television followed by SONY (21.52 per cent), SAMSUNG (12.66 per cent) and ONIDA (11.39 per cent). Besides, the purchase of television by the consumers of durable goods is ranging from BPL (6.33 per cent) to PHILIPS and THOSHIBA (0.00 per cent).

Among the monthly income group of `10001-20000, about 21.05 per cent of the consumers of durable goods purchase SONY brand of television followed by LG(17.76 per cent), SAMSUNG (15.79 per cent) and ONIDA(11.84 per cent). Besides, the purchase of television by the consumers
of durable goods is varying from AKAI and BPL (5.92 per cent) to TCL (0.00 per cent).

Among the monthly income group of ` 20001-30000, about 21.49 per cent of the consumers of durable goods purchase SAMSUNG brand of television followed by SONY (18.18 per cent), LG (12.84 per cent) and VIDEOCON (10.14 per cent). Besides, the purchase of television by the consumers of durable goods is ranging from ONIDA (8.26 per cent) to THOSHIBA (0.83 per cent).

Among the monthly income group of more than ` 30000, about 20.95 per cent of the consumers of durable goods purchase SAMSUNG brand of television followed by SONY (18.24 per cent) and SAMSUNG (13.48 per cent). Besides, the purchase of television by the consumers of durable goods is varying from ONIDA (8.78 per cent) to BPL and THOSHIBA (0.00 per cent).

The Chi-Square value of 83.094 is significant at five per cent level. Hence, the null hypothesis of there is no significant difference in purchase value of television brands among the monthly income groups of the consumers of durable goods is rejected. Therefore it can be concluded that there is a significant difference in purchase of television brands among the monthly income groups of the consumers of durable goods.

**Purchase value of refrigerator brands among the age groups.**
The results indicate that among the age group of less than 20 years, about 95.24 per cent of the consumers of durable goods purchase LG brand of refrigerator followed by VIDEOCON (4.76 per cent). Among the age group of 21-30 years, about 26.72 per cent of the consumers of durable goods purchase SAMSUNG brand of refrigerator followed by LG (19.83 per cent), WHIRLPOOL (19.38 per cent), VIDEOCON (13.79 per cent), GODREJ
Among the age group of 31-40 years, about 33.13 per cent of the consumers of durable goods purchase LG brand of refrigerator followed by SAMSUNG (18.75 per cent), WHIRLPOOL (16.88 per cent), GODREJ (11.88 per cent), KELVINATOR (8.75 per cent), VIDEOCON (8.13 per cent), ELECTROLUX and HAIER (1.25 per cent). Among the age group of 41-50 years, about 33.33 per cent of the consumers of durable goods purchase LG brand of refrigerator followed by WHIRLPOOL (21.99 per cent), GODREJ (19.55 per cent), SAMSUNG (16.31 per cent), KELVINATOR (5.67 per cent) and VIDEOCON (3.55 per cent).

Among the age group of more than 50 years, about 25.81 per cent of the consumers of durable goods purchase GODREJ brand of refrigerator followed by LG (24.19 per cent), SAMSUNG (17.74 per cent), WHIRLPOOL (16.13 per cent), KELVINATOR and VIDEOCON (8.06 per cent).

The Chi-Square value of 65.835 is significant at five per cent level. Hence, the null hypothesis of there is no significant difference in purchase value of refrigerator brands among the age groups of the consumers of durable goods is rejected. Therefore it can be concluded that there is a significant difference in purchase of refrigerator brands among the age groups of the consumers of durable goods.

**Purchase value of refrigerator brands among the educational qualification.** The results show that among the consumers of school level education, about 28.78 per cent of the consumers of durable goods purchase LG brand of refrigerator followed by GODREJ (19.42 per cent), SAMSUNG and WHIRLPOOL (17.99 per cent), VIDEOCON (5.76 per cent) and HAIER (2.16 per cent).
Among consumers of graduate level education, about 32.16 per cent of the consumers of durable goods purchase LG brand of refrigerator followed by SAMSUNG (18.50 per cent), WHIRLPOOL (17.62 per cent), GODREJ (14.98 per cent), VIDEOCON (9.25 per cent) and KELVINATOR (7.49 per cent).

Among the consumers of post graduate level education, about 35.71 per cent of the consumers of durable goods purchase LG brand of refrigerator followed by SAMSUNG (17.86 per cent), WHIRLPOOL (14.29 per cent), GODREJ (11.90 per cent), VIDEOCON (8.33 per cent), ELECTROLUX and KELVINATOR (4.76 per cent) and HAIER (2.38 per cent). Among the consumers of professionals, about 22.00 per cent of the consumers of durable goods purchase SONY brand of refrigerator followed by SAMSUNG (14.00 per cent), LG, ONIDA and SANSUI (10.00 per cent) and VIDEOCON (8.33 per cent).

The Chi-Square value of 61.825 is significant at five per cent level. Hence, the null hypothesis of there is no significant difference in purchase value of refrigerator brands among the educational qualifications of the consumers of durable goods is rejected. Therefore it can be concluded that there is a significant difference in purchase of refrigerator brands among the educational qualifications of the consumers of durable goods.

**Purchase value of refrigerator brands among the monthly income group.** It is observed that among the monthly income group of `less than 10000, about 25.32 per cent of the consumers of durable goods purchase LG brand of refrigerator followed by GODREJ (20.25 per cent), SAMSUNG (18.99 per cent), WHIRLPOOL (11.39 per cent), VIDEOCON (10.13 per cent), KELVINATOR (8.86 per cent) and HAIER (5.06 per cent). Among the monthly income group of `10001-20000, about 30.92 per cent of the
consumers of durable goods purchase LG brand of refrigerator followed
GODREJ (19.98 per cent), SAMSUNG (17.76 per cent), WHIRLPOOL
(16.45 per cent), VIDEOCON (8.55 per cent), KELVINATOR (5.92 per cent)
and ELECTROLUX (1.32 per cent).

Among the monthly income group of ` 20001-30000, about 35.54
per cent of the consumers of durable goods purchase LG brand of refrigerator
followed by GODREJ, SAMSUNG and WHIRLPOOL (15.70 per cent),
KELVINATOR (8.26 per cent), VIDEOCON (6.61 per cent), ELECTROLUX
(1.65 per cent) and HAIER (0.83 per cent).

Among the monthly income group of more than ` 30000, about
32.43 per cent of the consumers of durable goods purchase LG brand of refrigerator followed by SAMSUNG and WHIRLPOOL (22.97 per cent),
GODREJ (8.78 per cent), VIDEOCON (7.43 per cent), KELVINATOR
(4.73 per cent) and ELECTROLUX (0.68 per cent).

The Chi-Square value of 80.722 is significant at five per cent level.
Hence, the null hypothesis of there is no significant difference in purchase value of refrigerator brands among the monthly income groups of the consumers of durable goods is rejected. Therefore it can be concluded that there is a significant difference in purchase of refrigerator brands among the monthly income groups of the consumers of durable goods.

**Purchase value of washing machine brands among the age groups.** The results indicate that among the age group of less than 20 years, about 47.62 per cent of the consumers of durable goods purchase LG brand of washing machine followed by SAMSUNG (42.86 per cent) and GODREJ (9.52 per cent). Among the age group of 21-30 years, about 29.31 per cent of the consumers of durable goods purchase LG brand of washing machine followed by SAMSUNG (19.83 per cent), WHIRLPOOL (17.24 per cent),
VIDEOCON (12.93 per cent), IFB (9.48 per cent), GODREJ (5.17 per cent), ELECTROLUX (3.45 per cent) and ONIDA (2.59 per cent).

Among the age group of 31-40 years, about 32.50 per cent of the consumers of durable goods purchase LG brand of washing machine followed by SAMSUNG (20.00 per cent), WHIRLPOOL (16.88 per cent), GODREJ (9.38 per cent), VIDEOCON (7.50 per cent), IFB (6.88 per cent), ONIDA (5.00 per cent) and ELECTROLUX (1.88 per cent).

Among the age group of 41-50 years, about 34.04 per cent of the consumers of durable goods purchase LG brand of washing machine followed by WHIRLPOOL (21.99 per cent), GODREJ (19.55 per cent), SAMSUNG (16.31 per cent), WHIRLPOOL (21.99 per cent), SAMSUNG (16.31 per cent), IFB (12.77 per cent), GODREJ (4.26 per cent), ELECTROLUX and VIDEOCON (3.55 per cent), ONIDA (2.84 per cent) and HAIER (0.71 per cent).

Among the age group of more than 50 years, about 27.42 per cent of the consumers of durable goods purchase LG brand of washing machine followed by IFB (22.58 per cent), SAMSUNG (17.74 per cent), WHIRLPOOL (16.13 per cent), VIDEOCON (8.06 per cent), GODREJ (4.84 per cent), HAIER and ONIDA (1.61 per cent).

The Chi-Square value of 68.103 is significant at five per cent level. Hence, the null hypothesis of there is no significant difference in purchase value of washing machine brands among the age groups of the consumers of durable goods is rejected. Therefore it can be concluded that there is a significant difference in purchase of washing machine brands among the age groups of the consumers of durable goods.
Purchase value of washing machine brands among the educational qualifications. The results show that among the consumers of school level education, about 30.94 per cent of the consumers of durable goods purchase LG brand of washing machine followed by SAMSUNG and WHIRLPOOL (17.99 per cent), IFB (14.39 per cent), GODREJ (7.19 per cent), VIDEOCON (5.76 per cent), ONIDA (3.60 per cent), ELECTROLUX (1.44 per cent) and HAIER (0.72 per cent).

Among consumers of graduate level education, about 32.60 per cent of the consumers of durable goods purchase LG brand of washing machine followed by SAMSUNG (18.94 per cent), WHIRLPOOL (17.62 per cent), IFB (10.13 per cent), VIDEOCON (8.81 per cent), GODREJ (7.49 per cent), ONIDA (3.52 per cent) and ELECTROLUX (0.88 per cent).

Among the consumers of post graduate level education, about 34.52 per cent of the consumers of durable goods purchase LG brand of washing machine followed by SAMSUNG (19.05 per cent), WHIRLPOOL (15.48 per cent), IFB (9.52 per cent), ELECTROLUX and VIDEOCON (7.14 per cent), GODREJ (4.76 per cent) and ONIDA (2.38 per cent).

Among the consumers of professionals, about 30.00 per cent of the consumers of durable goods purchase LG brand of washing machine followed by SAMSUNG (28.00 per cent), WHIRLPOOL (20.00 per cent), IFB and VIDEOCON (6.00 per cent), ELECTROLUX (4.00 per cent), GODREJ, HAIER and ONIDA (2.00 per cent).

The Chi-Square value of 65.827 is significant at five per cent level. Therefore, the null hypothesis of there is no significant difference in purchase value of washing machine brands among the educational qualifications of the consumers of durable goods is rejected. Therefore it can be concluded that
there is a significant difference in purchase of washing machine brands among the educational qualifications of the consumers of durable goods.

**Purchase value of washing machine brands among the monthly income groups.** It is apparent that among the monthly income group of less than 10000, about 29.11 per cent of the consumers of durable goods purchase LG brand of washing machine followed by SAMSUNG (18.99 per cent), IFB (16.46 per cent), WHIRLPOOL (11.39 per cent), VIDEOCON (10.13 per cent), VIDEOCON (8.86 per cent), ELECTROLUX (2.53 per cent), HAIER and ONIDA (1.27 per cent).

Among the monthly income group of 10001-20000, about 30.92 per cent of the consumers of durable goods purchase LG brand of washing machine followed SAMSUNG (17.76 per cent), WHIRLPOOL (17.11 per cent), IFB (11.18 per cent), GODREJ (9.87 per cent), VIDEOCON (7.89 per cent), ONIDA (3.29 per cent) and ELECTROLUX (1.97 per cent).

Among the monthly income group of 20001-30000, about 33.88 per cent of the consumers of durable goods purchase LG brand of washing machine followed by SAMSUNG (16.53 per cent), WHIRLPOOL (15.70 per cent), IFB (10.74 per cent), GODREJ (7.44 per cent), VIDEOCON (6.61 per cent), ONIDA (4.96 per cent), ELECTROLUX (3.31 per cent) and HAIER (0.83 per cent).

Among the monthly income group of more than 30000, about 33.78 per cent of the consumers of durable goods purchase LG brand of washing machine followed by SAMSUNG (24.32 per cent), WHIRLPOOL (22.97 per cent), IFB (7.43 per cent), VIDEOCON (6.08 per cent), ONIDA (2.70 per cent), ELECTROLUX (2.03 per cent) and GODREJ (0.68 per cent).
The Chi-Square value of 64.299 is significant at five per cent level. Hence, the null hypothesis of there is no significant difference in purchase value of washing machine brands among the monthly income groups of the consumers of durable goods is rejected. Therefore it can be concluded that there is a significant difference in purchase of washing machine brands among the monthly income groups of the consumers of durable goods.

**Purchase value of mixer-grinder brands among the age groups.**
The results indicate that among the age group of less than 20 years, about 52.38 per cent of the consumers of durable goods purchase PHILIPS brand of mixer-grinder followed by PREETHI (47.62 per cent). Among the age group of 21-30 years, about 17.24 per cent of the consumers of durable goods purchase MAHARAJA brand of mixer-grinder followed by PREETHI (12.04 per cent) and BUTTERFLY (10.34 per cent). Besides, the purchase of mixer-grinder by the consumers of durable goods is ranging from PRESTIGE (8.62 per cent) to APIX and GANGA (0.83 per cent).

Among the age group of 31-40 years, about 15.63 per cent of the consumers of durable goods purchase MAHARAJA brand of mixer-grinder followed by PHILIPS (14.38 per cent) and PREETHI (11.25 per cent). Besides, the purchase of mixer-grinder by the consumers of durable goods is varying from BAJAJ and BUTTERFLY (8.13 per cent) to MORPHY (0.00 per cent).

Among the age group of 41-50 years, about 16.31 per cent of the consumers of durable goods purchase PRESTIGE brand of mixer-grinder followed by PREETHI (11.35 per cent). Besides, the purchase of mixer-grinder by the consumers of durable goods is ranging from KENSTAR (9.93 per cent) to AJANTA, MORPHY and VIJAY (0.00 per cent).
Among the age group of more than 50 years, about 24.19 per cent of the consumers of durable goods purchase BUTTERFLY brand of mixer-grinder followed by PREETHI (14.52 per cent) and PRESTIGE (12.90 per cent). Besides, the purchase of mixer-grinder by the consumers of durable goods is varying from KENSTAR (9.68 per cent) to AJANTA, APIX, LAXMI, MORPHY and USHA (0.00 per cent).

The Chi-Square value of 88.561 is significant at one per cent level. Hence, the null hypothesis of there is no significant difference in purchase value of mixer-grinder brands among the age groups of the consumers of durable goods is rejected. Therefore it can be concluded that there is a significant difference in purchase of mixer-grinder brands among the age groups of the consumers of durable goods.

**Purchase value of mixer-grinder brands among the educational qualifications.** The results show that among the consumers of school level education, about 16.55 per cent of the consumers of durable goods purchase BUTTERFLY brand of mixer-grinder followed by PRESTIGE (13.67 per cent), PREETHI (12.23 per cent) and PHILIPS (10.07 per cent). Besides, the purchase of mixer-grinder by the consumers of durable goods is varying from KENSTAR (9.35 per cent) to AJANTA, MORPHY and USHA (0.00 per cent).

Among consumers of graduate level education, about 13.66 per cent of the consumers of durable goods purchase PREETHI brand of mixer-grinder followed by MAHARAJA (12.78 per cent), PHILIPS (11.89 per cent), BUTTERFLY (11.01 per cent) and PRESTIGE (10.57 per cent). Besides, the purchase of mixer-grinder by the consumers of durable goods is ranging from BAJAJ (7.49 per cent) to AJANTA, APIX and MORPHY (0.00 per cent).
Among the consumers of post graduate level education, about 17.86 per cent of the consumers of durable goods purchase MAHARAJA brand of mixer-grinder followed by PREETHI (13.10 per cent). Besides, the purchase of mixer-grinder by the consumers of durable goods is varying from BUTTERFLY and SUMEET (9.52 per cent) to GANGA and LAXMI (0.00 per cent).

Among the consumers of professionals, about 16.00 per cent of the consumers of durable goods purchase PREETHI brand of mixer-grinder followed by PRESTIGE (14.00 per cent), MAHARAJA (12.00 per cent), PHILIPS and PIEGON (10.00 per cent). Besides, the purchase of mixer-grinder by the consumers of durable goods is ranging from BUTTERFLY (8.00 per cent) to APIX, GANGA, LAXMI, MORPHY and VIJAY (0.00 per cent).

The Chi-Square value of 73.876 is significant at five per cent level. Hence, the null hypothesis of there is no significant difference in purchase value of mixer-grinder brands among the educational qualifications of the consumers of durable goods is rejected. Therefore it can be concluded that there is a significant difference in purchase of mixer-grinder brands among the educational qualifications of the consumers of durable goods.

**Purchase value of mixer-grinder brands among the monthly income groups.** It is observed that among the monthly income group of less than 10000, about 18.99 per cent of the consumers of durable goods purchase BUTTERFLY brand of mixer-grinder followed by PREETHI (16.46 per cent) and PRESTIGE (10.13 per cent). Besides, the purchase of mixer-grinder by the consumers of durable goods is ranging from KENSTAR and MAHARAJA (8.86 per cent) to AJANTA MORPHY, SUMEET and USHA (0.00 per cent).
Among the monthly income group of `10001-20000, about 12.50 per cent of the consumers of durable goods purchase BUTTERFLY and PREETHI brands of mixer-grinder followed PHILIPS (11.18 per cent), KENSTAR and PRESTIGE (10.53 per cent). Besides, the purchase of mixer-grinder by the consumers of durable goods is varying from MAHARAJA (8.55 per cent) to APIX, KAILASH, LEXUS, MORPHY, USHA and VIJAY (0.66 per cent).

Among the monthly income group of `20001-30000, about 15.70 per cent of the consumers of durable goods purchase MAHARAJA brand of mixer-grinder followed by BUTTERFLY (12.40 per cent), PREETHI (11.57 per cent) and PHILIPS (10.74 per cent). Besides, the purchase of mixer-grinder by the consumers of durable goods is ranging from BAJAJ and PRESTIGE (8.26 per cent) to APIX, GANGA, LAXMI and VIJAY (0.00 per cent).

Among the monthly income group of more than `30000, about 18.24 per cent of the consumers of durable goods purchase MAHARAJA brand of mixer-grinder followed by PREETHI (14.19 per cent), PHILIPS and PRESTIGE (12.84 per cent). Besides, the purchase of mixer-grinder by the consumers of durable goods is varying from BUTTERFLY and SUMEET (7.43 per cent) to APIX, LAXMI and MORPHY, (0.00 per cent).

The Chi-Square value 93.906 is significant at five per cent level. Hence, the null hypothesis of there is no significant difference in purchase value of mixer-grinder brands among the monthly income groups of the consumers of durable goods is rejected. Therefore it can be concluded that there is a significant difference in purchase of mixer-grinder brands among the monthly income groups of the consumers of durable goods.
Purchase value of digital camera brands among the age groups.
The results indicate that among the age group of less than 20 years, about 38.10 per cent of the consumers of durable goods purchase SAMSUNG brand of digital camera followed by CANON (23.81 per cent), KODAK (19.05 per cent), CASIO (14.29 per cent) and SONY (4.76 per cent). Among the age group of 21-30 years, about 46.55 per cent of the consumers of durable goods purchase CANON brand of digital camera followed by SONY (17.24 per cent), NIKON (11.21 per cent), OLYMBUS (10.31 per cent), CASIO and PANASONIC (5.17 per cent), SAMSUNG (3.45 per cent) and KODAK (0.86 per cent).

Among the age group of 31-40 years, about 43.75 per cent of the consumers of durable goods purchase CANON brand of digital camera followed by SONY (18.75 per cent), FUJI (10.63 per cent), CASIO (6.88 per cent), KODAK (6.25 per cent), NIKON (5.63 per cent), PANASONIC (4.38 per cent) and SAMSUNG (3.75 per cent).

Among the age group of 41-50 years, about 28.37 per cent of the consumers of durable goods purchase CANON brand of digital camera followed by CASIO (23.40 per cent), SONY (21.99 per cent), KODAK (6.38 per cent), FUJI (5.67 per cent), NIKON and SAMSUNG (4.96), PANASONIC (2.84 per cent) and OLYMBUS (1.42 per cent).

Among the age group of more than 50 years, about 38.71 per cent of the consumers of durable goods purchase SONY brand of digital camera followed by CASIO (12.90 per cent), CANON (9.68 per cent), FUJI, KODAK, NIKON and SAMSUNG (8.06 per cent), OLYMBUS (4.84 per cent) and PANASONIC (1.61 per cent).

The Chi-Square value of 73.343 is significant at one per cent level. Hence, the null hypothesis of there is no significant difference in purchase
value of digital camera brands among the age groups of the consumers of durable goods is rejected. Therefore it can be concluded that there is a significant difference in purchase of digital camera brands among the age groups of the consumers of durable goods.

**Purchase value of digital camera brands among the educational qualifications.** The results show that among the consumers of school level education, about 42.45 per cent of the consumers of durable goods purchase CANON brand of digital camera followed by SONY (12.95 per cent), CASIO (10.79 per cent), FUJI (8.63 per cent), KODAK (7.19 per cent), SAMSUNG (5.76 per cent), NIKON and OLYMBUS (5.04 per cent) and PANASONIC (2.16 per cent).

Among consumers of graduate level education, about 35.24 per cent of the consumers of durable goods purchase CANON brand of digital camera followed by SONY (22.03 per cent), CASIO (18.06 per cent), KODAK (6.17 per cent), FUJI and NIKON (4.41 per cent), SAMSUNG (3.96 per cent), PANASONIC (3.52 per cent) and OLYMBUS (2.20 per cent).

Among the consumers of post graduate level education, about 29.76 per cent of the consumers of durable goods purchase CANON brand of digital camera followed by SONY (23.81 per cent), NIKON (19.05 per cent), FUJI (8.33 per cent), SAMSUNG (5.95 per cent), PANASONIC (4.76 per cent), CASIO (3.57 per cent), KODAK and OLYMBUS (2.38 per cent).

Among the consumers of professionals, about 36.00 per cent of the consumers of durable goods purchase SONY brand of digital camera followed by CANON (22.00 per cent), SAMSUNG (16.00 per cent), KODAK, OLYMBUS and PANASONIC (6.00 per cent), CASIO (4.00 per cent), FUJI and NIKON (2.00 per cent).
The Chi-Square value of 70.969 is significant at five per cent level. Hence, the null hypothesis of there is no significant difference in purchase value of digital camera brands among the educational qualifications of the consumers of durable goods is rejected. Therefore it can be concluded that there is a significant difference in purchase of digital camera brands among the educational qualifications of the consumers of durable goods.

**Purchase value of digital camera brands among the monthly income groups.** It is observed that among the monthly income group of `less than 10000, about 35.44 per cent of the consumers of durable goods purchase CANON brand of digital camera followed by CASIO (12.66 per cent), FUJI and KODAK (11.39 per cent), SONY (10.13 per cent), NIKON (7.59 per cent), PANASONIC (5.06 per cent), SAMSUNG (3.80 per cent) and OLYMBUS (2.53 per cent).

Among the monthly income group of `10001-20000, about 38.82 per cent of the consumers of durable goods purchase CANON brand of digital camera followed SONY (17.11 per cent), CASIO (13.16 per cent), FUJI (9.87 per cent), NIKON (8.55 per cent), SAMSUNG (4.61 per cent), KODAK (3.95 per cent), OLYMBUS (2.63 per cent) and PANASONIC (1.32 per cent).

Among the monthly income group of `20001-30000, about 27.27 per cent of the consumers of durable goods purchase SONY brand of digital camera followed by CANON (21.49 per cent), CASIO (19.83 per cent), NIKON and SAMSUNG (6.61 per cent), KODAK, OLYMBUS and SAMSUNG (6.61 per cent) and FUJI (3.31 per cent).

Among the monthly income group of more than `30000, about 41.89 per cent of the consumers of durable goods purchase CANON brand of digital camera followed by SONY (26.35 per cent), SAMSUNG
(8.81 per cent), KODAK (5.41 per cent), CASIO and NIKON (4.73 per cent), PANASONIC (4.05 per cent), OLYMBUS (3.38 per cent) and FUJI (1.35 per cent).

The Chi-Square value of 73.235 is significant at one per cent level. Hence, the null hypothesis of there is no significant difference in purchase value of digital camera brands among the monthly income groups of the consumers of durable goods is rejected. Therefore it can be concluded that there is a significant difference in purchase of digital camera brands among the monthly income groups of the consumers of durable goods.

**Purchase value of CD/DVD brands among the age groups.** The results indicate that among the age group of less than 20 years, about 66.67 per cent of the consumers of durable goods purchase SAMSUNG brand of CD/DVD player followed by PHILIPS (23.81 per cent) and SAMSUNG (9.52 per cent). Among the age group of 21-30 years, about 36.21 per cent of the consumers of durable goods purchase SONY brand of CD/DVD player followed by VIDEOCON (20.69 per cent). Besides, the purchase of CD/DVD player by the consumers of durable goods is ranging from ONIDA and SAMSUNG (6.90 per cent) to HAIER, OMKAR and SHARP (0.86 per cent).

Among the age group of 31-40 years, about 40.00 per cent of the consumers of durable goods purchase SONY brand of CD/DVD player followed by VIDEOCON (19.38 per cent). Besides, the purchase of CD/DVD player by the consumers of durable goods is varying from ONIDA and SAMSUNG (6.88 per cent) to SHARP (0.00 per cent).

Among the age group of 41-50 years, about 27.66 per cent of the consumers of durable goods purchase SONY brand of CD/DVD player followed by VIDEOCON (23.40 per cent) PHILIPS (14.18 per cent) and LG
(11.35 per cent). Besides, the purchase of CD/DVD player by the consumers of durable goods is ranging from SAMSUNG (5.67 per cent) to MITASI (0.00 per cent).

Among the age group of more than 50 years, about 29.03 per cent of the consumers of durable goods purchase SONY brand of CD/DVD player followed by LG (20.97 per cent) and VIDEOCON (17.74 per cent). Besides, the purchase of CD/DVD player by the consumers of durable goods is varying from PHILIPS (9.68 per cent) to AKAI, JVC, MITASI, PIONEER, SAMSUI and SHARP (0.00 per cent).

The Chi-Square value of 59.213 is significant at one five cent level. Hence, the null hypothesis of there is no significant difference in purchase value of CD/DVD brands among the age groups of the consumers of durable goods is rejected. Therefore it can be concluded that there is a significant difference in purchase of CD/DVD player brands among the age groups of the consumers of durable goods.

**Purchase value of CD/DVD brands among the educational qualifications.** The results show that among the consumers of school level education, about 29.50 per cent of the consumers of durable goods purchase SONY brand of CD/DVD player followed by VIDEOCON (20.14 per cent), LG and PHILIPS (12.23 per cent). Besides, the purchase of CD/DVD player by the consumers of durable goods is varying from ONIDA (6.47 per cent) to PIONEER (0.00 per cent).

Among consumers of graduate level education, about 36.12 per cent of the consumers of durable goods purchase SONY brand of CD/DVD player followed by VIDEOCON (20.26 per cent). Besides, the purchase of CD/DVD player by the consumers of durable goods is ranging from PHILIPS (8.37 per cent) to MITASI and SHARP (0.44 per cent).
Among the consumers of post graduate level education, about 41.67 per cent of the consumers of durable goods purchase SONY brand of CD/DVD player followed by VIDEOCON (16.67 per cent). Besides, the purchase of CD/DVD player by the consumers of durable goods is varying from AKAI and SAMSUNG (5.95 per cent) to JVC, OMKAR, PIONEER and SHARP (1.19 per cent).

Among the consumers of professionals, about 38.00 per cent of the consumers of durable goods purchase SONY brand of CD/DVD player followed by VIDEOCON (22.00 per cent) and SAMSUNG (11.00 per cent). Besides, the purchase of CD/DVD player by the consumers of durable goods is ranging from LG (8.00 per cent) to HAIER, INTEX, MITASI, OMKAR and SHARP (0.00 per cent).

The Chi-Square value of 70.066 is significant at five per cent level. Hence, the null hypothesis of there is no significant difference in purchase value of CD/DVD brands among the educational qualifications of the consumers of durable goods is rejected. Therefore it can be concluded that there is a significant difference in purchase of CD/DVD player brands among the educational qualifications of the consumers of durable goods.

**Purchase value of CD/DVD brands among the monthly income groups.** The results show that among the monthly income group of ` less than 10000, about 34.18 per cent of the consumers of durable goods purchase SONY brand of CD/DVD player followed by VIDEOCON (13.92 per cent), LG and PHILIPS (11.39 per cent). Besides, the purchase of CD/DVD player by the consumers of durable goods is ranging from ONIDA (8.86 per cent) to PIONEER, SAMSUI and SHARP (0.00 per cent).

Among the monthly income group of `10001-20000, about 29.61 per cent of the consumers of durable goods purchase SONY brand of
CD/DVD player followed VIDEOCON (20.39 per cent), PHILIPS (13.82 per cent). Besides, the purchase of CD/DVD player by the consumers of durable goods is varying from LG (9.21 per cent) to MITASI (0.00 per cent).

Among the monthly income group of ` 20001-30000, about 36.36 per cent of the consumers of durable goods purchase SONY brand of CD/DVD player followed by VIDEOCON (16.53 per cent). Besides, the purchase of CD/DVD player by the consumers of durable goods is ranging from LG and PHILIPS (7.44 per cent) to PIONEER and SHARP (0.83 per cent).

Among the monthly income group of more than ` 30000, about 41.22 per cent of the consumers of durable goods purchase SONY brand of CD/DVD player followed by VIDEOCON (25.00 per cent) and SAMSUNG (10.14 per cent). Besides, the purchase of CD/DVD player by the consumers of durable goods is varying from LG (6.76 per cent) to HAIER, JVC, MITASI and SHARP (0.00 per cent).

The Chi-Square value of 71.659 is significant at one per cent level. Therefore, the null hypothesis of there is no significant difference in purchase value of CD/DVD brands among the monthly income groups of the consumers of durable goods is rejected. Therefore it can be concluded that there is a significant difference in purchase of CD/DVD player brands among the monthly income groups of the consumers of durable goods.

### 5.2.3 Consumer Buying Behaviour of Durable Goods

The results indicate that about 64.80 per cent of the consumers of durable goods is strongly agreed that they will recognize or need of the product or brand before buying followed by agree (30.60 per cent), neither agree nor disagree (3.80 per cent), disagree and strongly disagree (0.40 per cent).
The consumers will search information from various sources before buying is agreed by 53.60 per cent of them followed by strongly agree (38.40 per cent), neither agree nor disagree (6.20 per cent), disagree (1.60 per cent) and strongly disagree (0.20 per cent).

The results indicate that about 49.40 per cent of the consumers agreed that with they will compare or evaluate the number of alternatives before buying followed by strongly agree (37.80 per cent), neither agree nor disagree (12.20 per cent), strongly disagree (0.40 per cent) and disagree (0.20 per cent).

The consumers will select the best product or brand among alternative is strongly agreed by 45.80 per cent of them followed by agree (44.40 per cent), neither agree nor disagree (8.80 per cent) and disagree (1.00 per cent).

It is observed that about 44.60 per cent of the consumers agreed that with they will purchase the product repetitively once satisfied with the product or brand followed by strongly agree (41.80 per cent), neither agree nor disagree (12.60 per cent), disagree (0.80 per cent) and strongly disagree (0.20 per cent).

The F-value of 11.287 is significant at one per cent level indicating that there is a significant difference in consumer buying behaviour of durable goods. Hence, the null hypothesis of there is no significant difference in consumer buying behaviour of durable goods is rejected.
5.2.4 Relationship between Dimensions of Buying Behaviour of Durable Goods

The correlation analysis indicates that need is positively and weekly associated with selection and purchase and it is also positively and moderately correlated with information and evaluation at one per cent level of significance.

The results show that information is positively and moderately correlated with evaluation, selection and purchase at one per cent level of significance. The evaluation is positively and moderately associated with selection and purchase. Besides, selection is also positively and moderately correlated with purchase at one per cent level of significance. Hence, the null hypothesis of there is no relationship between dimensions of buying behaviour of durable goods is rejected.

5.2.5 Influence of Demographic Factors on Consumer’s Purchase Decisions of Durable Products

The multiple regression analysis shows that age, educational qualification, monthly income and marital status are positively influencing the consumer’s purchase decisions of durable products at one per cent level of significance, while family size is also positively influencing the consumer’s purchase decisions of durable products at five per cent level of significance. Therefore, the null hypothesis of there is no significant influence of demographic factors on consumers purchase decisions of durable products is rejected.
5.2.6. Dimensions of Consumer based Brand Equity on Durable Products

5.2.6.1 Brand Awareness

The results show that about 56.20 per cent of the consumers of durable goods are strongly agreed with they are familiar with the brand followed by agree (36.40 per cent), neither agree nor disagree (7.00 per cent). Consumers can recognize the brand quickly among other competing brands is agreed by 53.20 per cent of the consumers of durable goods followed by strongly agree (29.20 per cent), neither agree nor disagree (13.60 per cent), disagree (2.20 per cent) and strongly disagree (1.80 per cent).

The results indicate that about 60.60 per cent of the consumers of durable goods are agreed with they automatically know which of the customer durable products to buy followed by strongly agree (21.40 per cent), neither agree nor disagree (13.40 per cent), disagree (3.80 per cent) and strongly disagree (0.80 per cent). When consumers think about consumer durable products, they always remember the brand or product is agreed by 52.00 per cent of the consumers of durable goods followed by strongly agree (31.20 per cent), neither agree nor disagree (13.00 per cent), disagree (2.80 per cent) and strongly disagree (1.00 per cent).

The results also show that about 45.80 per cent of the consumers of durable goods agreed with they heard about the brands many times followed by strongly agree (33.80 per cent), neither agree nor disagree (16.60 per cent), disagree (3.00 per cent) and strongly disagree (0.80 per cent).

The F-value of 32.472 is significant at one per cent level of significance indicating that there is a significance difference in brand awareness among the consumers of durable goods. Hence, the null hypothesis
of there is no significant difference in brand awareness among the consumers of durable goods is rejected.

5.2.6.2 Brand Image

The results indicate that about 50.00 per cent of the consumers of durable goods strongly agreed with some characteristics of their brand come to their mind quickly followed by agree (39.00 per cent), neither agree nor disagree (8.60 per cent), disagree and strongly disagree (1.20 per cent). Consumers can quickly recall the symbol or logo of their brand is agreed by 50.40 per cent of the consumers of durable goods followed by strongly agree (29.60 per cent), neither agree nor disagree (17.40 per cent), strongly disagree (1.60 per cent) and disagree (1.00 per cent).

The results indicate that about 46.40 per cent of the consumers of durable goods is agreed with their brand have created a distinct image in their mind followed by strongly agree (30.20 per cent), neither agree nor disagree (17.60 per cent), disagree (4.60 per cent) and strongly disagree (1.20 per cent). Compared with competitors, they appreciate their brand is agreed by 47.80 per cent of the consumers of durable goods followed by strongly agree (31.80 per cent), neither agree nor disagree (14.00 per cent), disagree (5.80 per cent) and strongly disagree (0.60 per cent).

It is clear that about 46.60 per cent of the consumers of durable goods agreed with their brand would be their first choice followed by strongly agree (35.40 per cent), neither agree nor disagree (11.80 per cent), disagree (5.20 per cent) and strongly disagree (1.00 per cent). Brand has fair price is agreed by 40.80 per cent of the consumers of durable goods followed by strongly agree (40.60 per cent), neither agree nor disagree (13.80 per cent), strongly disagree (3.00 per cent) and disagree (1.80 per cent).
It is apparent that about 47.40 per cent of the consumers of durable goods agreed with their brand are high quality followed by strongly agree (30.60 per cent), neither agree nor disagree (17.00 per cent), disagree (3.00 per cent) and strongly disagree (2.00 per cent). The results further show that their brands have durability is agreed by 53.40 per cent of the consumers of durable goods followed by strongly agree (28.80 per cent), neither agree nor disagree (13.40 per cent), disagree (3.20 per cent) and strongly disagree (1.20 per cent).

The results also indicate that about 53.40 per cent of the consumers of durable goods are agreed with their brands have many features compare to other brands followed by strongly agree (25.80 per cent), neither agree nor disagree (16.40 per cent), disagree (3.80 per cent) and strongly disagree (0.60 per cent). The reliability of their brands are very high is agreed by 43.40 per cent of the consumers of durable goods followed by strongly agree (30.00 per cent), neither agree nor disagree (20.80 per cent), disagree (4.80 per cent) and strongly disagree (1.00 per cent).

The results also show that about 43.40 per cent of the consumers of durable goods is agreed with their brand products have very good service followed by strongly agree (30.00 per cent), neither agree nor disagree (19.20 per cent), disagree (4.80 per cent) and strongly disagree (2.60 per cent).

The F-value of 24.639 is significant at five per cent level of significance indicating that there is a significance difference in brand image among the consumers of durable goods. Hence, the null hypothesis of there is no significant difference in brand image among the consumers of durable goods is rejected.
5.2.6.3 Perceived Quality

The results indicate that about 52.40 per cent of the consumers of durable goods is strongly agreed with the trust the quality of the brand followed by agree (38.80 per cent), neither agree nor disagree (8.20 per cent) and disagree (0.60 per cent). Products from those brand would be of very good quality is agreed by 50.60 per cent of the consumers of durable goods followed by strongly agree (34.20 per cent), neither agree nor disagree (11.80 per cent), disagree (2.20 per cent) and strongly disagree (1.20 per cent).

Products from those brand offer excellent features is agreed by 51.00 per cent of the consumers of durable goods followed by strongly agree (28.20 per cent), neither agree nor disagree (17.00 per cent), disagree (2.00 per cent) and strongly disagree (1.80 per cent). The results indicate that about 55.60 per cent of the consumers of durable goods agreed with the brand has met their expectations followed by strongly agree (26.80 per cent), neither agree nor disagree (13.40 per cent), disagree (3.40 per cent) and strongly disagree (0.80 per cent).

The brand has very good service facilities is agreed by 49.40 per cent of the consumers of durable goods followed by strongly agree (26.60 per cent), neither agree nor disagree (21.80 per cent), disagree (1.80 per cent) and strongly disagree (0.40 per cent). The results further show that about 46.20 per cent of the consumers of durable goods is agreed that brand has very good technology followed by strongly agree (31.00 per cent), neither agree nor disagree (19.00 per cent), disagree (2.80 per cent) and strongly disagree (1.00 per cent).

The F-value of 30.016 is significant at one per cent level of significance indicating that there is a significance difference in perceived quality among the consumers of durable goods. Therefore, the null hypothesis
of there is no significant difference in perceived quality among the consumers of durable goods is rejected.

5.2.6.4 Brand Association

The results show that about 45.20 per cent of the consumers of durable goods is strongly agreed with those brands have very unique brand image, compared with the competing brands followed by agree (41.80 per cent), neither agree nor disagree (10.20 per cent), disagree (2.00 per cent) and strongly disagree (0.80 per cent). The results show that about 57.00 per cent of the consumers of durable goods are agreed that they respect and admire people who are having those brands followed by strongly agree (18.80 per cent), neither agree nor disagree (17.40 per cent), strongly disagree (4.00 per cent) and disagree (2.80 per cent).

It is observed that about 53.40 per cent of the consumers of durable goods agreed that they like the brand image of those companies followed by strongly agree (31.20 per cent), neither agree nor disagree (10.40 per cent), disagree (3.20 per cent) and strongly disagree (1.80 per cent). It is apparent that about 49.60 per cent of the consumers of durable goods is agreed with they like and trust those brands followed by strongly agree (30.40 per cent), neither agree nor disagree (13.80 per cent), disagree (4.80 per cent) and strongly disagree (1.40 per cent).

The brand has enough warranty is agreed by 54.00 per cent of the consumers of durable goods followed by strongly agree (27.00 per cent), neither agree nor disagree (12.20 per cent), disagree (6.00 per cent) and strongly disagree (0.80 per cent). The elegant brand is agreed by 49.20 per cent of the consumers of durable goods followed by neither agree nor disagree (24.80 per cent), strongly agree (22.40 per cent), disagree (2.80 per cent) and strongly disagree (0.80 per cent).
The brand is always available is agreed by 52.20 per cent of the consumers of durable goods followed by strongly agree (29.60 per cent), neither agree nor disagree (12.80 per cent), disagree (3.20 per cent) and strongly disagree (2.20 per cent). The brand or product has very good service a facility is agreed by 49.20 per cent of the consumers of durable goods followed by strongly agree (31.00 per cent), neither agree nor disagree (14.00 per cent), disagree (3.20 per cent) and strongly disagree (2.60 per cent).

The F-value of 26.548 is significant at five per cent level of significance indicating that there is a significance difference in brand association among the consumers of durable goods. Hence, the null hypothesis of there is no significant difference in brand association among the consumers of durable goods is rejected.

5.2.6.5 Brand Loyalty

The results indicate that about 47.80 per cent of the consumers of durable goods agreed with and they consider themselves to be loyal to the brand followed by strongly agree (41.20 per cent) and neither agree nor disagree (11.00 per cent). In future, consumers want to buy this brand and it will be their first choice is agreed by 52.40 per cent of the consumers of durable goods followed by strongly agree (24.80 per cent), neither agree nor disagree (20.20 per cent), disagree (1.40 per cent) and strongly disagree (1.20 per cent).

The results indicate that 45.80 per cent of the consumers of durable goods is agreed with they would love to recommend this brand to their friends followed by strongly agree (30.60 per cent), neither agree nor disagree (21.40 per cent), disagree (1.80 per cent) and strongly disagree (0.40 per cent). It is observed that about 44.60 per cent of the consumers of durable goods is agreed that they will buy this brand even its price increased followed by
strongly agree (26.00 per cent), neither agree nor disagree (21.60 per cent),
disagree (5.60 per cent) and strongly disagree (2.20 per cent).

When buying product this brand will be their first choice is agreed
by 48.60 per cent of the consumers of durable goods followed by strongly
agree (30.40 per cent), neither agree nor disagree (19.60 per cent), strongly
disagree (0.80 per cent) and disagree (0.60 per cent). The results further
indicate that about 52.20 per cent of the consumers of durable goods is agreed
that they will not buy other brands if their brands are available at the store
followed by strongly agree (29.80 per cent), neither agree nor disagree
(14.20 per cent), strongly disagree (2.00 per cent) and disagree (1.80 per cent).

The F-value of 29.982 is significant at one per cent level of
significance indicating that there is a significance difference in brand loyalty
among the consumers of durable goods. Therefore, the null hypothesis of
there is no significant difference in brand loyalty among the consumers of
durable goods is rejected.

5.2.7 Difference between Dimensions of Consumer based Brand
Equity on Durable Products

The results show that the t-value for Brand Awareness-Brand
Image is 42.855 which are significant at one per cent level of significance.
Hence, there is a significant difference exiting between Brand Awareness-
Brand Image among the consumers of durable goods. The t-value for Brand
Awareness-Perceived Quality is 42.914, significant at one per cent level of
significance. It indicates there is a significant difference between Brand
Awareness-Perceived Quality among the consumers of durable goods.

The results also indicate that t-value for Brand Awareness-Brand
Association is 11.236 significant at one per cent level of significance.
Therefore, there is a significant difference between Brand Awareness-Brand Association among the consumers of durable goods. The results show that the t-value for Brand Awareness-Brand Loyalty is 11.241 which is significant at one per cent level of significance. Hence, there is a significant difference exiting between Brand Awareness-Brand Loyalty among the consumers of durable goods.

The t-value for Brand Image- Perceived Quality is 29.393, significant at one per cent level of significance. It indicates there is a significant difference between Brand Image- Perceived Quality among the consumers of durable goods. The results also indicate that t-value for Brand Image- Brand Association is 29.422 significant at one per cent level of significance. Therefore, there is a significant difference between Brand Image- Brand Association among the consumers of durable goods.

The results show that the t-value for Brand Image- Brand Loyalty is 13.446 which is significant at one per cent level of significance. Hence, there is a significant difference exiting between Brand Image- Brand Loyalty among the consumers of durable goods. The t-value for Perceived Quality-Brand Association is 13.451, significant at one per cent level of significance. It indicates there is a significant difference between Perceived Quality-Brand Association among the consumers of durable goods.

The results also indicate that t-value for Perceived Quality-Brand Loyalty is 34.089 significant at one per cent level of significance. Therefore, there is a significant difference between Perceived Quality-Brand Loyalty among the consumers of durable goods. The results show that the t-value for Brand Association-Brand Loyalty is 34.053 which is significant at one per cent level of significance. Hence, there is a significant difference exiting between Brand Association-Brand Loyalty among the consumers of durable goods.
goods. Hence, the null hypothesis of there is no significant difference between dimensions of consumer based brand equity on durable goods brand awareness among the consumers of durable goods is rejected.

5.2.8 Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA) for Brand Equity on Durable Goods

The brand awareness is presented by five items and based on results of the CFA. It indicates an excellent fit with chi-square statistic of 4.856. The Goodness of Fit Index (GFI) is 0.99 and Comparative Fit Index (CFI) is 1.00. These GFI and CFI indicate perfect fit. The standardized Root Mean Residual (RMR) is 0.07 and Root Mean Square Error of Approximation (RMSEA) is 0.00 indicating excellent fit.

The results of CFA for brand image show an excellent fit with chi-square value of 14.771 and GFI and CFI are greater than 0.90 and RMR and RMSEA values are less than 0.1 indicate excellent fit. The results of CFA for perceived quality indicate an excellent fit with chi-square value of 5.046 and GFI and CFI are greater than 0.90 and RMR and RMSEA values are less than 0.1 indicate excellent fit.

The results for brand association show chi-square value of 5.351 with other indices (GFI and CFI) indicating excellent fit which is more than 0.90 with RMR and RMSEA less than 0.1. The results for brand loyalty indicate chi-square value of 4.888 with other indices (GFI and CFI) indicating excellent fit which is more than 0.90 with RMR and RMSEA less than 0.1.

The results indicate that composite reliability for brand equity on durable goods is above the cut off value of 0.70, average variance extracted is greater than the minimum value of 0.50 and discriminant validity is above
0.60 indicating that convergent validity is confirmed for brand equity on durable goods.

5.2.9 **Relationship between Dimensions of Brand Equity on Durable Goods**

The correlation coefficients indicate that the brand awareness of consumers on durable goods is positively and moderately correlated with brand image, while the brand awareness is also positively but weekly associated with perceived quality, brand association and brand loyalty at one per cent level of significance.

The results show that the brand image of the consumers on durable goods is positively and strongly associated with the perceived quality, while, the brand image is also positively and moderately correlated with brand association. Besides, the brand image is also positively and weekly correlated with brand loyalty at one per cent level of significance.

The results also indicate that the perceived quality of the consumers on durable goods is positively and moderately correlated with both brand association and brand loyalty at one per cent level of significance. Besides, the brand association of consumers on durable goods is strongly associated with the brand loyalty at one per cent level of significance. Therefore, the null hypothesis of there is no significant relationship between dimensions of brand equity on durable goods is rejected.

5.2.10 **Discriminant Analysis for Brand Equity on Durable Goods**

The discriminant analysis shows that the hearing of brand, durability of brands, brand features and availability of brands discriminate best among the urban, semi-urban and rural consumers. Based on the
discriminant function, 79.00 per cent of the measures have been correctly classified. Therefore, the null hypothesis of there is no significant brand equity dimensions discriminate the urban, semi-urban and rural consumers of durable goods.

5.2.11 Impact of Brand Equity Dimensions on Overall Brand Equity of Durable Goods

The multiple regression analysis indicates that brand awareness, brand image and brand loyalty have positive impact on overall brand equity of durable products at one per cent level of significance. Hence, the null hypothesis of there is no significant impact of brand equity dominions on overall brand equity of durable products is rejected.

5.2.12 Impact of Brand Equity Dimensions on Consumers’ Buying Behaviour of Durable Goods

The multiple regression analysis shows that brand awareness, brand image and perceived quality have positive impact on consumer’s buying behaviour of durable products at one per cent level of significance. Hence, the null hypothesis of there is no significant impact of brand equity dominions on consumers, buying behaviour of durable products is rejected.

5.2.13 Measurement of Customer Based Brand Equity on Durable Products

The estimate for overall brand equity against brand awareness is 0.733 and it is statistically significant at one per cent level. It is inferred that the brand awareness is directly and positively influences the overall brand equity. Hence, the null hypothesis of brand awareness has no significant positive direct effect on overall brand equity is rejected. The estimate for
overall brand equity against brand image is 1.088 and it is statistically significant at one per cent level. It reveals that the brand image is directly and positively influences the overall brand equity. Hence, the null hypothesis of brand image has no significant positive direct effect on overall brand equity is rejected.

Meanwhile, the estimate for overall brand equity against perceived quality is 1.026 and it is statistically significant at one per cent level. It is observed that the perceived quality is directly and positively influences the overall brand equity. Hence, the null hypothesis of perceived quality has no significant positive direct effect on overall brand equity is rejected. The estimate for overall brand equity against brand association is 0.961 and it is statistically significant at one per cent level. It is apparent that the brand association is directly and positively influences the overall brand equity. Hence, the null hypothesis of brand association has no significant positive direct effect on overall brand equity is rejected.

Besides, the estimate for overall brand equity against brand loyalty is 0.998 and it is significant at one per cent level. It is clear that the brand loyalty is directly and positively influences the overall brand equity. Hence, the null hypothesis of brand loyalty has no significant positive direct effect on overall brand equity is rejected.

The results indicate an excellent fit with chi-square statistic of 7.317. The Goodness of Fit Index (GFI) is 0.95 and Comparative Fit Index (CFI) is 0.95. These GFI and CFI indicate perfect fit. The standardized Root Mean Residual (RMR) is 0.01 and Root Mean Square Error of Approximation (RMSEA) is 0.04 indicating excellent fit. Hence, the null hypothesis of there is no inter-relationship between customer based brand equity dimensions for durable products is rejected.
5.3 SUGGESTIONS

Brand awareness is reached through a company’s marketing communications efforts towards brand equity. Perceive advertising and spending money on favourable conditions affect brand awareness. In fact, brand recognition and awareness can imply a rise in the level of confidence regarding the product’s expected performance. When buying durable goods, it is normal to look for a recognised brand with a high level of brand awareness to reinforce the purchase.

The associations that consumers make regarding a brand and its image are configured by their own experience, the non-formalised information they receive about the product and also by the information transmitted by the companies with regard to their product’s quality and excellence. Hence, it is recommended that the effective communication strategies should be formulated and implemented effectively in order to make brand awareness and familiarity of the durable goods among the different segments of the consumes of durable goods.

The different brand equity dimensions contribute to overall brand equity in different ways, and that an order exists among the five dimensions. Since marketing/brand managers often have limited resources (e.g. money, time, and manpower) to implement branding strategies, these findings can help them prioritize and allocate resources across the dimensions.

The managers should concentrate their efforts primarily on brand loyalty and brand image, which have high importance in the construct of brand equity. In the highly competitive durable goods industry, the key is to create a unique, favourable and strong brand image to provide consumers with a reason to buy the brand, then work to keep their loyalty and gain their repeat business.
Celebrity/star endorsements, event sponsorships, advertising across different media, and non-price promotion are potentially effective marketing strategies to build a strong brand image and brand loyalty of durable goods further. It is also suggested that when concentrating on creating brand association and brand loyalty, managers should not undervalue the effects of perceived quality and brand awareness.

Promotions for favorite brands have a strong impact on the probability to respond to a promotion (the relative probability to respond is multiplied with at least a factor. Furthermore, the promotional quantity purchased is bigger for favorite brands. This seems to stress that promotions mainly result in purchases by consumers that would have bought the brand anyway.

The establishment of effective linkages between companies and agencies is recommended in order to improve market competitiveness in the long run. Lastly, establishing effective price strategies in providing different levels of quality and various types of attribute experiences can be recommended for developing durable market as a competitive business. It can be said that marketers stand to benefit from favorable consumer attitudes, as reflected in the consistency of consumer behaviours with respect to their brand, brand loyalty and positive word-of-mouth about brands of durable goods.

5.4 MANAGERIAL IMPLICATIONS

Firstly, the study contributes to our understanding of customer based brand equity phenomena and its measurement by examining the dimensions of brand equity. Secondly, customer based brand equity concept is measured by breaking down this construct into the sub components and the relations between these sub components are tested. Thirdly, the relationship between
customer demographics variables and the dimensions of brand equity also tested. Hence, the end results give opportunity to managers to develop detailed brand equity strategies for their organizations. The present research also enriches customer-based brand equity measurement on consumer durable products by adding a detailed brand equity construct measures. The findings depicts that several components of brand equity have a significant and direct effect on brand loyalty, while some of them have an indirect and significant impact on brand image. This study also focuses on the strategic and managerial aspects of brand equity: that is, in defining, managing and leveraging brand equity. The management of brand equity can be seen as a continuous, planned and long-term strategy. It aims at increasing confidence in the brand. The present study will provide a holistic framework for managers developing successful brand strategies, so that the relationship with the consumer can be strengthened.

This study was mainly focused on impact of consumer buying behaviour and brand equity on buying consumer durable products and the identification of different influential variables that lead consumers to choose brands of durable products. The research findings may help producers, policymakers to understand what key factors helped implement successful competitive strategies in the competitive market. These results are likely to help academicians and marketers to collect information and plan appropriate competitive strategies based on the brand equity dimensions, which they prefer to develop.

An important advantage of measurement of consumer based brand equity for durable goods is that it allows managers to parcel out brand equity into its respective components and estimate the relative importance of each of the components of brand equity. This information allows managers to align (or re-align) their marketing mix strategies to increase brand equity and
thereby, increase a brand’s long term sustainability. In addition, the findings of this research allow managers to assess the long term health of their brands.

As managerial implications, if companies enhance their brand equity (brand image, brand awareness, perceived quality brand association and brand loyalty) they will get loyal customer for that companies should use effective advertisement, service, and promotional strategy and offer quality products.

5.5 CONCLUSION

The research work is contributed to the society on the impact of the consumer behaviour and brand equity on durable products. Research is exploring the knowledge of consumer purchase and brand choices behaviour of durable products. The result from this study contributes to understanding of consumer behaviour and brand equity and its effects on consumer durable products.

The majority of the consumers of durable goods purchase SONY brand of television, LG brand of refrigerator and washing machine, PREETHI brand of mixer-grinder, CANON brand of digital camera and SONY brand of CD / DVD player. The consumer will recognize or need of the product or brand before buying and the consumers will select the best product the brand among alternative are strongly agreed by the consumes of durable goods, where as the consumer will search information from various sources before buying, the consumers will compare or evaluate the number of alternatives before buying, the consumers will purchase the product repetitively once satisfied with the product or brand are agreed by the consumers of durable goods.
The information is positively and moderately correlated with evaluation, selection and purchase. The evaluation is positively and moderately associated with selection and purchase. Besides, selection is also positively and moderately correlated with purchase. The demographic factors of age, educational qualification, monthly income marital status and family size are positively influencing the consumer’s purchase decisions of durable products.

The brand awareness of consumers on durable goods is positively and moderately correlated with brand image, while the brand awareness is also positively but weekly associated with perceived quality, brand association and brand loyalty. The brand image of the consumers on durable goods is positively and strongly associated with the perceived quality, while, the brand image is also positively and moderately correlated with brand association. Besides, the brand image is also positively and weekly correlated with brand loyalty. The perceived quality of the consumers on durable goods is positively and moderately correlated with both brand association and brand loyalty. Besides, the brand association of consumers on durable goods is strongly associated with the brand loyalty.

The brand awareness, brand image and brand loyalty have positive impact on overall brand equity of durable products and the brand awareness, brand image and perceived quality have positive impact on consumer’s buying behaviour of durable products. The brand awareness, brand image, perceived quality, brand association and brand loyalty are directly and positively influence the overall brand equity of durable goods. The study is useful in gaining an understanding about consumer behaviour and brand
equity on purchase of durable products. Further, with the help of this research, the researcher may apply results to measure the brand equity of other products.

5.6 SUGGESTIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

Based on the results of this study, the following recommendations could be considered in future research:

The present research is strongly limited in terms of the consumer-based measures of brand equity. In addition, there are many other dimensions and measures of consumer-based brand equity which this present study has not looked at and which may be more appropriate for the durable goods industry. Hence, the researchers should take these measures into account in future research on brand equity measurement and management. It is also recommended to study the effects of marketing activities as elements of the impersonal environment and the role of reference groups, opinion leaders given as elements of the closer social environment in purchasing behaviour of durable goods.

It is also suggested that the practice of providing customer rebates is related to the consumers’ negative equity problem. Thus, if all consumers have the ability to pay, it would not expect durable manufacturers to offer customer rebates. (However, offer promotions through the trade) Likewise, if the percentage of consumers who are upside down rises, it would expect the incidence of rebate to increase. An interesting avenue for future research is to examine the link between the extent of the negative equity problem and the incidence of consumer rebates in a longitudinal study.
Another interesting area for research is to determine if manufacturers’ and retailers’ marketing actions such as trade and consumer promotions contribute to the existence of the negative equity problems. The future research can also done in the area of effect competition and competitive price polices of durable goods on consumer’s purchasing behaviour of the durable goods. The future research can also explore the impact of intensity of the marketing communications and a company’s high perceived advertising spending on consumers’ brand preference and loyal behaviour towards the brand.