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FINDINGS - APARTMENT

7.1. Findings related to Apartment

7.1.1. Respondents Profile

1. Out of the total 600 respondents from Apartments, 136 (22.67%) were from the Southern region, 389 (64.83%) were from the Central region, and 75 (12.5%) were from the Northern region.

2. Analysis of location-wise profile of the respondents shows that 68 respondents were from the Panchayat area, 338 were from the Municipality area, and 194 were from the Corporation area.

3. 398 (66.3%) belong to the age group ‘below 40’, 170 (28.3%) were in the age group of ‘40 to 60’, and 32 (5.3%) belong to the age group ‘above 60 years’.

4. As regards Apartments, male respondents were 393 (65.5%) and female respondents were 207 (34.5%).

5. Among the respondents from Apartments, 2.5% were ‘Below Graduates’, 51.0% were ‘Graduates’, 41.7% were ‘Post graduate’, and 4.8% belong to the group ‘Others’.

6. It is seen that 38 (6.3%) respondents were working in the Government sector, 119 (19.8%) respondents were working in the Private sector (MNC with foreign holdings), 84 (14.0%) were doing Business, 198 (33.0%) were from Private Sector (Indian companies), 73 (12.2) were NRIs, and 88 (14.6%) belong to the group ‘others’.

7. Regarding the income of the respondents, 133 (22.16%) respondents have monthly income ‘below Rs. 25000’. 196 (32.67%) respondents were in the category of Rs. 25001 – 50,000, 147 (24.5%) respondents were in the group of 50,000 – 1,00,000, 88 (14.67%) respondents were in the category of 1,00,000- 5,00,000 and 36 (6%) respondents were in the category of ‘above Rs. 5,00,000’.
8. 147 (24.5%) respondents were ‘Young Singles (Young single people not living at home)’, 45(7.5%) respondents were in the category of ‘Newly Married Couples (Young, no children)’, 178 (29.7%) were ‘Married (youngest child under six years of age)’, 138 (23%) were ‘Married (Youngest child six or above)’,51 (8.5%) were ‘Older married couples with dependent children’,15 (2.5) were ‘Older married couples without dependent children’, 17 (2.8%) were ‘Married, No Kids’ and 9 (1.5%) were ‘Older Singles’.

9. With regard to education of respondents spouses, 24% was ‘Below Graduates’, 41% was ‘Graduates’, 34.67% was ‘Post graduates’ and 0.33% belong to the category ‘others’.

10. With regard to occupation of respondents spouses, 47.67% was ‘House wife’, 6.0% was ‘Government service’, 38.67% was ‘Private sector’, 7.5% was ‘Business’ and 0.16% belong to the category ‘others’.

11. 86 (14.3%) were living alone, 379 (63.2%) live with spouse, 66 (11%) live with close relatives, 28 (4.7%) live with an unrelated person, 41 (6.8%) belong to the group ‘others’.

7.1.2. **Factors Influencing Buying Decision and Buyer Preferences**

12. In the case of Apartment, 73 (12.16%) mentioned that location decision was taken by themselves. 335 (55.83%) consumers commented that they took location decision jointly in consultation with their spouse. 148 (24.67%) opined that they took location decision in consultation with their parents. 44 (7.34%) said that their location decision came out after consultation with relatives/ friends/consultants.

13. In the case of Apartment 71 (11.83%) opined that type of building decision was taken by themselves. 329 (54.83%) consumers opined that they are took decision about type of building, jointly in consultation with their spouse. 153 (25.5%) opined that they took decision about type of building in consultation with their parents. 47 (7.84%) said that their type of building decision came out after consultation with relatives/ friends/Consultants.
14. 82 (13.67%) opined that the decision about total Sq. ft area was taken by themselves. 328 (54.67%) respondents commented that they took the decision jointly in consultation with their spouse. 144 (24%) opined that they took the decision in consultation with their parents. 46 (7.66%) said that their decision regarding total Sq. ft area came out after consultation with relatives/ friends/ Consultants.

15. 89 (14.83%) opined that the decision about Budget was taken by themselves. 291 (48.5%) respondents commented that they took the decision jointly in consultation with their spouse. 180 (30.0%) opined that they took the decision in consultation with their parents. 40 (6.67%) said that their decision regarding Budget came out after consultation with relatives/ friends/ Consultants.

16. 100 (16.67%) opined that the decision about Funding Agency was taken by themselves. 276 (46.0%) consumers commented that they took the decision jointly in consultation with their spouse. 184 (30.67%) opined that they took the decision in consultation with their parents. 40 (6.66%) said that their decision regarding Funding Agency came out after consultation with relatives/ friends/ Consultants.

17. 118 (19.67%) opined that the decision about Number of bedrooms was taken by themselves. 360 (60.0%) consumers commented that they took the decision jointly in consultation with their spouse. 120 (20.0%) opined that they took the decision in consultation with their parents. 2 (0.33%) said that their decision regarding Number of bedrooms came out after consultation with relatives/ friends/ Consultants.

18. 85 (14.17%) opined that the decision about Vasthu was taken by themselves. 229 (38.17%) consumers commented that they took the decision jointly in consultation with their spouse. 151 (25.16%) opined that they took the decision in consultation with their parents. 135 (22.5%) said that their decision regarding Vasthu came out after consultation with relatives/ friends/ Consultants.
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19. Out of the 600 buyers of Apartment 339 (56.5%) gave importance to religious aspects. While 57 (9.5%) are neutral, 204 (34%) consumers do not give any importance to this aspect.

20. Out of 600 buyers of Apartments 501 (83.5%) opined that regional preference is important in their decision making. 50 (8.3%) opted a neutral stand. 49 (8.2%) showed no importance to this aspect.

21. Out of 600 buyers of Apartment 449 (74.8%) opined that expression of individuality is important to them while purchasing. On the other hand 79 (13.2%) opted neutral position. Remaining 72 (12%) gave no importance to expression of individuality concept.

22. 432 (72%) out of 600 respondents from Apartments remarked that family tradition aspect is important in their purchasing decision. Another 60 (10%) has no opinion in this aspect. Remaining 108 (18%) considered it as an unimportant factor.

23. 70 (11.7%) said that they got the information from brochure, 71 (11.8%) got the information from sales person, 223 (37.2%) got information from friends/colleagues, 58 (9.7%) got information from family, 76 (12.7%) collected information from advertisements, 40 (6.7%) received information from websites, 54 (9.0%) got information from real estate brokers and 8(1.3) got information from sources other than those mentioned above.

24. 410 (68.3%) said that they have purchased Apartment for the first time in their life’s. 138 (23%) said that they purchased for the second time. 52 (8.7%) said that they have purchased thrice or more than that.

25. Out of 600 respondents from Apartments 202 (33.7%) persons stated that they have shifted their house once in last ten years. For 250 (41.7%) there were two moves in last ten years, for 109 (18.2%) there were three to four moves in last ten years. Finally 39 (6.5%) respondents said that they have shifted their house five or more number of times during the last ten years.

26. It was found that 316 (52.67%) out of 600 buyers of Apartments were not in receipt of any financial aid from their parents. On the other hand 284
(47.33%) agreed that they have availed the benefit of financial support from their parents.

27. In the case of 70 (11.7%) buyers of Apartments their parents owned house with in the last five years. 67 (11.2%) stated that their parents purchased house with in the period between five to ten years. 213 (35.5%) respondents stated that their parents purchased house with in eleven to twenty years. Finally 246 (41%) said that their parents did not make any purchase during the last 35 years.

28. The study revealed that, for 92 (15.3%) respondents, it was the feeling of community living that influenced their purchasing. 302 (50.3%) stated that the opportunity to get all facilities under one roof prompted them to prefer an Apartment. Remaining 206 (34.3%) said that the feeling of security motivated them to purchase Apartment.

29. The study revealed that for 105 (17.5%) respondents, affordability was the most attractive feature in the selection of an apartment. 227 (37.8%) stated that to get freed from all the construction risk attracted them. Remaining 268 (44.7%) said that the need for living in prime location attracted their preference.

30. For (43%) of respondents, budget for an Apartment was 50 – 75 lakhs. For (39.5%) budget was 75 Lakhs -1Crore, for 9.8% of consumers’ budget was 25 – 50 Lakhs, for 5.3% consumers, budget was above one Crore and for 2.3% consumers’ budget was Less than 25 Lakhs for purchase an Apartment.

31. In terms of Size, majority of the consumers of Apartment prefer (36.3%) 900 – 1500 Square feet. 32.2% of consumers prefer 1500 – 2000 Sft. 13.5% prefer 2000 – 2500 Sft , 9.3% prefer 2500 -3000 Sft and 4.3% prefer above 3000 Sft. Also, there is a demand for smaller Apartment (4.3%).

32. In the case of Apartment 171 (28.5%) consumers spent one to three months, 153 (25.5%) spent 3 to 6 months. 135 (22.5%) spent 6 to 9 month, 74 (12.3%) spent 9 to 12 month and 67 (11.2%) spent 12 months and above for searching and finalization of Apartment purchase decision making process.
33. In the case of Apartment 381 (63.5%) considered 1 to five projects. 167 (27.8%) considered 6 to ten projects. 33 (5.5%) compared 11 to 15 projects. Finally 19 (3.2%) considered 16 to 20 projects.

7.1.3. Opinion of Buyers of Apartments

34. Since the mean values of dwelling unit features such as ‘Square ft. area of building’ ‘Availability of space allotted for each room’, ‘Arrangement of rooms’, ‘The privacy with in your house’, ‘Size and location of rooms’, ‘Space for children to study’, ‘Availability of storage room’, ‘Size of windows’ and ‘Over all Vasthu aspects’ are above four, the respondents have strong agreement with these factors. Hence these are highly important dwelling unit features preferred by the respondents. For factors such as ‘Number of floors’, ‘UDS (Undivided share)’ and ‘Space for prayer room’ the mean values are between 3.5 and 4. Hence these features are also important.

35. The mean values of dwelling unit support services such as ‘Garbage collection’, ‘Cleanliness of drain’, ‘Total environment Cleanliness’, ‘Car/ Motorcycle parking’, ‘Home insurance’, ‘Play area’, ‘Rain water harvesting’, ‘Perimeter road’ and ‘Pedestrian walkways are above four. Hence the respondents have strong agreement with these factors. These are relatively very important dwelling unit support services preferred by the respondents. For factors such as ‘Installation of CC TV’, ‘Local shops’, ‘Installation of solar energy panel’, ‘Multi – purpose hall’, ‘Space for drivers and servants in the buildings’, ‘Food stalls’, ‘Wi-fi’, ‘Prayer hall’, ‘Banking/ ATM facility’, ‘Landscaping’, ‘Library’, ‘Common party area’, ‘Common visitors room’, ‘Gymnasium’, ‘Swimming pool’ and ‘Periodical medical check-up/ Immunisation programs within the premises’ the mean values are between three and four. Hence these features are relatively important.

36. The mean values in respect of Social environment factors such as ‘Air quality’, ‘Round the clock security’, ‘Fire and Safety measures’, ‘Noise level’, ‘Location away from Industrial area’ and ‘Alarm system’ are above four. The respondents have strong agreement with these factors. Hence, all
the factors considered under social environment are very important and preferred by the respondents.

37. The mean values with regard to Neighborhood facilities such as ‘Location near to schools/ Colleges’, ‘Location near to town centre’, ‘Location near to Hospital’, ‘Location near to public transportation services’, ‘Location near to Market’ and ‘Location near to place of worship’ are above four. Hence the respondents have strong agreement with these factors. Accordingly these are relatively very important Neighborhood facilities preferred by the respondents. For the factor ‘Location near to police station’ the mean value is between three and four. It can be inferred that compared to other factors, this factor is slightly less important for the respondents.

38. Since the mean values of Documentation factors such as ‘Obtaining layout permission’, ‘Building plan’, ‘Basic infrastructure facility’, ‘No objection certificates’ and ‘Work permit from Revenue Authorities’ are above four, the respondents have strong agreement with these factors. Hence it can be inferred that all the factors considered under ‘Documentation’ are very important for the respondents.

39. The mean values of factors with regard to Builders reputation such as ‘Meeting project timelines’, ‘Commitment to quality’, ‘Communicating project status’, ‘Reliability & Integrity’, ‘After sales support’, ‘Understanding customer needs’, ‘Availability of resources’ and ‘Program and project management skills’ are above four. Hence the respondents have strong agreement with these factors. These are very important factors related to Builders reputation preferred by the respondents. For ‘Global presence’ the mean value is 3.88. Hence this factor is also important for the respondents.

40. The mean values of factors related to Builders management procedures such as ‘Establishment & maintenance of Garbage collection system’, ‘Management response to construction defect (Detected after purchase)’, ‘Handling of Residents’ complaints’ and ‘Furnishing provided by the management on request’ are above four. Hence the respondents have strong
agreement with these factors. Therefore these are relatively very important factors related to Builders management procedures, preferred by the respondents.

41. The mean values of factors related to Builders sales person’s characteristics such as ‘Confidentiality’, ‘Commitment’, ‘Knowledge and Expertise’, ‘Understanding customers’, ‘Responsiveness’, ‘Product knowledge’, ‘Flexibility’, ‘Self-management (Time management, Punctuality, Priority setting etc.)’, ‘Market knowledge’, ‘Friendliness’, ‘Experience’, ‘Good interpersonal and Communication skills’ are above four. Hence the respondents have strong agreement with these factors. Therefore these are relatively very important factors related to Builders sales person characteristics preferred by the respondents.

42. The mean values of factors connected with consumer brand preference such as ‘Builders market position’, ‘Popularity of the brand’, ‘Integrity of the builder’, ‘Attractiveness of the brand’ and ‘Recommendation to others’ are above four. Hence the respondents have strong agreement with these factors. These are relatively very important factors with regard to consumer brand preference. For factors such as ‘Brand loyalty’ and, ‘Brand reference’ the mean values are between three and four. Hence these features are slightly less important.

43. The mean values of factors such as ‘Attractive package influences buying decision positively’, ‘Package adds value to product ’and ‘Package misleads buyers’ are between three and four. Hence these factors are important.

44. Since the mean values of promotional scheme related to the purchase of an Apartment such as ‘Credit facility’ and ‘Discounts’ are between three and four, these factors are important. For ‘Free gifts’, the mean value is less than three. Hence this factor is unimportant.

45. The mean values of factors related to advertisement/brochure settings such as ‘Design & layout’, ‘Green life style’ and ‘Natural environment’ are above four and the respondents have strong agreement with these factors. Hence these are relatively very important factors related to advertisement/brochure
settings preferred by the respondents. For ‘Imaginary/ Artificial environment’, the mean value is between three and four. Hence these factors are also important.

46. The mean values in respect of Advertisement presenter such as ‘Expert’, ‘Normal people’, ‘Company person’ and ‘Celebrity’ are between three and four. The respondents have agreement with these factors. Hence these are relatively important factors preferred by the respondents. For factors such as ‘Cartoon’, ‘No presenter’ and ‘Animals’ the mean values are less than three. Therefore these factors are unimportant.

47. Since the mean values of consumer expectation about Company identification mark such as ‘Green awards’ and ‘Environmental slogan’ are four and above, the respondents have strong agreement with these factors. As such these are relatively very important company identification marks preferred by the respondents. For the factor ‘Green logo type’ mean value is between three and four. Hence this factor is also important.

48. Since the mean values of factors related to ‘Consumer expectation about Web sites design such as ‘Design & Layout’, ‘Updating’, ‘Reliability of information’, ‘Comprehensiveness’ and ‘Appealing’ are four and above, the respondents have strong agreement with these factors. Hence these are relatively very important Web sites design factors preferred by the respondents.

49. The mean values for the factors ‘not purchasing apartment due to hike in price’ and ‘not purchasing apartment due to uncertainty of employment’ are between three and four. Hence respondents agreed that these factors are important.

50. The mean values for the factors, ‘Level of pollution in the neighborhood’, ‘Materials used for the construction’ and ‘Eco-friendly construction concept’ are four and above. The respondents strongly agreed with these factors. Hence these are relatively very important Technological environment factors preferred by the respondents. For factors such as ‘International Architectural
standards’ and ‘Theme based homes’, mean values are between three and four. Hence respondents agreed that these factors are important.

51. The mean value in respect of factors such as ‘Unethical practice of trade unions’, ‘Levels of crime in the neighborhood’, ‘Communal forces within the society’ and ‘Programmes related to housing in media/channels’ are between three and four. Hence respondents agreed that these factors are important. Since the mean value of the factor ‘Ideologies of the political parties’ is less than three, respondents disagreed with this factor and hence unimportant.

52. The mean values of Legal environment factors like ‘The prevailing statutory norms’ and ‘The Rules & Regulations’ are between three and four. Hence respondents agreed that these factors are important.

53. The mean values of factors ‘Vasthu concept’ and ‘Rich customary tradition followed in the region’ are between three and four. Hence respondents agreed that these factors are important.

54. The mean value for ‘joint decision by husband and wife’ is above four. Hence it is highly agreed by the respondents. For factors such as ‘main earner making decision’, ‘children plays important role’ and ‘husband making decision’, mean values are between three and four. Hence respondents agreed with these factors. Since the mean value for the factor ‘wife alone making decision’ is less than three, respondents disagreed with this factor.

55. Respondents strongly agreed to the factor ‘preferred location close to work place’, since the mean value is above four. This was followed by ‘location close to own family’ (mean value 3.48), ‘location close to relatives and friends’ (mean value 3.34) and ‘location close to spouse’s family’ (mean value 3.22). Hence respondents agreed that these factors are also important in buying Apartment.

56. For all the factors considered under the variable ‘involvement’, mean values are above four. Hence respondents strongly agreed to the factors such as
‘conducting personal visit before purchase’, ‘conducting detailed market enquiry’ and ‘consulting friends’ before making purchasing decision.

57. Factors such as ‘Family status’ and ‘Inner concepts’ have great influence in purchase decision making and are strongly agreed by the respondents with mean values above four. For the factor ‘purchase not made in accordance with the heart’s feeling’ mean value is 3.80. Hence respondents agreed for this factor also.

58. Respondents made purchase decision after conducting comparative analysis with other projects. The mean value of this factor is above four. Hence respondents strongly agreed that this factor is very important. Information available in the brochure and other sources are also taken in to account by consumers. For this factor the mean value is between three and four. Respondents agreed that this factor is also important in buying an Apartment.

59. For the factors ‘Availability of all modern amenities’, ‘Social status’, ‘Association with people of equal status’ and ‘Inner harmony’ the mean values are between three and four. Hence respondents agreed that all these factors are important in motivating them to buy an Apartment.

60. Personality is closely associated with one’s life style. Self-image will also be reflected in the purchase decision. Also it is important that the individuality will reflect in any purchase decision. Mean values for all these factors are between three and four. Hence respondents agreed that these factors are important in buying an Apartment.

61. Purchase of an Apartment is for the satisfaction of one’s personal needs and it is not an attempt to make an impression on other people. Since mean values of this factor is above four, respondents strongly agreed that it is very important in buying an Apartment. Factors such as ‘making life comfortable/convenient’, ‘knowing who will buy from certain builders’, ‘free offers’, ‘making impression on others’ and ‘paying attention to what others buy’ have mean value between three and four. Hence respondents agreed that these factors are important in buying Apartment.
Respondents tried to develop an image based on the things they acquire. The mean value of this factor is 3.81. The concept of community living and the materialization are also important for the respondents. Since the mean values are between three and four, all these factors included in this section are agreed by the respondents and are important.

The mean values of the factors ‘Purchase decision often taken after thinking about the future’ and ‘Wanted to be different from the crowd’ are above four. Hence the respondents strongly agreed to these factors and are very important for them.

While making purchase an Apartment Project plan that matches with one’s expectation is a very important factor. This feature is strongly agreeable to respondents and the mean value is above four. Mean values of factors such as ‘Information from E – brochure’ ‘Uniqueness of the apartment’ and ‘Promotional activities offered by the builder’ are between three and four. Hence respondents agreed to these factors and are important for them.

The mean values of factors such as ‘time pressure due to busy life style’ and ‘difficulty to construct a house in international architectural standards within a short period’ are between three and four. Hence respondents agreed to these factors and are important in the buying of Apartments.

Perception related factors such as ‘Product uniqueness’, ‘Value for money’, ‘Availability of apartment from preferred builder’, ‘Affordable price’, ‘Uncertainty in the market’, ‘Competitive rate’, ‘Quality linked with price’, ‘Availability with in the time limit’ and ‘Status symbol’ have mean values between 3 three and four. Hence these factors are agreeable to respondents and are perceived to be important.

The mean values of factors such as ‘Timely handing over of Apartment’, ‘Substandard fittings and raw materials’, ‘Financial risk’, ‘Legal formalities’, ‘Breach of contractual agreement by the developer’, ‘Allotment as per scheduled chart’, and ‘Incurring periodical additional expenditure for the maintenance’ are above four and influenced the purchase decision. Respondents strongly agreed to these factors and are very important risk
factors. ‘Lack of sufficient time for the construction’, ‘Psychological risk’, ‘Urgency arising out of transfer’, ‘Deviation from the traditional life style’ have mean values between three and four. Hence these are also important risk factors perceived by the respondents.

68. Out of 600 buyers of Apartments, 483 (80.5%) viewed purchase of an Apartment as an investment. But 117 (19.5%) not viewed it as an investment.

69. For 50.7% respondents, the most important reason for viewing purchase of an Apartment as investment is ‘Long term investment’, for 25.9% the reason is ‘Income from rent’, for 10.4% it is ‘Anticipated income after retirement’ and for 13% it is ‘Reducing taxable income.

70. The mean values of factors such as ‘Expectation about future economic conditions’, ‘Current and expected real disposable income’, ‘Mortgage interest rate in comparison with competitor’ are above four. Hence respondents strongly agreed with these factors and are very important. ‘Low EMI’, ‘Longer delivery period’, ‘Company ensuring financing source’, ‘Schedule of payment’ and ‘Long term payment’ have mean values between three and four. Hence respondents agreed with these factors and are important.

71. ‘Desire to own Apartment’, ‘Location near to Educational institution/Shopping area/Transportation facilities/Hospitals’, ‘Security problems’, ‘Availability of central water supply and sewage system’ have mean values above four. Hence respondents have strong agreement with these factors and are very important. For factors such as ‘Gives feeling of community living’, ‘Allows for entertainment and sociability’, ‘Buying is less expensive than Renting’, ‘Provides good return on money invested’, ‘More living space and room for children’, ‘Earlier contact with Area’, ‘Greater privacy from neighbours’, ‘Better Privacy than traditional house’, ‘Change in respondent’s job location’, ‘Change of job location of other family member’ have mean values between three and four. So these factors are relatively important. For factors such as ‘Infrastructure problems with previous housing’, ‘Expansion
of family’, ‘Different background of neighbours’ and ‘Children should not brought up in rented Apartment’ have mean values below two. Therefore these are unimportant.

72. Respondents are highly satisfied with the Dwelling Unit Features such as ‘Air circulation’, ‘Arrangement of rooms’, ‘Number & level of socket’. They are moderately satisfied with ‘Garbage line’ and ‘Clothes line facilities’.

73. Respondents have higher level of satisfaction on ‘Safety of building’ with a mean score of 4.12, followed by ‘Water supply’ with a mean score of 3.90 and ‘Garbage disposal’ with a score of 3.88. The lowest value was obtained for ‘Maintenance of centralized cooking gas distribution facility’, with a score of 3.49.

74. The respondents have highest level of satisfaction on ‘Accessibility to Educational institutions’ with a mean score of 4.22, followed by ‘Accessibility to Clinic/hospital’ with a mean score of 4.16, ‘Accessibility to Public transport’ with a score of 4.06. The lowest value was obtained for ‘Accessibility to Community hall’, with a score of 3.70.

75. ‘Location’ with mean value of 4.18 is the factor on which respondents are highly satisfied which is followed by ‘Windows and doors’ with a mean score of 4.08 and ‘Exterior & interior construction’ with a score of 4.05. The lowest rank was given to ‘Pests and rat control’, with a score of 3.68.

76. Respondents are satisfied on factors such as ‘No writing on Walls’, ‘people not consuming alcohol in public’, ‘No Drug dealers or drug users’, ‘No disturbing noise’ and ‘No Gangs’.

7.1.4 Correlation and Regression Analysis

Correlation Analysis – Buyers expectation about Apartment and External factors

1. There is a possible correlation between Economic environment factors and Dwelling unit features and Neighbourhood facilities, but they are not statistically significant. There is a negative correlation between Economic
environment factors and Dwelling unit support services and Social environment, but not statistically significant.

2. Technological environment factors are positively correlated with the four components of buyers expectation about apartments—Dwelling unit features, Dwelling unit support services, Social environment and Neighbourhood facilities. The correlation analysis reveals that the correlations are significant at 1% level of significance and the strength of the association between Technological environment factors and the four component of buyers' expectation about apartment are very strong.

3. Political environment factors are positively correlated with Dwelling unit features, Dwelling unit support services and Neighbourhood facilities. Also, Political environment is negatively related to Social environment. The correlation of Political environment with Dwelling unit support services and Neighbourhood facilities are significant at 1% level of significance and other correlations are not statistically significant.

4. Legal environment factors are positively correlated with Dwelling unit support services with significance level at 5%. Legal environment is negatively correlated with Dwelling unit features, Social environment and Neighbourhood facilities. But these correlations are not significant.

5. Beliefs and Traditions are positively correlated with the three components of buyers expectation about apartment—Dwelling unit features, Dwelling unit support services, and Neighbourhood facilities. The correlation analysis reveals that the association is significant at 1% level of significance and the strength of the association between Beliefs and Traditions and the three component of buyer’s expectation about apartment are very strong. ‘Beliefs and Traditions’ is negatively related to Social environment which is not statistically significant.

6. Family decision making is positively correlated with the three components of buyer’s expectation about apartment—Dwelling unit features, Dwelling unit support services, and Neighbourhood facilities. Also, Family decision making is negatively related to Social environment. The correlation of
Family decision making with Dwelling unit support services is significant at 1% level of significance and other correlations are not statistically significant.

7. Situational pressure in connection with proximity to relatives and work place is positively correlated with the four components of buyers expectation about Apartment - Dwelling unit features, Dwelling unit support services, Social environment and Neighbourhood facilities. The correlation of ‘Situational pressure in connection with proximity to relatives and work place’ with Dwelling unit support services and Neighbourhood facilities are significant at 1% level of significance and Dwelling unit features at 5% level of significance. The correlation analysis reveals that the association is significant and the strength of the association between ‘Situational pressure in connection with proximity to relatives and work place’ and the four components of buyer’s expectation about apartment are strong.

Regression analysis - Relationship between Neighbourhood facilities and External Factors

The analysis of variance of multiple regression model shows that the model is significant at 1% level of significance. (F = 18.362, P value < 0.01) This indicates that at a confidence level of 99%, the ANOVA test proves that null hypothesis is rejected. So there is a significant relationship between Neighbourhood facilities and External factors.

The Beta values are the standardized coefficients which gives an indication of the relative importance of independent variable on the dependent variables. Thus it shows that among the external factors, technological environment and situational pressure in connection with proximity to relatives have a higher level of relationship with neighbourhood facilities.
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**Relationship between Social Environment and External Factors**

The analysis of variance of multiple regression model shows that the model is significant at 1% level of significance. \( F = 4.128, \ P \text{ value} < 0.01 \) This indicates that at a confidence level of 99%, the ANOVA test proves that null hypothesis is rejected. So there is a significant relationship between Social environment and External factors.

Among the external factors, technological environment and situational pressure in connection with proximity to relatives have a higher level of relationship with Social environment.

**Relationship between Dwelling Unit Support Services and External Factors**

The analysis of variance of multiple regression model shows that the model is significant at 1% level of significance. \( F = 26.305, \ P \text{ value} < 0.01 \) This indicates that at a confidence level of 99%, the ANOVA test proves that null hypothesis is rejected. So there is a significant relationship between Dwelling unit support services and External Factors.

Among the external factors, technological environment, situational pressure in connection with proximity to relatives and family decision making have a higher level of relationship with Dwelling unit support services.

**Relationship between Dwelling Unit Features and External Factors**

The analysis of variance of multiple regression model shows that the model is significant at 1% level of significance. \( F = 6.648, \ P \text{ value} < 0.01 \) This indicates that at a confidence level of 99%, the ANOVA test proves that null hypothesis is rejected. So there is a significant relationship between Dwelling unit features and External factors.

Among the external environment factors technological environment and beliefs & traditions have a higher level of relationship with Dwelling unit features.
II Correlation Analysis - Buyers expectation about Apartment and Internal Factors

The results obtained from the Pearson correlation analysis, indicates that Involvement is positively correlated with the four components of buyer’s expectation about Apartment - Dwelling unit features (.320), Dwelling unit support services (.315), Social environment (.267), Neighbourhood facilities (.209). The correlation analysis reveals that the correlations are significant at 1% level of significance and the strength of the association between Involvement and the four components of buyer’s expectation about Apartment are very strong.

‘Feelings’ is positively correlated with the four components of buyers expectation about Apartment- Dwelling unit features (.345), Dwelling unit support services (.295), Social environment (.083), Neighbourhood facilities (.432). The correlation of Feelings with Dwelling unit features, Dwelling unit support services and Neighbourhood facilities are significant at 1% level of significance and Social environment at 5% level of significance. The correlation analysis reveals that the association is significant and the strength of the association between Feelings and the four components of buyer’s expectation about Apartment are strong.

Knowledge is positively correlated with the four components of buyers expectation about Apartment- Dwelling unit features (.213), Dwelling unit support services (.217), Social environment (.002), Neighbourhood facilities (.241). The correlation of Knowledge with Dwelling unit features, Dwelling unit support services and Neighbourhood facilities are significant at 1% level of significance. The correlation analysis reveals that the association is significant and the strength of the association between Knowledge and the four components of buyer’s expectation about Apartment are strong.

Motivation is positively correlated with the three components of buyers expectation about Apartment- Dwelling unit features (.175), Dwelling unit support services (.315) and Neighbourhood facilities (.324). The correlation analysis reveals that the correlations are significant at 1% level of significance and the strength of the association between Motivation and three component of buyer’s expectation about
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Apartment are very strong. Motivation is negatively related to Social environment (-.032) which is not statistically significant.

Personality is positively correlated with the four components of buyers expectation about Apartment: Dwelling unit features (.350), Dwelling unit support services (.331), Social environment (.138), Neighbourhood facilities (.400). The correlation analysis reveals that the correlations are significant at 1% level of significance and the strength of the association between Personality and the four component of buyer’s expectation about Apartment are very strong.

Attitude is positively correlated with the four components of buyer’s expectation about Apartment: Dwelling unit features (.204), Dwelling unit support services (.287), Social environment (.123), Neighbourhood facilities (.271). The correlation analysis reveals that the correlations are significant at 1% level of significance and the strength of the association between Attitude and the four component of buyer’s expectation about Apartment are very strong.

‘Values’ is positively correlated with the four components of buyers expectation about Apartment: Dwelling unit features (.187), Dwelling unit support services (.411), Social environment (.093), Neighbourhood facilities (.283). The correlation of Values with Dwelling unit features, Dwelling unit support services and Neighbourhood facilities are significant at 1% level of significance and Social environment at 5% level of significance. The correlation analysis reveals that the association is significant and the strength of the association between Values and the three components of buyer’s expectation about Apartment are strong.

Taste and Preference is positively correlated with Dwelling unit features (.009) and not statistically significant. Taste and Preference is negatively related with Dwelling unit support services (-.059), Social environment (-.056), and Neighbourhood facilities (-.047) and not statistically significant.

Learning is positively correlated with Dwelling unit features (.031), Neighbourhood facilities (.047) and not statistically significant. Learning is negatively related with Dwelling unit support services (-.009) and Social environment (-.023) and not statistically significant.
Time pressure is positively correlated with Neighbourhood facilities (.021) and not statistically significant. Time pressure is negatively related with Dwelling unit features (-.024), Dwelling unit support services (-.018) and Social environment (-.014) and not statistically significant.

Perception is positively correlated with Neighbourhood facilities (.006) and not statistically significant. Perception is negatively related with Dwelling unit features (-.012), Dwelling unit support services (-.043) and Social environment (-.084) and not statistically significant.

**Relationship between Dwelling Unit Features and Internal Factors**

The analysis of variance of multiple regression model shows that the model is significant at 1% level of significance. \( F = 13.985, P \text{ value} < 0.01 \) This indicates that at a confidence level of 99%, the ANOVA test proves that null hypothesis is rejected. So there is a significant relationship between Dwelling unit features and Internal factors.

Among the internal factors involvement, personality and feelings have a higher level of relationship with Dwelling unit features.

**Relationship between Dwelling Unit Support Services and Internal Factors**

The analysis of variance of multiple regression model shows that the model is significant at 1% level of significance. \( F = 15.912, P \text{ value} < 0.01 \) This indicates that at a confidence level of 99%, the ANOVA test proves that null hypothesis is rejected. So there is a significant relationship between Dwelling unit support services and Internal factors.

Among the internal factors, values and involvement have a higher level of relationship with Dwelling unit support services.

**Relationship between Social Environment and Internal Factors**

The analysis of variance of multiple regression model shows that the model is significant at 1% level of significance. \( F = 6.497, P \text{ value} < 0.01 \) This indicates that at a confidence level of 99%, the ANOVA test proves that null hypothesis is rejected. So there is a significant relationship between Social environment and Internal factors.
Among the internal factors, involvement and personality have a higher level of relationship with Social environment.

**Relationship between Neighbourhood Facilities and Internal Factors**

The analysis of variance of multiple regression model shows that the model is significant at 1% level of significance. ($F = 16.658$, $P$ value $< 0.01$) This indicates that at a confidence level of 99%, the ANOVA test proves that null hypothesis is rejected. So there is a significant relationship between Neighbourhood facilities and Internal factors.

Among the internal factors, feelings and personality have a higher level of relationship with Neighbourhood facilities.

**III. Correlation Analysis- Expectation from Builder and External Factors**

Economic environment is positively correlated with Management procedure (.026) and Builders sales promotional activities (.131). The correlation of Economic environment with Builders sales promotional activities are significant at 1% level of significance. Economic environment is negatively related with Documentation (-.012) and Builders reputation (-.006) and not statistically significant.

Technological environment is positively correlated with the four components of buyers expectation from builder- Documentation (.152), Builders reputation (.390), Management procedure (.307), Sales promotional activities (.485). The correlation analysis also reveals that the correlations are significant at 1% level of significance and the strength of the association between Technological environment and the four component of buyer’s expectation from builder are very strong.

Political environment is positively correlated with Builders reputation (.020), Management procedure (.057) and Sales promotional activities (.311). The correlation of political environment with builders sales promotional activities is significant at 1% level of significance, Also Political environment is negatively related with Documentation (-.128) and not statistically significant.

Legal environment is positively correlated with Builders reputation (.020) and Sales promotional activities (.046). But these correlations are not significant.
Legal environment is negatively related with Documentation (-.084) and Management procedure (-.002) and not statistically significant.

Beliefs and Traditions is positively correlated with Builders reputation (.042), Management procedure (.038) and Sales promotional activities (.344). The correlation of Beliefs and Traditions with builders sales promotional activities is significant at 1% level of significance, Also Beliefs and Traditions is negatively related with Documentation (-.053) and not statistically significant.

Family decision making is positively correlated with Builders reputation (.098), Management procedure (.030), and Sales promotional activities (.414). The correlation of Family decision making with builders sales promotional activities is significant at 1% level of significance, Also Family decision making is negatively related with Documentation (-.028) and not statistically significant.

Situational pressure in connection with proximity to relatives and work place is positively correlated with Builders reputation (.122), Management procedure (.092), and Sales promotional activities (.397). The correlation of Situational pressure in connection with proximity to relatives and work place with builders sales promotional activities is significant at 1% level of significance Situational pressure relating proximity to relatives and work place is negatively related with Documentation (-.033) and not statistically significant.

**Relationship between Documentation and External Factors**

The analysis of variance of multiple regression model shows that the model is significant at 1% level of significance. (F = 6.529, P value < 0.01) This indicates that at a confidence level of 99%, the ANOVA test proves that null hypothesis is rejected. So there is a significant relationship between Documentation and External factors.

Among the external environment factors technological environment have a higher level of relationship with Documentation.

**Relationship between Builders Reputation and External Factors**

The analysis of variance of multiple regression model shows that the model is significant at 1% level of significance. (F = 18.849, P value < 0.01) This indicates
that at a confidence level of 99%, the ANOVA test proves that null hypothesis is rejected. So there is a significant relationship between Builders Reputation and External factors.

Among the external factors, technological environment and Family decision making have a higher level of relationship with Builders Reputation.

**Relationship between Management Procedures and External Factors**

The analysis of variance of multiple regression model shows that the model is significant at 1% level of significance. \( F = 9.576, \text{P value} < 0.01 \) This indicates that at a confidence level of 99%, the ANOVA test proves that null hypothesis is rejected. So there is a significant relationship between Management Procedures and External factors.

Among the external factors, technological environment have a higher level of relationship with Management Procedures.

**Relationship between Builders Sales Promotional Activities and External Factors**

The analysis of variance of multiple regression model shows that the model is significant at 1% level of significance. \( F = 49.154, \text{P value} < 0.01 \) This indicates that at a confidence level of 99%, the ANOVA test proves that null hypothesis is rejected. So there is a significant relationship between Builders sales promotional activities and External factors.

Among the external environment factors technological environment, family decision making and situational pressure in connection with proximity to relatives have a higher level of relationship with Builders sales promotional activities.

**IV. Correlation Analysis-Buyers expectation From Builder and Internal Factors**

Involvement is positively correlated with the four components of buyers expectation from Builder - Documentation (.355), Builders Reputation (.347), Management Procedures (.314), Sales Promotional Activities (.433). The correlation analysis reveals that the correlations are significant at 1% level of significance and the strength of the association between Involvement and the four component of buyer’s expectation from builders are very strong.
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Feelings is positively correlated with the four components of buyers' expectation from Builder - Documentation (.192), Builders Reputation (.252), Management Procedures (.164), Sales Promotional Activities (.394). The correlation analysis reveals that the correlations are significant at 1% level of significance and the strength of the association between Feelings and the four components of buyer’s expectation from builders are very strong.

Knowledge is positively correlated with the four components of buyers' expectation from Builder - Documentation (.027), Builders Reputation (.155), Management Procedures (.134), Sales Promotional Activities (.385) The correlation of Knowledge with Builders reputation and Builders sales promotional activities are significant at 1% level of significance. The correlation analysis reveals that the association is significant and the strength of the association between Knowledge and the four components of buyer’s expectation from builder are strong.

Motivation is positively correlated with Builders Reputation (.089), Management Procedures, Builders sales promotional activities (.462). The correlation of Knowledge with Builders sales promotional activities is significant at 1% level of significance. Motivation is negatively related with Documentation (-.085) and not statistically significant.

Personality is positively correlated with the four components of buyer’s expectation from Builder - Documentation (.167), Builders Reputation (.282), Management Procedures (.183), Sales Promotional Activities (.490). The correlation analysis reveals that the correlations are significant at 1% level of significance and the strength of the association between Personality and the four component of buyer’s expectation from builders are very strong.

Attitude is positively correlated with the four components of buyers' expectation from Builder - Documentation (.088), Builders Reputation (.202), Management Procedures (.205), Sales Promotional Activities (.465) The correlation analysis reveals that the correlations are significant at 1% level of significance and the strength of the association between Attitude and the four component of buyer’s expectation from builders are very strong.
‘Values’ is positively correlated with the four components of buyers expectation from Builder - Documentation (.082), Builders Reputation (.223), Management Procedures (.117), Sales Promotional Activities (.526). The correlation of Values with Builders reputation and Builders sales promotional activities are significant at 1% level of significance and Management procedures at 5% level of significance. The correlation analysis reveals that the association is significant and the strength of the association between Values and the four components of buyer’s expectation from builder are strong.

Taste and Preference is negatively correlated with the four components of buyers expectation from Builder - Documentation (-.005), Builders Reputation (-.015), Management Procedures (-.070), Sales Promotional Activities (-.062) and not statistically significant.

Learning is positively correlated with Documentation (.017) and Builders Reputation (.005) and not statistically significant. Learning is negatively related with Management Procedures (-.011) and Builders sales promotional activities (-.045) and not statistically significant.

Time Pressure is positively correlated with Documentation (.032), Management Procedures (.029) and Builders sales promotional activities (.000) and not statistically significant. Time Pressure is negatively related with Builders Reputation (-.023) and not statistically significant.

Perception is negatively correlated with the four components of buyers expectation from Builder - Documentation (-.047), Builders Reputation (-.035), Management Procedures (-.088), Sales Promotional Activities (-.038) and not statistically significant.

**Relationship between Documentation and Internal Factors**

The analysis of variance of multiple regression model shows that the model is significant at 1% level of significance. (F = 14.141, P value < 0.01) This indicates that at a confidence level of 99%, the ANOVA test proves that null hypothesis is rejected. So there is a significant relationship between Documentation and Internal factors.
Among the internal factors involvement, feelings and personality have a higher level of relationship with Documentation.

**Relationship between Builders Reputation and Internal Factors**

The analysis of variance of multiple regression model shows that the model is significant at 1% level of significance. (F = 12.627, P value < 0.01) This indicates that at a confidence level of 99%, the ANOVA test proves that null hypothesis is rejected. So there is a significant relationship between Builders Reputation and Internal factors.

Among the internal factors, involvement, personality and feelings have a higher level of relationship with Builders Reputation.

**Relationship between Management Procedures and Internal Factors**

The analysis of variance of multiple regression model shows that the model is significant at 1% level of significance. (F = 9.838, P value < 0.01) This indicates that at a confidence level of 99%, the ANOVA test proves that null hypothesis is rejected. So there is a significant relationship between Management Procedures and Internal factors.

Among the internal factors, involvement, attitude and personality have a higher level of relationship with Management procedures.

**Relationship between Builders Sales promotional Activities and Internal Factors**

The analysis of variance of multiple regression model shows that the model is significant at 1% level of significance. (F = 38.666, P value < 0.01) This indicates that at a confidence level of 99%, the ANOVA test proves that null hypothesis is rejected. So there is a significant relationship between Builders Sales Promotional Activities and Internal factors.

Among the internal factors, involvement, values and personality have a higher level of relationship with Builders sales promotional activities.
V. Correlation Analysis- Buyer Objectives and Buyers expectation about Apartment.

Buyer Objectives is positively correlated with the four components of buyers expectation about Apartment Dwelling unit features (.262), Dwelling unit support services (.402), Social environment (.113), Neighbourhood facilities (.310). The correlation analysis reveals that the correlations are significant at 1% level of significance and the strength of the association between Buyer Objectives and the four component of buyer’s expectation about Apartment are very strong.

Regression- Buyer Objectives and Buyers expectation about Apartment

The analysis of variance of multiple regression model shows that the model is significant at 1% level of significance. (F = 35.664, P value < 0.01) This indicates that at a confidence level of 99%, the ANOVA test proves that null hypothesis is rejected. So there is a significant relationship between Buyer Objectives and buyer’s expectation about Apartment.

Among the Buyers expectation about Apartment factors, Dwelling unit support services and Neighbourhood facilities have a higher level of relationship with Buyer Objectives.

VI. Correlation Analysis-Buyer Objectives and Buyers expectation From Builder

Buyer Objectives is positively correlated with the four components of buyers expectation from builder [Documentation (.109), Builders reputation (.218), Management procedure (.140), Sales promotional activities (.400). The correlation analysis reveals that the association is highly significant and the strength of the association between Buyer Objectives and the four component of buyer’s expectation from builder are very strong.

Regression- Buyer Objectives and Buyers expectation From Builder

The analysis of variance of multiple regression model shows that the model is significant at 1% level of significance. (F = 29.615, P value < 0.01) This indicates that at a confidence level of 99%, the ANOVA test proves that null hypothesis is
rejected. So there is a significant relationship between Buyer Objectives and buyer’s expectation from builder.

Among the Buyers expectation from builder, factors such as Builders sales promotional activities and Builders Reputation have a higher level of relationship with Buyer Objectives.

VII. **Correlation Analysis-PIVR Factors and Buyer Objectives**

Buyer objectives is positively correlated with the three components of PIVR factors Vasthu (.236), Construction related risk (.208), Price & Investment (.361). The correlation analysis reveals that the correlations are significant at 1% level of significance and the strength of the association between Buyer objectives and the three component of PIVR are very strong.

**Regression- Buyer Objectives and PIVR factors**

The analysis of variance of multiple regression model shows that the model is significant at 1% level of significance. (F = 45.535, P value < 0.01) This indicates that at a confidence level of 99%, the ANOVA test proves that null hypothesis is rejected. So there is a significant relationship between Buyer objectives and PIVR factors.

Among the PIVR factors Price & Investment, Construction related risk and Vasthu have a higher level of relationship with Buyer objectives.

VIII. **Relationship between Buying Decision and Buyer Objectives**

Buying decision is positively correlated with Buyer objectives (.394). The correlation analysis reveals that the correlations are significant at 1% level of significance and the strength of the association between Buying decision and Buyer objectives about Apartment are very strong.

**Regression- Buying decision and Buyer Objectives**

The analysis of variance of multiple regression model shows that the model is significant at 1% level of significance. (F = 109.652, P value < 0.01) This indicates that at a confidence level of 99%, the ANOVA test proves that null
hypostasis is rejected. So there is a significant relationship between Buying decision and Buyer objectives about Apartment.

Buyer objectives have a higher level of relationship with Buying decisions.

IX. Correlation Analysis-Buyer Satisfaction and Buying Decision.

Satisfaction is positively correlated with Buying decision about Apartment (.463). The correlation analysis also reveals that the correlations are significant at 1% level of significance and the strength of the association between Satisfaction and Buying decision about Apartment are very strong.

Regression- Buyer Satisfaction with Dwelling Unit Features and Buying Decision

The analysis of variance of multiple regression model shows that the model is significant at 1% level of significance. (F = 53.086, P value < 0.01) This indicates that at a confidence level of 99%, the ANOVA test proves that null hypothesis is rejected. So there is a significant relationship between Satisfaction with dwelling unit.

Buying decisions about Apartment have a higher level of relationship with Satisfaction with dwelling unit features.

Relationship between Satisfaction with Services by Developer and Buying Decision

The analysis of variance of multiple regression model shows that the model is significant at 1% level of significance. (F = 155.581, P value < 0.01) This indicates that at a confidence level of 99%, the ANOVA test proves that null hypothesis is rejected. So there is a significant relationship between Satisfaction with services by developer and Buying decision about Apartment.

Buying decisions about Apartment have a higher level of relationship with Satisfaction with services by developer.

Relationship between Satisfaction with Neighbourhood Facilities and Buying Decision

The analysis of variance of multiple regression model shows that the model is significant at 1% level of significance. (F = 41.063, P value < 0.01) This indicates that at a confidence level of 99%, the ANOVA test proves that null hypothesis is
rejected. So there is a significant relationship between Satisfaction with Dwelling unit support services and neighbourhood facilities and Buying decision about Apartment.

The Beta values are the standardized coefficients which gives an indication of the relative importance of independent variable on the dependent variables. Thus it shows that Buying decisions about Apartment have a higher level of relationship with Satisfaction with Neighbourhood facilities.

**Relationship between Satisfaction with Housing Quality and Buying Decision**

The analysis of variance of multiple regression model shows that the model is significant at 1% level of significance. (F = 180.037, P value < 0.01) This indicates that at a confidence level of 99%, the ANOVA test proves that null hypothesis is rejected. So there is a significant relationship between Satisfaction with Housing Quality and Buying decision about Apartment.

Buying decisions about Apartment have a higher level of relationship with Satisfaction with Housing Quality.

**Relationship between Satisfaction with Neighbourhood Problems and Buying Decision**

The analysis of variance of multiple regression model shows that the model is significant at 1% level of significance. (F = 53.517, P value < 0.01) This indicates that at a confidence level of 99%, the ANOVA test proves that null hypothesis is rejected. So there is a significant relationship between Satisfaction with Neighbourhood problems and Buying decision about Apartment.

Buying decisions about Apartment have a higher level of relationship with Satisfaction with Neighbourhood problems.

**7.1.5. Relationship between Buyer Expectation about Apartment and Demographic factors of respondents**

In the case of age, asymmetric significance is found to be .000, which is smaller than the cut off value of .05. This indicates that at a confidence level of 95%, the ANOVA test proves that null hypothesis is rejected. So there is a significant
relationship between Buyers expectation about apartment and Age of the respondents.

As far as Gender is concerned, asymmetric significance is found to be .000, which is smaller than the cut off value of .05. This indicates that at a confidence level of 95%, the ANOVA test proves that null hypothesis is rejected. So there is a significant relationship between Buyers expectation about apartment and Gender of the respondents.

In the ANOVA test, conducted for Educational Qualification, asymmetric significance is found to be .000, which is smaller than the cut off value of .05. This indicates that at a confidence level of 95%, the ANOVA test proves that null hypothesis is rejected. So there is a significant relationship between Buyers expectation about apartment and Educational Qualification of the respondents.

In the result of Employment status, asymmetric significance is found to be .000, which is smaller than the cut off value of .05. This indicates that at a confidence level of 95%, the ANOVA test proves that null hypothesis is rejected. So there is a significant relationship between Buyers expectation about apartment and Employment status of the respondents.

Assessing the result of Gross income, asymmetric significance is found to be .000, which is smaller than the cut off value of .05. This indicates that at a confidence level of 95%, the ANOVA test proves that the null hypothesis is rejected. So there is a significant relationship between Buyers expectation about apartment and Gross income of the respondents.

In the ANOVA test conducted for Family status, asymmetric significance is found to be .000, which is smaller than the cut off value of .05. This indicates that at a confidence level of 95%, the ANOVA test proves that the null hypothesis is rejected. So there is a significant relationship between Buyers expectation about apartment and Family status of the respondents.

7.1.6 Relationship between Buyers Expectation from Builder and Demographic factors of respondents

In the case of age, asymmetric significance is found to be .000, which is smaller than the cut off value of .05. This indicates that at a confidence level of 95%,
the ANOVA test proves that null hypothesis is rejected. So there is a significant relationship between Buyers Expectation from Builder and Age of the respondents.

As far as Gender is concerned, asymmetric significance is found to be .000, which is smaller than the cut off value of .05. This indicates that at a confidence level of 95%, the ANOVA test proves that null hypothesis is rejected. So there is a significant relationship between Buyers Expectation from Builder and Gender of the respondents.

In the ANOVA test, conducted for Educational Qualification, asymmetric significance is found to be .000, which is smaller than the cut off value of .05. This indicates that at a confidence level of 95%, the ANOVA test proves that null hypothesis is rejected. So there is a significant relationship between Buyers Expectation from Builder and Educational Qualification of the respondents.

In the result of Employment status, asymmetric significance is found to be .000, which is smaller than the cut off value of .05. This indicates that at a confidence level of 95%, the ANOVA test proves that null hypothesis is rejected. So there is a significant relationship between Buyers Expectation from Builder and Employment status of the respondents.

Assessing the result of Gross income, asymmetric significance is found to be .000, which is smaller than the cut off value of .05. This indicates that at a confidence level of 95%, the ANOVA test proves that null hypothesis is rejected. So there is a significant relationship between Buyers Expectation from Builder and Gross income of the respondents.

In the ANOVA test conducted for Family status, asymmetric significance is found to be .000, which is smaller than the cut off value of .05. This indicates that at a confidence level of 95%, the ANOVA test proves that the null hypothesis is rejected. So there is a significant relationship between Buyers Expectation from Builder and Family status of the respondents.
7.1.7. Relationship between Buyers Satisfaction and Demographic factors of respondents

In the case of age, asymmetric significance is found to be .000, which is smaller than the cut off value of .05. This indicates that at a confidence level of 95%, the ANOVA test proves that null hypothesis is rejected. So there is a significant relationship between Buyers Satisfaction and Age of the respondents.

As far as Gender is concerned, asymmetric significance is found to be .000, which is smaller than the cut off value of .05. This indicates that at a confidence level of 95%, the ANOVA test proves that null hypothesis is rejected. So there is a significant relationship between Buyers Satisfaction and Gender of the respondents.

In the ANOVA test, conducted for Educational Qualification, asymmetric significance is found to be .000, which is smaller than the cut off value of .05. This indicates that at a confidence level of 95%, the ANOVA test proves that null hypothesis is rejected. So there is a significant relationship between Buyers Satisfaction and Educational Qualification of the respondents.

In the result of Employment status, asymmetric significance is found to be .000, which is smaller than the cut off value of .05. This indicates that at a confidence level of 95%, the ANOVA test proves that null hypothesis is rejected. So there is a significant relationship between Buyers Satisfaction and Employment status of the respondents.

Assessing the result of Gross income, asymmetric significance is found to be .000, which is smaller than the cut off value of .05. This indicates that at a confidence level of 95%, the ANOVA test proves that null hypothesis is rejected. So there is a significant relationship between Buyers Satisfaction and Gross income of the respondents.

In the ANOVA test conducted for Family status, asymmetric significance is found to be .000, which is smaller than the cut off value of .05. This indicates that at a confidence level of 95%, the ANOVA test proves that the null hypothesis is rejected. So there is a significant relationship between Buyers Satisfaction and Family status of the respondents.
FINDINGS - VILLA

7.2 Findings related to Villa

7.2.1. Respondents Profile

1. Out of the total 150 respondents from Villa 35 (23.3%) were from Southern region, 88 (58.67%) were from Central region and 27 (18.00%) were from Northern region.

2. 6 respondents from Panchayat, 82 were from Municipality and 62 were from Corporation.

3. Out of 150 respondents from villas, 94 (62.7%) were in the age group ‘below 40’, 45 (30%) were in the age group ‘40 to 60’ and 11 (7.3%) were in the age group ‘above 60 years’.

4. In the case of Villas, male respondents were 90 (60%) and female respondents were 60 (40%).

5. Among the Villa respondents, 2.7% were ‘Below Graduates’, 45.3.0% were ‘Graduates’, 47.3% were ‘Post graduates’ and 4.7% were in the group ‘others’.

6. In the case of villa, it was found that 13 (8.7%) of the respondents were working in Government sector, 22 (14.7%) respondents were in Private Sector (MNC with foreign holdings), 23 (15.3%) were doing Business, 46 (30.7%) were in Private sector (Indian companies), 73 (14.0) were NRIs and 25 (16.6%) belonged to the group ‘others’.

7. 38 (25.33%) respondents have monthly income ‘below Rs. 25000’. 48 (32%) respondents were in the category of Rs. 25001 – 50,000, 31 (20.67%) respondents were in the category of 50,000 – 1,00,000, 29 (19.3%) respondents were in the category of 1,00,000- 5,00,000 and 4 (2.7%) respondents were in the category of ‘above Rs. 5,00,000’

8. 32 (21.3%) respondents were ‘Young Singles (Young single people not living at home)’, 10(6.7%) respondents were in the category of ‘Newly Married Couples (Young, no children)’, 45 (30%) were ‘Married (youngest
child under six years of age’), 36 (24%) were ‘Married (Youngest child six or above)’, 16 (10.7%) were ‘Older married couples with dependent children’, 3 (2%) were ‘Older married couples without dependent children’, 4 (2.7%) were ‘Married, No Kids’ and 4 (2.7%) were ‘Older Singles’.

9. 13.33% was ‘Below Graduates’, 52.67% was ‘Graduates’, 33.33% was ‘Post graduate’ and 0.67% belong to the category ‘others’.

10. 46.0% was ‘House wife’, 5.33% was ‘Government service’, 41.34% was ‘Private sector’, 6% was doing ‘Business’ and 1.33% belong to the category ‘others’.

11. 20 (13.3%) respondents were living alone, 94 (62.7%) respondents were living with spouse, 21 (14%) were living with close relatives, 8 (5.3%) were living with an unrelated person and 7 (4.7%) belonged to the group ‘others’.

7.2.2. **Factors Influencing buying Decision and Buyer Preferences**

12. 15 (10.0%) out of 150 mentioned that location decision taken by themselves. 84 (56.0%) consumers commented that they took location decision jointly in consultation with their spouse. 41 (27.33%) opined that they took location decision in consultation with their parents. 10 (6.67%) agreed that their location decision came out after consultation with relatives/ friends/ consultants.

13. 15 (10.0%) said that type of building decision taken by themselves. 86 (57.33%) consumers opined that they are took decision about type of building, jointly in consultation with their spouse. 36 (24.0%) opined that they took decision about type of building in consultation with their parents. 13 (8.67%) said that their type of building decision came out after consultation with relatives/friends/ Consultants.

14. 22 (14.67%) opined that the decision about total Sq. ft area was taken by themselves. 80 (53.33%) consumers commented that they took the decision jointly in consultation with their spouse. 36 (24.0%) opined that they took the decision in consultation with their parents. 12 (8.0%) said that their
decision regarding total Sq. ft area came out after consultation with relatives/friends/Consultants.

15. 14 (9.33%) opined that the decision about Budget was taken by themselves. 81 (54.0%) consumers commented that they took the decision jointly in consultation with their spouse. 46 (30.67%) opined that they took the decision in consultation with their parents. 9 (6.0%) said that their decision regarding Budget came out after consultation with relatives/friends/Consultants.

16. 21 (14.0%) opined that the decision about Funding Agency was taken by themselves. 70 (46.67%) consumers commented that they took the decision jointly in consultation with their spouse. 49 (32.67%) opined that they took the decision in consultation with their parents. 10 (6.66%) said that their decision regarding Funding Agency came out after consultation with relatives/friends/Consultants.

17. 30 (20.0%) respondents opined that the decision about Number of bedrooms was taken by themselves. 88 (58.67%) respondents commented that they took the decision jointly in consultation with their spouse. 31 (20.67%) opined that they took the decision in consultation with their parents. 1 (0.66%) respondent said that his decision regarding Number of bedrooms came out after consultation with relatives/friends/Consultants.

18. 21 (14.0%) respondents opined that the decision about Vasthu was taken by themselves. 54 (36.0%) consumers commented that they took the decision jointly in consultation with their spouse. 37 (24.67%) opined that they took the decision in consultation with their parents. 38 (25.33%) said that their decision regarding Vasthu came out after consultation with relatives/friends/Consultants.

19. Out of the 150 Villa consumers 89 (59.3%) gave importance to religious aspects. While 15 (10%) were neutral, 46 (30.7%) consumers do not give any importance to this aspect while selecting Villas.
20. 121 (80.7%) opined that regional preference is important in their decision making. 17 (11.3%) opted a neutral stand. 12 (8%) gave no importance to this aspect.

21. 110 (73.3%) opined that expression of individuality while purchasing is important to them. On the other hand 19 (12.7%) opted neutral position. Remaining 21 (14%) gave no importance to individuality concept.

22. 104 (69.3%) out of 150 buyers of Villa said that family tradition aspect is important in their purchasing decision. Another 17 (11.3%) has no opinion in this aspect. Yet another 29 (19.3%) considered it as an unimportant factor.

23. 11 (7.3%) of them said that they got the information from brochure, 13 (8.7%) got the information from sales person, 62 (41.3%) got information from friends/colleagues, 16 (10.7%) got information from family, 23 (15.3%) collected information from advertisements, 10 (6.7%) received information from websites, 14 (9.3%) got information from real estate brokers and 1 (0.7%) got information from sources other than those mentioned above.

24. 109 (72.7%) said that they have purchased Villa for the first time in their life’s. 29 (19.3%) said that they purchased for the second time. 12 (8%) said that they have purchased thrice or more than that.

25. Out of 150 respondents from Villas 53 (35.3%) persons stated that they have shifted their house once in last ten years. For 50 (33.3%) there were two moves in last ten years, for 34 (22.7%) there were three to four moves in last ten years. Finally 13 (8.7%) respondents said that they have shifted their house five or more number of times during the last ten years.

26. It was found that 85 (56.7%) out of 150 buyers of Villa were not in receipt of any financial aid from their parents. On the other hand 65 (43.3%) agreed that they have availed the financial support from their parents.

27. In the case of 26 (17.3%) buyers of Villa their parents owned house within the last five years. 18 (12%) stated that their parents purchased house within the period between five to ten years. 49 (32.7%) respondents stated that their
28. For 14 (9.3%) respondents, it was the feeling of independent living that influenced their purchasing of Villa. 12 (8%) stated that feeling of community living prompted them to prefer Villas. 76 (50.7%) stated that ownership of land attracted them. Remaining 48 (32%) agreed that the feeling of secured investment motivated their preference.

29. For 21 (14.0%) respondents, eco-friendly atmosphere was the most attractive feature in the selection of villa. 66 (44.0%) stated that direct contact with land attracted them. Remaining 63 (42.0%) agreed that feeling of traditional home concept attracted their preference.

30. For (48%) of respondents, budget for Villa was 50 – 75 lakhs. For (38.7%) budget was 75 Lakhs -1Crore, for 7.3% of respondents budget was 25 – 50 Lakhs, 4.7% respondents budget was above one Crore and for 1.3% respondents budget was Less than 25 Lakhs for purchase a Villa.

31. In terms of Size, majority of the respondents of Villa prefer (41.3%) prefer 1500- 2000 Square feet. 32.0% of respondents prefer 900 -1500 Sft. 8.7% prefer 2000 – 2500 Sft, 8% prefer 2500 -3000 Sft and 3.3% prefer 3000Sft above. Also, there is a demand for smaller Villa (6.7%).

32. 47 (31.3%) respondents took one to three months for making Villa purchase decision. 40 (26.7%) spent 3 to 6 months, 34 (22.7%) spent 6 to 9 month, 15 (10%) spent 9 to 12 months, 14 (9.3%) spent 12 months and above for searching and finalization of Villa purchase decision making process.

33. 97 (64.7%) respondents considered 1 to five projects before making the final decision. 42 (28%) considered 6 to ten projects. 6 (4%) compared 11 to 15 projects. Finally 5 (3.2%) considered 16 to 20 projects.

7.2.3. Opinion of Buyers of Villa

34. Since the mean values of dwelling unit features such as ‘Square ft. area of building’ ‘Availability of space allotted for each room’, ‘Arrangement of rooms’, ‘Size and location of rooms’, ‘The privacy with in your house’,
‘Space for children to study’, ‘Availability of storage room’, ‘Size of windows’ and ‘Number of floors’ are above four the respondents have strong agreement with these factors. Hence these are highly important dwelling unit features preferred by the respondents. For factors such as ‘Space for prayer room’ and ‘Over all Vasthu aspects’ the mean values are between three and four. Hence these features are also important.

35. The mean values of dwelling unit support services such as ‘Garbage collection’, ‘Cleanliness of drain’, ‘Total environment Clea

liness’ ‘Car/ Motorcycle parking’ ‘Play area’ ‘Perimeter road’ ‘Home insurance’, ‘Rain water harvesting’ and ‘Installation of CC TV’ are above four. Hence the respondents have strong agreement with these factors. These are relatively very important dwelling unit support services preferred by the respondents.


36. The mean values in respect of Social environment factors such as ‘Air quality’, ‘Round the clock security’, ‘Fire and Safety measures’, ‘Noise level’, ‘Location away from Industrial area’ and ‘Alarm system’ are above four. The respondents have strong agreement with these factors. Hence, all the factors considered under social environment are very important and preferred by the respondents.

37. The mean values with regard to Neighborhood facilities such as ‘Location near to schools/ Colleges’, ‘Location near to town centre’, ‘Location near to Hospital’, ‘Location near to public transportation services’, ‘Location near to Market’ and ‘Location near to place of worship’ are above four. Hence the respondents have strong agreement with these factors. Accordingly these are relatively very important Neighborhood facilities preferred by the
respondents. For the factor ‘Location near to police station’ the mean value is between three and four. It can be inferred that compared to other factors, this factor is slightly less important for the respondents.

38. Since the mean values of Documentation factors such as ‘Obtaining layout permission’, ‘Basic infrastructure facility’, ‘No objection certificates’, ‘building plan’ and ‘Work permit from Revenue Authorities’ are above four, the respondents have strong agreement with these factors. Hence it can be inferred that all the factors considered under ‘Documentation’ are very important for the respondents.

39. The mean values of factors with regard to Builders reputation such as ‘Meeting project timelines’, ‘Reliability & Integrity’, ‘Communicating project status’, ‘Commitment to quality’, ‘After sales support’, ‘Understanding customer needs’, ‘Program and project management skills’ and ‘Availability of resources’ are above four. Hence the respondents have strong agreement with these factors. These are very important factors related to Builders reputation preferred by the respondents. For ‘Global presence’ the mean value is 3.90. Hence this factor is also important for the respondents.

40. The mean values of factors related to Builders management procedures such as ‘Establishment & maintenance of Garbage collection system’, ‘Management response to construction defect (Detected after purchase)’, ‘Handling of Residents’ complaints’ and ‘Furnishing provided by the management on request’ are above four. Hence the respondents have strong agreement with these factors. Therefore these are relatively very important factors related to Builders management procedures, preferred by the respondents.

41. The mean values of factors related to Builders sales person’s characteristics such as ‘Confidentiality’, ‘Have a great deal of product knowledge (both of their own and competitive product)’, ‘Have a great deal of market knowledge’, ‘Can manage themselves well (Time management, Punctuality, Priority setting etc)’, ‘Know and Understand their customers very well’,
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‘Sales person Characteristics - Knowledge and Expertise’, ‘Flexibility’, ‘Friendliness’, ‘Commitment’, ‘Responsiveness’, ‘Experience’ and ‘Good interpersonal and Communication skills’ are above four. Hence the respondents have strong agreement with these factors. Therefore these are relatively very important factors related to Builders sales person characteristics preferred by the respondents.

42. The mean values of factors connected with consumer brand preference such as ‘Builders market position’, ‘Popularity of the brand’, ‘Integrity of the builder’ and ‘Attractiveness of the brand’ are above four. Hence the respondents have strong agreement with these factors. These are relatively very important factors with regard to consumer brand preference. For factors such as ‘Recommendation to others’, ‘Brand loyalty’ and ‘Brand reference’ the mean values are between three and four. Hence these features are slightly less important.

43. The mean values of factors such as ‘Package adds value to product’, ‘Attractive package influences buying decision positively’ and ‘Package misleads buyers’ are between three and four. Hence these factors are important.

44. Since the mean values of promotional scheme related to the purchase of Villa such as ‘Credit facility’ and ‘Discounts’ are between three and four, these factors are important. For ‘Free gifts’, the mean value is less than three. Hence this factor is unimportant.

45. The mean values of factors related to advertisement/brochure settings such as ‘Design & layout’ ‘Green life style’ and ‘Natural environment’ are above four and the respondents have strong agreement with these factors. Hence these are relatively very important factors related to advertisement/brochure settings preferred by the respondents. For ‘Imaginary/Artificial environment’, the mean value is between three and four. Hence this factor is also important.

46. The mean values in respect of Advertisement presenter such as ‘Expert’ ‘Normal people’ and ‘Company person and, Celebrity’ are rated in between
three and four. The respondents have agreement with these factors. Hence these are relatively important factors preferred by the respondents. For factors such as ‘Cartoon’ ‘No presenter’ and ‘Animals’ the mean values are less than three. Therefore these factors are unimportant.

47. Since the mean values of consumer expectation about Company identification marks such as ‘Green awards’ are four and above, the respondents have strong agreement with these factors. As such these are relatively very important company identification mark settings preferred by the respondents. For the factors such as ‘Environmental slogan’ and ‘Green logo type’ mean values are between three and four. Hence these factors are also important.

48. Since the mean values of factors related to ‘Consumer expectation about Web sites design such as ‘Updating’, ‘Reliability of information’, ‘Design & Layout’, ‘Comprehensiveness’ and ‘Appealing’ are four and above, the respondents have strong agreement with these factors. Hence these are relatively very important Web sites design factors preferred by the respondents.

49. The mean values for the factors ‘not purchasing villa due to hike in price’ and ‘not purchasing villa due to uncertainty of employment’ are between three and four. Hence respondents agreed that these factors are important in the purchase of villas.

50. The mean values for the factors, ‘Level of pollution in the neighborhood’, ‘Materials used for the construction’ and ‘Eco-friendly construction concept’ are four and above. The respondents strongly agreed with these factors. Hence these are relatively very important Technological environment factors preferred by the respondents. For factors such as ‘International Architectural standards’ ‘Theme based homes’ mean values are between three and four. Hence respondents agreed that these factors are important.

51. The mean value in respect of factors such as ‘Levels of crime in the neighborhood’ ‘Unethical practice of trade unions’ ‘Communal forces within the society’ ‘Programmes related to housing in media/channels’ are between
three and four. Hence respondents agreed that these factors are important. Since the mean value of the ‘Ideologies of the political parties’ is less than three, respondents disagreed with this factor and hence unimportant.

52. The mean values of Legal environment factors like ‘The prevailing statutory norms’ and ‘The Rules & Regulations’ are between three and four. Hence respondents agreed that these factors are important in the purchase of Villas.

53. The mean values of factors ‘Vasthu concept’ and ‘Rich customary tradition followed in the region’ are between three and four. Hence respondents agreed that these factors are important in the purchase of Villas.

54. The mean value for ‘joint decision by husband and wife’ is above 4. Hence it is highly agreed by the respondents. For factors such as ‘main earner making decision’, ‘children plays important role’ and ‘husband making decision’, mean values are between three and four. Hence respondents agreed with these factors. Since the mean value for the factor ‘wife alone making decision’ is less than three, respondents disagreed with this factor.

55. Respondents strongly agreed to the factors ‘preferred Location close to work place’ and the mean value is above four. This was followed by ‘location close to own family’ (mean value 3.59), ‘location close to relatives and friends’ (mean value 3.44) and ‘location close to spouse’s family’ (mean value 3.23). Hence respondents agreed that these factors are also important in the purchase of Villas.

56. For all these factors considered under the variable ‘involvement’, mean values are above four. Hence respondents strongly agreed to the factors such as ‘conducting personal visit before purchase’, ‘conducting detailed market enquiry’ and ‘consulting friends’.

57. Factors such as ‘Family status’ have great influence in purchase decision making and are strongly agreed by the respondents with mean values above four. For the factors, ‘Inner concepts’ and factor ‘purchase not made in accordance with the heart feeling’ mean values are in between three and four. Hence respondents agreed for this factor also.
58. Respondents made purchase decision after conducting comparative analysis with other projects. The mean value of this factor is above four. Hence respondents strongly agreed that this factor is very important. Information available in the brochure and other sources are also taken into account by consumers. For this factor the mean value is between three and four. Respondents agreed that this factor is also important in buying a Villa.

59. For the factors ‘Availability of all modern amenities’, ‘Social status’, ‘Association with people of equal status’ and ‘Inner harmony’ the mean values are between three and four. Hence respondents agreed that all these factors are important in motivating them to buy a Villa.

60. Personality is closely associated with one’s lifestyle. Self-image will also be reflected in the purchase decision. Also it is important that the individuality will reflect in any purchase decision. Mean values for all these factors are between three and four. Hence respondents agreed that these factors are important in buying a Villa.

61. Purchase of a Villa is for the satisfaction of one’s personal needs and it is not an attempt to make an impression on other people. Since mean values of this factor is above four, respondents strongly agreed that it is very important in buying of Villa. A Villa make life more comfortable. Factors such as ‘making life comfortable/convenient’, ‘knowing who will buy from certain builders’, ‘free offers’, ‘making impression on others’ and ‘paying attention to what others buy’ have mean value between three and four. Hence respondents agreed that these factors are important.

62. Respondents tried to develop an image based on the things they acquire. The mean value of this factor is 3.77. The concept of community living and the materialization of are also important for the respondents. Since the mean values are between three and four, all the factors are agreed by the respondents and are important.

63. The mean values of the factors Purchase decision ‘often taken after thinking about the future’ and ‘Wanted to be different from the crowd’ are above four.
Hence the respondents strongly agreed to these factors and are very important for them.

64. While making purchase a Villa, Project plan that matches with one’s expectation is a very important factor. This feature is strongly agreeable to respondents and the mean value is above four. Mean values of factors such as ‘Information from E – brochure’ ‘Uniqueness of the Villa’ and ‘Promotional activities offered by the builder’ are between three and four. Hence respondents agreed to these factors and are important for them.

65. The mean values of factors such as time pressure due to ‘busy life style’ and ‘difficulty to construct a house in international architectural standards within a short period’ are between three and four. Hence respondents agreed to these factors are important in the buying of Villas.

66. Perception related factors such as ‘Product uniqueness’, ‘Value for money’, ‘Availability of apartment from preferred builder’, ‘Affordable price’, ‘Uncertainty in the market’, ‘Competitive rate’, ‘Quality linked with price’, ‘Availability within the time limit’ and ‘Status symbol’ have mean values between three and four. Hence these factors are agreeable to respondents and are perceived to be important.

67. The mean values of factors such as ‘Timely handing over of Villa’, ‘Substandard fittings and raw materials’, ‘Financial risk’, ‘Legal formalities’, ‘Breach of contractual agreement by the developer’, ‘Allotment as per scheduled chart’, and ‘Incurring periodical additional expenditure for the maintenance’ are above four and influenced the purchase decision. Respondents strongly agreed to these factors and are very important risk factors. ‘Lack of sufficient time for the construction’, ‘Psychological risk’, ‘Urgency arising out of transfer’, ‘Deviation from the traditional life style’ have mean values between three and four. Hence these factors also important for the respondents.

68. Out of 600 buyers of Villas, 136 (90.7%) viewed purchase of Villa as an investment. But 14 (9.3%) not viewed it as an investment.
69. For 45.33% respondents, the most important reason for viewing purchase of an Apartment as investment is ‘Long term investment’, for 26.67% the reason is ‘Income from rent’, for 12.67% it is ‘Anticipated income after retirement’ and for 15.33% it is ‘Reducing taxable income.

70. The mean values of factors such as ‘Expectation about future economic conditions’, ‘Current and expected real disposable income’, ‘Mortgage interest rate in comparison with competitor’ are above four. Hence respondents strongly agreed with these factors and are very important. ‘Low EMI’, ‘Longer delivery period’, ‘Company ensuring financing source’, ‘Schedule of payment’ and ‘Long term payment’ have mean values between three and four. Hence respondents agreed with these factors are important.

71. ‘Security problems’, ‘Desire to own Villa’, ‘Availability of central water supply and sewage system’, ‘Location near to Educational institution/Shopping area/Transportation facilities/Hospitals’, have mean values above four. Hence respondents have strong agreement with these factors and are very important. For factors such as ‘Gives feeling of community living’, ‘Allows for entertainment and sociability’, ‘Buying is less expensive than Renting’, ‘Earlier contact with Area’, ‘Provides good return on money invested’, ‘More living space and room for children’, ‘Change in respondent’s job location’, ‘Better Privacy than traditional house’, ‘Greater privacy from neighbour’s’, ‘Change of job location of other family member’ have mean values between three and four. So these factors are relatively important. For factors such as ‘Infrastructure problems with previous housing’, ‘Expansion of family’, ‘Different background of neighbours in previous’, ‘Children should not brought up in rented House’ have mean values below two. Therefore these are unimportant.

72. Respondents are highly satisfied with the dwelling unit features such as ‘Arrangement of rooms’, ‘Air circulation of building’ and ‘Number & level of socket’. They are moderately satisfied with ‘Garbage line’ and ‘Clothes line facilities’.
73. Respondents have higher level of satisfaction on ‘Safety of building’ with a mean score of 4.09, followed by ‘Garbage disposal’ with a mean score of 3.92 and ‘Water supply’ was ranked with a score of 3.92. The lowest value was obtained for ‘Maintenance of centralized cooking gas distribution facility’ with a score of 3.46.

74. The respondents have highest level of satisfaction on ‘Accessibility to Educational institutions’ with a mean score of 4.28, followed by ‘Accessibility to Clinic/hospital’ with a mean score of 4.22, ‘Accessibility to Public transport’ with a score of 4.21. The lowest value was obtained for ‘Accessibility to Community hall’, with a score of 3.70.

75. ‘Location’ with mean value of 4.19 is the factor on which respondents are highly satisfied which followed by ‘Windows and doors’ with a mean score of 4.13 and ‘Electrification’ with a score of 4.09. The lowest rank was given to Pests and rat control, with a score of 3.69.

76. Respondents are satisfied on factors such as ‘No writing on Walls’, ‘people not consuming alcohol in public’, ‘No Drug dealers or drug users, No disturbing noise and No Gangs.

I Correlation Analysis – Buyers expectation about Villa and External factors

1. There is a possible correlation between Economic environment factors and Dwelling unit features (.099), Dwelling unit support services (.005) and Neighbourhood facilities (.126) but they are not statistically significant. Economic environment is negatively related to Social environment (-.024) but not statistically significant.

2. Technological environment factors are positively correlated with the four components of buyer’s expectation about villas- Dwelling unit features (.326), Dwelling unit support services (.341), Social environment (.249), Neighbourhood facilities (.414). The correlation analysis also reveals that the correlations are significant at 1% level of significance and the strength of the association between Technological environment factors and the four component of buyer’s expectation about villa are very strong.
3. Political environment factors are positively correlated with Dwelling unit features (.177), Dwelling unit support services (.250) and Neighbourhood facilities (.236). Also, Political environment is negatively related to Social environment (-.015). The correlation of Political environment with Dwelling unit features, Dwelling unit support services and Neighbourhood facilities are significant at 5% level of significance and other correlations are not statistically significant.

4. Legal environment factors are positively correlated with Dwelling unit support services (.058) and Social environment (.088). Legal environment is negatively correlated with Dwelling unit features (-.024), and Neighbourhood facilities (-.056) but these correlations are not significant.

5. Beliefs and Traditions are positively correlated with the three components of buyer’s expectation about villa - Dwelling unit features (.213), Dwelling unit support services (.221), and Neighbourhood facilities (.276). The correlation analysis also reveals that the association is significant at 1% level of significance and the strength of the association between Beliefs and Traditions and the three component of buyer’s expectation about apartment are very strong. Beliefs and Traditions is negatively related to Social environment (-.012) which is not statistically significant.

6. Family decision making is positively correlated with the four components of buyer’s expectation about Villa - Dwelling unit features (.199), Dwelling unit support services (.420), Social environment (.098) and Neighbourhood facilities (.066). The correlation of Family decision making with Dwelling unit support services is significant at 1% level of significance and other correlations are not statistically significant.

Situational pressure in connection with proximity to relatives and work place is positively correlated with the four components of buyers expectation about villa - Dwelling unit features (.163), Dwelling unit support services (.415), Social environment (.153) and Neighbourhood facilities (.250). The correlation of Situational pressure in connection with proximity to relatives and work place with Dwelling unit support services and Neighbourhood facilities is significant at 1% level of significance.
facilities are significant at 1% level of significance and Dwelling unit features at 5% level of significance. The correlation analysis reveals that the association is significant and the strength of the association between Situational pressure in connection with proximity to relatives and work place and the four components of buyer’s expectation about Villa are strong.

1.1. **Regression analysis - Relationship between Dwelling Unit Features and External Factors.**

The analysis of variance of multiple regression model shows that the model is significant at 1% level of significance. \( F = 3.424, P \text{ value} < 0.01 \) This indicates that at a confidence level of 99%, the ANOVA test proves that null hypothesis is rejected. So there is a significant relationship between Dwelling unit features and External factors.

The Beta values are the standardized coefficients which gives an indication of the relative importance of independent variable on the dependent variables. Thus its shows that among the external environment factors, technological environment and family decision making have a higher level of relationship with Dwelling unit features.

1.2. **Regression analysis - Relationship between Dwelling Unit Support Services and External Factors**

The analysis of variance of multiple regression model shows that the model is significant at 1% level of significance. \( F = 8.416, P \text{ value} < 0.01 \) This indicates that at a confidence level of 99%, the ANOVA test proves that null hypothesis is rejected. So there is a significant relationship between Dwelling unit support services and External factors.

Among the external factors, family decision making, technological environment and situational pressure in connection with proximity to relatives have a higher level of relationship with Dwelling unit support services.
1.3. Regression analysis - Relationship between Social Environment and External Factors.

The analysis of variance of multiple regression model shows that the model is significant at 1% level of significance. \( F = 2.648, P \text{ value} < 0.01 \) This indicates that at a confidence level of 99%, the ANOVA test proves that null hypothesis is rejected. So there is a significant relationship between Social environment and External factors.

Among the external factors, technological environment, legal environment and situational pressure in connection with proximity to relatives have a higher level of relationship with Social environment.

1.4. Regression analysis - Relationship between Neighbourhood facilities and External Factors

The analysis of variance of multiple regression model shows that the model is significant at 1% level of significance. \( F = 5.742, P \text{ value} < 0.01 \) This indicates that at a confidence level of 99%, the ANOVA test proves that null hypothesis is rejected. So there is a significant relationship between Neighbourhood facilities and External factors.

Among the external factors, technological environment and situational pressure in connection with proximity to relatives and have a higher level of relationship with neighbourhood facilities.

II. Correlations- Buyers expectation about Villa and Internal Factors

The results obtained from the Pearson correlation analysis, indicates that Involvement is positively correlated with the four components of buyer’s expectation about Villa - Dwelling unit features (.429), Dwelling unit support services (.362), Social environment (.284), Neighbourhood facilities (.271). The correlation analysis reveals that the correlations are significant at 1% level of significance and the strength of the association between Involvement and the four components of buyer’s expectation about villa are very strong.

Feelings is positively correlated with the four components of buyers expectation about Villa- Dwelling unit features (.351), Dwelling unit support
services (.219), Social environment (.042), Neighbourhood facilities (.334). The correlation of Feelings with Dwelling unit features, Dwelling unit support services and Neighbourhood facilities are significant at 1% level of significance. The correlation analysis reveals that the association is significant and the strength of the association between Feelings and the four components of buyer’s expectation about apartment are strong.

Knowledge is positively correlated with the three components of buyers expectation about Villa - Dwelling unit features (.300), Dwelling unit support services (.233), Neighbourhood facilities (.218). The correlation of Knowledge with Dwelling unit features is significant at 1% level of significance and Dwelling unit support services at 5% level of significance. The correlation analysis reveals that the association is significant and the strength of the association between Knowledge and the three components of buyer’s expectation about apartment are strong. Knowledge is negatively related to social environment (-.035) and not statistically significant.

Motivation is positively correlated with the three components of buyers expectation about Villa - Dwelling unit features (.258), Dwelling unit support services (.321) and Neighbourhood facilities (.354). The correlation analysis reveals that the correlations are significant at 1% level of significance and the strength of the association between Motivation and three component of buyer’s expectation about apartment are very strong. Motivation is negatively related to Social environment (-.044) which is not statistically significant.

Personality is positively correlated with the four components of buyer’s expectation about Villa- Dwelling unit features (.318), Dwelling unit support services (.246), Social environment (.119), Neighbourhood facilities (.347). The correlation of personality with Dwelling unit features and neighbourhood facilities at 1% level of significance and Dwelling unit support services at 5% level of significance.

Attitude is positively correlated with the four components of buyer’s expectation about Villa -Dwelling unit features (.288), Dwelling unit support services (.320), Social environment (.138), Neighbourhood facilities (.261). The correlation of attitude with Dwelling unit features, Dwelling unit support services
and neighbourhood facilities at 1% level of significance and the strength of the association between Attitude and the three component of buyer’s expectation about apartment are very strong.

Values is positively correlated with the four components of buyers expectation about Villa- Dwelling unit features (.320), Dwelling unit support services (.368), Social environment (.049), Neighbourhood facilities (.292). The correlation of Values with Dwelling unit features, Dwelling unit support services and Neighbourhood facilities are significant at 1% level of significance. The correlation analysis reveals that the association is significant and the strength of the association between Values and the four components of buyer’s expectation about apartment are strong.

Taste and Preference is negatively related with Dwelling unit features (-.021), Dwelling unit support services (-.071), Social environment (-.059), and Neighbourhood facilities (-.005) and not statistically significant.

Learning is positively correlated with Social environment (.107) and Neighbourhood facilities (.038) and not statistically significant. Learning is negatively related with Dwelling unit features (-.077) and Dwelling unit support services (-.002) and not statistically significant.

Time pressure is negatively related with Dwelling unit features (-.012), Dwelling unit support services (-.141) and Neighbourhood facilities (-.097) and Social environment (-.152) and not statistically significant.

Perception is positively correlated with Neighbourhood facilities (.061) and not statistically significant. Perception is negatively related with Dwelling unit features (-.047), Dwelling unit support services (-.071) and Social environment (-.022) and not statistically significant.

2.1. Regression analysis - Relationship between Dwelling Unit Features and Internal Factors

The analysis of variance of multiple regression model shows that the model is significant at 1% level of significance. (F = 4.533, P value < 0.01) This indicates that at a confidence level of 99%, the ANOVA test proves that null hypothesis is
rejected. So there is a significant relationship between Dwelling unit features and External factors.

Among the internal factors, involvement, knowledge and feelings have a higher level of relationship with Dwelling unit features.

2.2. Regression analysis - Relationship between Dwelling Unit Support Services and Internal Factors

The analysis of variance of multiple regression model shows that the model is significant at 1% level of significance. (F = 4.229, P value < 0.01) This indicates that at a confidence level of 99%, the ANOVA test proves that null hypothesis is rejected. So there is a significant relationship between Dwelling unit support services and Internal factors.

Among the internal factors, involvement, values and learning have a higher level of relationship with Dwelling unit support services.

2.3. Regression analysis - Relationship between Social Environment and Internal Factors

The analysis of variance of multiple regression model shows that the model is significant at 1% level of significance. (F = 2.722, P value < 0.01) This indicates that at a confidence level of 99%, the ANOVA test proves that null hypothesis is rejected. So there is a significant relationship between Social environment and Internal factors.

Among the internal factors, involvement, learning and attitude have a higher level of relationship with Social environment.

2.4. Regression analysis - Relationship between Neighbourhood Facilities and Internal Factors

The analysis of variance of multiple regression model shows that the model is significant at 1% level of significance. (F = 3.795, P value < 0.01) This indicates that at a confidence level of 99%, the ANOVA test proves that null hypothesis is rejected. So there is a significant relationship between Neighbourhood facilities and Internal factors.
Among the internal factors, involvement, feelings and learning have a higher level of relationship with Neighbourhood facilities.

III. **Correlations- Buyers expectation From Builder and External Factors**

Economic environment is positively correlated with Documentation (0.024) and Builders reputation (0.032) Management procedure (0.053) and Builders sales promotional activities (0.156) and not statistically significant.

Technological environment is positively correlated with the four components of buyers expectation from builder- Documentation (0.253), Builders reputation (0.414), Management procedure (0.373), Sales promotional activities (0.541). The correlation analysis also reveals that the correlations are significant at 1% level of significance and the strength of the association between Technological environment and the four component of buyer’s expectation from builder are very strong.

Political environment is positively correlated with Builders reputation (0.043), Management procedure (0.103) and Sales promotional activities (0.306). The correlation of political environment with builders sales promotional activities is significant at 1% level of significance, Also Political environment is negatively related with Documentation (-0.029) and not statistically significant.

Legal environment is positively correlated with Builders reputation (0.030) and Management procedure (0.059). But these correlations are not significant. Legal environment is negatively related with Documentation (-0.026) and Sales promotional activities (-0.129) and not statistically significant.

Beliefs and Traditions is positively correlated with Documentation (0.003), Builders reputation (0.064), Management procedure (0.088) and Sales promotional activities (0.320). The correlation of Beliefs and Traditions with builders sales promotional activities is significant at 1% level of significance.

Family decision making is positively correlated with Documentation (0.109), Builders reputation (0.202), Management procedure (0.169), and Sales promotional activities (0.390). The correlation of Family decision making with builders sales promotional activities is significant at 1% level of significance.
Situational pressure in connection with proximity to relatives and work place is positively correlated with Documentation (.095), Builders reputation (.200), Management procedure (.196), and Sales promotional activities (.440). The correlation of Situational pressure in connection with proximity to relatives and work place with builders sales promotional activities is significant at 1% level of significance.

3.1. **Regression analysis -Relationship between Documentation and External Factors**

The analysis of variance of multiple regression model shows that the model is significant at 5% level of significance. (F = 2.198, P value < 0.05) This indicates that at a confidence level of 95%, the ANOVA test proves that null hypothesis is rejected. So there is a significant relationship between Documentation and External factors.

Among the external environment factors, technological environment and family decision making have higher levels of relationship with Documentation.

3.2. **Regression analysis -Relationship between Builders Reputation and External Factors**

The analysis of variance of multiple regression model shows that the model is significant at 1% level of significance. (F = 6.091, P value < 0.01) This indicates that at a confidence level of 99%, the ANOVA test proves that null hypothesis is rejected. So there is a significant relationship between Builders Reputation and External factors.

Among the external factors, technological environment and Family decision making have higher level of relationship with Builders Reputation.

3.3. **Regression analysis -Relationship between Management Procedures and External Factors**

The analysis of variance of multiple regression model shows that the model is significant at 1% level of significance. (F = 4.291, P value < 0.01) This indicates that at a confidence level of 99%, the ANOVA test proves that null hypothesis is
rejected. So there is a significant relationship between Management Procedures and External factors.

Among the external factors, technological environment, family decision making and legal environment have a higher level of relationship with Management Procedures.

3.4. Regression analysis - Relationship between Builders Sales Promotional Activities and External Factors

The analysis of variance of multiple regression model shows that the model is significant at 1% level of significance. (F = 15.303, P value < 0.01) This indicates that at a confidence level of 99%, the ANOVA test proves that null hypothesis is rejected. So there is a significant relationship between Builders sales promotional activities and External factors.

Among the external factors, technological environment, family decision making and situational pressure in connection with proximity to relatives have a higher level of relationship with Builders sales promotional activities.

IV. Correlations- Buyers Expectation from Builder and Internal Factors

Involvement is positively correlated with the four components of buyer’s expectation from Builder - Documentation (.412), Builders Reputation (.416), Management Procedures (.397), and Sales Promotional Activities (.488). The correlation analysis reveals that the correlations are significant at 1% level of significance and the strength of the association between Involvement and the four component of buyer’s expectation from builders are very strong.

Feelings is positively correlated with the four components of buyers expectation from Builder - Documentation (.208), Builders Reputation (.248), Management Procedures (.100), Sales Promotional Activities (.498). The correlation of feelings with Builders reputation and Builders sales promotional activities are significant at 1% level of significance.

Knowledge is positively correlated with the four components of buyers expectation from Builder - Documentation (.028), Builders Reputation (.122), Management Procedures (.155), Sales Promotional Activities (.419) The correlation
of Knowledge with Builders sales promotional activities are significant at 1% level of significance.

Motivation is positively correlated with Builders Reputation (.146), Management Procedures (.085), and Builders sales promotional activities (.515). The correlation of Knowledge with Builders sales promotional activities is significant at 1% level of significance. Motivation is negatively related with Documentation (-.007) and not statistically significant.

Personality is positively correlated with the four components of buyer’s expectation from Builder - Documentation (.136), Builders Reputation (.242), Management Procedures (.209), Sales Promotional Activities (.603). The correlation of personality with Builders sales promotional activities is significant at 1% level of significance.

Attitude is positively correlated with the four components of buyer’s expectation from Builder Documentation (.110), Builders Reputation (.249), Management Procedures (.266), Sales Promotional Activities (.525). The correlation of attitude with Management procedures and Builders sales promotional activities are significant at 1% level of significance and Builders reputation at 5% level of significance.

Values is positively correlated with the four components of buyers expectation from Builder - Documentation (.169), Builders Reputation (.288), Management Procedures (.158), Sales Promotional Activities (.628). The correlation of Values with Builders reputation and Builders sales promotional activities are significant at 1% level of significance. The correlation analysis reveals that the association is significant and the strength of the association between Values and the four components of buyer’s expectation from builder are strong.

Taste and Preference is negatively correlated with the four components of buyers expectation from Builder - Documentation (-.096), Builders Reputation (-.062), Management Procedures (-.077), Sales Promotional Activities (-.039) and not statistically significant.
Learning is positively correlated with Documentation (.042) and Management Procedures (.026) and not statistically significant. Learning is negatively related with Builders Reputation (-.048) and Builders sales promotional activities (-.102) and not statistically significant.

Time Pressure is negatively correlated with Documentation (-.042), Builders Reputation (-.075) Management Procedures (.045) and Builders sales promotional activities (-.129) and not statistically significant.

Perception is negatively correlated with the four components of buyers expectation from Builder - Documentation (-.034), Builders Reputation (-.098), Management Procedures (-.052), Sales Promotional Activities (-.108) and not statistically significant.

4.1. **Regression analysis - Relationship between Documentation and Internal Factors**

The analysis of variance of multiple regression model shows that the model is significant at 1% level of significance. (F = 3.993, P value < 0.01) This indicates that at a confidence level of 99%, the ANOVA test proves that null hypothesis is rejected. So there is a significant relationship between Documentation and Internal factors.

Among the internal factors, involvement, feelings and learning have a higher level of relationship with Documentation.

4.2. **Regression analysis - Relationship between Builders Reputation and Internal Factors**

The analysis of variance of multiple regression model shows that the model is significant at 1% level of significance. (F = 3.505, P value < 0.01) This indicates that at a confidence level of 99%, the ANOVA test proves that null hypothesis is rejected. So there is a significant relationship between Builders Reputation and Internal factors.

Among the internal factors, involvement, feelings and values have a higher level of relationship with Builders Reputation.
4.3. **Regression analysis - Relationship between Management Procedures and Internal Factors**

The analysis of variance of multiple regression model shows that the model is significant at 1% level of significance. \( F = 9.838, P \text{ value} < 0.01 \) This indicates that at a confidence level of 99%, the ANOVA test proves that null hypothesis is rejected. So there is a significant relationship between Management Procedures and Internal factors.

Among the internal factors involvement, attitude and learning have a higher level of relationship with Management procedures.

4.4. **Regression analysis - Relationship between Builders Sales promotional Activities and Internal Factors**

The analysis of variance of multiple regression model shows that the model is significant at 1% level of significance. \( F = 15.87, P \text{ value} < 0.01 \) This indicates that at a confidence level of 99%, the ANOVA test proves that null hypothesis is rejected. So there is a significant relationship between Builders Sales Promotional Activities and Internal factors.

Among the internal factors, involvement, values and personality have a higher level of relationship with Builders sales promotional activities.

V. **Correlations - Buyer Objectives and Buyers expectation about Villa**

Buyer Objectives is positively correlated with the four components of buyers expectation about Villa Dwelling unit features (.220), Dwelling unit support services (.302), Social environment (.013), Neighbourhood facilities (.332). The correlation of Buyer Objectives with Dwelling unit features, Dwelling unit support services and Neighbourhood facilities are significant at 1% level of significance. The correlation analysis also reveals that the association is significant and the strength of the association between Buyer Objectives and the four components of buyer’s expectation about apartment are strong.

5.1. **Regression - Buyer Objectives and Buyers Expectation about Villa**

The analysis of variance of multiple regression model shows that the model is significant at 1% level of significance. \( F = 8.510, P \text{ value} < 0.01 \) This indicates
that at a confidence level of 99%, the ANOVA test proves that null hypothesis is rejected. So there is a significant relationship between Buyer Objectives and buyer’s expectation about Villa.

Among the Buyers expectation about Villa factors Dwelling unit support services and Neighbourhood facilities have a higher level of relationship with Buyer Objectives.

VI.  Correlations- Buyer Objectives and Buyers expectation From Builder

Reason for Buying is positively correlated with the four components of buyers expectation from builder [Documentation (.027), Builders reputation (.120), Management procedure (.132), Sales promotional activities (.410). The correlations of Reason for buying with Builders sales promotional activities are significant at 1% level of significance.

6.1.  Regression- Buyer Objectives and Buyers expectation From Builder

The analysis of variance of multiple regression model shows that the model is significant at 1% level of significance. (F = 8.745, P value < 0.01) This indicates that at a confidence level of 99%, the ANOVA test proves that null hypothesis is rejected. So there is a significant relationship between Reason for buying and buyer’s expectation from builder.

Among the Buyers expectation from builder, factors such as Builders sales promotional activities and Management procedures have a higher level of relationship with buyer objectives.

VII.  Correlation Analysis- PIVR Factors and Buyer Objectives

Buyer Objectives is positively correlated with the three components of PIVR - Vasthu (.169), Construction related risk (.138), Price & Investment (.366). The correlation of Buyer Objectives with price & investment is significant at 1% level of significance.

7.1.  Regression- Buyer Objectives and PIVR factors

The analysis of variance of multiple regression model shows that the model is significant at 1% level of significance. (F = 8.200, P value < 0.01) This indicates...
that at a confidence level of 99%, the ANOVA test proves that null hypothesis is rejected. So there is a significant relationship between Buyer Objectives and PIVR factors.

Among the PIVR factors, Price & Investment, Vasthu and Construction related risk have a higher level of relationship with Buyer Objectives.

VIII. **Correlation Analysis- Buying Decision and Buyer Objectives**

Buying decision is positively correlated with Buyer objectives (.403). The correlation analysis also reveals that the correlations are significant at 1% level of significance and the strength of the association between buying decision and Buyer objectives about Villa are very strong.

8.1. **Regression- Buying decision and Buyer Objectives**

The analysis of variance of multiple regression model shows that the model is significant at 1% level of significance. (F = 28.613, P value < 0.01) This indicates that at a confidence level of 99%, the ANOVA test proves that null hypothesis is rejected. So there is a significant relationship between Buying decision and Buyer objectives about Villa.

Buyer objectives have a higher level of relationship with Buying decisions.

IX. **Correlation Analysis- Buyer Satisfaction and Buying Decision**

Satisfaction is positively correlated with Buying decision about Apartment (.449). The correlation analysis also reveals that the correlations are significant at 1% level of significance and the strength of the association between Satisfaction and Buying decision about Villa are very strong.

9.1. **Regression-Buyer Satisfaction with Dwelling Unit Features and Buying Decision**

The analysis of variance of multiple regression model shows that the model is significant at 1% level of significance. (F = 13.809, P value < 0.01) This indicates that at a confidence level of 99%, the ANOVA test proves that null hypothesis is rejected. So there is a significant relationship between Satisfaction with dwelling unit features and Buying decision about Villa.
Buying decisions about Villa have a higher level of relationship with Satisfaction with dwelling unit features.

9.2. **Regression-Relationship between Satisfaction with Services by Developer and Buying Decision**

The analysis of variance of multiple regression model shows that the model is significant at 1% level of significance. (F = 39.797, P value < 0.01) This indicates that at a confidence level of 99%, the ANOVA test proves that null hypothesis is rejected. So there is a significant relationship between Satisfaction with services by developer and Buying decision about Villa.

Buying decisions about Villa have a higher level of relationship with Satisfaction with services by developer.

9.3. **Relationship between Satisfaction with Neighbourhood Facilities and Buying Decision**

The analysis of variance of multiple regression model shows that the model is significant at 1% level of significance. (F = 9.403, P value < 0.01) This indicates that at a confidence level of 99%, the ANOVA test proves that null hypothesis is rejected. So there is a significant relationship between Satisfaction with Neighbourhood facilities and Buying decision about Villa.

Buying decisions about Villa have a higher level of relationship with Satisfaction with Neighbourhood facilities.

9.4. **Relationship between Satisfaction with Housing Quality and Buying Decision**

The analysis of variance of multiple regression model shows that the model is significant at 1% level of significance. (F = 36.705, P value < 0.01) This indicates that at a confidence level of 99%, the ANOVA test proves that null hypothesis is rejected. So there is a significant relationship between Satisfaction with Housing Quality and Buying decision about Villa.

Buying decisions about Villa have a higher level of relationship with Satisfaction with Housing Quality.
9.5. **Relationship between Satisfaction with Neighbourhood Problems and Buying Decision**

The analysis of variance of multiple regression model shows that the model is significant at 1% level of significance. \((F = 13.902, P \text{ value } < 0.01)\) This indicates that at a confidence level of 99%, the ANOVA test proves that null hypothesis is rejected. So there is a significant relationship between Satisfaction with Neighbourhood problems and Buying decision about Villa.

Buying decisions about Apartment have a higher level of relationship with Satisfaction with Neighbourhood problems.

10. **Relationship between Buyer Expectation about Villa and Demographic factors of respondents**

In the case of age, asymmetric significance is found to be .000, which is smaller than the cut off value of .05. This indicates that at a confidence level of 95%, the ANOVA test proves that null hypothesis is rejected. So there is a significant relationship between Buyers expectation about Villas and Age of the respondents.

As far as Gender is concerned, asymmetric significance is found to be .000, which is smaller than the cut off value of .05. This indicates that at a confidence level of 95%, the ANOVA test proves that null hypothesis is rejected. So there is a significant relationship between Buyers expectation about Villas and Gender of the respondents.

In the ANOVA test, conducted for Educational Qualification, asymmetric significance is found to be .255, which is greater than the cut off value of .05. This indicates that at a confidence level of 95%, the ANOVA test proves that null hypothesis can be accepted. Hence the Educational Qualification of the respondents does not affect the Buyers expectation about Villas.

In the result of Employment status, asymmetric significance is found to be .000, which is smaller than the cut off value of .05. This indicates that at a confidence level of 95%, the ANOVA test proves that null hypothesis is rejected. So there is a significant relationship between Buyers expectation about Villas and Employment status of the respondents.
Assessing the result of Gross income, asymmetric significance is found to be .001, which is smaller than the cut off value of .05. This indicates that at a confidence level of 95%, the ANOVA test proves that the null hypothesis is rejected. So there is a significant relationship between Buyers expectation about Villas and Gross income of the respondents.

In the ANOVA test conducted for Family status, asymmetric significance is found to be .031, which is smaller than the cut off value of .05. This indicates that at a confidence level of 95%, the ANOVA test proves that the null hypothesis is rejected. So there is a significant relationship between Buyers expectation about Villas and Family status of the respondents.

11. **Relationship between Buyers Expectation from Builder and Demographic factors of respondents**

In the case of age, asymmetric significance is found to be .000, which is smaller than the cut off value of .05. This indicates that at a confidence level of 95%, the ANOVA test proves that null hypothesis is rejected. So there is a significant relationship between Buyers Expectation from Builder and Age of the respondents.

As far as Gender is concerned, asymmetric significance is found to be .000, which is smaller than the cut off value of .05. This indicates that at a confidence level of 95%, the ANOVA test proves that null hypothesis is rejected. So there is a significant relationship between Buyers Expectation from Builder and Gender of the respondents.

In the ANOVA test, conducted for Educational Qualification, asymmetric significance is found to be .000, which is smaller than the cut off value of .05. This indicates that at a confidence level of 95%, the ANOVA test proves that null hypothesis is rejected. So there is a significant relationship between Buyers Expectation from Builder and Educational Qualification of the respondents.

In the result of Employment status, asymmetric significance is found to be .000, which is smaller than the cut off value of .05. This indicates that at a confidence level of 95%, the ANOVA test proves that null hypothesis is rejected.
there is a significant relationship between Buyers Expectation from Builder and Employment status of the respondents.

Assessing the result of Gross income, asymmetric significance is found to be .000, which is smaller than the cut off value of .05. This indicates that at a confidence level of 95%, the ANOVA test proves that the null hypothesis is rejected. So there is a significant relationship between Buyers Expectation from Builder and Gross income of the respondents.

In the ANOVA test conducted for Family status, asymmetric significance is found to be .000, which is smaller than the cut off value of .05. This indicates that at a confidence level of 95%, the ANOVA test proves that the null hypothesis is rejected. So there is a significant relationship between Buyers Expectation from Builder and Family status of the respondents.

12. **Relationship between Buyers Satisfaction and Demographic factors of respondents**

For Age, asymmetric significance is found to be .414, which is greater than the cutoff value of .05. This indicates that at a confidence level of 95%, the ANOVA test proves that null hypothesis can be accepted. Hence there is no significant relationship between Buyers Satisfaction and Age of the respondents.

For Gender, asymmetric significance is found to be .674, which is greater than the cutoff value of .05. This indicates that at a confidence level of 95%, the ANOVA test proves that null hypothesis can be accepted. Hence there is no significant relationship between Buyers Satisfaction and Gender of the respondents.

For Educational Qualification, asymmetric significance is found to be .125, which is greater than the cutoff value of .05. This indicates that at a confidence level of 95%, the ANOVA test proves that null hypothesis can be accepted. Hence there is no significant relationship between Buyers Satisfaction and Educational Qualification of the respondents.

For Employment Status, asymmetric significance is found to be .029, which is greater than the cutoff value of .05. This indicates that at a confidence level of 95%, the ANOVA test proves that null hypothesis can be accepted. Hence there is
no significant relationship between Buyers Satisfaction and Employment Status of the respondents.

Assessing the result of Gross income, asymmetric significance is found to be .003, which is smaller than the cut off value of .05. This indicates that at a confidence level of 95%, the ANOVA test proves that the null hypothesis is rejected. So there is a significant relationship between Buyers Satisfaction and Gross income of the respondents.

For Family Status, asymmetric significance is found to be .241, which is greater than the cutoff value of .05. This indicates that at a confidence level of 95%, the ANOVA test proves that null hypothesis can be accepted. Hence there is no significant relationship between Buyers Satisfaction and Family Status of the respondents.