CHAPTER IV
ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION

In this chapter the analysis and interpretation of the study “A study on marketing of dairy products - Customer perceptive” is based on a sample of 500 customers and 50 retailers from Coimbatore is presented. The data were collected from the respondents through two interview schedules (customers and retailers) comprising of personal factors and study factors. The collected information’s were processed and analyzed using the following tools in tune with the objectives of the study.

- Percentage analysis
- Chi-square analysis
- Average rank analysis
- Average score analysis
- Correlation analysis
- T – test
- Multiple regression analysis
- Analysis of variance
- Factor analysis
- Z - test
- Gap analysis

All the statistical tests are performed @ 5% level of significance.

The percentage analysis is used in any study mainly to know the distribution or Pattern of the respondents selected for the study. The percentage analysis/descriptive analysis represent the distribution of respondents selected under each classification. As the values are expressed in percentage, it facilitates comparison. Charts and diagrams are also drawn for selected tables in order to enhance the understanding of the reader.
The chi-square test is an important statistical tool used to test the independence of two attributes/ factors. In this study, the factors are classified under two groups such as personal factors and study factors. The chi square analysis is performed between the personal factors and study factors to assess their influence. The results are presented in suitable hypothesis with relevant interpretations.

The average rank analysis is adopted in any study relating to social sciences mainly to assess the priority/ importance of the different category of the respondents on the various aspects relating to the study. In this study also, this technique is employed to indentify the priority of the respondents on the various aspects relating to the study. Based on the consolidated opinion of the respondents, the average rank is calculated (Rank 1 with weight 1, Rank 2 with weight 2 and so on…) and the final rank is arrived using the criterion ‘lesser the average rank more is the priority’. The results are presented in suitable tables with relevant interpretations.

Average score analysis is used to identify the level of opinion/ satisfaction/ agreeability of the different category of respondents on the various aspects considered for the study. In this study, also this technique is employed to assess the level of satisfaction of the respondents on the various aspects relating to the study. First, the opinions of the respondents were ascertained using a 5 point scaling technique similar to Likert scaling (Score 5 for very high, Score 4 for high, Score 3 for moderate, Score 2 for low and Score 1 for very low) and based on the consolidated opinion of the respondents, the average score is calculated and the results are presented in appropriate tables with suitable interpretation.

The correlation analysis is used in any study to find the extent of relationships between the variables. If there are only two variables in the study,
then it is called simple correlation, otherwise the study is either partial or multiple correlation. In this study, the simple correlation analysis was performed between the selected variables through Karl Pearson’s co-efficient of correlation and the results are presented in the form correlation matrix. Further, the significance of correlation was also tested at 5% level of significance using t-test and provided relevant interpretation.

The Regression expresses the functional relationship between the variables. If there are only two variables in the study of regression then it is called simple regression otherwise the study is multiple regression. In this study, the Multiple Regression is performed between a dependant variable and a set of independent variables mainly to assess the percentage of explanation provided by an independent variable on the variations of the dependent variable. This is assessed through the co-efficient of determination ($R^2$), where $R$ is the co-efficient of correlation. These results are presented in tables and followed by suitable interpretations.

The technique of Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) is an extension of t-test which is used to test the homogeneity of several means. In this study, this technique is adopted to study whether there exists significant difference between the personal classifications of respondents on the various issues relating to the study. The results are presented with suitable hypothesis and relevant interpretations.

The Factor analysis is used in any study relating to social science and management mainly for two reasons a) Factor reduction b) To identify the important factor. In this study also, this technique is employed not only for factor reduction but also to identify the important factor using extraction method of principal component analysis under Vari-max Kaizer normalization method. The
results are presented in different tables with suitable interpretations. Charts are also provided for the easy understanding of the readers.

The Z-test is the large sample test used to identify whether there exist significant difference between the proportions of respondents in two groups relating to a particular aspect. In this study, this technique is employed to assess whether there exist significant difference between proportion of respondents aware and the proportion of respondents availed the particular brand/product. The results are presented in suitable hypothesis followed by relevant interpretations.

The gap analysis is an important technique used in any study relating to marketing mainly to identify the gap between the level of opinion of the customer and the level of opinion of the dealers / retailers. In this study, this technique is adopted to identify whether there exist significant difference between the derived level of satisfaction by the customers and perceived level of satisfaction of the dealers / retailers on various issues considered in this study. The results are presented in suitable hypothesis, tables and relevant interpretation. Charts are also drawn for facilitating the understanding of the customers and retailers.

**Gender**

The table 1 describes the distribution of the respondents based on gender. The gender is classified as male and female.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Number of respondents</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>36.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>319</td>
<td>63.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is found from the table 1 that out of the total respondents taken for the study, 319 (63.8%) are female and 181(36.2%) respondents are male.
It is concluded that the majority (63.8%) of the respondents are female.

Chart -4: Gender wise distribution of the respondents

Age group

The table 2 describes the distribution of the respondents based on age group. The age group is classified as Below 20 years, 20-40 years, 40-60 years and 60 years and above.

Table 2: Age wise distribution of the respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age group (years)</th>
<th>Number of respondents</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Below 20 years</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>24.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-40 years</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>55.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-60 years</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>19.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 and above</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is found from table 2 that out of the total respondents taken for the study, 278(55.6%) of the respondents are in the age group between 20-40 years, 121(24.2%) respondents are in the age group of less than 20 years and 98 (19.6%) of the respondents are in the age group between 40-60 years.
It is concluded that the majority (55.6%) of the respondents are in the age group 20-40 years.

**Chart -5: Age wise distribution of the respondents**

![Age wise distribution of the respondents](image)

**Educational level**

The table 3 depicts the educational level of the respondents. The educational level of the respondents are classified as School level, college level, professional qualification and others such as no formal education etc,

**Table 3: Educational level of the respondents**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Educational level</th>
<th>Number of respondents</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School level</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College level</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>59.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Qualification</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>20.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is observed from table 3 that out of the total respondents taken for the study, 295 (59%) of the respondents completed college level education, 102
(20.4%) of the respondents are professionally qualified and 100 (20%) of the respondents have completed their school level education.

It is concluded that the majority (59%) of the respondents have completed college level education.

**Chart -6: Educational level of the respondents**

![Educational level chart]

**Occupational status**

The table 4 depicts the occupational status of the respondents. The occupational status of the respondents are classified as Agriculture, Business/professional, public sector employee, Private sector employee, Home maker and others such as students, pensioners etc.,

**Table 4: Occupational status of the respondents**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupational status</th>
<th>Number of respondents</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business/professional</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>27.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public sector employee</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>19.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private sector employee</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>21.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home maker</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>18.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>11.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
It is identified from table 4 that out of the total respondents taken for the study, 138 (27.6%) of the respondents fall under the categories business/professional, 106 (21.2%) of the respondents are private sector employees and 95 (19.0%) of the respondents are public sector employees.

It is concluded from the above table that most of 27.6% of the respondents fall under the categories business/professional.

**Chart -7: Occupational status of the respondents**

Marital status

The table 5 depicts the marital status of the respondents. The marital statuses of the respondents are classified as married and unmarried.

**Table 5: Marital status of the respondents**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marital status</th>
<th>Number of respondents</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>53.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unmarried</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>46.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is known from table 5 that out of the total respondents taken for the study, 269 (53.8%) of the respondents are married and 231 (46.2%) of the respondents are unmarried.

It is concluded that majority (53.8%) of the respondents were married.
Type of family

The table 6 describes the type of family of the respondents. The type of family is classified as Joint family and nuclear family.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of family</th>
<th>Number of respondents</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Joint Family</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>30.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nuclear family</td>
<td>349</td>
<td>69.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is clear from table 6 that out of the total respondents taken for the study 349 (69.8%) of the respondents belong to nuclear family and 151 (30.2%) of the respondents belong to joint family.

It is concluded that Majority (69.8%) of the respondents belong to nuclear family.
Number of earning members

The table 7 describes the number of earning members in the respondent’s family. The number of earning members in a family size is listed as 1, 2, 3 and above.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of earning members</th>
<th>Number of respondents</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>48.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>32.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 and above</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>19.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is observed from table 7 that out of the total respondents taken for the study, 244 (48.8%) respondents’ have 1 earning member in their family, 160
(32%) respondents have 2 earning members in their family and 96 (19.2%) respondents have 3 and above earning members in their family.

It is concluded that most of 48.8% of the respondents have one earning member in their family.

**Chart -10: Number of earning members in the family**
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**Number of children**

The table 8 describes the number of children in the respondent’s family. The number of children in a family is classified as 1, 2, 3 and above.

**Table 8: Number of children**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of children</th>
<th>Number of respondents</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>23.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>63.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 and above</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>13.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>430</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is identified from table 8 that out of the respondents who have children (430) in their family, 271 (63.0%) respondents family consists of 2 children, 103
(23.9%) respondents family have 1 child in their family and 56 (13.1%) respondents family have 3 and above children.

It is concluded that majority (63%) of the respondents family consists of 2 children.

Chart -11: Number of children

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Children</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>23.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 and above</td>
<td>13.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Family monthly income

The table 9 describes the monthly income of the respondents’ family. The monthly income in a family is classified as less than Rs 10,000, Rs 10000-20000, Rs 20000-30000 and Rs 30000 and above.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Family monthly income (Rs)</th>
<th>Number of respondents</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 10000</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10000-20000</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>29.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20000-30000</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>22.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30000 and above</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>36.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is identified from table 9 that out of the total respondents taken for the study 182 (36.4%) of the respondents family monthly Income is Rs 30,000 and
above, 146 (29.2\%) of the respondents family monthly income is between Rs 10,000 – Rs 20,000 and 112 (22.4\%) of the respondents family monthly income is between Rs 20,000 – Rs 30,000.

It is concluded that most of 36.4\% of the respondents family monthly income is 30,000 and above.

**Table -12: Family monthly income of the respondents**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Family Monthly Income (Rs)</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 10000</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10000-20000</td>
<td>29.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20000-30000</td>
<td>22.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30000 and above</td>
<td>36.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Awareness level of respondents**

The table 10 describes the awareness level of the respondents towards different brands of dairy products. The awareness level is classified as very high awareness, high awareness, moderate awareness, Low awareness, very low awareness.
Table 10: Awareness level of respondents towards different brands of dairy product

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Brands / Awareness</th>
<th>Aavin</th>
<th>Amul</th>
<th>Aroka/ Hatsun</th>
<th>Aroma</th>
<th>Cakin</th>
<th>Sakthi</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very high</td>
<td>309 (61.8)</td>
<td>93 (18.6)</td>
<td>70 (14.0)</td>
<td>119 (23.8)</td>
<td>41 (8.2)</td>
<td>58 (11.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High awareness</td>
<td>125 (25.0)</td>
<td>180 (36.0)</td>
<td>271 (54.2)</td>
<td>128 (25.6)</td>
<td>77 (15.4)</td>
<td>67 (13.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate awareness</td>
<td>66 (13.2)</td>
<td>176 (35.2)</td>
<td>111 (22.2)</td>
<td>144 (28.8)</td>
<td>138 (27.6)</td>
<td>102 (20.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low awareness</td>
<td>49 (9.78)</td>
<td>11 (2.2)</td>
<td>97 (19.4)</td>
<td>165 (33.0)</td>
<td>132 (26.4)</td>
<td>141 (28.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very low awareness</td>
<td>2 (0.4)</td>
<td>37 (7.4)</td>
<td>12 (2.4)</td>
<td>79 (15.8)</td>
<td>141 (28.2)</td>
<td>500 (100)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The values in brackets are in percentages

It is observed from table 10 that among the total respondents taken for the study, 309 (61.8%) respondents awareness level is very high for aavin next comes aroma 119 (23.8%) followed by amul 93 (19.6%) followed by aroka/hatsun 70 (14.0%), sakthi 58 (11.6%) and cavin 41 (8.1%).

It is concluded that awareness level of respondents is very high for aavin (61.8%) than any other brands of dairy products.

Awareness about the brands and its products

The table 11 describes the awareness of the respondents towards different brands of dairy products. The response is classified in the brands as Aavin, amul, aroka/hatsun, aroma, cavin and sakthi and in the products as milk, ghee and curd

Table 11: Awareness about the brands and its products

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Brands / Products</th>
<th>Milk</th>
<th>Ghee</th>
<th>Curd</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aavin</td>
<td>500 (100)</td>
<td>362 (72.4)</td>
<td>307 (61.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amul</td>
<td>325 (65)</td>
<td>383 (76.6)</td>
<td>230 (46)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aroka/ Hatsun</td>
<td>471 (94.2)</td>
<td>277 (55.4)</td>
<td>366 (73.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aroma</td>
<td>456 (91.2)</td>
<td>142 (28.4)</td>
<td>220 (44.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cavin</td>
<td>380 (76.0)</td>
<td>15 (3.0)</td>
<td>226 (45.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sakthi</td>
<td>439 (87.8)</td>
<td>169 (33.8)</td>
<td>174 (34.6)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The values in brackets are in percentages
It is known from the table 11 that out of the total respondents taken for the study, 500 (100%) of the respondents aware of the brand aavin, 471 (94.2%) of the respondents are aware of the brand arokia/hatsun in milk and 383(76.6%) of the respondents aware of the brand amul, 362(72.4%) of the respondents are aware of the brand aavin in ghee and 366(73.2%) of the respondents are aware of the brand arokia/hatsun, 307 (61.4%) of the respondents are aware of the brand aavin in curd.

It is concluded from the study that all (100%) the respondents are aware of milk in aavin, majority (76.6%) of the respondents are aware of ghee in the brand amul and majority (73.2%) of the respondents are aware of curd in the brand arokia/Hatsun.

**Awareness about the nutrients available in the dairy products**

The table 12 depicts the awareness of the respondents about the nutrients available in the dairy products. The nutrients are classified as Calcium, protein vitamin A, vitamin B, VitaminB 12 and riboflaxin, vitamin D, vitamin K potassium, selenium and thiamin.

**Table 12: Awareness about the nutrients available in the dairy products**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nutrients</th>
<th>Aware</th>
<th>Not aware</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Calcium</td>
<td>468(93.6)</td>
<td>32 (6.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protein</td>
<td>393(78.6)</td>
<td>107(21.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vitamin A</td>
<td>318 (63.6)</td>
<td>181(36.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vitamin B</td>
<td>273 (54.6)</td>
<td>227 (45.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vitamin B12 and riboflaxin</td>
<td>86(17.2)</td>
<td>414(82.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vitamin D</td>
<td>174 (34.8)</td>
<td>326(65.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vitamin K</td>
<td>152(30.4)</td>
<td>348(69.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potassium</td>
<td>119(23.8)</td>
<td>381(76.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selenium</td>
<td>27(5.4)</td>
<td>473(94.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tiamin</td>
<td>39 (7.8)</td>
<td>461(92.2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The values in brackets are in percentages
It is identified from the table 12 that out of the total respondents taken for the study, 468(93.6%) of the respondents are aware of calcium, 393(78.6%) of the respondents are aware of Protein, 318(63.6%) of the respondents are aware of Vitamin A.

It is concluded from the study that majority (93.6%) of the respondents are aware of calcium available in the milk and the majority (94.6%) are not aware of selenium available in the milk.

**Awareness about the active ingredients available in the dairy products**

The table 13 depicts the awareness of the respondents about the active ingredients available in the dairy products. The active ingredients are classified as Lactose, casein, whey, fat and minerals.

**Table 13: Awareness about the active ingredients available in the dairy products**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Active ingredients</th>
<th>Aware</th>
<th>Not aware</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lactose</td>
<td>211(42.2)</td>
<td>285 (57.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casein</td>
<td>348 (69.6)</td>
<td>152(30.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whey</td>
<td>283 (56.6)</td>
<td>217(43.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fat</td>
<td>454 (90.8)</td>
<td>46 (9.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minerals</td>
<td>283 (56.6)</td>
<td>217 (43.4)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The values in brackets are in percentages

It is identified from the table 13 that out of the total respondents taken for the study, 454(90.8%) of the respondents are aware of Fat, 348(69.6%) of the respondents are aware of Casein, 283(56.6%) of the respondents are aware of whey and minerals.

It is concluded from the study that majority (90.8%) of the respondents are aware of Fat available in the milk and majority (57.8%) of the respondents are not aware of lactose available in the dairy products.
Sources of Awareness of the respondents

The table 14 depicts the sources of awareness of the respondents towards various brands of dairy products. The sources of awareness is classified as Self, family members, Neighbors, friends and relatives, Dealers/Representatives and others.

**Table 14: Sources of Awareness of different brands of dairy product**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sources of awareness</th>
<th>Number of respondents</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>15.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family members</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>12.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbors, friends &amp; Relatives</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>15.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advertisement</td>
<td>282</td>
<td>56.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dealers / representatives</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is clear from table 14 that out of the total respondents taken for the study, 282 (56.4%) of the respondents are aware of the dairy products through advertisements, 79(15.8%) of the respondents are aware of the dairy products by themselves, 75(15%) of the respondents are aware of the dairy products through neighbor, friends & relatives.

It is concluded that majority (56.4%) of the respondents are aware of the dairy products through advertisements.

Media of advertisements

The table 15 depicts the media of advertisement through which the respondents are aware of various brands of dairy product if their awareness is through advertisements. The media of awareness is classified as television, radio, newspapers & magazines and notices & pamphlets, poster & Banners and others.
Table 15: Media of Awareness of different brands of dairy products

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Media of awareness</th>
<th>No of respondents</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Television</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>85.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radio</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newspapers &amp; Magazines and notices &amp; Pamphlets</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>8.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Posters &amp; Banners</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>282</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is clear from the table 15 that out of the respondents who are aware of the various brands dairy products through advertisements, 241(85.4%) of the respondents aware of different brands of dairy products through the media television, 25(8.9%) of the respondents are aware of dairy products through the media newspapers & magazines and notices & pamphlets and 9(3.2%) of the respondents are aware of the different brands of dairy products through the media posters and banners.

It is concluded from the study that majority (85.4%) of the respondents are aware of various brands of dairy products through the media television.

Brands of dairy products purchased

The table 16 depicts the brand of dairy products purchased by the respondents. The different brands of dairy products are classified as Milk, ghee, curd.

Table 16: Brands of dairy products purchased by the respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Brands Awareness</th>
<th>Aavin</th>
<th>Amul</th>
<th>Arookia/Hatsun</th>
<th>Aroma</th>
<th>Cakin</th>
<th>Sakthi</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Milk</td>
<td>426</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(85.2)</td>
<td>(17.8)</td>
<td>(30.8)</td>
<td>(43.8)</td>
<td>(16.4)</td>
<td>(40.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ghee</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(3.6)</td>
<td>(37.0)</td>
<td>(9.0)</td>
<td>(2.6)</td>
<td>(2.2)</td>
<td>(11.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curd</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1.4)</td>
<td>(21.6)</td>
<td>(43.2)</td>
<td>(3.6)</td>
<td>(18.8)</td>
<td>(7.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>451</td>
<td>334</td>
<td>415</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>294</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The values in brackets are in percentages
It is known from table 16 that out of the total respondents taken for the study, 426(85.2%) of the respondents purchase the brand aavin, 219(43.8%) of the respondents purchase the brand aroma in milk. 185(37%) of the respondents purchase the brand amul, 59(11.8%) of the respondents purchase the brand sakthi in ghee. 216(43.2%) of the respondents purchase the brand arokia/hatsun, 94(18.8%) of the respondents purchase the brand cavin in milk.

It is concluded from the study that majority (85.2%) of the respondents purchase milk in aavin, most of 37.0% of the respondents purchase ghee in amul and maximum of 43.2% of the respondents purchase curd in arokia/hatsun.

**Sources of purchase**

The table 17 shows the sources of purchase of dairy products by the respondents. The different sources of purchase of dairy products are classified as Dairy shop, other retail store, petty shop, departmental store and others sources.

**Table 17: Source of purchase of dairy products by the respondents**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sources of purchase</th>
<th>Number of respondents</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dairy shop</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other retail store</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>23.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petty shop</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>12.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Departmental store</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>37.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is known from table 17 that out of the total respondents taken for the study, 189(37.8%) of the respondents purchase the dairy products from the departmental stores, 125 (25%) of the respondents purchase dairy products from
the dairy shops and 115(23%) of the respondents purchase dairy products from other retail stores.

It is concluded that most of 37.8% of the respondents purchase the dairy products from the departmental stores.

**Monthly expenditure**

The table 18 depicts the monthly expenditure made by the respondents for purchasing the dairy products. The monthly expenditure is classified as less than Rs 1000, Rs 1000-2000, Rs 2000-3000, Rs 3000 and above.

**Table 18: Monthly expenditure for purchase of dairy products by the respondents**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Monthly expenditure (Rs)</th>
<th>Number of respondents</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 1000</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>38.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1000-2000</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>42.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000-3000</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>14.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3000 and above</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is understood from the table 18 that out of the total respondents taken for the study, 300 (42.0%) of the respondents spend from Rs1000-2000 for purchase of dairy products, 190(38%) of the respondents spend less than Rs 1000 of dairy products and 73(14.6%) of the respondents are spending between Rs 2000-3000.

It is concluded that most of 42.0% of the respondents spend from Rs 1000-2000 per month for the purchase of dairy products.
Mode of payment

The table 19 describes the mode of payment adopted by the respondents for purchasing the dairy products. The mode of payment is divided as Cash, credit and both.

Table 19: Mode of payment for the purchase of dairy products

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mode of payment</th>
<th>Number of respondents</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cash</td>
<td>452</td>
<td>90.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credit</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is found from table 19 that out of the total respondents taken for the study, 452(90.4%) of them purchase the dairy products by making cash payment, 25(5.0%) of them purchase the dairy products through cash and credit payment and 23(4.6%) of them purchase the dairy products through credit payment.

It is concluded that majority (90.4%) of the respondents purchase dairy products by making cash payment.

Frequency of purchase of dairy products other than milk

The table 20 depicts the frequency of purchase of dairy products other than milk. The frequency of purchase is classified as Very frequently, Frequently, Occasionally, Rarely, and Very rarely.
Table 20: Frequency of purchase of dairy products other than milk

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency of purchase</th>
<th>Ghee</th>
<th>Curd</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very frequently</td>
<td>100(20.0)</td>
<td>113(22.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequently</td>
<td>193(38.6)</td>
<td>229(45.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occasionally</td>
<td>129(25.8)</td>
<td>104(20.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rarely</td>
<td>64(12.8)</td>
<td>38(7.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very rarely</td>
<td>14(2.8)</td>
<td>16(3.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The values in brackets are in percentages

It is known from table 20 that out of the total respondents taken for the study, 193(38.6%) of the respondents purchase ghee frequently, 129 (25.8%) of the respondents purchase the ghee occasionally, 229(45.8%) of the respondents purchase curd frequently and 113(22.6%) of the respondents purchase curd very frequently.

It is concluded from the study that most of 38.6% of the respondents and maximum of 45.8% of the respondents purchase ghee and curd frequently.

Choice of the respondents for non availability of current brand that they use

The table 21 depicts the opinion of the respondents for non availability of dairy products. The Choices are classified as Postpone the purchase, buy the other brand, buy the unbranded products and others.

Table 21: Choice of the respondents for non availability of current brands that they use

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Choices</th>
<th>Number of respondents</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Postpone the purchase</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>21.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buy the other brand</td>
<td>355</td>
<td>71.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buy the unbranded products</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
It is known from table 21 that out of the total respondents taken for the study, 355 (71%) of the respondents prefer to buy the other brand, 108(21.6%) of the respondents are willing to postpone the purchase and 35(7%) of the respondents will change their preference to unbranded products.

It is concluded that majority (71%) of the respondents prefer to buy the other branded dairy products.

**Influence of family members**

The table 22 describes the influence of family members for purchasing the dairy products. The response is classified as yes and no.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Number of respondents</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>378</td>
<td>75.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>24.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is depicted from table 22 that out of the total respondents taken for the study, 378 (75.6%) of the respondents are influenced by the family members in purchase of dairy products and 122(24.4%) of the respondents are not influenced by their family members.

It is concluded that majority (75.6%) of the respondents are influenced by the family members in purchase of dairy products.

**Level of Influence of family members / Intensity of influence**

The table 23 describes the level of influence of family members while purchasing dairy products. The level of influence is denoted as very high
influence, high influence, moderate influence, low influence and very low influence.

| Table 23: Level of Influence of family members while purchasing dairy products |
|-----------------------------|-----------------|----------------|
| Level of influence          | Number of respondents | Percentage |
| Very High Influence        | 75               | 19.9         |
| High Influence              | 160              | 42.2         |
| Moderate Influence          | 113              | 29.9         |
| Low Influence               | 29               | 7.7          |
| Very Low influence          | 1                | 0.3          |
| Total                       | 378              | 100          |

It is identified from table 23 that out of the total respondents taken for the study, 160 (42.2%) of the respondents are highly influenced by their family members while purchasing dairy products, 113 (29.9%) of the respondents are moderately influenced by their family members and 75 (19.9%) of the respondents are very highly influenced by their family members.

It is concluded that most of 42.2% of the respondents are highly influenced by their family members while purchasing dairy products.

**Respondent’s opinion about the branded dairy products**

The table 24 describes the opinion of the respondents about the branded dairy products. Their opinion is denoted as very good, good, normal, poor and very poor.
Table 24: Opinion of the respondents about the branded dairy products

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Opinion</th>
<th>Number of respondents</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very good</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>25.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>70.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normal</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 24 reveals that out of the total respondents taken for the study, 350 (70%) of the respondents are of the opinion that the branded dairy products are good, 128 (25.6%) of them feel that the branded dairy products are very good and 20 (4%) of the respondents are of the opinion that they are normal.

It is concluded that majority (70%) of the respondents are of the opinion that the branded dairy products are good.

Respondent’s opinion about the price variation in branded dairy products

The table 25 describes the opinion of the respondents about price variation in the branded dairy products. Their opinion is classified as yes and no.

Table 25: Opinion of the respondents about the price variation in branded dairy products.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Opinion</th>
<th>Number of respondents</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>90.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is understood from table 25 that out of the total respondents taken for the study, 450 (90%) of the respondents opine that there is price variation between
branded dairy products and only 50(10%) of the respondents opine that there is no price variation between branded dairy products.

It is concluded that majority (90%) of the respondents opine that there exist price variation in branded dairy products.

**Respondent’s opinion about the level of price variation in branded dairy products**

The table 26 describes the opinion of the respondents about the level of price variation in the branded dairy products. Their opinion is classified as High and low.

**Table 26: Respondents opinion about the level of price variation in branded dairy products**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Brands</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>No opinion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aavin</td>
<td>230 (46.0)</td>
<td>214 (42.8)</td>
<td>56 (11.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amul</td>
<td>275 (55)</td>
<td>94 (18.8)</td>
<td>131 (26.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arockia/Hatsun</td>
<td>230 (46)</td>
<td>132 (26.4)</td>
<td>138 (27.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aroma</td>
<td>178 (35.6)</td>
<td>149 (29.8)</td>
<td>190 (38.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cavin</td>
<td>161 (32.2)</td>
<td>163 (32.6)</td>
<td>176 (35.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sakthi</td>
<td>161 (32.2)</td>
<td>221 (44.2)</td>
<td>118 (23.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>24 (4.8)</td>
<td>39 (7.8)</td>
<td>437 (87.4)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The values in brackets are in percentages

It is known from the table 26 that out of the various brands taken for the study, 275(55%) of the respondents feel that the price of amul is high, 230 (46%) of the respondents feel that the price of aavin and arockia/hatsun is high and 178 (35.6%) of the respondents feel that the price of aroma is high.
It is concluded that majority (55%) of the respondents feel that the price of the brand amul is high and most of 44.2% of the respondents feel that the price of sakthi is low.

**Respondents’ opinion regarding the purchase of unbranded dairy products**

The table 27 describes the opinion of the respondents regarding the purchase of unbranded dairy products. Their opinion is classified as yes and no.

**Table 27: Opinion regarding the purchase of unbranded dairy products**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Opinion</th>
<th>Number of respondents</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>16.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>416</td>
<td>83.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is known from table 27 that out of the total respondents taken for the study, 416 (83.2%) of them opined that they are not having the willingness to buy unbranded dairy products, 84 (16.8%) of them opined that they will buy unbranded dairy product.

It is concluded that majority (83.2%) of the respondents are not willing to buy unbranded dairy product

**Respondents level of opinion regarding the purchase of unbranded dairy products**

The table 28 describes the level of opinion of the respondents regarding the purchase of unbranded dairy products. Their level of opinion is classified as very good, good, normal and poor.
Table 28: Level of opinion regarding the purchase of unbranded dairy products

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of acceptance</th>
<th>Number of respondents</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very good</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>40.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normal</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>38.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is known from table 28 that out of the respondents willing to buy unbranded dairy products, 34 (40.47%) of the respondents feel that the unbranded dairy products are good, 32(38.09%) of the respondents feel that the unbranded dairy products are normal and 12(14.29%) of the respondents feel that it is poor.

It is concluded that most of 40.47% of the respondents feel that the unbranded dairy products are good from the respondents who are willing to buy unbranded dairy products.

Idea of switching over to other brands

The table 29 depicts respondent’s idea to switch over to other brands of dairy products. Their response is classified as yes and no.

Table 29: Respondents idea of switching over to other brands

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Number of respondents</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>34.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>329</td>
<td>65.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is identified from table 29 that out of the total respondents taken for the study, 329 (65.8%) of the respondents have no idea of switching over to other
brands and 171(34.2%) of the respondents have the idea to switch over to other brands of dairy products.

It is concluded that majority (65.8%) of the respondents have no idea of switching over to other brands.

Preference towards milk

The table 30 depicts respondent’s preference towards milk. Their preferences are classified as whole milk and standardized / skimmed milk.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Preferences</th>
<th>Number of respondents</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Whole milk</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>28.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standardized/skimmed milk</td>
<td>357</td>
<td>71.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is understood from table 30 that out of the total respondents taken for the study, 357 (71.4%) of the respondents prefer standardized/skimmed milk and 143 (28.6%) of the respondents prefer whole milk.

It is concluded that majority (71.4%) of the respondents prefer standardized/skimmed milk.

Preference towards type of standardized milk

The table 31 depicts respondent’s preference towards type of milk purchased. Their preferences towards standardized milk are classified as partial fat removal and full fat removal.
Table 31: Respondents preference towards type of standardized milk

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of milk</th>
<th>Number of respondents</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Partial fat removal</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>68.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full fat removal</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>31.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>357</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is known from table 31 that out of the respondents who prefer standardized milk, 246 (68.9%) of the respondents prefer partial fat removal and 111 (31.1%) of the respondents prefer full fat removed milk.

It is concluded that majority (68.9%) of the respondents prefer partial fat removal.

Level of satisfaction towards factors relating to purchase of dairy products

The table 32 depicts respondent’s level of satisfaction towards the factors relating to purchase of dairy products. The level of satisfaction is classified as very high satisfaction, high satisfaction, moderate satisfaction, low satisfaction and very low satisfaction.

Table 32: Level of satisfaction towards factors relating to purchase of dairy products

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S.No</th>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>Very high satisfaction</th>
<th>High satisfaction</th>
<th>Moderate satisfaction</th>
<th>Low satisfaction</th>
<th>Very Low satisfaction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Quality</td>
<td>146 (29.2)</td>
<td>273 (54.6)</td>
<td>78 (15.6)</td>
<td>1 (0.2)</td>
<td>2 (0.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Health aspect</td>
<td>153 (30.6)</td>
<td>144 (28.8)</td>
<td>169 (33.8)</td>
<td>11 (2.2)</td>
<td>23 (4.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Quantity</td>
<td>76 (15.2)</td>
<td>256 (51.2)</td>
<td>143 (28.6)</td>
<td>22 (4.4)</td>
<td>3 (0.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Packaging</td>
<td>122 (24.4)</td>
<td>208 (41.6)</td>
<td>159 (31.8)</td>
<td>9 (1.8)</td>
<td>2 (0.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Price</td>
<td>65 (13)</td>
<td>155 (31)</td>
<td>161 (32.2)</td>
<td>107 (21.4)</td>
<td>12 (2.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Availability</td>
<td>115 (23)</td>
<td>226 (45.2)</td>
<td>80 (16)</td>
<td>77 (15.4)</td>
<td>2 (0.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.No</td>
<td>Factors</td>
<td>Very high satisfaction</td>
<td>High satisfaction</td>
<td>Moderate satisfaction</td>
<td>Low satisfaction</td>
<td>Very Low satisfaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Exchange facility</td>
<td>17 (3.4)</td>
<td>41 (8.2)</td>
<td>136 (27.2)</td>
<td>163 (32.6)</td>
<td>143 (28.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Offers &amp; Discounts</td>
<td>27 (5.4)</td>
<td>33 (6.6)</td>
<td>43 (8.6)</td>
<td>177 (35.4)</td>
<td>220 (44)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Home delivery</td>
<td>150 (30)</td>
<td>84 (16.8)</td>
<td>45 (9.0)</td>
<td>104 (20.8)</td>
<td>117 (23.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Taste</td>
<td>171 (34.2)</td>
<td>145 (29)</td>
<td>118 (23.6)</td>
<td>33 (6.6)</td>
<td>33 (6.6)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The values in brackets are in percentages

It is found from the table 32 that out of the total respondents taken for the study, 171 (34.2%), 153(30.6%) and 150(30%) of the respondents are very highly satisfied with the taste, health aspect and home delivery. Further 273(54.6%), 256(51.2%) and 226 (45.2%) of the respondents are highly satisfied with the quality, quality and availability of dairy products.

It is concluded that maximum of 34.2% of the respondents are very highly satisfied with taste when compared to other factors.

**Opinion about hygienic factor of dairy products**

The table 33 depicts respondent’s opinion about hygienic factor of dairy products used by them. Their opinion about hygienic factor is categorized as yes and no.

**Table 33: Opinion about hygienic factor of dairy products**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Opinion</th>
<th>Number of respondents</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>442</td>
<td>88.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>11.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is indicated from the table 33 that out of the total respondents taken for the study, 442 (88.4%) are of the opinion that their brand is more hygienic than any other brands of dairy products and 58(11.6%) of them are of the opinion that their brand is not more hygienic than any other brands of dairy product.
It is concluded that majority (88.4%) of the respondents opined that their brand of dairy product is more hygienic than any other brands of dairy products.

Level of opinion about hygienic factor of dairy products

The table 34 depicts respondent’s opinion level about hygienic factor of dairy products used by them. Their opinion level about hygienic factor is categorized as very good, good, normal and poor.

Table 34: Opinion about hygienic factor of dairy products

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Opinion</th>
<th>Number of respondents</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very good</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>19.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>313</td>
<td>70.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normal</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>9.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>442</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is indicated from table 34 that out of the total respondents taken for the study 313 (70.8%) of the respondents opined that the dairy products are good, 86(19.4%) of them opined that the dairy products as very good and 42 (9.5%) of the respondents opined that the dairy products are Normal.

It is concluded from table that majority (70.8%) of the respondents opined that the hygienic factor of the dairy products are good.

Opinion about superiority of dairy products

The table 35 depicts the respondent’s opinion about superiority of dairy products used by them. Their opinion about superiority is categorized as yes and no.

Table 35: Opinion about superiority of dairy products

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Opinion</th>
<th>Number of respondents</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>399</td>
<td>79.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>20.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
It is observed from table 35 that out of the total respondents taken for the study, 399 (79.8%) of them opined that the brand they use is superior than other brands of dairy products and 101(20.2%) of them opined that the brand they use is not superior than other brands of dairy products.

It is concluded that majority (79.8%) of them opined that the brand of dairy products they use is superior to other brands of dairy products.

**Opinion about the fulfillment of expectations**

The table 36 depicts the respondent’s opinion about fulfillment of expectation of the product that they use. Their feeling is expressed as yes and no.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Opinion</th>
<th>Number of respondents</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>434</td>
<td>86.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>13.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is identified from the table 36 that out the total respondents taken for the study, 434(86.8%) of the respondents expectations are fulfilled by the brand which they use and 66 (13.2%) of them feel that their expectations are not fulfilled.

It is concluded that majority (86.8%) of the respondents expectations are fulfilled by the brand which they use.

**Brands Preferred to change**

The table 37 depicts respondent’s preference to change the brands which they presently use. Their brands are classified as Aavin, amul, arokia/hatsun, aroma, cavin, sakthi and others.
Table 37: Brands preferred to change by the respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Brands</th>
<th>Number of respondents</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aavin</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amul</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>30.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arokrina/hutsun</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>21.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aroma</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cavin</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>19.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sakthi</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is depicted from the table 37 that out of the respondents who wish to change their brands, 20(30.3%) Prefer to change to amul, 14(21.2%) of the respondents prefer to change to arokrina/hutsun and 13 (19.7%) of the respondents prefer to change to cavin.

It is concluded that most of 30.3% of the respondents prefer to change to the brand amul.

Reasons for the change

The table 38 describes reasons for the change of the brand by the respondent’s. Their reasons are classified as Inferior quality, price variation, non availability of current brand, to use on trail basis and others.

Table 38: Reasons for the change of brands

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reasons</th>
<th>Number of respondents</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inferior quality</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>25.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Price Variations</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>48.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non- availability of current brand</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To use on trail basis</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
It is observed from the table 38 that out of the respondents who wish to change their brands, 32 (48.5%) of the respondents change the brand due to price variation, 17(25.8%) of the respondents change the brand due to inferior quality and 8(12.1%) of them change their brands due to non-availability of current brand and to use on trial basis.

It is concluded that most of 48.5% of the respondents change the brand due to price variation of dairy products.

**Opinion about price of the dairy products**

The table 39 depicts the opinion about the price of the dairy products. Their opinion about the price is classified as very high, high, moderate, low and very low.

**Table 39: Opinion about the price of the dairy products**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Opinion about price</th>
<th>Number of respondents</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very high</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>19.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>45.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normal</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>34.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 39 reveals that out of the total respondents taken for the study, 226 (45.2%) of the respondents opine that the prices of dairy products are high, 17(34.8%) of the respondents feel that the prices of dairy products are normal and 99(19.8%) of the respondents feel that the prices of dairy products are very high.

It is concluded from the table that most of 45.2% of the respondents are of the opinion that the prices of the dairy products are high.
Type of package preferred by the respondents

The table 40 describes the type of package preferred by the respondents for the purchase of dairy products. The type of package is classified as tins, polybags, bottles and others.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of package</th>
<th>Number of respondents</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tins</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>16.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ploybags</td>
<td>306</td>
<td>61.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bottles</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>22.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is known from the table 40 that 306 (61.2%) of the respondents feel that polybags are convenient packaging to buy dairy products, 112(22.4%) of the respondents feel that bottles are convenient packages and 80(16%) of them feel tins as convenient packages.

It is concluded from the table that majority (61.2%) of the respondents feel that polybags are convenient packaging to buy dairy products.

Suggestion of brands to others

The table 41 describes the respondent’s suggestion to purchase other brands of dairy products. Their response is classified as yes and no.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Number of respondents</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>402</td>
<td>80.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>19.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is understood from the table 41 that 402 (80.4%) of the respondents suggest their brands to others and remaining 98(19.6 %) are not interested in suggesting their brands to others.
It is concluded from the table that majority (80.4%) of the respondents suggest their brands to others.

**Reasons for non-suggestion of brands to others**

The table 42 describes the reasons for non suggestion of brands to others. The reasons are classified as high price, quality deterioration, taste difference and poor packaging.

**Table 42: Reasons for non suggestion of brands to others**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reasons</th>
<th>Number of respondents</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High Price</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality Deterioration</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taste Difference</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>53.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor Packaging</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is evident from the table 42 that out of the respondents who are not willing to suggest their brands to others, 52 (53.06%) of the respondents are not willing to suggest their brands because of taste difference, 18(18.37 %) of them are not suggesting their brands due to poor packaging and 15(15.30%) of them do not suggest their brands due to quality deterioration.

It is concluded from the table that majority (53.06%) of the respondents do not suggest their brands because of taste difference.

**Superiority of branded dairy products over unbranded dairy products**

The table 43 shows opinion of the respondents as to whether branded dairy products are better than unbranded dairy products. Their opinion is classified as yes and no.
It is identified from table 43 that out of the total respondents taken for the study, 409 (81.8%) respondents feel that branded dairy products are better than unbranded dairy products, and 91 (18.2%) respondents feel that the branded dairy products are not better than unbranded dairy products.

It is concluded that majority (81.8%) respondents feel that branded dairy products are better than unbranded dairy products.

**Reasons**

The table 44 depicts the reasons for feeling branded dairy products are better than unbranded dairy products. The reasons are classified as assured quality, safely packed, reasonable price, always available and others.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reasons</th>
<th>Number of respondents</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assured quality</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safely Packed</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>13.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reasonable price</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Always Available</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>19.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>409</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is known from the table 44 that out of the respondents who states that branded dairy products are superior, 241 (49%) of the respondents states that the
branded dairy products are better than unbranded dairy products because of assured quality, 78 (19.1%) of the respondents feel that the branded dairy products are better than unbranded dairy products because it is always available and 56 (13.7%) of the respondents feel that the branded dairy products are better than unbranded dairy products because it is safely packed.

It is concluded that most of 49% of the respondents feel that the branded dairy products are better than unbranded dairy products because of assured quality.

**Level of satisfaction relating to the services provided by retailers / shop keepers**

The table 45 shows level of satisfaction relating to the services provided by retailers / shop keepers. Their satisfaction level is classified as very high satisfaction, high satisfaction, moderate satisfaction, low satisfaction and very low satisfaction.

**Table 45: Level of satisfaction relating to the services provided by retailers / shop keepers**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Services / Level of satisfaction</th>
<th>Very high satisfaction</th>
<th>High satisfaction</th>
<th>Moderate satisfaction</th>
<th>Low satisfaction</th>
<th>Very low satisfaction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Easy availability</td>
<td>289 (57.8)</td>
<td>142 (28.4)</td>
<td>42 (8.4)</td>
<td>26 (5.2)</td>
<td>1 (0.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helps to make selection</td>
<td>25 (5.0)</td>
<td>270 (54.0)</td>
<td>117 (23.4)</td>
<td>83 (16.6)</td>
<td>5 (1.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Door delivery</td>
<td>104 (20.8)</td>
<td>81 (16.2)</td>
<td>104 (20.8)</td>
<td>163 (32.6)</td>
<td>48 (9.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courtesy &amp; friendliness</td>
<td>31 (6.2)</td>
<td>175 (35.0)</td>
<td>209 (41.8)</td>
<td>76 (15.2)</td>
<td>9 (1.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing samples of new products</td>
<td>24 (4.8)</td>
<td>48 (9.6)</td>
<td>77 (15.4)</td>
<td>110 (22.0)</td>
<td>241 (48.2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The values in brackets are in percentages
It is understood from the table 45 that out of the total respondents taken for the study, 289 (57.8%) of the respondents are very highly satisfied with the service of easy availability, 270(54.0%) of the respondents are highly satisfied with the service of the retailers in helping them to make selection and 209(41.8%) of the respondents are moderately satisfied with the service of courtesy and friendliness of the retailers.

It is concluded that majority (57.8%) of the respondents are very highly satisfied with the service of easy availability.

**Opinion about the problems faced by the respondents**

The table 46 depicts the opinion of the respondents towards the problems faced by them. Their responses are classified as yes and no.

**Table 46: Opinion about the problems faced by respondents**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Opinion</th>
<th>Number of respondents</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>27.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>364</td>
<td>72.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is identified from table 46 that out of the total respondents taken for the study, 364(72.8%) respondents says that they do not have any problems in the usage of the dairy products and 136 (27.2%) of the respondents feel that they have some problem in the usage of dairy products.

It is concluded that majority (72.8%) respondents says that they do not have problems in the usage of the dairy products.

**Nature of the problems faced by the respondents**

The table 47 depicts the nature of the problems faced by the respondents. The nature of the problems are classified as contamination, supply after expiry date, poor packaging, adulteration, taste differ and other problems.
Table 47: Nature of the problems faced by the respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nature of the problem</th>
<th>Number of respondents</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contamination</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>11.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supply after expiry date</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>46.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor packaging</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>17.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adulteration</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taste differ</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>14.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is observed from the table 47 that out of the respondents who faced problems when using the dairy product, 63 (46.4%) respondents said that they have the problem of supply after expiry date, 24 (17.6%) of the respondents opine that they have the problem of poor packaging and 20 (14.7%) of the respondents said that they have the problem of others such as difference in price, lack of door delivery etc.

It is concluded that most 46.4% of the respondents said that they have the problem of supply after expiry date.

Complained to concerned authorities

The table 48 depicts whether the complaints made to concerned authorities regarding the problem faced by the respondents. The responses are classified as yes and no.

Table 48: Complaints made to concerned authorities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Number of respondents</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>63.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>36.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
It is found from table 48 that out of the respondents who faced problem, 86 (63.2%) said that they have made complaints to the concerned authorities and remaining 50 (36.8%) of them said that they have not made any complaints to the concerned authorities.

It is concluded from that majority (63.2%) of the respondents said that they have made complaints to the concerned authorities.

**Response of the concerned authorities towards the complaints made by the respondents**

The table 49 depicts response of the concerned authorities towards the complaints made by the respondents. The responses are classified as Very good, good, normal, poor and very poor.

**Table 49: Response of the concerned authorities towards the complaints made by the respondents**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Number of respondents</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very good</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>27.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normal</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>54.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very poor</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is obvious from the table 49 that out of the respondents who have complained to the concerned authorities, 47 (54.7%) of the respondents fell that that response of authorities is normal, 24 (27.9%) of the respondents have stated that the response of the authorities is good and 11 (12.8%) respondents feel that the response of the authorities is poor.

It is concluded that majority (54.7%) of the respondents have stated that that response of authorities is normal.
Agreeability of the respondents towards various statements

The table 50 depicts agreeability of the respondents towards various statements. The responses are classified as strongly agree, agree, neutral, disagree and strongly disagree.

Table 50: Agreeability of the respondents towards various statements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statements</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Price of dairy products is always reasonable</td>
<td>138 (27.6%)</td>
<td>198 (39.6%)</td>
<td>79 (15.8%)</td>
<td>71 (14.2%)</td>
<td>14 (2.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of the dairy product is up to the expectations of the customers</td>
<td>44 (8.8%)</td>
<td>272 (54.4%)</td>
<td>181 (36.2%)</td>
<td>2 (0.4%)</td>
<td>1 (0.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The hygienic aspect of dairy product is always good</td>
<td>104 (20.8%)</td>
<td>142 (28.4%)</td>
<td>218 (43.6%)</td>
<td>22 (4.4%)</td>
<td>14 (2.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All dairy products are properly packed and sold</td>
<td>67 (13.4%)</td>
<td>155 (31.0%)</td>
<td>182 (36.4%)</td>
<td>51 (10.2%)</td>
<td>45 (9.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The dairy products are always available</td>
<td>103 (20.6%)</td>
<td>217 (43.4%)</td>
<td>86 (17.2%)</td>
<td>50 (10.0%)</td>
<td>44 (8.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The retailers services are always good</td>
<td>17 (3.4%)</td>
<td>169 (33.8%)</td>
<td>213 (42.6%)</td>
<td>81 (16.2%)</td>
<td>20 (4.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequate discount is offered by retailers</td>
<td>9 (1.8%)</td>
<td>45 (9.0%)</td>
<td>73 (14.6%)</td>
<td>232 (46.4%)</td>
<td>141 (28.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No adulteration is done by the retailers</td>
<td>22 (4.4%)</td>
<td>72 (14.4%)</td>
<td>236 (47.2%)</td>
<td>114 (22.8%)</td>
<td>76 (15.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The retailers supply dairy products in small quantity also</td>
<td>34 (6.8%)</td>
<td>129 (25.8%)</td>
<td>162 (32.4%)</td>
<td>109 (21.8%)</td>
<td>66 (13.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The retailers attend the complaints of customer with due care.</td>
<td>28 (5.6%)</td>
<td>115 (23%)</td>
<td>166 (33.2%)</td>
<td>116 (23.2%)</td>
<td>75 (15%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The values in brackets are in percentages

It is found from the table 50 that 138 (27.6%), 104 (20.8%) of the respondents strongly agree towards “Price of dairy products is always reasonable” and “The hygienic factor of dairy products is always good” respectively. Further 272(54.4%), 217 (43.4%) of the respondents agree with the statements “Quality of the dairy product is up to the expectations of the customers”, “The dairy products are always available” respectively.
It is concluded that a maximum of 27.6% of the respondents strongly agree towards “Price of dairy products is always reasonable”.

**Chi square analysis**

The chi square test is used to test the independence of two attributes. In this section the results of chi square analysis is presented to identify the personal factors which influences the study related factors. The study related factors considered are

- Sources of awareness
- Media of awareness
- Sources of purchase
- Mode of payment for your purchase
- Choice of the respondents if the brand they use is not available
- Type of package
- Reasons of not suggesting their brands to others
- Reasons for stating that branded dairy products are better than unbranded dairy products

The results are presented with suitable hypothesis and relevant interpretations.

**Personal factors and sources of awareness**

**Hypothesis:** The personal factors of the respondents have no significant influence on the sources of awareness of the various brands of dairy products.

The table 51 describes the results of chi-square analysis in terms of personal factor, chi-square values, p- values and their significance on the sources of awareness of various brands of dairy products.
Table 51: Chi-square value – personal factor and sources of awareness of various brands of dairy products

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personal factors</th>
<th>Chi-square values</th>
<th>p values</th>
<th>Significant/not significant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>11.643</td>
<td>0.020</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age (years)</td>
<td>57.922</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational qualification</td>
<td>115.100</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupational status</td>
<td>119.796</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital status</td>
<td>33.6421</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of family</td>
<td>52.078</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No of earning members in the family</td>
<td>81.523</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No of children in the family</td>
<td>19.129</td>
<td>0.014</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family monthly income</td>
<td>86.608</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: S-Significant at 5% level (p-value < 0.05) NS- Not significant (p-value > 0.05)

It is found from the table 51 that the hypothesis is rejected (significant) in all the cases.

It is concluded that all the personal factors have significant influence on the sources of awareness of various brands of dairy products.

**Personal factors and media of awareness**

**Hypothesis**: The personal factors of the respondents have no significant influence on the media of awareness of the various brands of dairy products.

The table 52 describes the results of chi-square analysis in terms of personal factor, chi-square values, p-values and their significance on the media of awareness of various brands of dairy products.
Table 52: Chi - square value – personal factor and media of awareness of various brands of dairy products

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personal factors</th>
<th>Chi- square values</th>
<th>P - values</th>
<th>Significant/not significant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>9.521</td>
<td>0.049</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age (years)</td>
<td>176.615</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational qualification</td>
<td>18.143</td>
<td>0.111</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupational status</td>
<td>29.268</td>
<td>0.083</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital status</td>
<td>4.057</td>
<td>0.398</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of family</td>
<td>9.003</td>
<td>0.061</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No of earning members in the family</td>
<td>40.119</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No of children in the family</td>
<td>27.434</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family monthly income</td>
<td>30.339</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: S-Significant at 5% level (p - value ≤ 0.05) NS- Not significant (p- value > 0.05)

It is found from the table 52 that the hypothesis is rejected (significant) in 5 cases and in 4 cases the hypothesis is accepted (Not significant).

It is concluded that the personal factors such as gender, age, number of earning members in the family, Number of children in the family and family monthly income have significant influence on the media of awareness of various brands of dairy products.

**Personal factors and Source of purchase**

**Hypothesis:** The personal factors of the respondents have no significant influence on the source of purchase of the various brands of dairy products.

The table 53 describes the results of chi-square analysis in terms of personal factor, chi-square values, p- values and their significance on the source of purchase of various brands of dairy products.
Table 53: Chi - square value – personal factor and source of purchase of various brands of dairy products

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personal factors</th>
<th>Chi- square values</th>
<th>p - values</th>
<th>Significant /not significant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>19.155</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age (years)</td>
<td>72.117</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational qualification</td>
<td>52.878</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupational status</td>
<td>192.100</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital status</td>
<td>47.124</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of family</td>
<td>23.445</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No of earning members in the family</td>
<td>41.590</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No of children in the family</td>
<td>42.876</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family monthly income</td>
<td>113.497</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: S-Significant at 5% level p - value ≤ 0.05) NS- Not significant (p - value > 0.05)

It is found from the table 53 that the hypothesis is rejected (significant) in all the cases.
It is concluded that all the personal factors have significant influence on the sources of purchase of various brands of dairy products.

**Personal factors and mode of purchase of various brands of dairy products**

**Hypothesis:** The personal factors of the respondents have no significant influence on the mode of payment made for the purchase of various brands of dairy products.

The table 54 describes the results of chi-square analysis in terms of personal factor, chi-square values, p - values and their significance on the mode of payment made for the purchase of various brands of dairy products.
Table 54: Chi - square value – personal factor and media of awareness of various brands of dairy products

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personal factors</th>
<th>Chi- square values</th>
<th>p - values</th>
<th>Significant/not significant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>1.321</td>
<td>0.519</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age (years)</td>
<td>15.536</td>
<td>0.016</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational qualification</td>
<td>57.627</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupational status</td>
<td>14.942</td>
<td>0.134</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital status</td>
<td>8.052</td>
<td>0.018</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of family</td>
<td>3.143</td>
<td>0.208</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No of earning members in the family</td>
<td>7.568</td>
<td>0.109</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No of children in the family</td>
<td>9.208</td>
<td>0.056</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family monthly income</td>
<td>31.064</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note:  S-Significant at 5% level (p - value ≤ 0.05) NS- Not significant (p - value > 0.05)

It is found from the table 54 that the hypothesis is rejected (significant) in 4 cases and in 5 cases the hypothesis is accepted (Not significant).

It is concluded that the personal factors such as age, educational qualification, marital status and family monthly income have significant influence on the Mode of purchase of various brands of dairy products.

**Personal factors and Choice of the respondents if the brand they use is not available**

**Hypothesis:** The personal factors of the respondents have no significant influence on the choice of respondents if the brand they use is not available.

The table 55 describes the results of chi-square analysis in terms of personal factor, chi-square values, p - values and their significance on the choice of the respondents if the brand they use is not available.
**Table 55: Chi - square value – personal factor and the choice of the respondents if the brand they use is not available.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personal factors</th>
<th>Chi- square values</th>
<th>p - values</th>
<th>Significant /not significant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>8.365</td>
<td>0.039</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age (years)</td>
<td>69.007</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational qualification</td>
<td>26.487</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupational status</td>
<td>179.026</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital status</td>
<td>30.868</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of family</td>
<td>50.862</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No of earning members in the family</td>
<td>99.401</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No of children in the family</td>
<td>15.483</td>
<td>0.017</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family monthly income</td>
<td>110.197</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note:  S-Significant at 5% level (p - value < 0.05) NS- Not significant (p - value > 0.05)

It is found from the table 55 that the hypothesis is rejected (significant) in all the cases.

It is concluded that all the personal factors have significant influence on the choice of the respondents if the brand they use is not available.

**Personal factors and type of package**

**Hypothesis:** The personal factors of the respondents have no significant influence on the type of package preferred for the purchase of the various brands of dairy products.

The table 56 describes the results of chi-square analysis in terms of personal factor, chi-square values, p - values and their significance on the type of package preferred for the purchase of the various brands of dairy products.
Table 56: Chi - square value – personal factor and the type of package preferred for the purchase of the various brands of dairy products.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personal factors</th>
<th>Chi- square values</th>
<th>p - values</th>
<th>Significant /not significant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>4.688</td>
<td>0.196</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age (years)</td>
<td>57.748</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational qualification</td>
<td>16.346</td>
<td>0.060</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupational status</td>
<td>51.010</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital status</td>
<td>6.915</td>
<td>0.075</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of family</td>
<td>11.696</td>
<td>0.008</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No of earning members in the family</td>
<td>26.458</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No of children in the family</td>
<td>33.253</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family monthly income</td>
<td>50.441</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note:  S-Significant at 5% level (p - value ≤ 0.05) NS- Not significant (p - value > 0.05)

It is found from the table 56 that the hypothesis is rejected (significant) in 6 cases and in 3 cases the hypothesis is accepted (Not significant).

It is concluded that the personal factors such as age, occupational status, Type of family, Number of earning members in the family, Number of children in the family and family monthly income on have significant influence on the type of package preferred for the purchase of the various brands of dairy products.

Personal factors and reasons for not suggesting their brands to others

Hypothesis: The personal factors of the respondents have no significant influence on the reasons for not suggesting their brands to others.

The table 57 describes the results of chi-square analysis in terms of personal factor, chi-square values, p - values and their significance on the reasons for not suggesting their brands to others.
Table 57: Chi-square value – personal factor and reasons for not suggesting their brands to others

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personal factors</th>
<th>Chi-square values</th>
<th>p - values</th>
<th>Significant /not significant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>7.175</td>
<td>0.067</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age (years)</td>
<td>23.638</td>
<td>0.005</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational qualification</td>
<td>16.279</td>
<td>0.061</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupational status</td>
<td>63.852</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital status</td>
<td>5.561</td>
<td>0.135</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of family</td>
<td>14.372</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No of earning members in the family</td>
<td>22.611</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No of children in the family</td>
<td>29.379</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family monthly income</td>
<td>40.280</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: S-Significant at 5% level (p-value < 0.05) NS- Not significant (p-value > 0.05)

It is found from the table 57 that the hypothesis is rejected (significant) in 6 cases and in 3 cases the hypothesis is accepted (Not significant).

It is concluded that the personal factors such as age, occupational status, Type of family, Number of earning members in the family, Number of children’s in the family and family monthly income have significant influence on the reasons for not suggesting their brands to others.

**Personal factors and reasons for stating that branded dairy products are better than unbranded dairy products**

**Hypothesis:** The personal factors of the respondents have no significant influence on the reasons for stating that branded dairy products are better than unbranded dairy products.

The table 58 describes the results of chi-square analysis in terms of personal factor, chi-square values, p-values and their significance on the reasons for stating that branded dairy products are better than unbranded dairy products.
Table: 58 Chi - square value – personal factor and reasons for stating that branded dairy products are better than unbranded dairy products

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personal factors</th>
<th>Chi- square values</th>
<th>p - values</th>
<th>Significant/not significant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>54.199</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age (years)</td>
<td>81.432</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational qualification</td>
<td>35.642</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupational status</td>
<td>61.451</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital status</td>
<td>61.913</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of family</td>
<td>91.071</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No of earning members in the family</td>
<td>95.695</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No of children in the family</td>
<td>45.760</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family monthly income</td>
<td>37.993</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: S-Significant at 5% level (p - value ≤ 0.05) NS- Not significant (p - value > 0.05)

It is found from the table 58 that the hypothesis is rejected (significant) in all the cases.

It is concluded that all the personal factors have significant influence on the choice of the respondents if the brand they use is not available.

**Average Rank analysis**

The average rank analysis is mainly used to identify the priority of the different category of the respondents on the various aspects relating to the study. In this section the results of average rank analysis is presented for different study factors such as

- The factors influencing the purchase of dairy products.
- Brands of dairy products preferred to buy in future.
- Reasons to feel that their brand is superior than other brands of dairy products.
Based on the consolidated opinion of the different category of respondents the average rank is calculated and the final rank is arrived using the criterion “lesser the average rank more is the priority”. The results are presented in different tables with suitable interpretations.

**Personal factors and the factors influencing the purchase of dairy products**

In this section, the results of average rank analysis is presented for the respondents under different personal classification on their priorities towards the factors influencing the purchase decision.

The factors considered are

- Quality - A_1
- Quantity - A_2
- Price - A_3
- Convenience - A_4
- Taste - A_5
- Home delivery - A_6
- Freshness - A_7
- Special offers - A_8
- Packaging - A_9
- Others - A_10

The table 59 describes the results of average rank analysis in terms of personal factors, factors influencing the purchase decision and their average rank and final rank.
Table 59: Average Rank – Personal factors and factors influencing to purchase the dairy products

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personal factors</th>
<th>A1</th>
<th>A2</th>
<th>A3</th>
<th>A4</th>
<th>A5</th>
<th>A6</th>
<th>A7</th>
<th>A8</th>
<th>A9</th>
<th>A10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>AR</td>
<td>2.51</td>
<td>3.96</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>4.95</td>
<td>4.06</td>
<td>6.06</td>
<td>5.36</td>
<td>7.67</td>
<td>6.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FR</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>AR</td>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>4.19</td>
<td>3.87</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>6.70</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>5.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FR</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age group</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below 20 years</td>
<td>AR</td>
<td>1.59</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>2.97</td>
<td>6.17</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>7.09</td>
<td>5.22</td>
<td>8.19</td>
<td>6.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FR</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-40 years</td>
<td>AR</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>3.91</td>
<td>4.29</td>
<td>5.71</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>6.58</td>
<td>4.85</td>
<td>7.61</td>
<td>5.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FR</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-60 year</td>
<td>AR</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>4.63</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>4.67</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>5.38</td>
<td>5.08</td>
<td>7.01</td>
<td>7.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FR</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 and above</td>
<td>AR</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>5.33</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>7.33</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>4.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FR</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Educational level</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School level</td>
<td>AR</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>4.09</td>
<td>4.51</td>
<td>4.78</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>6.38</td>
<td>5.28</td>
<td>8.07</td>
<td>6.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FR</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College level</td>
<td>AR</td>
<td>2.21</td>
<td>4.23</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>6.01</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>6.75</td>
<td>5.03</td>
<td>7.74</td>
<td>6.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FR</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>AR</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>5.39</td>
<td>3.96</td>
<td>5.75</td>
<td>4.49</td>
<td>6.95</td>
<td>6.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FR</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>AR</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>6.33</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>6.33</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>6.67</td>
<td>6.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FR</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Occupational status</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>AR</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>7.50</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>7.50</td>
<td>8.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FR</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business/professional</td>
<td>AR</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>4.32</td>
<td>6.18</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>6.79</td>
<td>4.62</td>
<td>7.72</td>
<td>6.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FR</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public sector employee</td>
<td>AR</td>
<td>2.07</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>2.28</td>
<td>4.21</td>
<td>4.40</td>
<td>5.69</td>
<td>5.76</td>
<td>7.18</td>
<td>7.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FR</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private sector employee</td>
<td>AR</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>4.58</td>
<td>4.54</td>
<td>5.28</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>5.54</td>
<td>4.60</td>
<td>7.69</td>
<td>6.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FR</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home maker</td>
<td>AR</td>
<td>2.01</td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>5.08</td>
<td>5.87</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>6.98</td>
<td>4.87</td>
<td>7.46</td>
<td>5.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FR</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>AR</td>
<td>1.85</td>
<td>4.51</td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td>6.09</td>
<td>2.97</td>
<td>7.14</td>
<td>5.09</td>
<td>7.98</td>
<td>6.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FR</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal factors</td>
<td>A₁</td>
<td>A₂</td>
<td>A₃</td>
<td>A₄</td>
<td>A₅</td>
<td>A₆</td>
<td>A₇</td>
<td>A₈</td>
<td>A₉</td>
<td>A₁₀</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>AR</td>
<td>2.48</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>4.09</td>
<td>4.87</td>
<td>3.73</td>
<td>5.87</td>
<td>4.89</td>
<td>7.38</td>
<td>6.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FR</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unmarried</td>
<td>AR</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>6.48</td>
<td>2.84</td>
<td>7.17</td>
<td>5.08</td>
<td>7.95</td>
<td>6.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FR</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family type</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint family</td>
<td>AR</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>4.28</td>
<td>5.01</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>6.08</td>
<td>4.72</td>
<td>7.36</td>
<td>5.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FR</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nuclear family</td>
<td>AR</td>
<td>2.12</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>3.59</td>
<td>5.89</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>6.64</td>
<td>5.06</td>
<td>7.76</td>
<td>6.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FR</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of earning members in the family</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>AR</td>
<td>2.12</td>
<td>3.73</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>6.84</td>
<td>5.41</td>
<td>7.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FR</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AR</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>3.93</td>
<td>4.56</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>5.93</td>
<td>4.41</td>
<td>7.53</td>
<td>5.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FR</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AR</td>
<td>1.82</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>4.91</td>
<td>6.43</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td>6.41</td>
<td>4.76</td>
<td>8.20</td>
<td>5.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FR</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of children in the family</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>AR</td>
<td>2.61</td>
<td>4.37</td>
<td>4.88</td>
<td>5.20</td>
<td>2.66</td>
<td>5.71</td>
<td>4.87</td>
<td>7.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FR</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AR</td>
<td>2.09</td>
<td>4.18</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>5.30</td>
<td>3.73</td>
<td>6.36</td>
<td>5.08</td>
<td>7.68</td>
<td>6.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FR</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AR</td>
<td>2.61</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>5.14</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>6.91</td>
<td>4.57</td>
<td>7.48</td>
<td>5.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FR</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family monthly income</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than Rs 10,000</td>
<td>AR</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>4.32</td>
<td>4.43</td>
<td>5.03</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>7.32</td>
<td>4.80</td>
<td>8.23</td>
<td>5.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FR</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rs 10,000-20,000</td>
<td>AR</td>
<td>2.36</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>5.40</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>6.33</td>
<td>5.27</td>
<td>7.42</td>
<td>6.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FR</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rs 20,000-30,000</td>
<td>AR</td>
<td>1.93</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td>5.59</td>
<td>3.77</td>
<td>6.76</td>
<td>5.52</td>
<td>7.83</td>
<td>6.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FR</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rs 30,000 and above</td>
<td>AR</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td>4.62</td>
<td>4.73</td>
<td>6.01</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>6.12</td>
<td>4.49</td>
<td>7.50</td>
<td>5.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FR</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: AR – Average rank, FR – First rank.

It is found from the table 59 that the respondents irrespective of their personal classification have opined that quality (A₁) is the influencing factor followed by quantity (A₂) and price (A₃) in purchasing the dairy products.
It is concluded that the majority of respondent’s irrespective of their personal classification have given top priority to quality (A₁) as the influencing factor in their purchase decision.

**Personal factors and the brands of dairy products preferred to buy in future.**

In this section the results of average rank analysis is presented for the respondents under different personal classification on their priorities towards the brands of dairy products preferred to buy in future.

The factors considered are

- Aavin - B₁
- Amul - B₂
- Aroka/Hatsun - B₃
- Aroma - B₄
- Cavin - B₅
- Sakthi - B₆
- Others - B₇

The table 60 describes the results of average rank analysis in terms of personal factors, brands of dairy products preferred to buy in future and their average rank and final rank.

**Table 60: Average Rank – Personal factors and brands of dairy products preferred to buy in future**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personal factors</th>
<th>B₁</th>
<th>B₂</th>
<th>B₃</th>
<th>B₄</th>
<th>B₅</th>
<th>B₆</th>
<th>B₇</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td>4.23</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>7.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FR</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>4.76</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>6.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FR</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age group</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below 20 years</td>
<td>2.68</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2.21</td>
<td>4.65</td>
<td>4.35</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>7.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FR</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-40 years</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>4.74</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>6.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FR</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-60 year</td>
<td>4.88</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>4.35</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>7.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FR</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 and above</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Personal factors</strong></td>
<td>B₁</td>
<td>B₂</td>
<td>B₃</td>
<td>B₄</td>
<td>B₅</td>
<td>B₆</td>
<td>B₇</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Educational level</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School level</td>
<td>AR</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>2.69</td>
<td>3.77</td>
<td>4.67</td>
<td>3.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FR</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College level</td>
<td>AR</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>3.01</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>4.21</td>
<td>3.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FR</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>AR</td>
<td>1.81</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td>4.30</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>5.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FR</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>AR</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FR</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Occupational status</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>AR</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FR</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business/professional</td>
<td>AR</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>3.37</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>2.21</td>
<td>5.25</td>
<td>2.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FR</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public sector employee</td>
<td>AR</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>4.73</td>
<td>2.59</td>
<td>3.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FR</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private sector employee</td>
<td>AR</td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>4.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FR</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home maker</td>
<td>AR</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>2.47</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>4.53</td>
<td>3.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FR</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>AR</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>4.29</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>3.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FR</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Marital status</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>AR</td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>3.77</td>
<td>6.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FR</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unmarried</td>
<td>AR</td>
<td>2.99</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>2.84</td>
<td>5.02</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>7.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FR</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Family type</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint family</td>
<td>AR</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>4.40</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FR</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nuclear family</td>
<td>AR</td>
<td>2.84</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>5.10</td>
<td>3.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FR</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of earning members in the family</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>AR</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>4.06</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>2.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FR</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>AR</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td>4.15</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>4.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FR</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 and above</td>
<td>AR</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>4.15</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>4.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FR</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of children in the family</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>AR</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td>2.45</td>
<td>3.91</td>
<td>5.09</td>
<td>3.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FR</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>AR</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>4.37</td>
<td>3.01</td>
<td>3.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FR</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 and above</td>
<td>AR</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>1.69</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>4.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FR</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Family monthly income</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than Rs 10,000</td>
<td>AR</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>4.29</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>4.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FR</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rs 10,000-20,000</td>
<td>AR</td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>4.09</td>
<td>3.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FR</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rs 20,000-30,000</td>
<td>AR</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>4.22</td>
<td>3.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FR</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rs 30,000 and above</td>
<td>AR</td>
<td>2.30</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>4.60</td>
<td>4.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FR</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: AR – Average rank, FR – First rank
It is evident from the table 60 that the respondent’s irrespective of their personal classification have opined that aavin (B₁) is the brand of dairy product to be preferred in future followed by Arockia/Hatsun (B₃) and amul (B₂).

It is concluded that the majority of respondents irrespective of their personal classification have given top priority to aavin (B₁) as the brand of dairy product preferred to buy in future.

**Personal factors and the reasons to feel that their brand is superior to other brands of dairy products**

In this section the results of average rank analysis is presented for the respondents under different personal classification on their priorities towards the reasons to feel that their brand of dairy product is superior to other brands of dairy products.

The factors considered are

- Good in taste - C₁
- Best quality - C₂
- Proper quantity - C₃
- Packaging - C₄
- Reasonable price - C₅
- Availability - C₆

The table 61 describes the results of average rank analysis in terms of personal factors the reasons to feel that their brand of dairy product is superior to other brands of dairy products.
Table 61: Average Rank – Personal factors and reasons as why their brand is superior to other brand of dairy products

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personal factors</th>
<th>C1</th>
<th>C2</th>
<th>C3</th>
<th>C4</th>
<th>C5</th>
<th>C6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>AR</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>1.92</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>4.40</td>
<td>4.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FR</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>AR</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>2.09</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td>4.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FR</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age group</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below 20 years</td>
<td>AR</td>
<td>1.96</td>
<td>1.51</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>4.58</td>
<td>5.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FR</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-40 years</td>
<td>AR</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2.21</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>4.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FR</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-60 year</td>
<td>AR</td>
<td>2.54</td>
<td>2.28</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>4.35</td>
<td>4.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FR</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 and above</td>
<td>AR</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>5.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FR</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Educational level</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School level</td>
<td>AR</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>1.95</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>4.16</td>
<td>4.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FR</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College level</td>
<td>AR</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>4.07</td>
<td>4.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FR</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>AR</td>
<td>2.62</td>
<td>1.81</td>
<td>4.01</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>4.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FR</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>AR</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FR</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Occupational status</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>AR</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FR</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business/professional</td>
<td>AR</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>3.01</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>2.52</td>
<td>4.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FR</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public sector employee</td>
<td>AR</td>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>4.30</td>
<td>4.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FR</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private sector employee</td>
<td>AR</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>2.41</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>4.30</td>
<td>3.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FR</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home maker</td>
<td>AR</td>
<td>4.19</td>
<td>2.03</td>
<td>2.62</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>4.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FR</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>AR</td>
<td>2.06</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>4.73</td>
<td>5.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FR</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal factors</td>
<td>C₁</td>
<td>C₂</td>
<td>C₃</td>
<td>C₄</td>
<td>C₅</td>
<td>C₆</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Marital status</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>AR</td>
<td>1.96</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>4.09</td>
<td>4.37</td>
<td>4.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FR</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unmarried</td>
<td>AR</td>
<td>2.12</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>4.82</td>
<td>4.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FR</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Family type</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint family</td>
<td>AR</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>1.87</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>4.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FR</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nuclear family</td>
<td>AR</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>4.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FR</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of earning members in the family</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>AR</td>
<td>2.52</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>4.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FR</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>AR</td>
<td>1.85</td>
<td>2.01</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>4.21</td>
<td>4.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FR</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 and above</td>
<td>AR</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>1.81</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>4.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FR</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of children in the family</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>AR</td>
<td>2.47</td>
<td>2.28</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>4.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FR</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>AR</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>1.78</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>4.38</td>
<td>4.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FR</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 and above</td>
<td>AR</td>
<td>1.94</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>4.06</td>
<td>4.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FR</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Family monthly income</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than Rs 10,000</td>
<td>AR</td>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>4.09</td>
<td>4.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FR</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rs 10,000-20,000</td>
<td>AR</td>
<td>2.45</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>4.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FR</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rs 20,000-30,000</td>
<td>AR</td>
<td>2.42</td>
<td>1.94</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>4.65</td>
<td>4.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FR</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rs 30,000 and above</td>
<td>AR</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>2.03</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>4.15</td>
<td>4.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FR</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: AR – Average rank, FR – First rank
It is clear from the table 61 that the respondent’s irrespective of their personal classification have opined that best quality (C₂) is the reason to feel their brand is superior to other brand of dairy products followed by good in taste (C₁) and proper quantity (C₃) in purchasing the dairy products.

It is concluded that the majority of respondent’s irrespective of their personal classification have given top priority to best quality (C₂) as the reason to feel their brand is superior to other brand of dairy products.

**Average Score Analysis**

The average score analysis is performed in any study to assess the level of opinion / satisfaction of the different category of respondents on the various aspects relating to the study. In this section the results of average score analysis is presented based on the opinion of the respondents obtained through a five point scaling technique similar to likert scaling on various aspects.

The different aspects considered for this purpose are

- Awareness towards various brands of dairy products.
- Frequency of purchase of dairy products other than milk.
- Opinion about branded and unbranded dairy products.
- Level of satisfaction towards the purchase of various brands of dairy products.
- Level of satisfaction on the factors relating to the services rendered by the retailers.
- Level of agreeability on the following statements relating to the purchase of dairy products

The results are presented in different tables with suitable interpretations.
Personal factor and level of awareness towards various brands of dairy products

In this section, the results of average score analysis is presented for the respondents under different personal classification on their level of awareness towards various brands of dairy products.

The various brands considered are

- Aavin - D₁
- Amul - D₂
- Arokia/Hatsun - D₃
- Aroma - D₄
- Cavin - D₅
- Sakthi - D₆
- Others - D₇

The table 62 describes the personal factors of the respondents, various brands and their average scores.

**Table 62: Average Score – Personal factors and Level of awareness towards various brands the dairy products**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personal factors</th>
<th>D₁</th>
<th>D₂</th>
<th>D₃</th>
<th>D₄</th>
<th>D₅</th>
<th>D₆</th>
<th>D₇</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>3.87</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>2.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>4.70</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td>2.66</td>
<td>3.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below 20 years</td>
<td>4.61</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td>2.54</td>
<td>3.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-40 years</td>
<td>4.66</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>3.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-60 year</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>3.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 and above</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School level</td>
<td>4.61</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College level</td>
<td>4.44</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td>2.59</td>
<td>2.61</td>
<td>3.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>4.52</td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td>3.73</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>3.37</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>3.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>3.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal factors</td>
<td>D₁</td>
<td>D₂</td>
<td>D₃</td>
<td>D₄</td>
<td>D₅</td>
<td>D₆</td>
<td>D₇</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Occupational status</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business/professional</td>
<td>4.44</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>2.59</td>
<td>3.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public sector employee</td>
<td>3.99</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>2.42</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>3.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private sector employee</td>
<td>4.69</td>
<td>3.97</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>2.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home maker</td>
<td>4.69</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>3.87</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>2.61</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>4.61</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>3.87</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>2.36</td>
<td>2.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Marital status</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>4.41</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>3.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unmarried</td>
<td>4.58</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>3.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Family type</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint family</td>
<td>4.40</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td>2.97</td>
<td>2.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nuclear family</td>
<td>4.52</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>3.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of earning members in the family</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.45</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td>2.47</td>
<td>3.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.51</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>2.76</td>
<td>3.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 and above</td>
<td>4.53</td>
<td>3.97</td>
<td>4.01</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>2.36</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>2.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of children’s in the family</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.51</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>3.87</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td>2.99</td>
<td>2.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.45</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>2.69</td>
<td>2.54</td>
<td>3.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 and above</td>
<td>4.30</td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>4.18</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Family monthly income</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than Rs 10,000</td>
<td>4.78</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>2.29</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rs 10,000-20,000</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>3.01</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td>3.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rs 20,000-30,000</td>
<td>4.69</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>2.29</td>
<td>3.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rs 30,000 and above</td>
<td>4.57</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>4.01</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>2.80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is found from the table 62 that the respondents irrespective of their personal classifications have high level of awareness towards aavin (D₁), followed
by amul (D2) and arokiya / hatsun (D3) when compared to other brands of dairy products.

It is concluded that the respondents have high level of awareness towards aavin (D1) when compared to other brands of dairy products.

**Personal factor and Frequency of purchase of dairy products other than milk**

In this section the results of average score analysis is presented for the respondents under different personal classification on their Frequency of purchase of dairy products other than milk.

The various products considered are

- Ghee - E1
- Curd - E2

The table 63 describes the personal factors of the respondents, various products and their average scores.

**Table 63: Average Score – Personal factors and Frequency of purchase of dairy products other than milk**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personal factors</th>
<th>E1</th>
<th>E2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>3.37</td>
<td>3.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>3.73</td>
<td>3.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age group</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below 20 years</td>
<td>3.87</td>
<td>4.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-40 years</td>
<td>3.59</td>
<td>3.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-60 year</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>3.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 and above</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Educational level</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School level</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>3.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College level</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>3.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>3.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal factors</td>
<td>( E_1 )</td>
<td>( E_2 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>4.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business/professional</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>3.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public sector employee</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>4.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private sector employee</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>3.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home maker</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>3.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>3.91</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupational status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital status</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>3.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>3.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unmarried</td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td>3.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family type</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>3.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint family</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>3.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nuclear family</td>
<td>3.59</td>
<td>3.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family type</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of earning members in the family</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>3.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>3.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td>3.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 and above</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>3.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of children’s in the family</td>
<td>3.73</td>
<td>3.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.73</td>
<td>3.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.59</td>
<td>3.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 and above</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>3.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of children’s in the family</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family monthly income</td>
<td>Less than Rs 10,000</td>
<td>2.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family monthly income</td>
<td>Rs 10,000-20,000</td>
<td>3.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rs 20,000-30,000</td>
<td>3.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rs 30,000 and above</td>
<td>3.81</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is found from the table 63 that the respondents irrespective of their personal classifications have indicated that they frequently purchase curd \((E_2)\) when compared to ghee \((E_1)\).

It is concluded that the respondents frequently purchase curd \((E_2)\) when compared to ghee \((E_1)\).
Personal factor and opinion about branded dairy product, unbranded dairy products.

In this section the results of average score analysis is presented for the respondents under different personal classification on their opinion about branded dairy product and unbranded dairy products.

The various products considered are

- Branded dairy products \(-F_1\)
- Unbranded dairy products \(-F_2\)

The table 64 describes the personal factors of the respondents, their opinion about branded \((F_1)\) and unbranded dairy products \((F_2)\) and their average scores.

Table 64: Average Score – Personal factors and opinion about branded dairy product, unbranded dairy products

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personal factors</th>
<th>(F_1)</th>
<th>(F_2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>4.37</td>
<td>3.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>4.12</td>
<td>3.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below 20 years</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>3.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-40 years</td>
<td>4.18</td>
<td>3.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-60 year</td>
<td>4.38</td>
<td>3.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 and above</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School level</td>
<td>4.24</td>
<td>3.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College level</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>3.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>3.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>3.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal factors</td>
<td>F₁</td>
<td>F₂</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Occupational status</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business/professional</td>
<td>4.38</td>
<td>4.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public sector employee</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>3.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private sector employee</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>3.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home maker</td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>4.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>4.12</td>
<td>4.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Marital status</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>4.23</td>
<td>3.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unmarried</td>
<td>4.18</td>
<td>3.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Family type</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint family</td>
<td>4.38</td>
<td>3.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nuclear family</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>3.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of earning members in the family</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>3.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.21</td>
<td>3.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 and above</td>
<td>4.29</td>
<td>2.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of children’s in the family</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>3.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.16</td>
<td>3.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 and above</td>
<td>4.41</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Family monthly income</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than Rs 10,000</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>2.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rs 10,000-20,000</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>3.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rs 20,000-30,000</td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>3.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rs 30,000 and above</td>
<td>4.29</td>
<td>3.61</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is found from the table 64 that the respondents irrespective of their personal classifications have indicated that they feel branded dairy products (F₂) as good when compared to unbranded dairy products (F₁).

It is concluded that the respondents feel that the branded dairy products (F₂) are good when compared to unbranded dairy products (F₁).
Personal factor and Level of satisfaction towards the purchase of various brands of dairy products

In this section the results of average score analysis is presented for the respondents under different personal classification on their level of satisfaction towards the purchase of various brands of dairy products.

The various factors considered are

- Quality \(-G_1\)
- Health aspect \(-G_2\)
- Quantity \(-G_3\)
- Packaging \(-G_4\)
- Price \(-G_5\)
- Availability \(-G_6\)
- Exchange facility \(-G_7\)
- Offers & discounts \(-G_8\)
- Home delivery \(-G_9\)
- Taste \(-G_{10}\)

The table 65 describes the personal factors of the respondents, various factors and their average scores.

<p>| Table 65: Average Score – Personal factors and Level of satisfaction towards the purchase of dairy products |
|-------------------------------------------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| Personal factors                               | (G_1)         | (G_2)         | (G_3)         | (G_4)         | (G_5)         | (G_6)         | (G_7)         | (G_8)         | (G_9)         | (G_{10})        |
| Gender                                         | Male            | 4.07            | 3.96            | 3.82            | 3.96            | 3.09            | 3.35            | 2.26            | 1.73            | 3.39            | 3.59            |
|                                                | Female          | 4.15            | 3.93            | 3.73            | 3.83            | 3.44            | 3.98            | 2.36            | 2.14            | 3.14            | 4.15            |
| Age group                                      | Below 20 years  | 4.37            | 3.86            | 3.65            | 4.03            | 3.28            | 4.02            | 2.38            | 2.30            | 3.64            | 3.92            |
|                                                | 20-40 years     | 4.10            | 4.02            | 3.67            | 3.75            | 3.38            | 3.76            | 2.20            | 1.97            | 2.85            | 4.22            |
|                                                | 40-60 year      | 3.91            | 3.86            | 4.16            | 4.07            | 3.21            | 3.43            | 2.56            | 1.62            | 3.72            | 3.25            |
|                                                | 60 and above    | 3.00            | 2.00            | 3.00            | 3.33            | 2.33            | 3.67            | 1.00            | 1.00            | 4.00            | 3.00            |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personal factors</th>
<th>$G_1$</th>
<th>$G_2$</th>
<th>$G_3$</th>
<th>$G_4$</th>
<th>$G_5$</th>
<th>$G_6$</th>
<th>$G_7$</th>
<th>$G_8$</th>
<th>$G_9$</th>
<th>$G_{10}$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Educational level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School level</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>3.77</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>1.92</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>3.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College level</td>
<td>4.09</td>
<td>3.99</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>3.97</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>2.46</td>
<td>1.95</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>4.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>4.45</td>
<td>3.87</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>2.35</td>
<td>2.26</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>3.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>4.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupational status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>4.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business/professional</td>
<td>4.22</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>3.93</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>3.98</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>4.26</td>
<td>4.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public sector employee</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>1.98</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>4.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private sector employee</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>3.77</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td>1.98</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>4.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home maker</td>
<td>3.77</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>2.21</td>
<td>2.09</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>4.51</td>
<td>3.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>3.96</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>2.42</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>3.73</td>
<td>3.99</td>
<td>4.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>4.06</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>3.73</td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>2.21</td>
<td>1.88</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>3.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unmarried</td>
<td>4.19</td>
<td>4.04</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>4.04</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>3.96</td>
<td>2.42</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>3.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family type</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint family</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>4.07</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>3.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nuclear family</td>
<td>4.06</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>3.73</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>2.35</td>
<td>2.09</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>4.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of earning members in the family</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.07</td>
<td>4.02</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.16</td>
<td>3.96</td>
<td>3.59</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>2.81</td>
<td>3.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 and above</td>
<td>4.18</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>4.03</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>2.36</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>4.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of children’s in the family</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>2.36</td>
<td>2.28</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>3.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.15</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>2.28</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>3.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 and above</td>
<td>4.36</td>
<td>3.96</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>2.98</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>1.85</td>
<td>2.84</td>
<td>3.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family monthly income</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than Rs 10,000</td>
<td>4.15</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>3.37</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>2.42</td>
<td>3.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rs 10,000-20,000</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>4.02</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>4.07</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td>2.98</td>
<td>3.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rs 20,000-30,000</td>
<td>4.34</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>4.04</td>
<td>4.04</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>2.62</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>3.97</td>
<td>4.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rs 30,000 and above</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>4.01</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>2.31</td>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>3.98</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is found from the table 65 that the respondents irrespective of their personal classifications have very high level of satisfaction towards quality ($G_1$)
followed health aspect ($G_2$), quantity ($G_3$) and packaging ($G_4$) when compared to other factors towards purchase of various brands of dairy products.

It is concluded that the respondents have very high level of satisfaction towards quality ($G_1$) when compared to other factors towards the purchase of various brands of dairy products.

**Personal factor and level of satisfaction on the factors relating to the services rendered by the retailers**

In this section the results of average score analysis is presented for the respondents under different personal classification on their level of satisfaction on the factors relating to the services rendered by the retailers.

The various factors considered are:

- Easy availability - $H_1$
- Helps to make selection - $H_2$
- Door delivery - $H_3$
- Courtesy & friendliness - $H_4$
- Providing sample of new products - $H_5$

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personal factors</th>
<th>$H_1$</th>
<th>$H_2$</th>
<th>$H_3$</th>
<th>$H_4$</th>
<th>$H_5$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>4.21</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>2.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>4.48</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>1.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age group</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below 20 years</td>
<td>4.40</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>2.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-40 years</td>
<td>4.35</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>2.81</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>1.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-60 year</td>
<td>4.45</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>3.37</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>2.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 and above</td>
<td>4.67</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal factors</td>
<td>H&lt;sub&gt;1&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>H&lt;sub&gt;2&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>H&lt;sub&gt;3&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>H&lt;sub&gt;4&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>H&lt;sub&gt;5&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational level</td>
<td>School level</td>
<td>3.97</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>3.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>College level</td>
<td>4.52</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>3.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>4.42</td>
<td>3.77</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>3.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Others</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>3.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupational status</td>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>2.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Business/professional</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>2.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Public sector employee</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td>2.81</td>
<td>1.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Private sector employee</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>2.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Home maker</td>
<td>3.59</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>2.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Others</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>1.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital status</td>
<td>Married</td>
<td>4.39</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>2.99</td>
<td>3.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unmarried</td>
<td>4.38</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>3.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family type</td>
<td>Joint family</td>
<td>4.51</td>
<td>3.77</td>
<td>2.99</td>
<td>2.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nuclear family</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>3.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of earning members in the family</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.35</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>3.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.28</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>3.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 and above</td>
<td>4.64</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>3.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of children’s in the family</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.46</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>3.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.42</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>3.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 and above</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>2.55</td>
<td>3.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family monthly income</td>
<td>Less than Rs 10,000</td>
<td>3.73</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>3.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rs 10,000-20,000</td>
<td>4.60</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>2.54</td>
<td>3.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rs 20,000-30,000</td>
<td>4.58</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td>4.07</td>
<td>3.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rs 30,000 and above</td>
<td>4.30</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>3.32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
It is found from the table 66 that the respondents irrespective of their personal classifications have very high level of satisfaction towards easy availability (H₁) service followed by helps to make selection (H₂) and door delivery (H₃) when compared to other services in purchasing various brands of dairy products.

It is concluded that the respondents have very high level of satisfaction towards easy availability (H₁) when compared to other services in the purchase of various brands of dairy products.

**Personal factor and level of agreeability on the following statements relating to the purchase of dairy products**

In this section the results of average score analysis is presented for the respondents under different personal classification on their level of agreeability on the following statements relating to the purchase of dairy products.

The various statements considered are

- Price of dairy product is always reasonable -I₁
- Quality of dairy product is up to the expectation of customers -I₂
- The hygienic aspect of dairy product is always good -I₃
- All dairy products are properly packed and sold -I₄
- The dairy products are always available -I₅
- The retailers services are always good -I₆
- Adequate discount is offered by retailers -I₇
- No adulteration is done by the retailers -I₈
- The retailers supply dairy products in small quantity also -I₉
- The retailers attend the complaints of customers with due care -I₁₀
Table 67: Average Score – Personal factors and level of agreeability on the following statements relating to the purchase of dairy products

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personal factors</th>
<th>I1</th>
<th>I2</th>
<th>I3</th>
<th>I4</th>
<th>I5</th>
<th>I6</th>
<th>I7</th>
<th>I8</th>
<th>I9</th>
<th>I10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>2.19</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>2.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>2.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below 20 years</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>2.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-40 years</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-60 year</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>3.37</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>2.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 and above</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School level</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td>2.99</td>
<td>2.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College level</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td>3.59</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>2.04</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>2.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>4.67</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupational status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business/professional</td>
<td>3.99</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>4.22</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>1.93</td>
<td>2.66</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>4.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public sector employee</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>1.98</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>2.59</td>
<td>3.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private sector employee</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td>2.76</td>
<td>2.87</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>3.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home maker</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>3.37</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>2.29</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>3.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>2.04</td>
<td>2.68</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td>3.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>2.98</td>
<td>2.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unmarried</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>3.77</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>1.98</td>
<td>2.61</td>
<td>2.84</td>
<td>2.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family type</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint family</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>2.97</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>2.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nuclear family</td>
<td>3.59</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>3.59</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>2.06</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>2.81</td>
<td>2.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal factors</td>
<td>I₁</td>
<td>I₂</td>
<td>I₃</td>
<td>I₄</td>
<td>I₅</td>
<td>I₆</td>
<td>I₇</td>
<td>I₈</td>
<td>I₉</td>
<td>I₁₀</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of earning members in the</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>1.95</td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td>2.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>family</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>2.19</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>2.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 and above</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>2.41</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>2.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of children’s in the family</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>2.46</td>
<td>2.84</td>
<td>3.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>2.06</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>2.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 and above</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>2.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family monthly income</td>
<td>Less than Rs 10,000</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>3.93</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>1.66</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>2.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rs 10,000-20,000</td>
<td>3.98</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td>2.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rs 20,000-30,000</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>3.34</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>3.37</td>
<td>2.29</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>2.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rs 30,000 and above</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>2.42</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>2.97</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is found from the table 67 that the respondents irrespective of their personal classifications have strongly agreed towards “the quality of dairy product is up to the expectation of customers” (I₂) followed by “price of dairy product is always reasonable” (I₁) and “all dairy products are properly packed and sold” (I₄) when compared to other statements in purchasing various brands of dairy products.

It is concluded that the respondents have strongly agreed towards “the quality of dairy product is up to the expectation of customers” (I₂) when compared to other statements in the purchase of various brands of dairy products.

**Correlation analysis**

Correlation is a study of finding the relationship between the variables. If there are only two variable in the study of correlation then it is called simple correlation otherwise the study is either partial or multiple correlation. In this section the inter-correlation between the various factors relating to the satisfaction
of customers in the purchase of dairy products is obtained and presented in the form of correlation matrix further the significance of correlation is also tested for its significance using t – test @ 5% level of significance.

The table 68 describes the results of correlation analysis in the form of correlation matrix in terms of various factors considered, correlation of coefficient and their significance.

Table 68: Correlation matrix – Correlation between the factors relating to satisfaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Quality</th>
<th>Health aspect</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Packaging</th>
<th>Price</th>
<th>Availability</th>
<th>Exchange facility</th>
<th>Offers &amp; Discounts</th>
<th>Home delivery</th>
<th>Taste</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quality</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>0.385*</td>
<td>0.220*</td>
<td>0.116*</td>
<td>0.065</td>
<td>0.304*</td>
<td>0.146*</td>
<td>0.294*</td>
<td>0.060</td>
<td>0.192*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health aspect</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>0.320*</td>
<td>0.006</td>
<td>0.223*</td>
<td>0.065</td>
<td>0.304*</td>
<td>0.285*</td>
<td>0.068</td>
<td>0.228*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quantity</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>0.362*</td>
<td>0.346*</td>
<td>0.227*</td>
<td>0.352*</td>
<td>0.114*</td>
<td>0.285*</td>
<td>0.047</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Packaging</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>0.357*</td>
<td>0.287*</td>
<td>0.288*</td>
<td>0.015</td>
<td>0.358*</td>
<td>0.110*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Price</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>0.299*</td>
<td>0.507*</td>
<td>0.278*</td>
<td>0.211*</td>
<td>0.308*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>0.292*</td>
<td>0.250*</td>
<td>0.381*</td>
<td>0.444*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exchange facility</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>0.573*</td>
<td>0.348*</td>
<td>0.326*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offers &amp; Discounts</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>0.287*</td>
<td>0.295*</td>
<td>0.295*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home delivery</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.185*</td>
<td>0.185*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taste</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is found from the table 68 that among the ten variables considered to find the interrelationship between them the exchange facility has significant intercorrelation with the majority (9) variables followed by quantity consumed, price of the product, availability, offers and discounts and taste have significant intercorrelation with 8 variables.

It is concluded that among the variables/factors considered the exchange facility has significant correlation with most of the variables considered.
Multiple Regression analysis

The multiple regression analysis depicts a functional relationship between a dependent variable and more than one independent variables. In this section the result of multiple regression analysis is presented between a set of independent variables such as quality, health aspect, quantity, packaging, price, availability, exchange facility, offers & discounts, home delivery and taste and the total score of the independent variable as the dependent variable. In performing this analysis one independent variable is introduced at each stage to assess the percentage of explanation provided by the independent variable on the variations of the dependent variable through $R^2$, the coefficient of determination. The results are presented in a table with suitable interpretation.

The table 69 describes the results of multiple regression analysis in terms of independent variables introduced at each stage, the co-efficient of variation (R), the co-efficient of determination ($R^2$) and the incremental value in $R^2$.

Table 69: Results of multiple regression analysis- Total satisfaction score as dependent variable

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Correlation coefficient (R)</th>
<th>Coefficient of determinant ($R^2$)</th>
<th>Incremental value in $R^2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quality</td>
<td>0.323</td>
<td>0.105</td>
<td>0.105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health aspect</td>
<td>0.456</td>
<td>0.208</td>
<td>0.103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quantity</td>
<td>0.601</td>
<td>0.361</td>
<td>0.153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Packaging</td>
<td>0.678</td>
<td>0.460</td>
<td>0.099</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Price</td>
<td>0.757</td>
<td>0.572</td>
<td>0.112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability</td>
<td>0.845</td>
<td>0.715</td>
<td>0.143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exchange facility</td>
<td>0.936</td>
<td>0.877</td>
<td>0.162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offers &amp; discounts</td>
<td>0.960</td>
<td>0.921</td>
<td>0.044</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home delivery</td>
<td>0.987</td>
<td>0.974</td>
<td>0.053</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taste</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>0.026</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
It is found from the table 69 that among the variables considered the variable exchange facility explains a maximum of (16.2%) followed by quantity with (15.2%), availability with (14.3%) on the variations of the dependent variable.

It is concluded that among the variables considered the variable exchange facility explains the maximum of (16.2%) on the dependent variable total satisfaction.

**Analysis of variance**

The technique of analysis of variance is an extension of t-test used to test the homogeneity of several means. In this section the results of analysis of variance is presented for the various study factors such as

- Satisfaction in quality level
- Satisfaction on health aspect
- Satisfaction on quantity
- Satisfaction on packaging aspect
- Satisfaction on price
- Satisfaction on availability
- Satisfaction on offers and discounts
- Satisfaction on exchange facility
- Satisfaction on home delivery
- Satisfaction on taste

The results are presented for each personal classification though hypothesis, ANOVA table with suitable interpretation.
**Personal factors and satisfaction on quality**

**Hypothesis:** There is no significant difference between the personal classifications of respondents on the level of satisfaction towards the quality aspect in the dairy products purchased by them.

The table 70 describes the results of ANOVA in terms of personal classification of the respondents, sources of variation, sum of squares, degrees of freedom, mean sum of squares, F values, p-values and their significance on their satisfaction on the quality aspect of the dairy products purchased.

**Table 70: Results of ANOVA – Personal factors and satisfaction in quality level**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personal factors</th>
<th>Sum of variation</th>
<th>Sum of squares</th>
<th>Degrees of fraction</th>
<th>Mean sum of squares</th>
<th>F - values</th>
<th>p - values</th>
<th>Significant/ Not significant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>0.818</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.818</td>
<td>1.712</td>
<td>0.191</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>237.982</td>
<td>498</td>
<td>0.478</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>238.8</td>
<td>499</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age group</td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>15.984</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.328</td>
<td>11.861</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>222.816</td>
<td>496</td>
<td>0.449</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>238.8</td>
<td>499</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational qualification</td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>18.786</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.262</td>
<td>14.117</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>220.014</td>
<td>496</td>
<td>0.444</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>238.8</td>
<td>499</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personal factors</th>
<th>Sum of variation</th>
<th>Degrees of freedom</th>
<th>Mean sum of squares</th>
<th>F-values</th>
<th>p-values</th>
<th>Significant/Not significant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Occupational status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>14.749</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>6.462</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>223.218</td>
<td>489</td>
<td>0.456</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>237.968</td>
<td>494</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>2.403</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.403</td>
<td>5.062</td>
<td>0.025</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>236.397</td>
<td>498</td>
<td>0.475</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>238.8</td>
<td>499</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of family</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>4.416</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.416</td>
<td>9.323</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>233.051</td>
<td>492</td>
<td>0.474</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>237.468</td>
<td>493</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earning members in the family</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>1.276</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>237.58</td>
<td>497</td>
<td>0.478</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>238.8</td>
<td>499</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No of childrens in the family</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>8.778</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.389</td>
<td>8.669</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>216.173</td>
<td>427</td>
<td>0.506</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>224.951</td>
<td>429</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family monthly income</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>11.036</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.679</td>
<td>8.011</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>227.764</td>
<td>496</td>
<td>0.459</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>238.8</td>
<td>499</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is found from table 70 that the hypothesis is rejected (significant) in 7 cases and in 2 cases the hypothesis is accepted (Not significant).
It is concluded that there exist significant difference between the personal classification of the respondents in respect of age, educational status, occupational status, marital status, type of family, Number of children in the family, and monthly family income on the level of satisfaction relating to quality aspect in the purchase of dairy product.

**Personal factors and satisfaction on Health aspect**

**Hypothesis:** There is no significant difference between the personal classifications of respondents on the level of satisfaction towards the Health aspect in the dairy products purchased by them.

The table 71 describes the results of anova in terms of personal classification of the respondents, sources of variation, sum of squares, degrees of freedom, mean sum of squares, F - values, p - values and their significance on their satisfaction on the Health aspect of the dairy products purchased.

**Table 71: Results of ANOVA – Personal factors and satisfaction in Health aspect**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personal factors</th>
<th>Sum of variation</th>
<th>Sum of squares</th>
<th>Degrees of fraction</th>
<th>Mean sum of squares</th>
<th>F values</th>
<th>p - values</th>
<th>Significant/ Not significant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>0.085</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.085</td>
<td>0.113</td>
<td>0.737</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>With in groups</td>
<td>355.129</td>
<td>469</td>
<td>0.757</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>355.214</td>
<td>470</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age group</td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>10.767</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.589</td>
<td>4.866</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>344.448</td>
<td>467</td>
<td>0.738</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>355.214</td>
<td>470</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational qualification</td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>4.125</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.375</td>
<td>1.829</td>
<td>0.141</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>351.09</td>
<td>467</td>
<td>0.752</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>355.214</td>
<td>470</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal factors</td>
<td>Sum of variation</td>
<td>Sum of squares</td>
<td>Degrees of fraction</td>
<td>Mean sum of squares</td>
<td>F values</td>
<td>p - values</td>
<td>Significant/ Not significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupational status</td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>15.529</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.106</td>
<td>4.271</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>334.54</td>
<td>460</td>
<td>0.727</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>350.069</td>
<td>465</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital status</td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>4.985</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.985</td>
<td>6.675</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>350.23</td>
<td>469</td>
<td>0.747</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>355.214</td>
<td>470</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of family</td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>3.279</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.279</td>
<td>4.392</td>
<td>0.037</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>345.655</td>
<td>463</td>
<td>0.747</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>348.933</td>
<td>464</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earning members in the family</td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>8.922</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.461</td>
<td>6.029</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>346.292</td>
<td>468</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>355.214</td>
<td>470</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No of children in the family</td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>1.024</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.512</td>
<td>0.727</td>
<td>0.484</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>280.587</td>
<td>398</td>
<td>0.705</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>281.611</td>
<td>400</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family monthly income</td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>4.869</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.623</td>
<td>2.164</td>
<td>0.092</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>350.345</td>
<td>467</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>355.214</td>
<td>470</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is found from table 71 that the hypothesis is rejected (significant) in 5 cases and in 4 cases the hypothesis is accepted (Not significant).

It is concluded that there exist significant difference between the personal classification of the respondents in respect of age, occupational status, marital status, type of family and earning members in the family on the level of satisfaction relating to health aspect in the purchase of dairy product.
Personal factors and satisfaction on Quantity

**Hypothesis:** There is no significant difference between the personal classifications of respondents on the level of satisfaction towards the Quantity aspect in the dairy products purchased by them.

The table 72 describes the results of ANOVA in terms of personal classification of the respondents, sources of variation, sum of squares, degrees of freedom, mean sum of squares, F values, p-values and their significance on their satisfaction on the quantity aspect of the dairy products purchased.

**Table 72: Results of ANOVA – Personal factors and satisfaction in Quantity**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personal factors</th>
<th>Sum of variation</th>
<th>Sum of squares</th>
<th>Degrees of fraction</th>
<th>Mean sum of squares</th>
<th>F values</th>
<th>p-values</th>
<th>Significant/Not significant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>0.944</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.944</td>
<td>1.545</td>
<td>0.214</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>With in groups</td>
<td>304.256</td>
<td>498</td>
<td>0.611</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>305.2</td>
<td>499</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age group</td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>21.179</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7.06</td>
<td>12.328</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>284.021</td>
<td>496</td>
<td>0.573</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>305.2</td>
<td>499</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational qualification</td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>11.454</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.818</td>
<td>6.447</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>293.746</td>
<td>496</td>
<td>0.592</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>305.2</td>
<td>499</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupational status</td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.04</td>
<td>3.391</td>
<td>0.005</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>294.192</td>
<td>489</td>
<td>0.602</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>304.392</td>
<td>494</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal factors</td>
<td>Sum of variation</td>
<td>Sum of squares</td>
<td>Degrees of fraction</td>
<td>Mean sum of squares</td>
<td>F values</td>
<td>p - values</td>
<td>Significant/ Not significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital status</td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>0.445</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.445</td>
<td>0.728</td>
<td>0.394</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>304.755</td>
<td>498</td>
<td>0.612</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>305.2</td>
<td>499</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of family</td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>0.574</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.574</td>
<td>0.957</td>
<td>0.328</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>294.789</td>
<td>492</td>
<td>0.599</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>295.362</td>
<td>493</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earning members in the family</td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>16.674</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8.337</td>
<td>14.361</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>288.526</td>
<td>497</td>
<td>0.581</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>305.2</td>
<td>499</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No of childrens in the family</td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>6.58</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>5.323</td>
<td>0.005</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>263.931</td>
<td>427</td>
<td>0.618</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>270.512</td>
<td>429</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family monthly income</td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>21.567</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7.189</td>
<td>12.571</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>283.633</td>
<td>496</td>
<td>0.572</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>305.2</td>
<td>499</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is found from table 72 that the hypothesis is rejected (significant) in 6 cases and in 3 cases the hypothesis is accepted (Not significant).

It is concluded that there exist significant difference between the personal classification of the respondents in respect of age, educational qualification, occupational status, earning members in the family, Number of children in the
family, and monthly family income on the level of satisfaction relating to quantity aspect in the purchase of dairy product.

**Personal factors and satisfaction on packaging**

**Hypothesis:** There is no significant difference between the personal classifications of respondents on the level of satisfaction towards the packaging aspect in the dairy products purchased by them.

The table 73 describes the results of anova in terms of personal classification of the respondents, sources of variation, sum of squares, degrees of freedom, mean sum of squares, F values, p-values and their significance on their satisfaction on the packaging aspect of the dairy products purchased.

**Table 73: Results of ANOVA – Personal factors and satisfaction in packaging aspect**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personal factors</th>
<th>Sum of variation</th>
<th>Sum of squares</th>
<th>Degrees of fraction</th>
<th>Mean sum of squares</th>
<th>F values</th>
<th>p-values</th>
<th>Significant/ Not significant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>1.717</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.717</td>
<td>2.625</td>
<td>0.106</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>With in groups</td>
<td>325.841</td>
<td>498</td>
<td>0.654</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>327.558</td>
<td>499</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age group</td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>12.149</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>6.369</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>315.409</td>
<td>496</td>
<td>0.636</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>327.558</td>
<td>499</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational qualification</td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>9.583</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.194</td>
<td>4.983</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>317.975</td>
<td>496</td>
<td>0.641</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>327.558</td>
<td>499</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personal factors</th>
<th>Sum of variation</th>
<th>Sum of squares</th>
<th>Degrees of fraction</th>
<th>Mean sum of squares</th>
<th>F values</th>
<th>p - values</th>
<th>Significant/ Not significant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Occupational status</td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>16.517</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.303</td>
<td>5.207</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>310.211</td>
<td>489</td>
<td>0.634</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>326.727</td>
<td>494</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital status</td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>11.731</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11.731</td>
<td>18.497</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>315.827</td>
<td>498</td>
<td>0.634</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>327.558</td>
<td>499</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of family</td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>0.265</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.265</td>
<td>0.405</td>
<td>0.525</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>322.182</td>
<td>492</td>
<td>0.655</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>322.447</td>
<td>493</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earning members in the family</td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>17.351</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8.675</td>
<td>13.899</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>310.207</td>
<td>497</td>
<td>0.624</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>327.558</td>
<td>499</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No of childrens in the family</td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>12.805</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.402</td>
<td>9.373</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>291.669</td>
<td>427</td>
<td>0.683</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>304.474</td>
<td>429</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family monthly income</td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>16.916</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.639</td>
<td>9.003</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>310.642</td>
<td>496</td>
<td>0.626</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>327.558</td>
<td>499</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is found from table 73 that the hypothesis is rejected (significant) in 7 cases and in 2 cases the hypothesis is accepted (Not significant).
It is concluded that there exist significant difference between the personal classification of the respondents in respect of age, educational qualification, occupational status, marital status, earning members in the family, Number of children in the family, and monthly family income on the level of satisfaction relating to packaging aspect in the purchase of dairy product.

**Personal factors and satisfaction on Price**

**Hypothesis:** There is no significant difference between the personal classifications of respondents on the level of satisfaction towards the price in the dairy products purchased by them.

The table 74 describes the results of anova in terms of personal classification of the respondents, sources of variation, sum of squares, degrees of freedom, mean sum of squares, F values, p - values and their significance on their satisfaction on the price aspect of the dairy products purchased.

**Table 74: Results of ANOVA – Personal factors and satisfaction in price**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personal factors</th>
<th>Sum of variation</th>
<th>Sum of squares</th>
<th>Degrees of freedom</th>
<th>Mean sum of squares</th>
<th>F values</th>
<th>p - values</th>
<th>Significant/Not significant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>13.809</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13.809</td>
<td>13.752</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>With in groups</td>
<td>498.063</td>
<td>496</td>
<td>1.004</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>511.871</td>
<td>497</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age group</td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>5.445</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.815</td>
<td>1.771</td>
<td>0.152</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>506.426</td>
<td>494</td>
<td>1.025</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>511.871</td>
<td>497</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational qualification</td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>18.75</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.25</td>
<td>6.261</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>493.122</td>
<td>494</td>
<td>0.998</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>511.871</td>
<td>497</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupational status</td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>23.07</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.614</td>
<td>4.636</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>484.65</td>
<td>487</td>
<td>0.995</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>507.72</td>
<td>492</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal factors</td>
<td>Sum of variation</td>
<td>Degrees of fraction</td>
<td>Mean sum of squares</td>
<td>F values</td>
<td>p - values</td>
<td>Significant/Not significant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital status</td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>23.293</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>23.293</td>
<td>23.647</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>488.578</td>
<td>496</td>
<td>0.985</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>511.871</td>
<td>497</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of family</td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>1.041</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>503.467</td>
<td>490</td>
<td>1.027</td>
<td>0.308</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>504.537</td>
<td>491</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earning members in the family</td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>82.132</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>41.066</td>
<td>47.302</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>429.74</td>
<td>495</td>
<td>0.868</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>511.871</td>
<td>497</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No of children in the family</td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>5.595</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.797</td>
<td>3.241</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>366.873</td>
<td>425</td>
<td>0.863</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>372.467</td>
<td>427</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family monthly income</td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>33.454</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11.151</td>
<td>11.514</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>478.418</td>
<td>494</td>
<td>0.968</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>511.871</td>
<td>497</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is found from table 74 that the hypothesis is rejected (significant) in 7 cases and in 2 cases the hypothesis is accepted (Not significant).

It is concluded that there exist significant difference between the personal classification of the respondents in respect of gender, educational status, occupational status, marital status, earning members in the family, Number of children in the family, and monthly family income on the level of satisfaction relating to price aspect in the purchase of dairy product.
Personal factors and satisfaction on Availability

**Hypothesis:** There is no significant difference between the personal classifications of respondents on the level of satisfaction towards the availability in the dairy products purchased by them.

The table 75 describes the results of anova in terms of personal classification of the respondents, sources of variation, sum of squares, degrees of freedom, mean sum of squares, F values, p - values and their significance on their satisfaction on the availability aspect of the dairy products purchased.

**Table 75: Results of ANOVA – Personal factors and satisfaction in availability**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personal factors</th>
<th>Sum of variation</th>
<th>Sum of squares</th>
<th>Degrees of fraction</th>
<th>Mean sum of squares</th>
<th>F values</th>
<th>p - values</th>
<th>Significant/Not significant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>45.881</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>45.881</td>
<td>52.265</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within groups</td>
<td>436.292</td>
<td>497</td>
<td>0.878</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>482.172</td>
<td>498</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age group</td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>18.745</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.248</td>
<td>6.674</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within groups</td>
<td>463.428</td>
<td>495</td>
<td>0.936</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>482.172</td>
<td>498</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational qualification</td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>32.477</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10.826</td>
<td>11.916</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within groups</td>
<td>449.695</td>
<td>495</td>
<td>0.908</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>482.172</td>
<td>498</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupational status</td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>57.644</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11.529</td>
<td>13.421</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within groups</td>
<td>419.206</td>
<td>488</td>
<td>0.859</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>476.85</td>
<td>493</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital status</td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>17.411</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17.411</td>
<td>18.619</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within groups</td>
<td>464.761</td>
<td>497</td>
<td>0.935</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>482.172</td>
<td>498</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal factors</td>
<td>Sum of variation</td>
<td>Sum of squares</td>
<td>Degrees of freedom</td>
<td>Mean sum of squares</td>
<td>F values</td>
<td>p - values</td>
<td>Significant/Not significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of family</td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>2.578</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.578</td>
<td>2.678</td>
<td>0.102</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>472.656</td>
<td>491</td>
<td>0.963</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>475.233</td>
<td>492</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earning members in the family</td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>10.709</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.354</td>
<td>5.633</td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>471.464</td>
<td>496</td>
<td>0.951</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>482.172</td>
<td>498</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No of children in the family</td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>9.925</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.963</td>
<td>4.715</td>
<td>0.009</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>448.354</td>
<td>426</td>
<td>1.052</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>458.28</td>
<td>428</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family monthly income</td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>32.873</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10.958</td>
<td>12.072</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>449.3</td>
<td>495</td>
<td>0.908</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>482.172</td>
<td>498</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is found from table 75 that the hypothesis is rejected (significant) in 8 cases and in 1 case the hypothesis is accepted (Not significant).

It is concluded that there exist significant difference between the personal classification of the respondents in respect of gender, age, educational status, occupational status, marital status, earning members in a family, Number of children in the family, and monthly family income on the level of satisfaction relating to availability aspect in the purchase of dairy products.

**Personal factors and satisfaction on Offers and discounts**

**Hypothesis:** There is no significant difference between the personal classifications of respondents on the level of satisfaction towards the offers and discounts in the dairy products purchased by them.

The table 76 describes the results of anova in terms of personal classification of the respondents, sources of variation, sum of squares, degrees of freedom, mean sum of squares, F values, p - values and their significance on their satisfaction on the offers and discounts of the dairy products purchased.
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Table 76: Results of ANOVA – Personal factors and satisfaction in offers and discounts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personal factors</th>
<th>Sum of variation</th>
<th>Sum of squares</th>
<th>Degrees of fraction</th>
<th>Mean sum of squares</th>
<th>F values</th>
<th>p - values</th>
<th>Significant/ Not significant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>18.517</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18.517</td>
<td>14.306</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>599.268</td>
<td>463</td>
<td>1.294</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>617.785</td>
<td>464</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age group</td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>26.754</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8.918</td>
<td>6.956</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>591.031</td>
<td>461</td>
<td>1.282</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>617.785</td>
<td>464</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational qualification</td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>14.611</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.87</td>
<td>3.722</td>
<td>0.011</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>603.174</td>
<td>461</td>
<td>1.308</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>617.785</td>
<td>464</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupational status</td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>31.654</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.331</td>
<td>4.983</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>576.856</td>
<td>454</td>
<td>1.271</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>608.511</td>
<td>459</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital status</td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>4.933</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.933</td>
<td>3.727</td>
<td>0.054</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>612.852</td>
<td>463</td>
<td>1.324</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>617.785</td>
<td>464</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of family</td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>12.657</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12.657</td>
<td>9.636</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>600.288</td>
<td>457</td>
<td>1.314</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>612.946</td>
<td>458</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earning members in the family</td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>21.253</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10.627</td>
<td>8.23</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>596.532</td>
<td>462</td>
<td>1.291</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>617.785</td>
<td>464</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No of childrens in the family</td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>11.067</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.533</td>
<td>4.003</td>
<td>0.019</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>541.87</td>
<td>392</td>
<td>1.382</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>552.937</td>
<td>394</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family monthly income</td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>29.621</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9.874</td>
<td>7.739</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>588.164</td>
<td>461</td>
<td>1.276</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>617.785</td>
<td>464</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
It is found from table 76 that the hypothesis is rejected (significant) in 8 cases and in 1 cases the hypothesis is accepted (Not significant).

It is concluded that there exist significant difference between the personal classification of the respondents in respect of gender, age, educational status, occupational status, type of family, earning members in the family, Number of children in the family, and monthly family income on the level of satisfaction relating to offers and discounts in the purchase of dairy product.

**Personal factors and satisfaction on Exchange facility**

**Hypothesis:** There is no significant difference between the personal classifications of respondents on the level of satisfaction towards the exchange facility in the dairy products purchased.

The table 77 describes the results of anova in terms of personal classification of the respondents, sources of variation, sum of squares, degrees of freedom, mean sum of squares, F values, p - values and their significance on their satisfaction on the exchange facility of the dairy products purchased.

**Table 77: Results of ANOVA – Personal factors and satisfaction in exchange facility**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personal factors</th>
<th>Sum of variation</th>
<th>Sum of squares</th>
<th>Degrees of fraction</th>
<th>Mean sum of squares</th>
<th>F values</th>
<th>P - values</th>
<th>Significant/ Not significant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>1.086</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.086</td>
<td>0.941</td>
<td>0.333</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>With in groups</td>
<td>528.575</td>
<td>458</td>
<td>1.154</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>529.661</td>
<td>459</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age group</td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>12.933</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.311</td>
<td>3.804</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>516.728</td>
<td>456</td>
<td>1.133</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>529.661</td>
<td>459</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational qualification</td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>21.794</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7.265</td>
<td>6.523</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>507.866</td>
<td>456</td>
<td>1.114</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>529.661</td>
<td>459</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal factors</td>
<td>Sum of variation</td>
<td>Sum of squares</td>
<td>Degrees of fraction</td>
<td>Mean sum of squares</td>
<td>F values</td>
<td>p - values</td>
<td>Significant/Not significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupational status</td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>32.948</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.59</td>
<td>6.029</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>490.736</td>
<td>449</td>
<td>1.093</td>
<td>6.029</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>523.684</td>
<td>454</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital status</td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>5.142</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.142</td>
<td>4.49</td>
<td>0.035</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>524.519</td>
<td>458</td>
<td>1.145</td>
<td>4.49</td>
<td>0.035</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>529.661</td>
<td>459</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of family</td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>1.391</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.391</td>
<td>1.199</td>
<td>0.274</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>524.567</td>
<td>452</td>
<td>1.161</td>
<td>1.199</td>
<td>0.274</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>525.958</td>
<td>453</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earning members in the family</td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>16.304</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8.152</td>
<td>7.257</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>513.357</td>
<td>457</td>
<td>1.123</td>
<td>7.257</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>529.661</td>
<td>459</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No of childrens in the family</td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>1.565</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.782</td>
<td>0.648</td>
<td>0.524</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>467.41</td>
<td>387</td>
<td>1.208</td>
<td>0.648</td>
<td>0.524</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>468.974</td>
<td>389</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family monthly income</td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>35.736</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11.912</td>
<td>10.998</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>493.924</td>
<td>456</td>
<td>1.083</td>
<td>10.998</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>529.661</td>
<td>459</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is found from table 77 that the hypothesis is rejected (significant) in 6 cases and in 3 cases the hypothesis is accepted (Not significant).

It is concluded that there exist significant difference between the personal classification of the respondents in respect of age, educational status, occupational status, marital status, earning members in the family, and monthly family income on the level of satisfaction relating to exchange facility in the purchase of dairy product.
Personal factors and satisfaction on Home delivery

Hypothesis: There is no significant difference between the personal classifications of respondents on the level of satisfaction towards the Home delivery in the dairy products purchased by them.

The table 78 describes the results of ANOVA in terms of personal classification of the respondents, sources of variation, sum of squares, degrees of freedom, mean sum of squares, F values, p-values and their significance on their satisfaction on the home delivery of the dairy products purchased.

Table 78: Results of ANOVA – Personal factors and satisfaction in home delivery

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personal factors</th>
<th>Sum of variation</th>
<th>Degrees of freedom</th>
<th>Mean sum of squares</th>
<th>F values</th>
<th>p-values</th>
<th>Significant/Not significant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>7.002</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.002</td>
<td>2.987</td>
<td>0.085 NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>1090.137</td>
<td>465</td>
<td>2.344</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1097.139</td>
<td>466</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age group</td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>81.832</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>27.277</td>
<td>12.439</td>
<td>0 S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>1015.307</td>
<td>463</td>
<td>2.193</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1097.139</td>
<td>466</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational qualification</td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>43.112</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14.371</td>
<td>6.313</td>
<td>0 S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>1054.027</td>
<td>463</td>
<td>2.277</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1097.139</td>
<td>466</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupational status</td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>58.43</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11.686</td>
<td>5.167</td>
<td>0 S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>1031.379</td>
<td>456</td>
<td>2.262</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1089.81</td>
<td>461</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital status</td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>1.718</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.718</td>
<td>0.729</td>
<td>0.394 NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>1095.421</td>
<td>465</td>
<td>2.356</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1097.139</td>
<td>466</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal factors</td>
<td>Sum of variation</td>
<td>Sum of squares</td>
<td>Degrees of fraction</td>
<td>Mean sum of squares</td>
<td>F values</td>
<td>p values</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of family</td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>4.267</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.267</td>
<td>1.807</td>
<td>0.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>1084.007</td>
<td>459</td>
<td>2.362</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1088.273</td>
<td>460</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earning members in the family</td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>53.747</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>26.873</td>
<td>11.951</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>1043.392</td>
<td>464</td>
<td>2.249</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1097.139</td>
<td>466</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No of children in the family</td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>32.243</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16.121</td>
<td>6.757</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>940.019</td>
<td>394</td>
<td>2.386</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>972.262</td>
<td>396</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family monthly income</td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>110.687</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>36.896</td>
<td>17.317</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>986.453</td>
<td>463</td>
<td>2.131</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1097.139</td>
<td>466</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is found from table 78 that the hypothesis is rejected (significant) in 6 cases and in 3 cases the hypothesis is accepted (Not significant).

It is concluded that there exist significant difference between the personal classification of the respondents in respect of age, educational qualification, occupational status, Number of children in the family, number of earning members in the family and monthly family income on the level of satisfaction relating to home delivery in the purchase of dairy product.

**Personal factors and satisfaction on Taste**

**Hypothesis:** There is no significant difference between the personal classifications of respondents on the level of satisfaction towards the Taste in the dairy products purchased by them.

The table 79 describes the results of anova in terms of personal classification of the respondents, sources of variation, sum of squares, degrees of
freedom, mean sum of squares, F values, p - values and their significance on their satisfaction on the taste of the dairy products purchased.

Table 79: Results of ANOVA – Personal factors and satisfaction in taste

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personal factors</th>
<th>Sum of variation</th>
<th>Sum of squares</th>
<th>Degrees of fraction</th>
<th>Mean sum of squares</th>
<th>F values</th>
<th>p - values</th>
<th>Significant/ Not significant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>34.861</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>34.861</td>
<td>36.85</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>439.905</td>
<td>465</td>
<td>0.946</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>474.767</td>
<td>466</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age group</td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>66.695</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>22.232</td>
<td>25.224</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>408.072</td>
<td>463</td>
<td>0.881</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>474.767</td>
<td>466</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational qualification</td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>6.408</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.136</td>
<td>2.112</td>
<td>0.098</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>468.359</td>
<td>463</td>
<td>1.012</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>474.767</td>
<td>466</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupational status</td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>77.614</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15.523</td>
<td>17.924</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>394.922</td>
<td>456</td>
<td>0.866</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>472.537</td>
<td>461</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital status</td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>20.797</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20.797</td>
<td>21.302</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>453.97</td>
<td>465</td>
<td>0.976</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>474.767</td>
<td>466</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of family</td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>7.348</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.348</td>
<td>7.286</td>
<td>0.007</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>462.869</td>
<td>459</td>
<td>1.008</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>470.217</td>
<td>460</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earning members in the family</td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>16.32</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8.16</td>
<td>8.259</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>458.446</td>
<td>464</td>
<td>0.988</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>474.767</td>
<td>466</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No of children in the family</td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>4.882</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.441</td>
<td>2.378</td>
<td>0.094</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>405.502</td>
<td>395</td>
<td>1.027</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>410.384</td>
<td>397</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family monthly income</td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>12.834</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.278</td>
<td>4.288</td>
<td>0.005</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>461.932</td>
<td>463</td>
<td>0.998</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>474.767</td>
<td>466</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
It is found from table 79 that the hypothesis is rejected (significant) in 7 cases and in 2 cases the hypothesis is accepted (Not significant).

It is concluded that there exist significant difference between the personal classification of the respondents in respect of gender, age, occupational status, marital status, type of family, Number of earning members in the family, and monthly family income on the level of satisfaction relating to taste aspect in the purchase of dairy product.

**Factor analysis**

The factor analysis is an important tool used in social science mainly for factor reduction and also to identify the important factors. In this study, this analysis is employed to identify the factors relating to customer preference towards various brands of dairy products. Based on the consolidated opinion of the respondents the extraction method of principal component analysis using varimax kaizer rotation method was used to not only for factor reduction but also to identify the important factor. Three components are extracted based on the eighen values greater than 1 (3.046, 1.675, 1.238), Further the factors are grouped and identified with separate names.

The table 80 describes the results of factor analysis in terms of various factors/statements relating to customers agreeability on various brands of dairy products and factor loadings.

**Table 80: Results of factor analysis- Level of agreeability**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statements</th>
<th>Group 1</th>
<th>Group 2</th>
<th>Group 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Price of dairy products is always reasonable</td>
<td>0.587</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The hygienic aspects of dairy products are always good.</td>
<td>0.711</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All dairy products are properly packed and sold</td>
<td>0.732</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statements</td>
<td>Group 1</td>
<td>Group 2</td>
<td>Group 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The dairy products are always available.</td>
<td>0.706</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The retailers attend the complaints of customers with due care.</td>
<td>0.650</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequate discount is offered by the retailers.</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.725</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No adulteration is done by the retailers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.652</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The retailers supply dairy product in small quantity also.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.579</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of dairy product is up to the expectation of customers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.609</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The retailers’ service is always good.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.665</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is found from table 80 that the ten aspects relating to agreeability on the purchase of dairy products can be reduced and grouped into three categories such as group 1 (Product related factors), group 2 (Retailers related factors), group 3 (Both product and retailers related factors).

It is concluded that the agreeability relating to the purchase of dairy products can be studied through

Group 1 (Product related factors)
- Price of dairy products is always reasonable.
- The hygienic aspect of dairy products is always good.
- All dairy products are properly packed and sold.
- The dairy products are always available.
- The retailers attend the complaints of customers with due care.

Further among the various aspects “All dairy products are properly packed and sold” (0.732%) is considered as the important factor.

Group 2 (Retailers related factors)
- Adequate discount is offered by the retailers.
- No adulteration is done by the retailers.
The retailers supply dairy product in small quantity also.

Further among the various aspects “Adequate discount is offered by the retailers” (0.725%) is considered as the important factor.

Group 3 (Both product and retailers related factors)

Quality of dairy product is up to the expectation of customers.
The retailers service is always good.

Further among the various aspects “The retailers service is always good” (0.665%) is considered as the important factor.

**Z test**

The Z-test is the large sample test used to identify whether there exist significant difference between the proportions of respondents in two groups relating to a particular aspect. In this study this technique is employed to assess whether there exist significant difference between proportion of respondents aware and the proportion of respondents availed the particular brand/product. The results are presented in suitable hypothesis followed by relevant interpretation.

**Hypothesis (Milk):** There is no significant difference between the proportion of respondents aware and the proportion of respondents availed various brands of milk.

The table 81 describes the results of z–test in terms of various brands of milk, proportion aware, proportion availed, z–values, p values and their significance.
Table 81: Results of Z-test - Milk

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Brands /Products</th>
<th>Milk</th>
<th>Proportion aware</th>
<th>Proportion availed</th>
<th>z-values</th>
<th>p-values</th>
<th>S/NS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aavin</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>8.94</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amul</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>15.15</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arockia/Hatsun</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>20.71</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aroma</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>16.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cavin</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>18.90</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sakthi</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>15.74</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is found from the table 81 that the hypothesis is rejected (Significant) in all the cases.

It is concluded that there exist significant difference in the proportion of respondents aware and avail the various brands of milk in respect of Aavin, amul, arockia, aroma, cavin and sakthi.

**Hypothesis (Ghee):** There is no significant difference between the proportion of respondents aware and the proportion of respondents availed various brands of ghee.

The table 82 describes the results of z –test in terms of various brands of ghee, proportion aware , proportion availed, z-values, p – values and their significance.
### Table 82: Results of z-test - Ghee

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Brands /Products</th>
<th>Proportion aware</th>
<th>Proportion availed</th>
<th>z-values</th>
<th>p – values</th>
<th>S/NS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aavin</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>22.41</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amul</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>12.64</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arookia/Hatsun</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>15.70</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aroma</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>11.27</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cavin</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sakthi</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>8.60</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is found from table 82 that the hypothesis is rejected (significant) in 5 cases and in 1 case the hypothesis is accepted (Not significant).

It is concluded that there exist significant difference in the proportion of respondents aware and avail the various brands of ghee in respect of Aavin, amul, arookia, aroma and sakthi.

**Hypothesis (Curd):** There is no significant difference between the proportion of respondents aware and the proportion of respondents availed various brands of curd.

The table 83 describes the results of z –test in terms of various brands of curd, proportion aware, proportion availed, z-values, p – values and their significance.
Table 83: Results of Z-test - curd

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Brands /Products</th>
<th>Curd</th>
<th>( z \text{-} \text{values} )</th>
<th>( p \text{-} \text{values} )</th>
<th>S/NS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Proportion aware</td>
<td>Proportion availed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aavin</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>20.44</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amul</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>11.85</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arokia/Hatsun</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>9.62</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aroma</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cavin</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>8.95</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sakthi</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>-6.02</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is found from the table 83 that the hypothesis is rejected (Significant) in all the cases.

It is concluded that there exist significant difference in the proportion of respondents aware and avail the various brands of curd in respect of Aavin, amul, arokia, aroma, cavin and sakthi.

Descriptive analysis of retailers

Type of organization

The table 84 describes the type of organization of the retailers. The type of organization is categorized as sole trading concern and partnership concern.

Table 84: Type of organization

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of organization</th>
<th>Number of retailers</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sole trading concern</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>90.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partnership concern</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is identified from table 84 that out of the total retailers taken for the study 45(90%) of the retailers are sole trader, 5(10%) of the retailers are partnership concerns.

It is concluded that majority (90%) of the retailers are sole trader.
Nature of business

The table 85 describes the nature of business of the retailers. The nature of business is categorized as dairy shop, other retail store, petty shop, departmental store and others.

Table 85: Nature of business of the retailer

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nature of business</th>
<th>Number of retailers</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dairy Shop</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other retail store</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petty shop</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>30.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Departmental store</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is evident from table 85 that out of the total retailers taken for the study, 20(40%), of the retailers conduct their business as retail stores, 15(30%) of the
retailers conduct their business as petty shop owners and 10(20%) of the retailers are dairy shop owners.

It is concluded that most of 40% of the retailers conduct their business as retail stores.

**Chart 14: Nature of business of the retailer**

![Chart showing nature of business of the retailer with percentages for Dairy Shop, Other retail store, Petty Shop, and Departmental store.]

**Sources of finance for the business**

The table 86 describes the sources of finance for their business. The sources of finance is categorized as own fund, borrowed fund and both.

**Table 86: Sources of finance for the business**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sources of finance</th>
<th>Number of retailers</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Own fund</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borrowed fund</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
It is evident from table 86 that out of the total retailers taken for the study, 34(90%) of the retailers use their own fund for their business and 7(10%) of the retailers borrow funds from different sources and 9(18) of the retailers use both own fund as well as borrowed fund for their business.

It is concluded from the study that majority (90%) of the retailers use their own fund for their business.

**Chart-15: Sources of finance for the business**

Sources of Borrowings

The table 87 describes the sources of borrowings for their business. The sources of borrowings are categorized as banks, financial institutions, friends & relatives and others.

**Table 87: Sources of borrowings for the business**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sources of borrowings</th>
<th>Number of retailers</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Banks</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>62.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends and relatives</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>37.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
It is evident from the table 87 that out of the total retailers taken for the study, 10 (62.5%) of the retailers borrow funds from banks and 6 (37.5%) retailer borrow funds from friends and relatives.

It is concluded that majority (62.5%) retailers borrow funds from banks.

Chart 16: Sources of borrowings for the business

Information about employees

The table 88 describes the information about employees of their organization. The response is classified as yes and no.

Table 88: Information about employees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Number of retailers</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>44.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>56.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is evident from the table 88 that out of the total retailers taken for the study, 28 (56%) of the retailers says that they does not have employees and
remaining 22(44%) of the retailers says that they have employees to manage their shops.

It is concluded that majority (56%) of the retailers says that they does not have employees to manage their business.

**Number of employees owned by the retailers**

The table 89 describes the number of employees owned by the retailers in their organization. The number of employees are classified as 1, 2 and 3 and more employees.

**Table 89: Number of employees in their organization**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of employees</th>
<th>Number of retailers</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 employee</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>36.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 employee</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 employee</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is observed from table 89 that out of the total retailers taken for the study, 11(50%) of the retailers have 2 employees in their organization, 8(36.3%) of the retailers have 1 employee in their organization and 3(13.7) of the retailers have 3 employees in their organization.

It is concluded that most of 30% of the retailers have 2 employees in their organization.

**Number of years dealing with the dairy products**

The table 90 describes the number of years of experience in dealing with the dairy products. The numbers of years of experience are classified as less than 2 years, 2-4 years, 4-6 years and 6 years and above.
Table 90: Number of years if experience in dealing with dairy products

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No of years of experience</th>
<th>Number of retailers</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>less than 2 years</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-4 years</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-6 years</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 years and above</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is identified from the table 90 that out of the total retailers taken for the study, 19(38%) of the retailers have an experience of 6 years and above, 12(24%) of the retailers have the experience of 2-4 years and 11(22%) of the retailers have 4-6 years of experience.

It is concluded from the study that maximum of 38% of the retailers have an experience of 6 years and above.

Brands of dairy products dealt by the retailers

The table 91 describes the different brands of dairy products dealt by the retailers. The different brands of dairy products are classified as Aavin, amul, arokia/hatsun, aroma, cavin, sakthi and others.

Table 91: Brands of dairy products dealt by the retailers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Brands</th>
<th>Number of retailers</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aavin</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>90.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amul</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>18.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arokia/hatsun</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>46.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aroma</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>48.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cavin</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>24.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sakthi</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>32.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
It is found from the table 91 that out of the total retailers taken for the study, 45(90%) of the retailers deal with the brand aavin, 24(48%) of the retailers deal with the brand aroma and 23(46%) of the retailers deal with the brand aroki/hatsun.

It is concluded that majority (90%) of the retailers deal with the brand aavin.

**Dairy products sold by the retailers**

The table 92 describes the different dairy products sold by the retailers. The various dairy products are classified as milk, ghee and curd.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Products</th>
<th>Number of retailers</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Milk</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ghee</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>44.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curd</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>70.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is obvious from table 92 that 50(100%) of the retailers sold milk, 22(44%) of the retailers sold ghee and 35(70%) of the retailers sold curd.

It is concluded that the all (100%) the retailers sold milk among the dairy products taken for the study.

**Brand of Dairy products demanded by the customers**

The table 93 describes the brand of dairy products demanded by the customers. The brand of dairy products demanded is classified as Aavin, amul, aroki/hatsun, aroma, cavin, sakthi and others.
Table 93: Brand of dairy products demanded by the customers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Brands</th>
<th>Number of retailers</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aavin</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>82.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amul</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>08.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arokia/hatsun</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>30.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aroma</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>32.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cavin</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>08.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sakthi</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>08.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is obvious from table 93 that out of the total respondents taken for the study, 41(82%) of the customers demanded aavin, 16(32%) of the customers demanded aroma and 15 (30%) of the customers demanded arokia/hatsun..

It is concluded that majority (82%) of the customers demanded aavin.

Level of satisfaction of customers

The table 94 describes the level of satisfaction of the customers with branded dairy products. The level of satisfaction is classified as very high satisfaction, high satisfaction, moderate satisfaction, low satisfaction and very low satisfaction.

Table 94: Level of satisfaction of customers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of satisfaction</th>
<th>Number of retailers</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very high satisfaction</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>30.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Satisfaction</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>60.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate Satisfaction</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is identified from table 94 that out of the total retailers taken for the study, 30(60%) of the retailers opine that their customers are highly satisfied,
15(30%) of the retailers opine that their customers are very highly satisfied and 
5(10%) of the retailers opine that their customers are moderately satisfied.

It is concluded that majority (60%) of the retailers opine that their customers are highly satisfied.

**Mode of payment**

The table 95 describes the mode of payment made by the retailers. The mode of payment is classified as cash, credit and both.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mode of payment</th>
<th>No of retailers</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cash</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>70.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credit</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is known from the table 95 that out of the total retailers taken for the study, 35(70%) of the retailers purchase the dairy products through cash payment, 5 (10) of them purchase the dairy products through credit payment and 10 (20%) of the retailers purchase the dairy products through both cash as well as credit payments.

It is concluded that Majority (70%) of the retailer purchase the dairy products through cash payment.

**Problems faced by the retailers**

The table 96 depicts the problems faced by the retailers in dealing with dairy products. Their response is classified as yes and no.
Table 96: Problems faced by the retailers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>No of retailers</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>34.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>66.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is observed from the table 96 that out of the total retailers taken for the study, 33(66%) of the retailers have not faced any problem while dealing with various brands of dairy products and remaining 17(34%) of the respondents had some problems when they deal with dairy products.

It is concluded that majority (66%) of the retailers have not faced any problem while dealing with various brands of dairy products.

Nature of Problems faced by the retailers

The table 97 depicts the nature of problems faced by the retailers in dealing with dairy products. The problems are classified as poor packaging, old stock, storage problem, frequent customer complaints and others.

Table 97: Nature of Problems faced by the retailers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nature of problem</th>
<th>Number of respondents</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>pool packing</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>35.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old stock</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Storage Problem</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>29.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequent customer complaints</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>23.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is found from the table 97 that out of the retailers who faced problems 6(35.3%) of the retailers faced the problem of poor packaging, 5(29.4%) of the respondents faced storage problem, 4(23.5%) of the retailers faced the problem of
frequent customers complaints and 2 (11.8%) of the retailers faced the problem of old stock.

It is concluded from the study that most of 35.3% of the retailers are facing the problem of poor packaging.

**Complaints made to the manufacturer**

The table 98 depicts the complaints made to the manufacturer regarding the problems faced by the retailers in dealing with dairy products. The responses are classified as yes and no.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Number of retailers</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>82.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is evident from table 98 that out of the total retailers who had problems, 14(82.3%) of the retailers said that they have made complaints to the manufacturer and 3(17.7%) of the retailers said that have not made any complaints to the manufacturer.

It is concluded from the study that majority (82.3%) of the retailers have made complaints to the manufacturers regarding the problems faced by them.

**Response of the manufacturer**

The table 99 depicts the response of the manufacturer for the complaints made by the retailers. The responses are classified as very good, good, moderate, poor and very poor.
Table 99: Response of the manufacturers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Number of retailers</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very good</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>28.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>57.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>14</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is known from the table 99 that out of the retailers who made complaints to the manufacturers, 8(57.1%) of the retailers said that the response of the manufacturers are moderate good, 4(28.6%) of the retailers said that the response of the manufacturers are good and 2 (14.3%) of the retailers said that the response of the manufacturers are very good.

It is concluded from the study that majority (57.1%) of the retailers said that the response of the manufacturers are moderate.

**Level of satisfaction of the customers for the service rendered by the retailers**

The table 100 depicts the level of satisfaction of the customers for the services rendered by the retailer. Their satisfaction level is classified as Very high satisfaction, high satisfaction, moderate satisfaction, low satisfaction and very low satisfaction.

Table 100: Level of satisfaction of the customers for the service rendered by the retailers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of satisfaction</th>
<th>Number of retailers</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very high satisfaction</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>30.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High satisfaction</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>70.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>50</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
It is identified from the table 100 that out of the total retailers taken for the study 35(70%) of the retailers said that the customers are highly satisfied by their services and 15(30%) of the retailers said that the customers are very highly satisfied by the services rendered by them.

It is concluded that majority (70%) of the retailers said that the customer are highly satisfied by their services.

**Employee’s relationship with the customers**

The table 101 depicts the employee’s relationship with the customers. The responses are classified as very cordial, cordial, normal, poor and very poor.

**Table 101: Employees relationship with the customers**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>No of retailers</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very cordial</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>31.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cordial</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>45.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normal</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>22.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is evident from the table 101 that out of the retailers who have employees, 10(45.5%) of them feel that their employees maintain cordial relationship with the customers, 7(31.8%) of them feel that their employees are very cordial with the employees and 5(22.7%) of the respondents feel that their employees have normal relationship with the customers.

It is concluded that most of 45.5% of the employees maintain cordial relationship with the customers.

**Level of Opinion about the branded dairy products**

The table 102 depicts the opinion about branded dairy products. Their opinion is classified as very good, good, moderate, poor and very poor.
**Table 102: Level of opinion about the branded dairy products**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of opinion</th>
<th>No of retailers</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very good</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>30.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>56.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normal</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is observed from the table 102 that out of the total retailers taken for the study, 28(56%) of them opined that the branded dairy products are good, 15(30%) of them opined it as very good and 7(14%) of them opined as normal.

It is concluded from the study that majority (56%) of the retailers opined that the branded dairy products are good.

**Opinion about the price of branded dairy products**

The table 103 depicts the opinion about branded dairy products. Their opinion is listed as very good, good, moderate, poor and very poor.

**Table 103: opinion about the branded dairy products**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Brands</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Low</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aavin</td>
<td>45(90)</td>
<td>5(10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amul</td>
<td>50(100)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aroka/Hatsun</td>
<td>25(50)</td>
<td>25(50)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aroma</td>
<td>30(60)</td>
<td>20(40)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cavin</td>
<td>25(50)</td>
<td>25(50)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sakthi</td>
<td>30(60)</td>
<td>20(40)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The values in brackets are in percentages

Table 103 reveals that 50(100%) of the retailers feel that the price of the brand amul is High, 45(90%) of the retailers feel that the price of the brand aavin is High and 30(60%) of the retailers feel that the price of the brand aroma is High.
It is concluded that all (100%) the retailers feel that the price of the brand amul is high and majority (50%) of the retailers feel that the price of the brands arokia/hatsun and cavin are low.

**Level of satisfaction towards the commission received by the retailer**

The table 104 depicts the level of satisfaction towards the commission received by the retailers. Their satisfaction level is classified as very high satisfaction, high satisfaction, moderate satisfaction, low satisfaction and very low satisfaction.

**Table 104: Level of satisfaction towards the commission received by the retailers**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of satisfaction</th>
<th>Number of retailers</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very high satisfaction</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High satisfaction</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate satisfaction</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is observed from the table 104 that out of the total retailers taken for the study, 25(50%) of them are moderately satisfied with the commission received, 20(40%) of them are highly satisfied with the commission they receive and 5(10%) of them are very highly satisfied with the commission they receive.

It is concluded from the study that majority (50%) of them are moderately satisfied with the commission they receive from the manufacturer.

**Opinion about superiority**

The table 105 depicts the opinion about superiority of the brands that the retailers are dealing with. Their response is classified as yes and no.
Table 105: Opinion about superiority of the brands of the retailers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Number of respondents</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>66.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>34.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is observed from the table 105 that out of the total retailers taken for the study, 33(66%) of the retailers feel that their brand is superior to other brands of dairy products and 17(34%) of the retailers feel that their brand is not superior to other brands of dairy products.

It is concluded that majority (66%) of retailers feel that their brand is superior over others.

Opinion about the variation in the prices of various brands of dairy products

The table 106 depicts the opinion about the variation in the prices of various brands of dairy products. Their response is classified as yes and no.

Table 106: Opinion about the variation in the prices of various brands of dairy products

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Number of respondents</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>80.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is identified from the table 106 that out of the total retailers taken for the study, 40(80%) of the retailers said there is considerable variation in the prices of the dairy products and remaining 10 retailers said there is no variation in the prices of the dairy products.

It is concluded that majority (80%) of the retailers said there is considerable variation in the prices of the dairy products.
Influence of price variation in the buying behavior of customers

The table 107 depicts the influence of price variation in the buying behavior of customers. Their influence is classified as no change in preference, shift to another brand, and reduce the quantity of purchase.

Table 107: Influence of price variation in the buying behavior of customers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Influences</th>
<th>Number of retailers</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No change in preference</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>42.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shift to another brand</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>45.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>reduce the quantity of purchase</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is evident from table 107 that out of the total retailers taken for the study, 18(45%) of them feel that the customers shift to another brand of dairy products, 18(45%) of the retailers feel that the customers do not change their preference and 5(12.5%) of the retailers have stated that the customers reduce the quantity of purchase if there is variation in the prices of the dairy products.

It is concluded that most of 45% of them feel that the customers shift to another brand of dairy products if there is variation in the prices of the dairy products.

Storage of dairy products

The table 108 depicts the opinion about the storage of dairy products. Their response is classified as very easy, easy, moderate difficult and very difficult.

Table 108: Opinion regarding the storage of dairy products

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>No of retailers</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very easy</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easy</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>70.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
It is found from the table 108 that out of the total retailers taken for the study, 35(70%) of them opined that it is easy to store the dairy products, 10((20%) of them opined that it is very easy to store the dairy products and 5(10%) of them opined that the storage of dairy products is moderately easy.

It is concluded from the study that majority (70%) of them opined that it is easy to store the dairy products.

**Level of satisfaction of the customers for the services given by the retailers**

The table 109 depicts the level of satisfaction of the customers for the services given by the retailers. Their satisfaction level is classified as very high satisfaction, high satisfaction, moderate satisfaction, low satisfaction and very low satisfaction.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Services Level of Satisfaction</th>
<th>Very high satisfaction</th>
<th>High satisfaction</th>
<th>Moderate satisfaction</th>
<th>Low satisfaction</th>
<th>Very low satisfaction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Easy availability</td>
<td>16 (32)</td>
<td>34 (68)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helps to make selection</td>
<td>21 (42)</td>
<td>29 (58)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Door delivery</td>
<td>14 (28)</td>
<td>11 (22)</td>
<td>15 (30)</td>
<td>10 (20)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courtesy &amp; friendliness</td>
<td>10 (20)</td>
<td>25 (50)</td>
<td>15 (30)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing sample of new products</td>
<td>5 (10)</td>
<td>10 (20)</td>
<td>30 (60)</td>
<td>5 (10)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The values in brackets are percentages

Table 109 reveals that out of the total respondents taken for the study, 21(42%) of the retailers said that their customers are very highly satisfied with the service helps to make selection and 34(68%) of the retailers said that their customers are highly satisfied with the service easy availability.
It is concluded from the study that majority (68%) of the retailers said that their customers are highly satisfied with the service easy availability.

**Preference to deal with unbranded dairy products**

The table 110 depicts the preference of the retailers to deal with unbranded dairy products. Their response is classified as yes and no.

**Table 110: Preference to deal with unbranded dairy products**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Number of respondents</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>92.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is show from table 110 that out of the total retailers taken for the study, 46 (92%) of them responded as no that they are not dealing with unbranded dairy products and remaining 4 (8%) responded as yes that they are dealing with unbranded dairy products.

It is concluded from the study that majority (92%) of them responded as no that they are not dealing with unbranded dairy products.

**Opinion about unbranded dairy products**

The table 111 depicts the opinion about unbranded dairy products. Their response is classified as very good, good, normal, poor and very poor.

**Table 111: opinion about unbranded dairy products**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Opinion</th>
<th>Number of retailers</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Normal</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
It is evident from table 111 that out of the retailers who deal with unbranded dairy products 4 (100%) of them opine that the unbranded dairy products are normal.

It is concluded that all (100%) of the retailers who deal with the unbranded dairy products said that it is normal.

**Agreeability of the retailers towards various statements**

The table 112 depicts agreeability of the retailers towards various statements. The responses are classified as strongly agree, agree, neutral, disagree and strongly disagree.

**Table 112: Agreeability of the respondents towards various statements**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statements</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Price of dairy products is always reasonable</td>
<td>25 (50)</td>
<td>20 (40)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5 (10)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of the dairy product is up to the expectations of the customers</td>
<td>25 (50)</td>
<td>20 (40)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5 (10)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The hygienic aspect of dairy product is always good</td>
<td>20 (40)</td>
<td>20 (40)</td>
<td>5 (10)</td>
<td>5 (10)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All dairy products are properly packed and sold</td>
<td>15 (30)</td>
<td>20 (40)</td>
<td>10 (20)</td>
<td>5 (10)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The dairy products are always available</td>
<td>10 (20)</td>
<td>35 (70)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5 (10)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The retailers services are always good</td>
<td>15 (30)</td>
<td>25 (50)</td>
<td>10 (20)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequate discount is offered by retailers</td>
<td>10 (20)</td>
<td>30 (60)</td>
<td>10 (20)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No adulteration is done by the retailers</td>
<td>5 (10)</td>
<td>40 (80)</td>
<td>5 (10)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The retailers supply dairy products in small quantity also</td>
<td>10 (20)</td>
<td>25 (50)</td>
<td>10 (20)</td>
<td>5 (10)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The retailers attend the complaints of customer with due care.</td>
<td>30 (60)</td>
<td>15 (30)</td>
<td>10 (20)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The values in brackets are percentages

It is found from the table 112 that 30(60%), 25(50%) of the retailers strongly agree towards the statement,” The retailers attend the complaints of
customer with due care”, “The price of the dairy product is always reasonable” and “the quality of the dairy product is up to the expectation of the customers” respectively. Further 40(80%), 35(70%) of the retailers agree with the statements, “No adulteration is done by the retailers” and “the dairy products are always available”.

It is concluded that majority (60%) of the retailers strongly agree towards “The retailers attend the complaints of customer with due care” and majority (80%) of the retailers agree towards “No adulteration is done by the retailers”.

**Gap analysis**

The gap analysis is an important technique used to identify whether there is any significant difference between the opinion of the customers and the retailers on various aspects relating the study. In this study this technique is employed using t-test mainly to ascertain whether there is any significant difference between the opinion of the customers and the retailers on the various aspects relating to the different brands of dairy products. In this section the three aspects such as the service provided by the retailers, the agreeability of the various issues on dairy products and the opinion of the customers and retailers regarding the prices of the dairy products (High, Low) alone are compared between customers and retailers. The results are presented for each aspect separately.

**Satisfaction on the various services provided by the retailers**

In this section the results of gap analysis between the opinion of the customers and the retailers on the various aspects relating to the services rendered by the retailers is presented through t-test. The various services considered are

- Easy availability - $J_1$
- Helps to make selection - $J_2$
- Door delivery - $J_3$
- Courtesy and friendliness - $J_4$
Problem: Providing samples of new products

Hypothesis: There is no significant difference between the opinion of customers and retailers on the various services offered by the retailers.

The table 113 provides the results of gap analysis between the retailers and the customers on the various services offered by the retailers in terms of various services, their mean and standard deviation values, t – values, p values and their significance.

Table 113: Results of gap analysis – Satisfaction on the various services provided by retailers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Services</th>
<th>Customers</th>
<th>Retailers</th>
<th>t – value</th>
<th>p – value</th>
<th>Significant/Not Significant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean (Standard deviation)</td>
<td>Mean (Standard deviation)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easy availability</td>
<td>1.616 (0.861)</td>
<td>1.600 (0.495)</td>
<td>0.129</td>
<td>0.897</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helps to make selection</td>
<td>2.548 (0.861)</td>
<td>1.600 (0.495)</td>
<td>7.640</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Door delivery</td>
<td>2.902 (1.287)</td>
<td>2.400 (1.125)</td>
<td>2.658</td>
<td>0.008</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courtesy and friendliness</td>
<td>2.714 (0.861)</td>
<td>2.100 (0.707)</td>
<td>4.878</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing samples of new products</td>
<td>4.10 (1.207)</td>
<td>2.700 (0.789)</td>
<td>7.400</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: S- Significant, NS – Not significant

It is found from the table 113 that the hypothesis is rejected (Significant) in 4 cases and in the remaining one case the hypothesis is accepted (Not significant). The results are presented in chart 17 for the easy understanding of the readers.

It is concluded that there exist significant difference between the derived level of satisfaction of the customers and the expected level of satisfaction (retailer) in respect of helps to make selection, courtesy and friendliness and providing samples of new products.
Chart -17: Satisfaction on the various services provided by retailers

Agreeability on the various aspects relating to various brands of dairy products

In this section the results of gap analysis between the opinion of the customer and the retailers on the various aspects relating to the brands of dairy products is presented through t – test. The various aspects considered are

- Price of dairy products is always reasonable -K₁
- Quality of dairy product is up to the expectation of customers -K₂
- The hygienic aspects of dairy products are always good. -K₃
- All dairy products are properly packed and sold -K₄
- The dairy products are always available -K₅
- The retailers service are always good -K₆
- Adequate discount is offered by retailers -K₇
- No adulteration is done by the retailers -K₈
- The retailers supply dairy products in small quantity also -K₉
The retailers attend the complaints of customers with due care.

The table 114 describes the results of gap analysis on the various aspects relating to milk products based on the level of agreeability of customers and retailers is presented in terms of various aspects, average score, standard deviation, t –value s, p values and their significance.

Table 114: Results of gap analysis – Level of agreeability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statements</th>
<th>Customers</th>
<th>Retailers</th>
<th>t –value</th>
<th>p –value</th>
<th>S / NS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Standard</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Standard</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>deviation</td>
<td>deviation</td>
<td>deviation</td>
<td>deviation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Price of dairy products is always reasonable</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td>0.909</td>
<td>3.999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of dairy product is up to the expectation of customers.</td>
<td>2.29</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td>0.909</td>
<td>4.466</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The hygienic aspects of dairy products is always good</td>
<td>2.39</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>0.952</td>
<td>3.466</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All dairy products are properly packed and sold.</td>
<td>2.54</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>0.953</td>
<td>3.115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The dairy products are always available</td>
<td>2.34</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>0.782</td>
<td>2.853</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The retailer’s service is always good.</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>0.707</td>
<td>8.165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequate discount is offered by the retailers.</td>
<td>4.01</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>0.639</td>
<td>18.777</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No adulteration is done by the retailers</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>0.452</td>
<td>15.776</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The retailers supply dairy product in small quantity also.</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>0.880</td>
<td>6.609</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The retailers attend the complaints of customers with due care.</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>0.678</td>
<td>15.632</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: S- Significant, NS – Not significant
It is found from the table 114 that the hypothesis is rejected (Significant) in all the 9 cases. The results are presented in chart 18 for the easy understanding of the readers.

It is concluded that there exist significant difference between the agreeability on various aspects relating to the dairy products in respect of ” price of dairy products is always reasonable”, “quality of dairy product is up to the expectation of customers”, “the hygienic aspects of dairy products is always good”, ”all dairy products are properly packed and sold”, “the retailers service are always good”, “adequate discount is offered by retailers”, “no adulteration is done by the retailers”, ” the retailers supply dairy products in small quantity also”, “the retailers attend the complaints of customers with due care”.

**Chart -18: Level of agreeability**

- Price of dairy products is always reasonable
- Quality of dairy product is up to the expectation of customers
- The hygienic aspects of dairy products is always good
- All dairy products are properly packed and sold
- The retailers service are always available
- The retailers supply dairy product in small quantity also
- Adequate discount is offered by the retailers
- No adulteration is done by the retailers
- The retailers attend the complaints of customers with due care
Opinion of the respondents towards the price of various brands of dairy products as high

In this section the results of gap analysis between the opinion of the customer and the retailers on the price of the various brands of dairy products is presented through $z$ – test. The various brands considered are

- Aavin
- Amul
- Arokia/Hatsun
- Aroma
- Cavin
- Sakthi

The table 115 describes the results of gap analysis on the opinion of the customers and retailers regarding the high price of various brands of dairy products presented in terms of various brands, average score, standard deviation, $z$ –values , $p$ values and their significance.

**Table 115: Results of gap analysis – Opinion of the respondents on various brands of dairy products as high**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Brands /Products</th>
<th>Proportion of customers</th>
<th>Proportion of retailers</th>
<th>$Z$–values</th>
<th>$P$-values</th>
<th>S/NS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aavin</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>13.10</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amul</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>15.19</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arokia/Hatsun</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>14.87</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aroma</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>11.53</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cavin</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>11.05</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sakthi</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>10.54</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: S- Significant, NS – Not significant
It is found from the table 115 that the hypothesis is rejected (Significant) in all the cases.

It is concluded that there exist significant difference between the opinion of the respondents on the price of the dairy products as high on various brands of dairy products in Aavin, amul aroki/a hatsun, aroma, cavin and sakthi.

**Opinion of the respondents towards the price of various brands of dairy products as low**

In this section the results of gap analysis between the opinion of the customer and the retailers on the various brands of dairy products is presented through z – test. The various brands considered are

- Aavin
- Amul
- Aroki/Hatsun
- Aroma
- Cavin
- Sakthi

The table 116 describes the results of gap analysis on the opinion of the customers and retailers regarding the low price of various brands of dairy products presented in terms of various brands, average score, standard deviation, Z –values, p value and their significance.
Table 116: Results of gap analysis – Opinion of the respondents on various brands of dairy products as low

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Brands /Products</th>
<th>Proportion of customers</th>
<th>Proportion of retailers</th>
<th>Z – values</th>
<th>P- values</th>
<th>S/NS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aavin</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>15.98</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amul</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>10.19</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arokia/Hatsun</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>9.30</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aroma</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>10.89</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cavin</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>11.17</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sakthi</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>14.86</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: S - Significant, NS – Not significant

It is found from the table 116 that the hypothesis is rejected (Significant) in all cases.

It is concluded that there exist significant difference between the opinion of the respondents on the price of the dairy products as low on various brands of dairy products in Aavin, amul arokia/hatsun, aroma, cavin and sakthi.