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#### Abstract

India is the leading exporter of the Basmati Rice to the global market as the country has exported 37, 02,260.12 MT of Basmati Rice to the world for the worth of ₹. 27,597.87 crores during the year 2014-15. The Jammu and Kashmir is considered to be favorable state of production of Basmati rice with its pleasant climatic conditions. In Jammu and Kashmir the Basmati is confined at the areas of R.S.Pura, Samba and Kathua. The present study was carried out in district Jammu of Jammu and Kashmir State with the aim of understanding the influence of demographic indicators on Consumer Satisfaction and Perception. The present study uses primary data ( 150 Sarveshwar Basmati Consumers) and secondary data for fulfilling the objectives of the study. The study adopts descriptive, regression and Cross Tab (Chi Square Test) for analysis purposes. The results of the study revealed that the customers are satisfied with the Sarveshwar products in terms of quality and packaging respectively and customer's perception towards the Sarveshwar rice is fair in terms of the factors related to perception level. The study also depicted that there existed no relation or influence of demographic indicators , age, education and income on the customer satisfaction and perception as result showed that the tabular value of these factors showed greater value than the expected value, hence rejection of the Null hypotheses. so hence has no impact or influence on the decision regarding the customer perception and satisfaction towards the rice brand in the same area.
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## Introduction

Customer satisfaction is a term frequently used in marketing. It is a measure of how products and services supplied by a company meet or surpass customer expectation. Customer satisfaction is defined as "the number of customers, or percentage of total customers, whose reported experience with a firm, its products, or its services (ratings) exceeds specified satisfaction goals. (Jamalet al.2002)

It acts as a key performance indicator within business and is often part of a balanced Scorecard. Customer satisfaction is seen as a key differentiator and increasingly has become a
key element of business strategy."Within organizations, customer satisfaction ratings can have powerful effects. They focus employees on the importance of fulfilling customers' expectations. To determine the consumer' perception and satisfaction level towards Sarveshwar basmati rice, so as to develop appropriate policies, the present endeavor plays a vital role. The purpose of this study was to recognize those factors which effect consumer perception and satisfaction about Sarveshwar rice and influence of various demographic indicators.

Perception is the virtue by which a customer perceives or sees a product, brand or a service. Perception is something which gives meaning to product in customer's mind. It is somewhat similar to brand image but is different because brand image is made through brand messages and identity but perception is sometimes more at a psychological level.(Eggert et al. 2002), (Woodruff et al. 1997)

## Objectives of the study

1. To study the influence of demographic indicators on customer perception and customer satisfaction.

## Research methodology

The study was based on primary and secondary sources of information. The research was conducted with the help of schedule and after collection of the required data from the company, it has been analysed by using various statistical tools (chi-square ( $\mathrm{X}^{2}$ ) test).

For studying the influencing of demographic indicate on customer perception and customer satisfaction, following statement were measured or analysed and to result were calculated by using cross-tab analysis (Chi-square test).

## Chi-square ( $\mathbf{X}^{2}$ ) test (crosstab Analysis)

A chi-square ( $\mathrm{X}^{2}$ ) test is used to test whether distributions of categorical variables differ from each another.

## Hypothesis

There is a significant difference between customer income and customer satisfaction.
There is a significant difference between customer education and customer satisfaction.
There is a significant difference between customer income and customer Perception.
There is a significant difference between customer education and customer perception.


The formula for the chi-square statistic used in the chi square test is:
$\mathrm{x}^{2}{ }_{\mathrm{c}}==\sum \frac{(\mathrm{Oi}-\mathrm{Ei}) 2}{\mathrm{Ei}}$

## Results and discussion

The Table 1 represents the gender profile of the respondents of the study area. It is clear from the Fig 5.1that out of 150 respondents, 116 ( 77 per cent) were male and 34 ( 23 per cent) were female.

Table 2 represents the age of the respondents of the sample area. It is clear from the Fig 2 that 33 respondents ( 22 per cent) were in the age group of 18 to 29 years, 69 respondents ( 46 per cent) age lies in 30 to 49 years and48 respondents ( 32 per cent) age lies in 50 to 69 years.

Table 3 represents the education of the respondents. It is clear from the Fig 3 that 14 respondent ( 9.33 percent) education level fall under category was up to of primary school, 23 respondent ( 15.33 percent) education level matric, 46 respondent ( 30.67 percent) education level fall under category high education, 38 respondent ( 25.33 percent) education level was graduation, 20 respondent ( 13.34 percent) education level was post-graduation and 9 respondents (6 percent) had Ph.D.

Table 4 shows that majorly 68 ( 45.33 percent) respondents has 3 to 4 members in their family, follow by 36 ( 24 percent) respondents had 1 to 2 members in their family, 31 ( 21 percent) respondents had 5 to 6 members in their family and 15 respondents ( 10 percent) belonged to 7 to 8 family size.

Table 5 highlighted that majorly 119 ( 79.33 percent) respondents was married, 25 (16.67per cent) respondents was single, 1 ( 0.67 per cent) respondents was divorces and 5 (3.33 per cent) respondents was widowed.

It has been observed from frequency table 6 that108 ( 72 percent) respondents were belonging to urban area, followed by 27 ( 18 percent) respondents belonged to suburban area and 15 (10 percent) respondents were belonged to rural area.

It has been analyzed from table 7 that majority of the respondents i.e. 87 ( 58 percent) income fall under range of 20,000 to 30,000 earned 20,000 to 30,000 , followed by 34 ( 22.67 percent) respondents earned 10,000 to 20,000 , followed by 19 ( 12.66 percent) respondent earned 30,000 to 40,000 and 10 (6.67per cent) respondents earned below 10,000 .
Table 1: Customer demography

| Customer demography | Frequency | Percentage |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Male | 116 | 77.33 |
| Female | 34 | 22.67 |
| Total | $\mathbf{1 5 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0}$ |

Source: survey
Table 2: Age of the respondents

| Age of the respondents | Frequency | Percentage |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 18 to 29 year old | 33 | 22 |
| 30 to 49 year old | 69 | 46 |
| 50 to 69 year old | 48 | 32 |
| Total | $\mathbf{1 5 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0}$ |

Source: survey
Table 3: Level of education of the respondents

| Level of education of the <br> respondents | Frequency | Percentage |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Primary school | 14 | 9.33 |


| Matric | 23 | 15.33 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| High education | 46 | 30.67 |
| Graduation | 38 | 25.33 |
| Post-graduation | 20 | 13.34 |
| Ph.D. | 9 | 6 |
| Total | $\mathbf{1 5 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0}$ |

Source: survey
Table 4: Family size of the respondents

| Family size of the <br> respondents | Frequency | Percentage |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 to 2 | 36 | 24 |
| 3 to 4 | 68 | 45.33 |
| 5 to 6 | 31 | 21 |
| 7 to 8 | 15 | 10 |
| Total | $\mathbf{1 5 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0}$ |

Source: survey
Table 5: Marital status of the respondents

| Marital status of the <br> respondents | Frequency | Percentage |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Single | 25 | 16.67 |
| Married | 119 | 79.33 |
| Divorces | 1 | 0.67 |
| Widowed | 5 | 3.33 |
| Total | $\mathbf{1 5 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0}$ |

Source: survey
Table 6: Area belongs to respondents

| Area belongs to respondents | Frequency | Percentage |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Urban | 108 | 72 |
| Suburban | 27 | 18 |
| Rural | 15 | 10 |
| Total | $\mathbf{1 5 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0}$ |

Source: survey
Table 7: Income Level of the respondents

| Income Level of the <br> respondents | Frequency | Percentage |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Below 10,000 | 10 | 6.67 |
| 10,000 to 20,000 | 34 | 22.67 |
| 20,000 to 30,000 | 87 | 58 |
| 30,000 to 40,000 | 19 | 12.66 |
| Total | $\mathbf{1 5 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0}$ |

Source: survey
Table 8: Perception \& satisfaction of respondents toward Sarveshwar basmati rice

|  | Price | Brand | Availa <br> bility | Taste | Advert <br> isemen <br> t | Package <br> Design | Size of <br> Pack | Nutritional <br> Value |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Mean | 2.693 | 3.220 | 3.400 | 3.440 | 2.227 | 2.820 | 2.727 | 2.700 |
| Median | 2.000 | 4.000 | 3.000 | 4.000 | 2.000 | 3.000 | 2.000 | 3.000 |
| Mode | 2.000 | 4.000 | 4.000 | 4.000 | 3.000 | 2.000 | 2.000 | 3.000 |
| Standard <br> Deviation | 1.003 | 1.423 | 0.811 | 0.839 | 0.913 | 1.254 | 1.061 | 0.712 |
| Sample <br> Variance | 1.006 | 2.025 | 0.658 | 0.704 | 0.834 | 1.571 | 1.126 | 0.507 |


| Count | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

The table 8 depicts that one of the various factors regards perception 7 satisfaction of respondents towards Sarveshwar basmati rice, respondents depends most upon taste attribute (3.440) followed by availability (3.400) followed by brand (3.220), followed by packaging design (2.820) followed by size of pack (2.727) followed by nutritional value (2.700) and followed by price (2.639) respectively.
Table 9: Importance of performance attributes in sample area

|  | Overall <br> Quality | Value | Purchasing <br> Experience | First <br> Experience | Usage <br> Experience |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Mean | 3.74 | 2.68 | 3.09 | 3.39 | $\mathbf{4 . 3 6}$ |
| Standard <br> Error | 0.05 | 0.07 | 0.07 | 0.05 | 0.06 |
| Median | 4.00 | 2.00 | 3.00 | 3.00 | 4.00 |
| Mode | 4.00 | 2.00 | 4.00 | 3.00 | 5.00 |
| Standard <br> Deviation | 0.61 | 0.85 | 0.91 | 0.35 | 0.73 |
| Count | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 |

Source: survey
The table 10 represent the influence of income on customer satisfaction. The table revealed that the factor of income doesn't shows positive relationship with the factors of the satisfaction. The table also showed that expected value in tabulated form is greater than the tabular value. Hence null hypothesises rejected.

The table 11 represent the influence of income on customer perception. The table revealed that the factor of income doesn't shoes a positive relationship with the factors of the perception. Hence table revealed that perception has no impact by any change in the income level of the respondents.

The table 12 represent that the influence of the education on the customer satisfaction and customer perception respectively. The table revealed that observed value shows greater value than the tabular value, hence hypothesis rejected. Which means, that the factors of education has no relationship with the factors of the satisfaction and perception level of has no impact on satisfaction and perception level of the respondent if there is any change in the education level of the respondents.

Table 10: Factors of customer satisfaction towards Sarveshwar basmati rice

| Regression Statistics |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Multiple R | 0.800 |
| R Square | 0.641 |
| Adjusted R Square | 0.612 |
| Standard Error | 0.628 |


| Observations | 150 |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ANOVA |  |  |  |  |
|  | $\boldsymbol{d f}$ | $\boldsymbol{S S}$ | $\boldsymbol{M S}$ | $\boldsymbol{F}$ |
| Regression | 11 | 97.163 | 8.833 | 22.367 |
| Residual | 138 | 54.497 | 0.395 |  |
| Total | 149 | 151.660 |  |  |
|  |  | Standard |  |  |
| Coefficients | Error | $\boldsymbol{t}$ Stat | $\boldsymbol{P}$-value |  |
| Intercept | 2.760 | 0.585 | 4.722 | 0.000 |
| Taste | 0.389 | 0.084 | 4.612 | 0.000 |
| Quality | 0.529 | 0.089 | 5.919 | 0.000 |
| Quantity | 0.006 | 0.074 | 0.082 | $\mathbf{0 . 3 5 0}$ |
| Availability | A | 0.083 | 4.908 | 0.005 |
| Packaging | 0.634 | 0.067 | 9.480 | 0.000 |
| Price | 0.376 | 0.082 | 4.567 | 0.000 |
| brand image | 0.491 | 0.093 | 5.292 | 0.000 |
| Advertisement | 0.152 | 0.111 | 1.368 | $\mathbf{0 . 1 7 3}$ |
| Aroma | 0.552 | 0.093 | 5.945 | 0.000 |
| Variety | 0.173 | 0.083 | 2.077 | $\mathbf{0 . 0 4 0}$ |
| Offers \& discount | -0.567 | 0.082 | -6.917 | 0.000 |
| Source: survey |  |  |  |  |

Source: survey
Table 11: Influence of Income on customer satisfaction in sample area

| Chi-Square Tests |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: |
|  | Value | Df | Asymp. Sig. (2-sided) |  |
| Pearson Chi-Square | $194.749^{\mathrm{a}}$ | 15 | .000 |  |
| Likelihood Ratio | 219.284 | 15 | .000 |  |
| Linear-by-Linear <br> Association | 1.227 | 1 | .268 |  |
| N of Valid Cases | 804 |  |  |  |
| a. 28 cells (46.7per cent) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count <br> is .18. |  |  |  |  |
| Chi-Square Tests |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Pearson Chi-Square | Value | df | Asymp. Sig. (2-sided) |  |
| Likelihood Ratio | 183.738 | 12 | .000 |  |
| Linear-by-Linear <br> Association | 28.667 | 12 | .000 |  |
| N of Valid Cases | 804 | .000 |  |  |
| a. 25 cells (41.7per cent) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count <br> is .13. |  |  |  |  |
| Chi-Square Tests |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Pearson Chi-Square | Value | df | Asymp. Sig. (2-sided) |  |


| Likelihood Ratio | 169.690 | 7 | . 000 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Linear-by-Linear Association | 8.442 | 1 | . 004 |
| N of Valid Cases | 804 |  |  |
| a. 41 cells ( 62.1 per cent) have expected count less than 5 . The minimum expected count is .03 . |  |  |  |
| Chi-Square Tests |  |  |  |
|  | Value | df | Asymp. Sig. (2-sided) |
| Pearson Chi-Square | $105.443^{\text {a }}$ | 13 | . 000 |
| Likelihood Ratio | 104.335 | 13 | . 000 |
| Linear-by-Linear Association | 13.547 | 1 | . 000 |
| N of Valid Cases | 804 |  |  |
| a. 23 cells (47.9per cent) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 09 . |  |  |  |
| Chi-Square Tests |  |  |  |
|  | Value | df | Asymp. Sig. (2-sided) |
| Pearson Chi-Square | $120.868^{\text {a }}$ | 12 | . 000 |
| Likelihood Ratio | 132.266 | 12 | . 000 |
| Linear-by-Linear Association | 2.245 | 1 | . 134 |
| N of Valid Cases | 804 |  |  |
| a. 13 cells (32.5per cent) have expected count less than 5 . The minimum expected count is 1.43 . |  |  |  |

Source: survey
Table12: Influence of Education on customer satisfaction

| Chi-Square Tests |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | Value | df | Asymp. Sig. (2-sided) |
| Pearson Chi-Square | $253.031^{\mathrm{a}}$ | 12 | .000 |
| Likelihood Ratio | 153.355 | 12 | .000 |
| Linear-by-Linear <br> Association | 43.562 | 1 | .000 |
| N of Valid Cases | 804 |  |  |
| a. 15 cells (37.5per cent) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is <br> .58. |  |  |  |
| Chi-Square Tests | Value | df | Asymp. Sig. (2-sided) |
|  |  |  |  |
| Pearson Chi-Square | $214.343^{\mathrm{a}}$ | 12 | .000 |
| Likelihood Ratio | 138.431 | 12 | .000 |
| Linear-by-Linear <br> Association | 9.182 | 1 | .002 |
| N of Valid Cases | 804 |  |  |
| a. 19 cells (47.5per cent) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is |  |  |  |


| . 29. |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Chi-Square Tests |  |  |  |
|  | Value | df | Asymp. Sig. (2-sided) |
| Pearson Chi-Square | $214.343^{\text {a }}$ | 8 | . 000 |
| Likelihood Ratio | 138.431 | 8 | . 000 |
| Linear-by-Linear Association | 9.182 | 1 | . 002 |
| N of Valid Cases | 804 |  |  |
| a. 19 cells (47.5per cent) have expected count less than 5 . The minimum expected count is . 29 . |  |  |  |
| Chi-Square Tests |  |  |  |
|  | Value | df | Asymp. Sig. (2-sided) |
| Pearson Chi-Square | $696.893^{\text {a }}$ | 12 | . 000 |
| Likelihood Ratio | 418.663 | 12 | . 000 |
| Linear-by-Linear Association | 207.077 | 1 | . 000 |
| N of Valid Cases | 804 |  |  |
| a. 20 cells (40.0per cent) have expected count less than 5 . The minimum expected count . 44. |  |  |  |
| Chi-Square Tests |  |  |  |
|  | Value | df | Asymp. Sig. (2-sided) |
| Pearson Chi-Square | $156.225^{\text {a }}$ | 7 | . 000 |
| Likelihood Ratio | 159.161 | 7 | . 000 |
| Linear-by-Linear Association | . 233 | 1 | . 629 |
| N of Valid Cases | 804 |  |  |
| a. 32 cells (53.3per cent) have expected count less than 5 . The minimum expected count . 04. |  |  |  |
| Chi-Square Tests |  |  |  |
|  | Value | df | Asymp. Sig. (2-sided) |
| Pearson Chi-Square | $141.741^{\text {a }}$ | 10 | . 000 |
| Likelihood Ratio | 132.246 | 10 | . 000 |
| Linear-by-Linear Association | . 124 | 1 | . 724 |
| N of Valid Cases | 804 |  |  |
| a. 44 cells ( 66.7 per cent) have expected count less than 5 . The minimum expected count is .01 . |  |  |  |

Source: survey

Table13: Influence of Education\& Income on customer perception

| Chi-Square Tests |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Value | df | Asymp. Sig. (2-sided) |
| Pearson Chi-Square | $213.387^{\text {a }}$ | 12 | . 000 |
| Likelihood Ratio | 185.036 | 12 | . 000 |
| Linear-by-Linear Association | 51.478 | 1 | . 000 |
| N of Valid Cases | 804 |  |  |
| a. 39 cells (59.1per cent) have expected count less than 5 . The minimum expected count . 20. |  |  |  |
| Chi-Square Tests |  |  |  |
|  | Value | df | Asymp. Sig. (2-sided) |
| Pearson Chi-Square | $157.267^{\text {a }}$ | 12 | . 000 |
| Likelihood Ratio | 160.013 | 12 | . 000 |
| Linear-by-Linear Association | 16.181 | 1 | . 000 |
| N of Valid Cases | 804 |  |  |
| a. 19 cells (39.6per cent) have expected count less than 5 . The minimum expected count 1.21. |  |  |  |
| Chi-Square Tests |  |  |  |
|  | Value | df | Asymp. Sig. (2-sided) |
| Pearson Chi-Square | $223.886^{\text {a }}$ | 10 | . 000 |
| Likelihood Ratio | 218.708 | 10 | . 000 |
| Linear-by-Linear Association | 1.438 | 1 | . 230 |
| N of Valid Cases | 804 |  |  |
| a. 21 cells ( 43.8 per cent) have expected count less than 5 . The minimum expected count . 60 . |  |  |  |
| Chi-Square Tests |  |  |  |
|  | Value | df | Asymp. Sig. (2-sided) |
| Pearson Chi-Square | $278.260^{\text {a }}$ | 10 | . 000 |
| Likelihood Ratio | 259.249 | 10 | . 000 |
| Linear-by-Linear Association | 34.222 | 1 | . 000 |
| N of Valid Cases | 804 |  |  |


| Chi-Square Tests |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | Value | df | Asymp. Sig. (2-sided) |
| Pearson Chi-Square | $124.654^{\mathrm{a}}$ | 9 | .000 |
| Likelihood Ratio | 127.872 | 9 | .000 |


| Linear-by-Linear Association | 8.894 | 1 | . 003 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| N of Valid Cases | 804 |  |  |
| a. 2 cells ( 10.0 per cent) have expected count less than 5 . The minimum expected count is 4.48. |  |  |  |
| Chi-Square Tests |  |  |  |
|  | Value | df | Asymp. Sig. (2-side |
| Pearson Chi-Square | $86.717^{\text {a }}$ | 10 | . 000 |
| Likelihood Ratio | 98.320 | 10 | . 000 |
| Linear-by-Linear Association | 51.666 | 1 | . 000 |
| N of Valid Cases | 804 |  |  |
| a. 9 cells ( 40.9 per cent) have expected count less than 5 . The minimum expected count . 75 . |  |  |  |
| Chi-Square Tests |  |  |  |
|  | Value | df | Asymp. Sig. (2-sided) |
| Pearson Chi-Square | $132.346^{\text {a }}$ | 7 | . 000 |
| Likelihood Ratio | 137.859 | 7 | . 000 |
| Linear-by-Linear Association | 76.003 | 1 | . 000 |
| N of Valid Cases | 804 |  |  |
| a. 1 cells (6.2per cent) have expected count less than 5 . The minimum expected count 4.48. |  |  |  |
| Chi-Square Tests |  |  |  |
|  | Value | df | Asymp. Sig. (2-sided) |
| Pearson Chi-Square | $31.377^{\text {a }}$ | 7 | . 000 |
| Likelihood Ratio | 32.768 | 7 | . 000 |
| Linear-by-Linear Association | 16.787 | 1 | . 000 |
| N of Valid Cases | 804 |  |  |
| a. 3 cells ( 18.8 per cent) have expected count less than 5 . The minimum expected count is 2.24 . |  |  |  |

Source: survey

## Conclusion and recommendations

Sarveshwar Brand is leading due to good perception level and response of the customers towards Sarveshwar Basmati Rice. Out of 150 respondents using Sarveshwar Basmati Rice 141 (94 per cent) liked Sarveshwar Basmati Rice. Sarveshwar XL brand is mostly preferred by the customers. The result also revealed that Hooding is the major factor influencing Sarveshwar purchase. Majority of the respondents preferred to go to other shop to search for their preferred brand. The best thing is that majority of the respondents were not at all consider other brands at the time of presence of different competitors, Among all the factor respondents have showed higher response on taste attribute that means taste is the most
important factor affecting the customer perception.
The study also depicted that Sarveshwar Basmati rice (Ultra XL, Grand, and Unique) has earned a well brand equity and customer base in the sample area with having 75 per cent market share. The results also revealed that the most influencing factor of Perception identified is taste attribute (3.440) followed by availability (3.400), brand (3.220), packaging (2.820), price (2.639), etc of the product. The study also reflected that the demographic factor (Education and Income) has no impact or relation over the customer satisfaction and perception level.
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