

# Influence of Durable Possession on Rural Consumers: A Study of Haryana

\*Vinod Kumar Bishnoi \*\*Bharti \*\*Ajay Kumar

With urban parts of India reaching to culmination of sales potential for many producers, rural India possess the potential to bring back the sales curves on inclination path. In recent past, rural customers were targeted seeing their potential and opportunity. Rural Indians being more traditional attach products they buy close to their feelings. This study surfaces the feelings and the extent to which rural people attach with their feelings with their products in durable category. The products covered are - Television, Refrigerator, Washing machines and Two wheelers.

## Introduction:

Indian economy is facing two facet changes - national to global market on one hand and urban to rural on the other. Many corporate from worldwide entered in India and contributed to the inclination of economy. The doors of opportunities open up with opening of the economy. The dream of Indian common man of improved lifestyle, better products, better quality, more options to choose from, less dependency on one manufacturer were not mere result of liberalization only but some of the best marketing practices adopted by these players in a new marketing environment played a major role and this all was best accelerated by the liberal economic policies. Indian markets are flooded with foreign products and the Indian consumers have more choices to make. Initially the focus of multinational companies was easily accessible and well developed urban market. Soon, the proliferation of companies' viz-a-viz brands, intense competition led to the saturation of urban market. This forced companies to look for a new market (Kashyap & Raut, 2009).

Indian consumer market is evolving because of high income opportunities, changing attitude towards saving, international exposure and lifestyle (KSA Technopark, 2006). 70 per cent of the great Indian consumer market which consist of 741 million Indians representing 138 million households resides in 6,38,365 villages (Census, 2001). Recent changes have turned customers seekers towards the most promising potential market of India - 'Indian rural market' (Kashyap & Raut, 2009). Current US \$487

million rural market will reach to US \$1.9 billion by 2015 according to Celent, International Consultancy Firm. By 2017, rural consumption will level the urban consumption. Between 2005 and 2025 as much as 300 million people from rural India would shift from the category of rural poor to rural lower middle class ([www.ibef.org](http://www.ibef.org)).

Urban Indian first became the target of quality products but now marketers have realised that rural India forms formidable part of Indian customer base. The census data state that rural India is much bigger and lucrative market. Adding to this, the increasing disposable income of rural customer has magnetised the producers towards them and ultimately they have started getting their share of attraction as well, as more and more corporate are focusing towards rural India. Diversified rural consumers speaking 1,652 languages are sure not an easy target as compared to their urban counterpart. But this is also sure that leaving this part will leave the Indian market untapped.

With all the states and villages in them are contributing strongly to the great nation. Punjab, Kerela, Haryana, Rajasthan, Gujrat, Andhra Pradesh and Maharashtra are being considered as highly prosperous states, the reason goes to increased rural expenditure as high and middle class income is rising and low income class is shrinking (Narang and Singh, 2009). The increased rural income has left quite impressive positive impact on purchase of Consumer Durables and FMCG. Taking US \$ 280

---

\*Associate Professor, Haryana School of Business, Guru Jambheshwar University of Science & Technology, Hisar

\*\*Research Fellow, Haryana School of Business, Guru Jambheshwar University of Science & Technology, Hisar

billion Indian retail market as whole, rural India constitute 40 per cent of it and in 2008 it increased at a rate of 25 per cent as compared to 7 to 8 per cent of urban retail market (SKP Securities Ltd.).

Rural statistics shows that when urban India was under the grip of recession during slowdown; at the same time an increase of demand by 25 per cent was witnessed in consumer market of rural India (Jain, 2010). Rural market of India was not impacted because of slow down. Chennai-based Francis Kanoi Marketing Planning Services Pvt Ltd, projected that the shift in demand from urban to rural incited all the major players of consumer durables to be more concentrated to rural consumers as the estimated value of this market is Rs 1,23,000 crores which comprises of Rs 65,000 crores for FMCG, Rs 5000 crores for durable, Rs 45,000 crores for agri inputs and Rs 8000 crore for four wheelers markets. Indian rural consumer market has seen a growth of 8 per cent annually (www.123eng.com). As on January 5, 2010 the market capitalization of consumer durables was INR 19,111.24 crore (www.siliconindia.com). The demand for consumer durables like televisions, refrigerators, air conditioners and microwave ovens is shooting up in rural areas (Anuradha, 2009).

### Review of Literature

Rural India consumer specifically has seen change in their consumption pattern. Multiplicative effect in income growth, aspirations and changed consumption pattern across the income level segments, have acted as catalyst in this unprecedented transition (Bijapurkar, 2000). More educated youth from rural India and their acceptance to change has brought changes in the lifestyle of middle, upper and aspiring lower class. As a result upper and middle income class is inclining and in result low income class is shrinking. Unlike decades ago, rural consumer has started spending more and more, increasing rural expenditure has started showing result as the economy of states like Punjab, Kerala, Haryana, Rajasthan, Gujarat, Andhra Pradesh and Maharashtra has seen inclination. (Narang & Singh, 2009).

Saturated urban markets and huge rural potential reflected in growing demand has initiated paradigm shift in rural market (Kumar and Bishnoi, 2007). Non food items have started getting more share of

consumers expenditures in rural parts now unlike the prior times when expenditure from rural areas would only be confined to food items. Earlier food items would bag 73 per cent of expenditure budget which now has declined to 55 per cent (NSSO, 2007). Now this shift helps in fulfilling the other needs like consumer goods and services (Bhandari, 2007). Colour televisions, tape recorders, two wheelers, cars have snatched the expenditure share of rural India from conventional items. High priced durables and other modern products are already being consumed by rural market of India (Ramaswamy & Namakumari, 1995).

Rural potential is so high that just one percent increase in income would result into Rs. 100,000 million of buying power. The rural market is growing twice faster than the urban market. Rural consuming class is growing at an annual growth rate of 3-4 percent, which results into 1.2 million new customers every year (Sridhar et. al, 2009).

Rural consumer is becoming more quality conscious, brand conscious and fully aware about the products available in the marketplace (Sakkthivel and Mishra, 2005). Therefore, the buying behaviour of rural consumers has acquired significant attention of the corporate biggies as they have started consuming everything from shampoo to motor cycles (Pani, 2000).

### Rationale of the Study

In today's dynamic environment when more and more urban markets are getting saturated, rural India is the next possible and formidable stand for producers. Despite this fact, marketers do not have much of understanding of rural consumer. There have been dearth of studies addressing the feelings rural consumes attach with products. Consumers do not only buy high involvement products for their core use, but they unconsciously attach their emotional, social and individual feelings like product as status symbol, products reinforcing self esteem, products as social statement etc. with products. If known, these attached feelings can be used as differentiation tool especially by a new marketer, who can use this information in communication campaign to get more positive response from consumers. Riding on to this knowledge, marketers can address specific rural

markets more minutely and precisely. In highly competitive era when purchasing power of rural consumer is increasing and available products are approaching to commodities (undifferentiated products), any differentiation can be a sound bell for consumers. The current study will surface the feelings which consumer attach to the durables which they currently have and will narrow the wide gap between the information required and information available on psychological feelings of rural consumers towards their durable products.

### Objectives of the Study

The main objective of study is to examine the impact of durable possession on rural consumers. For the purpose of achieving main objective, the following sub objectives have been framed:

- to study the impact of durable possession on personality, self esteem and status in society;
- to study the impact of durable possession on the socialization issue; and
- to study the impact of durable possession on their thinking process.

### Hypotheses

For achieving the above said objectives, the following hypotheses have been designed:

**H01** : There is no significant difference between

durable possession and the variables under study as far as respondents area of residence is concerned.

**H02** : There is no significant difference between durables possession and variables under study in respect of demographics variables of the respondents.

### Research Methodology

The present study is focused on the rural consumers of Haryana state. For this purpose, a stratified random sampling method was adopted. The study comprised of rural consumers residing in 8 villages from 4 districts of all four administrative divisions of Haryana. The villages were selected in a manner that one village lies near the district or town and one lies far from such district or town and nearness is defined as within 15 kilometres radius of the district or town. The respondents who posses at least one of the four durables namely television, refrigerator, washing machine and two-wheeler have been selected for scheduling of pilot tested questionnaire. All responses related to the statements for assessment of impact of durable possession on rural consumers have been taken on 5-point Likert scale ranging 1 for strongly disagree to 5 for strongly agree.

Consumers' response towards 9 statements related to durable impact was quantified by applying frequency, mean, ANOVA and t-test on SPSS17.0.

**Table 2: Summary of Mean and Grand Mean according to administrative zones of Haryana**

Sr. No.	Variables	Means				
		Ambala	Gurgaon	Hisar	Rohtak	Grand Mean
1	I feel myself better than those who don't possess these durables.	3.90	3.54	3.51	3.33	3.52
2	Durables have enhanced my status in the society.	3.94	3.63	3.64	3.85	3.77
3	I buy durables as it is a kind of investment for me.	3.72	3.44	3.11	3.12	3.30
4	Durables have become necessity of my life.	3.89	3.43	3.88	3.75	3.73
5	Durables help me to get associated with well-off people of society.	3.67	3.56	3.30	3.08	3.34
6	Durables have contributed in changing my beliefs and thoughts.	3.79	3.42	3.36	3.33	3.44
7	Possession of durables makes my self esteem high.	3.72	3.31	3.58	3.27	3.42
8	These products reflects my personality.	3.75	3.40	3.02	2.99	3.23
9	Durables make me feel proud.	4.10	3.43	3.74	3.36	3.59

## Results and Discussions

659 respondents were analyzed using mean of the responses. Finally 9 statements were put to mean, grand mean, ANOVA and t test according to demographics of respondents (Table2, Table3 and Table4). While mean and grand mean (Table2 and Table3) provided the extent and direction of opinion of respondents on agree and disagree scale, the ANOVA and t test (Table4) analyzed the significant differences between the respondents of different demographics on these variables.

The respondents living in different divisions of rural Haryana feel themselves better than their counterparts who do not possess the durables. The opinions is steadfast irrespective of the age, occupation, education, annual income and number of durable they posses as application of one way ANOVA did not result into significant differences of opinion in any of the above mentioned demographics (Table4). However proximity to the city provides significant differences ( $p < 0.05$ ) in the opinion of the respondents on this aspect. The mean values (Table4) for statement I feel myself better than those who do not posses these durables depicts that those who live near to city provide acceptance on the statement whereas negative nod has been provided by the respondents who live in far off villages.

The respondents of all the administrative zones, education, occupation and annual income perceive positive about the parameter - Durables have enhanced my status in society as indicated by the mean values (Table3) except for age and proximity to the city. In these cases, test statistic provides significant variations (Table4). Mean value for different ages of respondents explains that as age increases, the intensity of agreeableness for the statement goes on increasing and for respondents of above 50 age category; the mean value is 4.64 showing that old age people strongly associate presence of durables with their status in the society. Mean values for proximity shows that those who live within 15 km radius to city agree strongly to statement as compare to their counterparts who reside far from city.

For the parameter, I buy durable as it is a kind of investment for me is concerned, the respondents of different administrative divisions ( $p < 0.00$ ),

occupation ( $p < 0.01$ ) and proximity to the city ( $p < 0.00$ ) provide varied results as reflected by the table 4. The extent may also be seen through mean scores which reveals that the respondents of Ambala ( $\bar{x} = 3.72$ ) and Gurgaon ( $\bar{x} = 3.44$ ) zones agree strongly on the parameter as compared to the respondents of Hisar ( $\bar{x} = 3.11$ ) and Rohtak ( $\bar{x} = 3.12$ ) zones. The remaining demographics do not provide any significant result on this dimension; however, all of them have positive inclination towards this variable.

All respondents consider durables as necessity of life with almost equal intensities as there is no significant difference in the opinions for any of the demographics (Table4). The positivity of the results is also revealed by the mean values (Table3).

The grand mean highlights that the respondents of all the administrative divisions feel positive about the parameter that the Durable help me to get associated with well of people of society (Table2). However intensity on agreeableness is higher in case of Ambala ( $\bar{x} = 3.67$ ) and Gurgaon ( $\bar{x} = 3.56$ ) in comparison to Hisar ( $\bar{x} = 3.30$ ) and Rohtak ( $\bar{x} = 3.08$ ). ANOVA provides significant results on this aspect ( $p < 0.02$ ). Similarly the respondents near to the city and those far away from the city have also provided different level of intensity on this parameter ( $p < 0.00$ ) as divulged by table 4. However the respondents belong to all the categories have positive feeling towards the statement (Table3).

Almost all rural people of Haryana are inclined towards the acceptance and agreeableness that Durables they possess have changed their thoughts and beliefs with little variations in their opinions (Table3). But, it is clearly depicted by application of ANOVA and t test that this little difference in mean scores is not significant for any of the demographics of rural Haryana (Table4).

Rural people of Haryana are undivided on the fact that they associate their self esteem with the durables they possess and swings towards agreeing that yes they relate self esteem with durables (Table3) with little deviation in their opinions. ANOVA depicts that the variation is not significant for administrative zones, education, occupation, annual income and number of durables (Table4). t test applied on proximity factor surfaces that the variation is significant ( $p < 0.00$ ) as those who live

near to city feel more strongly of the association as compared to those who live far from city (Table3).

The responses for the statement These durables products reflects my personality on an average are inclining towards agreeableness (Table3). The difference in mean scores of this statement for administrative zones ( $p < 0.00$ ), education ( $p < 0.01$ ), occupation ( $p < 0.00$ ), no of durables ( $p < 0.00$ ) and proximity to city ( $p < 0.00$ ) are significant (Table4). Respondents of rural parts of Hisar and Rohtak neither agree nor disagree ( $x = 2.99$  and  $x = 3.02$  respectively) for the statement, but people of Ambala ( $x = 3.75$ ) agree to the statement and accept that the durables they have reflects their personality followed by the respondents of Gurgaon ( $x = 3.40$ ) (Table2). People who have studied till 10th slightly inclining towards agreeing to the personality statement where as post graduate respondents are inclining towards disagreeing (Table3). People engaged in agriculture are in dilemma whereas people who are in their own business are inclined towards agreeableness (Table3). Those who have one or two durables in their homes agree with same intensity whereas respondents with three durables are in lurch, they are neither agreeing nor disagreeing (Table3). People who live near to city feels agreeing to statement but those who live away from city do not (Table3).

People of rural Haryana unanimously feel proud because of the durables they are having (Table3) with average of grand mean scores is 3.59. The differences in mean scores for administrative zone ( $p < 0.00$ ), education ( $p < 0.01$ ), annual income ( $p < 0.05$ ) and no of durables ( $p < 0.02$ ) are significant (Table4). People of rural Ambala zone ( $x = 4.10$ ) comprehensively feel proud because of the durables they are having with them followed by Hisar ( $x = 3.74$ ), Gurgaon ( $x = 3.43$ ) and Rohtak ( $x = 3.36$ ) (Table2). People who are either illiterate ( $x = 3.67$ ) or have education up to 10th ( $x = 3.76$ ) feel more proud of their durables (Table3). Post graduate people are the least proud because of the durables they possess (Table3). People earning below one lakh per annum are more proud of their durables ( $x = 3.72$ ) and least proud are earning between two and three lakh ( $x = 3.42$ ) (Table3). People having two durables ( $x = 3.77$ ) in their homes are more proud of their durables followed by those having

one ( $x = 3.68$ ) (Table3).

## Marketing Implications

With increasing competition and saturating urban market, rural India is the next big destination of the corporate world. Rural Haryana being near to biggest market of Delhi, NCR can be more economical for the companies to reach. As customer do not buy the products for its core usage only. This fact is increasing the risk of falling down in relatively new markets, so it becomes farthest important to understand the association which customers make with products so that they can be targeted more efficiently and profitably.

The current study peeps deep inside in the way rural Haryana customer relates and associates the products (durables) with their feeling and their societal being. The current study in this way is a practical approach to the consumer behaviour of rural Haryana customers for durables. Questions of marketers relating to associations customer make to products are multiple and answers are few. The study will surely bridge the gap between the two and will help marketers to understand their next big customer minutely.

## References

1. Anuradha (2009), "Issues and Challenges in Rural Advertising and Promotion in India", *Marketing Mastermind*, March 2009, The Icfai University Press, 54-57
2. Bhandari Laveesh (May 4, 2007), "Trends and Trivia in India Story" *Indian Express*, Delhi
3. Bijapurkar Rama (2000 September 18), The marketing in India. *The Economic Times*, p6
4. Census of India (2001), [www.censusindia.gov.in](http://www.censusindia.gov.in)
5. Household Consumer Expenditure in India, 2006-07 *National Sample Survey Report*, 2007
6. Indian Brand Equity Foundation (2010), Retrieved February 10, 2010, from [http://www.ibef.org/artdispview.aspx?in=13&art\\_id=25090&cat\\_id=445&page=2](http://www.ibef.org/artdispview.aspx?in=13&art_id=25090&cat_id=445&page=2)
7. Jain Sachin (2010), "Rural marketing in India- a strategy to fight global recession", retrieved from <http://conf.pcte.edu.in/IMCTWGB2010/ResearchPapers/Rural%20Marketing.pdf>
8. KSA Technopark Report (2006), "The Indian Consumer", *Outlook*
9. Kumar, Sanjeev & Bishnoi Vinod (2007), Influence of marketers' efforts on rural consumers and their mindset, Proceedings from IIMA'07: *The Second Conference on Research on Marketing*, Ahmedabad

10. Narang Ritu & Singh Smita (2009), "Empowering Farmers through Creation of a Rural Hub: A Case Study on Haryali Kisaan Bazaar", *Velayudhan, Sanal Kumar & Sridhar, Guda (eds.) Marketing to Rural Consumers*, 1st Edition, Excel Publication, Delhi, pp 79-103
11. Pani Narender (2000), "The mirage in rural marketing", *The Economic Times*, July 14, p6
12. Ramaswamy V S and Namakumari S (1995), *Marketing Management - Planning, Implementation and Control*, Mcmillan India Ltd., New Delhi
13. Sakthivel A M & Mishra Bishnupriya (2005), "Effectiveness of sachets in modifying rural consumers' buying behaviour and their consumption pattern- A researcher's view", *Indian Journal of Marketing*, 35, 33-38
14. Siliconindia (2010), Retrieved February 6, 2010, from [http://www.siliconindia.com/shownews/Rural\\_market\\_strengthens\\_Consumer\\_Durables\\_business-nid-64343-cid-5.html](http://www.siliconindia.com/shownews/Rural_market_strengthens_Consumer_Durables_business-nid-64343-cid-5.html)
15. SKP securities Ltd (2010), Retrieved August 28, 2010 from [http://www.skpmoneywise.com/admin/Docs/Research/139032724\\_EmamiLtd-16022010.pdf](http://www.skpmoneywise.com/admin/Docs/Research/139032724_EmamiLtd-16022010.pdf)
16. Sridhar G Mishra Debiprasad & Vaswani L K (2009) "Executives' Representation of Rural Markets," Velayudhan, Sanal Kumar and Sridhar, Guda (Eds.) *Marketing to Rural Consumers*, Excel Publication, 1st Edition, New Delhi, pp 3-15 *123eng.* (2010). Retrieved March 10, 2010, from: <http://www.123eng.com/forum/viewtopic.php?p=127177>

## Annexure

Table 1: Characteristics of Respondents/Sample											
Demographic Variables	Characteristics	Administrative Zones of Haryana									
		Hisar		Ambala		Gurgaon		Rohtak		Total	
		No of Respondents	Percent	No of Respondents	Percent	No of Respondents	Percent	No of Respondents	Percent	No of Respondents	Percent
Age of the Respondent	18-25	42	6.37	23	3.49	68	10.32	77	11.68	210	31.87
	26-35	51	7.74	40	6.07	67	10.17	75	11.38	233	35.36
	36-50	33	5.01	48	7.28	16	2.43	72	10.93	169	25.64
	Above 50	11	1.67	4	0.61	5	0.76	27	4.10	47	7.13
<b>Total of Age</b>		137	20.79	115	17.45	156	23.67	251	38.09	659	100.00
Educational Qualification of the Respondent	Illiterate	9	1.37	8	1.21	7	1.06	34	5.16	58	8.80
	up to 10	33	5.01	47	7.13	30	4.55	89	13.51	199	30.20
	up to 12th	36	5.46	28	4.25	48	7.28	65	9.86	177	26.86
	Graduate	38	5.77	22	3.34	62	9.41	45	6.83	167	25.34
	Post Graduate	21	3.19	10	1.52	9	1.37	18	2.73	58	8.80
<b>Total of Qualification</b>		137	20.79	115	17.45	156	23.67	251	38.09	659	100.00
Occupation of the Respondent	Agriculture	55	8.35	9	1.37	49	7.44	138	20.94	251	38.09
	Govt. Service	31	4.70	17	2.58	15	2.28	42	6.37	105	15.93
	Private Service	17	2.58	29	4.40	81	12.29	49	7.44	176	26.71
	Business/ Profession	34	5.16	60	9.10	11	1.67	22	3.34	127	19.27
<b>Total of Occupation</b>		137	20.79	115	17.45	156	23.67	251	38.09	659	100.00
Annual income of household	Below One Lakh	47	7.13	50	7.59	45	6.83	112	17.00	254	38.54
	Between 1 Lakh and 2 Lakh	49	7.44	37	5.61	51	7.74	68	10.32	205	31.11
	Between 2 Lakh and 3 Lakh	26	3.95	15	2.28	29	4.40	39	5.92	109	16.54
	Above 3 Lakh	15	2.28	13	1.97	31	4.70	32	4.86	91	13.81
<b>Total of Income</b>		137	20.79	115	17.45	156	23.67	251	38.09	659	100.00
Total Number of Durables in Household	One Durable	13	1.97	25	3.79	31	4.70	51	7.74	120	18.21
	Two Durables	42	6.37	31	4.70	45	6.83	48	7.28	166	25.19
	Three Durables	25	3.79	29	4.40	39	5.92	70	10.62	163	24.73
	Four Durables	57	8.65	30	4.55	41	6.22	82	12.44	210	31.87
<b>Total of Durables</b>		137	20.79	115	17.45	156	23.67	251	38.09	659	100.00
Proximity to City	Near to City (Within 15 KM)	5	0.76	58	8.80	143	21.70	128	19.42	334	50.68
	Far from City (Above 15 KM)	132	20.03	57	8.65	13	1.97	123	18.66	325	49.32
<b>Total of Proximity to City</b>		137	20.79	115	17.45	156	23.67	251	38.09	659	100.00

Source: Primary Data

Table3:Summary of Mean and Grand Mean of Various Demographics										
Demographics	Characteristics	Statements								
		I feel myself better than those who don't possess these durables.	Durables have enhanced my status in the society.	I buy durables as it is a kind of investment for me.	Durables have become necessity of my life.	Durables help me to get associated with well-off people of society.	Durables have contributed in changing my beliefs and thoughts .	Possession of durables makes my self esteem high.	These products reflects my personality.	Durables make me feel proud.
Age	18-25	3.45	3.64	3.45	3.69	3.54	3.56	3.35	3.21	3.50
	26-35	3.47	3.62	3.25	3.65	3.29	3.36	3.30	3.22	3.54
	36-50	3.65	3.90	3.16	3.89	3.20	3.50	3.63	3.30	3.73
	Above 50	3.55	4.64	3.36	3.66	3.26	3.09	3.64	3.06	3.64
<b>Grand Mean for Age</b>		3.52	3.77	3.30	3.73	3.34	3.44	3.42	3.23	3.59
Education	Illiterate	3.14	3.55	3.09	3.22	3.09	3.22	3.29	3.12	3.67
	up to 10	3.56	3.94	3.32	3.90	3.22	3.39	3.73	3.36	3.76
	up to 12th	3.47	3.82	3.38	3.64	3.55	3.41	3.42	3.25	3.55
	Graduate	3.70	3.67	3.31	3.77	3.36	3.63	3.20	3.24	3.51
	Post Graduate	3.33	3.55	3.19	3.78	3.34	3.33	3.16	2.78	3.21
<b>Grand Mean for Education</b>		3.52	3.77	3.30	3.73	3.34	3.44	3.42	3.23	3.59
Occupation	Agriculture	3.35	3.87	3.09	3.74	3.26	3.36	3.44	3.04	3.54
	Business/ Profession	3.34	3.69	3.50	3.86	3.47	3.54	3.57	3.38	3.72
	Govt. Service	3.89	3.76	3.35	3.72	3.27	3.38	3.27	3.18	3.63
	Private Service	3.66	3.70	3.42	3.61	3.42	3.51	3.39	3.41	3.53
<b>Grand Mean for Occupation</b>		3.52	3.77	3.30	3.73	3.34	3.44	3.42	3.23	3.59
Annual Income	Below One Lakh	3.47	3.63	3.26	3.69	3.35	3.38	3.63	3.30	3.72
	Between 1 Lakh and 2 Lakh	3.45	3.69	3.33	3.59	3.43	3.47	3.33	3.19	3.49
	Between 2 Lakh and 3 Lakh	3.39	3.74	3.13	3.70	3.20	3.53	3.17	3.14	3.42
	Above 3 Lakh	3.97	4.37	3.53	4.17	3.30	3.41	3.38	3.23	3.60
No of Durables	One Durable	3.48	3.75	3.32	3.63	3.35	3.35	3.54	3.42	3.68
	Two Durables	3.80	4.00	3.28	3.55	3.41	3.35	3.53	3.42	3.77
	Three Durables	3.46	3.76	3.31	3.72	3.16	3.56	3.26	3.01	3.50
	Four Durables	3.36	3.61	3.29	3.93	3.43	3.47	3.40	3.13	3.45
<b>Grand Mean for No of Durables</b>		3.52	3.77	3.30	3.73	3.34	3.44	3.42	3.23	3.59
Proximity to City	Near to City	3.72	4.00	3.43	3.71	3.59	3.54	3.65	3.46	3.62
	Far from City	3.30	3.53	3.16	3.74	3.09	3.33	3.19	2.98	3.55
<b>Grand Mean for Distance from City</b>		3.52	3.77	3.30	3.73	3.34	3.44	3.42	3.23	3.59

Source: Primary Data



## Annexure

Demographic Variables	Characteristics	Administrative Zones of Haryana													
		Hisar			Ambala			Gurgaon			Rohtak			Total	
		No of Respondents	Percent	No of Respondents	Percent	No of Respondents	Percent	No of Respondents	Percent	No of Respondents	Percent	No of Respondents	Percent	No of Respondents	Percent
Age of the Respondent	18-25	42	6.37	23	3.49	68	10.32	77	11.68	210	31.87				
	26-35	51	7.74	40	6.07	67	10.17	75	11.38	233	35.36				
	36-50	33	5.01	48	7.28	16	2.43	72	10.93	169	25.64				
	Above 50	11	1.67	4	0.61	5	0.76	27	4.10	47	7.13				
<b>Total of Age</b>		137	20.79	115	17.45	156	23.67	251	38.09	659	100.00				
Educational Qualification of the Respondent	Illiterate	9	1.37	8	1.21	7	1.06	34	5.16	58	8.80				
	up to 10	33	5.01	47	7.13	30	4.55	89	13.51	199	30.20				
	up to 12th	36	5.46	28	4.25	48	7.28	65	9.86	177	26.86				
	Graduate	38	5.77	22	3.34	62	9.41	45	6.83	167	25.34				
<b>Total of Qualification</b>		137	20.79	115	17.45	156	23.67	251	38.09	659	100.00				
Occupation of the Respondent	Agriculture	55	8.35	9	1.37	49	7.44	138	20.94	251	38.09				
	Govt. Service	31	4.70	17	2.58	15	2.28	42	6.37	105	15.93				
	Private Service	17	2.58	29	4.40	81	12.29	49	7.44	176	26.71				
	Business/Profession	34	5.16	60	9.10	11	1.67	22	3.34	127	19.27				
<b>Total of Occupation</b>		137	20.79	115	17.45	156	23.67	251	38.09	659	100.00				
Annual income of household	Below One Lakh	47	7.13	50	7.59	45	6.83	112	17.00	254	38.54				
	Between 1 Lakh and 2 Lakh	49	7.44	37	5.61	51	7.74	68	10.32	205	31.11				
	Between 2 Lakh and 3 Lakh	26	3.95	15	2.28	29	4.40	39	5.92	109	16.54				
	Above 3 Lakh	15	2.28	13	1.97	31	4.70	32	4.86	91	13.81				
<b>Total of Income</b>		137	20.79	115	17.45	156	23.67	251	38.09	659	100.00				
Total Number of Durables in Household	One Durable	13	1.97	25	3.79	31	4.70	51	7.74	120	18.21				
	Two Durables	42	6.37	31	4.70	45	6.83	48	7.28	166	25.19				
	Three Durables	25	3.79	29	4.40	39	5.92	70	10.62	163	24.73				
	Four Durables	57	8.65	30	4.55	41	6.22	82	12.44	210	31.87				
<b>Total of Durables</b>		137	20.79	115	17.45	156	23.67	251	38.09	659	100.00				
Proximity to City	Near to City (Within 15 KM)	5	0.76	58	8.80	143	21.70	128	19.42	334	50.68				
	Far from City (Above 15 KM)	132	20.03	57	8.65	13	1.97	123	18.66	325	49.32				
<b>Total of Proximity to City</b>		137	20.79	115	17.45	156	23.67	251	38.09	659	100.00				

Source: Primary Data