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#### Abstract

Sports Utility Vehicle (SUV) market is one of the growing markets in India due to changed customer perceptions. Various studies in the past showed that buying behavior is not static it is dynamic. Consumer buying behavior changes as per the need, requirements and financial capacity of individuals. The main objective of this study is to identify the main factors which change the buying behavior of the Indian consumers for SUV segment. This study has considered only the Bhopal city of state Madhya Pradesh. A structured questionnaire is prepared on five point likert scale. Questionnaire is divided in to two parts. First part deals with demographic information of the respondents while second part deals with buying behavior and purchase decision. Relaibility and validity of the questionnaires is tested and the instruement found reliable and valid. Reliability of questionnaire is tested by Chronbach alpha and for validity it is tested by two experts. For collecting data simple random sampling is used. Data is collected from only those samples which have SUV cars or having prospect of purchasing car. Study targeted to collect the data from 350 samples. For colleting the data two months have been taken. For data analysis Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA) is used and data analysed on SPSS 20 software. Analysis found six important factors which affect the consumer buying behaviour for SUV cars in Bhopal city.
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## Introduction

India is the second-largestpopulated country in the world after China. The economy of India is growing at a faster pace compared to other countries in the world. After America-China trade war India is now home to many bigger companies like KIA Motors, Morris Garage, Isuzu Motors, Ford, Honda, BMW, and others. The Indian automobile industry is fourth largest in the World and seventh-largest commercial manufacturer vehicles in India. Indian automobile industry will reach to 18.18 trillion in 2026.

India is one of the major markets for SUV cars and Indian roads are suitable for SUV vehicles. The most popular SUV in India is Maruti Gypsy used for wildlife safari and other mountain sports. Other SUV cars present in India are Tata Safari Dicor, Honda CR-V, Mahindra Scorpio, Fords Endeavour, Toyota Fortuner, Mitsubishi Pajero, Chevrolet Captiva, etc. The growing economy of India is shifting population from lower-income class to middle-income class. As per India brand equity foundation India is expected to become a leader in shared mobility by 2030 providing opportunities for electric and autonomous vehicles. SUV cars are the first choice of young generation population in India and at present India is having large young population in comparison to other countries of the world. So market for SUV cars is very lucrative.

This study is trying to identify the important factors which affect the buying behavior of consumer during SUV purchase. This study is restricted to Bhopal city of state Madhya Pradesh where the population is approximate 7.33 Crores and prospective market for SUV ars.
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## Literature Review

Choo and Mokhtarian (2004), various models have been developed of vehicle choice type. Basically the developers do not consider consumer's travel attitude, personality, lifestyle and mobility as factors that may affect the choices towards the vehicles. Demographic variables have been analyzed for deciding the factors influencing the consumer's choice towards car purchasing. Compact, mid-size, large, luxury, sports, small, pickup and sport utility vehicles have been analyzed for the same.

Noblet, Teisl, and Rubin (2006), the psychological factors are also responsible for the fuelled passenger's vehicles. The study focused on the empirical framework under eco-labeled conditions. Ecoinformation can affect the two-stage vehicle process of purchase, it has been particularly in this research. Eco information can be considered in the decision of vehicle purchase, but not generally at the classlevel decisions.

Train and Winston (2007) a consumer-level model has been developed for analyzing the erosion of the US automobile manufacturers' market share during the past two decades. Nearly all of the losses of the US share market can be clearly explained by the changes in basic vehicle factors like size, price, and power, operating cost, reliability, transmission type and body type. Only US manufacturers improved the attributes of the vehicles where the manufacturers of Japan and Europe did not change the attributes of the vehicles.

Potoglou (2008), the popularity of SUV cars has been increased with a few implications for traffic accidents, air quality, and gasoline demands. Empirical findings report that on the relationship between neighborhood characteristics and vehicle type choice within the Census Metropolitan area of Hamilton in Canada. Discrete choice models of the household's vehicle type choice suggested that consumer's preferences for less-fuel efficient vehicles are affected marginally by the diversity of uses of land the residence.

Banerjee's (2010) market for passenger cars has been witnessed for phenomenal growth over the last few years. A high degree of competition has been found in this industry which is needed to understand because the consumer's choices are changing very frequently. Especially, the scenario is found to be very different whenever the customer is buying their second car. The buyers of the second car are having very different factors that influence buying behavior.

Zhang, Gensler, and Garcia's (2011) agent-based model (ABM) also used to investigate the factors which influence the consumer's behavior towards the choices of the brands for the automobiles. These factors can increase the effusion on eco-innovations which is AFVs (alternative fuel vehicles). Agent-based model provides an opportunity to consider the interdependencies between automobile industry and the key participants. Three experiments namely market pull, technology push, and regulatory push have been considered for the adoption of AFVs.

Raj, Sasikumar, and Sriram (2013) emotions associated with the consumer's choices for SUV's and MUV's cars are a special segment of the car industry. Some descriptive analysis of the consumer's behavior proved that marketing mix elements and associated brand equity from the perspective of consumers are important because it suggests both tactics and strategies. More than six factors have been analyzed during this research. Consumer's heterogeneous behavior towards the choice of brands of SUV cars can be identified mainly by its brand equity.

Shende (2014) in the present scenario, the Automobile industry is the most lucrative and attractive industry. Due to increase income and easy availability of finance people are purchasing cars very frequently in both rural and urban areas. Now the automobile market is highly competitive and consumers are changing their choices very frequently. Especially in the car segments, consumers are having a lot of choices. The purchasing choices are divided according to their behavior also. The passenger car segment is highly focused by the consumers of middle income class.

Gilmore and Patwardhan (2016), rapid expansion in income level and population in the developing countries, the demand for goods and services are increasing frequently, including the demand for automobiles, especially passenger cars. However, GHG (Greenhouse Gases) and air pollutants are increased by the use of passenger cars. Some options have been found to minimize the costs also. Over the vehicle lifetime the private costs are the combination of capital costs and discounted expected fuel cost over the lifetime of the vehicle.

Dumortier, Siddiki, Carley, Cisney, Krause, Lane and Graham (2015) from the reduced energy consumption the long-run financial benefitswhich might not be realized by the customers. To supply the information on the basis of total cost of ownership plays as metrics which is for the purchase
prices, the fuel cost and the other cost of the ownership. The research was based on five years fuel cost savings and total ownership which affects the consumer's choice for conventional hybrid, gasoline or battery electric vehicles.

Kushwaha and Sharma (2016) several environmental issues can be raised due to the increased market share of the automobile sector. Duel pressure is facing by automobile manufacturersto solve environmental issues such as carbon emission, global warming, etc. Firms can be judged by their financial, operational performances and marketing capabilities. This research took a green initiative towards the adoption of saving the environment. A sustainable relationship has been developed through the adoption of green initiatives.

Kumar (2018) examined consumer buying behavior and preference of consumers in India. The study found safety and performance are two important factors during car purchase. Karthik and Nigajuna (2018) analyzed consumer attitudes towards BIMAL auto Pvt. Itd Banglore.

## Objectives of the Study

The main objective of this study is to identify the main factors that are causing changes in buying behavior of the Indian consumers for SUV segment.

## Research Methodology

The research design for this study is exploratory. Primary and secondary data has been considered for the study. A structured questionnaire is prepared for this study and survey method is used for the data collection. The questionnaire is prepared on 5 pointsLikert scale.After questionnaire preparation pilot testing of questionnaire is done and found suitable for the study. The reliability of questionnaire is tested by Chronbach alpha and for validity it is tested by two experts. When the instrument is found reliable and valid then it is used for study purposes. Simple random sampling is used for sample selection and study is restricted to Bhopal city only. Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA) is used for extracting the factor.

## Result and Discussion

Table 1: Descriptive Statistics of the Data

|  | N | Mean | Std. Deviation | Skewness |  | Kurtosis |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Statistic | Statistic | Statistic | Statistic | Std. Error | Statistic | Std. Error |
| Gender | 338 | 1.28 | .450 | .978 | .133 | -1.049 | .265 |
| Marital Status | 339 | 1.67 | .470 | -.739 | .132 | -1.463 | .264 |
| Age | 338 | 1.77 | .971 | 1.278 | .133 | 1.151 | .265 |
| Qualification | 339 | 3.29 | .949 | .559 | .132 | 1.036 | .264 |
| Family Structure | 339 | 1.31 | .464 | .812 | .132 | -1.349 | .264 |
| Occupation | 339 | 2.31 | 1.552 | .897 | .132 | -.338 | .264 |
| Family Income (Annually) | 339 | 2.23 | 1.080 | .383 | .132 | -1.128 | .264 |
| Accommodation Ownership | 339 | 1.43 | .812 | 1.924 | .132 | 2.812 | .264 |
| Car Ownership | 339 | 1.57 | .496 | -.269 | .132 | -1.939 | .264 |
| Valid N (listwise) | 338 |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Table 1 present the descriptive statistics of data, it covers the demographic profile of the respondents. It includes gender, age, marital status, qualification, family structure, occupation, family income, accommodation, and car ownership.

Table 2: Frequency Distribution of Gender

|  |  | Gender |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | ---: |
| Valid | Male | 243 | 71.7 | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|  | Female | 95 | 28.0 | 71.9 | 71.9 |
|  | Total | 338 | 99.7 | 28.1 | 100.0 |
| Missing | System | 1 | .3 | 100.0 |  |
| Total |  |  | 339 | 100.0 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

Table 2 presents the frequency distribution of gender. Out of 350 samples, 338 samples is found appropriate. Out of $338,243(71.7 \%$ of total data) are males and $95(28 \%)$ were females. It shows that most of the SUV run by male.

Table 3: Frequency Distribution of Marital Status

|  |  | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Valid | married | 111 | 32.7 | 32.7 | 32.7 |
|  | unmarried | 228 | 67.3 | 67.3 | 100.0 |
|  | Total | 339 | 100.0 | 100.0 |  |

Source: SPSS 20
Table 3 present the data onthe marital status of the respondents. Out of $100 \%$ data $32.7 \%$ are married and $67.3 \%$ are unmarried.

Table 4: Frequency Distribution of Age

|  |  | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Valid | $18-25$ | 172 | 50.7 | 50.9 | 50.9 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | $25-35$ | 101 | 29.8 | 29.9 | 80.8 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | $36-45$ | 42 | 12.4 | 12.4 | 93.2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | $46-55$ | 17 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 98.2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Above 55 | 6 | 1.8 | 1.8 | 100.0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Total | 338 | 99.7 | 100.0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Missing |  |  |  |  |  |  | System | 1 | .3 |  |  |
| Total |  |  | 100.0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Source: SPSS 20
Table 4 present the frequency distribution of data on the basis of age. Most of the respondents lie in the age group of $18-25$ ( $50.7 \%$ ), $5 \%$ respondents are in the age group of $46-55$ and only $1.8 \%$ lies in the age group of above 55 . It shows that younger population has more craze towards SUV.

Table 5: Frequency Distribution of Family Structure

|  |  | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Valid | Nuclear | 233 | 68.7 | 68.7 | 68.7 |
|  | joint | 106 | 31.3 | 31.3 | 100.0 |
|  | Total | 339 | 100.0 | 100.0 |  |

Source: SPSS 20
Table 5 present the frequency distribution of the family structure. 68. \% families are nuclear and rest is joint families.

Table 6: Frequency Distribution of Occupation

|  |  | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative <br> Percent |
| :---: | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Valid | Student | 162 | 47.8 | 47.8 | 47.8 |
|  | Self employed | 53 | 15.6 | 15.6 | 63.4 |
|  | Government jobs | 28 | 8.3 | 8.3 | 71.7 |
|  | Private jobs | 71 | 20.9 | 20.9 | 92.6 |
|  | Part time jobs | 4 | 1.2 | 1.2 | 93.8 |
|  | Unemployed | 21 | 6.2 | 6.2 | 100.0 |
|  | Total | 339 | 100.0 | 100.0 |  |

Source: SPSS 20
Table 6 present the frequency distribution of occupation. Most respondents are students ( $47.8 \%$ ), $20.9 \%$ respondents are in private jobs, $15.6 \%$ are self-employed, $8.3 \%$ are in government jobs and rest are in part-time jobs and unemployed.

Table 7: Frequency Distribution of Family Income

|  |  | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
| :---: | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Valid | Below 5 lakh | 107 | 31.6 | 31.6 | 31.6 |
|  | 5-10 lakh | 107 | 31.6 | 31.6 | 63.1 |
|  | 10-15 lakh | 65 | 19.2 | 19.2 | 82.3 |
|  | Above 15 lakh | 60 | 17.7 | 17.7 | 100.0 |
|  | Total | 339 | 100.0 | 100.0 |  |

Source: SPSS 20

Table 7 present the frequency distribution of family income. 63.2\% of the population lies in the income slab of 1 to 10 lakhs. $19.2 \%$ are in the slab of 10 to 15 lakhs and rest (17.7\%) are having a family income of above 15 lakhs.

Table 8: Frequency Distribution of Accommodation Ownership

|  |  | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |  |
| :---: | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Valid | Owned | 247 | 72.9 | 72.9 | 72.9 |  |
|  | Rented | Government quarters | 24 | 15.9 | 15.9 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Others | 16 | 6.5 | 6.5 | 95.3 |  |
|  | Total | 339 | 100.0 | 4.7 | 100.0 |  |
| Source: SPSS 20 |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Table 8 presents the frequency distribution ownership of accommodation. Out of the total population, $72.9 \%$ have their own house and $15.9 \%$ population resides rented house, while $6.5 \%$ lives in government quarters.

Table 9: Frequency Distribution of Car Ownership

|  |  | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Valid | Yes | 147 | 43.4 | 43.4 | 43.4 |
|  | No | 192 | 56.6 | 56.6 | 100.0 |
|  | Total | 339 | 100.0 | 100.0 |  |

Source: SPSS 20
Table 9 presents the frequency distribution of car ownership in which $43.4 \%$ population has their own car while $56.6 \%$ respondents do not have their own car.

## Exploratory Factor Analysis

The objective of the study is to identify the most important variable which affects consumer behavior during SUV purchase. The study considered various factors in the instrument with the help of literature review and expert suggestions. Factor analysis extracted the most important and correlated variables for the study. Highly correlated variables clubbed together into a few latent factors by using factor analysis.

To run the EFA (Exploratory Factor Analysis) data must follow the assumptions of the test. KMO test checks whether the number of observations in the dataset is enough for applying factor analysis or not. The variation must be in the variables to run the factor analysis. KMO value of more than 0.6 is considered to be satisfactory and shows that data is sufficient for factor analysis. Table 22 shows the KMO value is .940 and it fulfills data sufficiency condition.

Bartlett's test of sphericity checks the correlation among the variables. The null hypothesis states that no correlation among the variables while alternative says correlation exists among variables. If no correlation exists then it is useless to apply factor analysis. Here p-value is less than $5 \%$, and study fails to accept the null hypothesis, it states that sufficient correlation exists among the variables that are required to run the factor analysis.

Table 10: KMO and Bartlett's Test for factor analysis

| Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy. |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Bartlett's Test of Sphericity | Approx. Chi-Square | 7091.043 |
|  | df | 861 |
|  | Sig. | .000 |

Source: SPSS 20
Table 23 presents the eigenvalues of principal components. The number of components is equal to the number of variables. In principal component analysis eigenvalues of the first variable is always high. Factor selection is depending on the eigenvalue. Eigenvalue more than one is considered for the selection of factors. 6 factors are found suitable which are having eigenvalue more than 1 and explaining $58.07 \%$ variance of variables.

Table 11: Eigen Values of Principal Components

| Component | Initial Eigenvalues |  |  | Extraction Sums of Squared Loadings |  |  | Rotation Sums of Squared Loadings |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Total | \% of Variance | $\begin{gathered} \text { Cumulative } \\ \% \end{gathered}$ | Total | \% of Variance | $\begin{gathered} \text { Cumulative } \\ \% \end{gathered}$ | Total | \% of Variance | $\begin{gathered} \text { Cumulative } \\ \% \end{gathered}$ |
| 1 | 14.886 | 35.444 | 35.444 | 14.886 | 35.444 | 35.444 | 7.316 | 17.418 | 17.418 |
| 2 | 3.930 | 9.356 | 44.800 | 3.930 | 9.356 | 44.800 | 6.596 | 15.705 | 33.124 |
| 3 | 1.930 | 4.596 | 49.396 | 1.930 | 4.596 | 49.396 | 4.060 | 9.667 | 42.791 |
| 4 | 1.333 | 3.173 | 52.569 | 1.333 | 3.173 | 52.569 | 2.648 | 6.304 | 49.095 |
| 5 | 1.257 | 2.992 | 55.561 | 1.257 | 2.992 | 55.561 | 2.237 | 5.326 | 54.421 |
| 6 | 1.057 | 2.517 | 58.078 | 1.057 | 2.517 | 58.078 | 1.536 | 3.657 | 58.078 |
| 7 | 1.034 | 2.462 | 60.541 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 8 | . 980 | 2.332 | 62.873 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 9 | . 935 | 2.225 | 65.098 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 10 | . 869 | 2.068 | 67.166 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 11 | . 833 | 1.984 | 69.150 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 12 | . 779 | 1.855 | 71.005 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 13 | . 729 | 1.736 | 72.741 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 14 | . 710 | 1.689 | 74.430 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 15 | . 653 | 1.555 | 75.986 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 16 | . 648 | 1.543 | 77.528 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 17 | . 619 | 1.474 | 79.002 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 18 | . 595 | 1.416 | 80.419 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 19 | . 556 | 1.325 | 81.743 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 20 | . 540 | 1.285 | 83.028 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 21 | . 500 | 1.190 | 84.219 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 22 | . 480 | 1.144 | 85.363 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 23 | . 450 | 1.071 | 86.433 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 24 | . 439 | 1.046 | 87.479 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 25 | . 415 | . 988 | 88.467 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 26 | . 403 | . 958 | 89.426 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 27 | . 371 | . 884 | 90.310 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 28 | . 365 | . 869 | 91.179 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 29 | . 360 | . 857 | 92.036 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 30 | . 342 | . 814 | 92.850 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 31 | . 335 | . 797 | 93.647 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 32 | . 309 | . 735 | 94.381 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 33 | . 303 | . 723 | 95.104 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 34 | . 289 | . 688 | 95.792 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 35 | . 276 | . 657 | 96.450 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 36 | . 257 | . 612 | 97.062 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 37 | . 246 | . 586 | 97.648 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 38 | . 220 | . 525 | 98.172 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 39 | . 213 | . 508 | 98.680 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 40 | . 204 | . 485 | 99.166 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 41 | . 183 | . 436 | 99.601 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 42 | . 167 | . 399 | 100.000 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Source: SPSS 20Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Figure 1: Scree Plot-Graphical Representation for the Eigenvalues of Components


Table 12: Rotated Component Matrix ${ }^{\text {a }}$

|  | Component |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| Q37 | . 786 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Q36 | . 764 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Q27 | . 753 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Q34 | . 746 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Q39 | . 745 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Q33 | . 742 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Q40 | . 737 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Q32 | . 701 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Q35 | . 646 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Q31 | . 633 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Q28 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Q42 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Q25 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Q24 |  | . 722 |  |  |  |  |
| Q23 |  | . 696 |  |  |  |  |
| Q11 |  | . 695 |  |  |  |  |
| Q21 |  | . 677 |  |  |  |  |
| Q15 |  | . 659 |  |  |  |  |
| Q22 |  | . 643 |  |  |  |  |
| Q17 |  | . 604 |  |  |  |  |
| Q26 |  | . 592 |  |  |  |  |
| Q13 |  | . 564 |  |  |  |  |
| Q16 |  | . 559 |  |  |  |  |
| Q19 |  | . 528 |  |  |  |  |
| Q18 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Q14 |  |  | . 719 |  |  |  |
| Q20 |  |  | . 661 |  |  |  |
| Q6 |  |  | . 607 |  |  |  |
| Q9 |  |  | . 537 |  |  |  |
| Q30 |  |  | . 512 |  |  |  |
| Q12 |  |  | . 502 |  |  |  |
| Q3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Q10 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Q5 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Q4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Q2 |  |  |  | . 651 |  |  |
| Q1 |  |  |  | . 634 |  |  |
| Q29 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Q8 |  |  |  |  | . 724 |  |
| Q7 |  |  |  |  | . 695 |  |
| Q41 |  |  |  |  |  | . 629 |
| Q38 |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Source: SPSS 20
Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.
Rotation Method: Varimax with Kaiser Normalization.
a. Rotation converged in 11 iterations.

Table 23 is showing the factor loadings of variables with different extracted factors. Factor loading presents a correlation between variables and factors. Value varies from -1 to +1 . Here only those factors are considered which have higher loading value. A higher loading value shows that variance of the variable is explained by that factor. A higher loading value supports the presence of convergent validity in the factors.

Table 13: Extracted Factors

| Factors | Characteristics | Final Factors |
| :---: | :--- | :---: |
| $36,37,27,34,39,33,40,32$ | Dealers/sales staff, Auto-expo, published report, country origin, existing <br> customer review, brand website, coworker opinion, relative/neighbor opinion | Reach and influence |
| $24,23,11,21,15,22,17,26$ | Size, warranty, the purpose of usage, after-sales service, value for money, <br> easy parts availability, ease of maintenance, resale value | Service and <br> Maintenance |
| $4,20,6,9,30,12$ | Power pulling capacity, advance technology, interior design, colors, off-road <br> ability, variants of a car | Performance and <br> comfort |
| 2,1 | Fuel efficiency, price | Cost efficiency |
| 8,7 | Brand image, brand popularity | Brand Value |
| 41 | The decision of family members | Family Decision |

Table 25 presents the factors which are extracted by using factor analysis. Six factors are identified which affect consumer behavior during SUV purchase. Factors are reach \& influence, service \& maintenance, performance \& comfort, cost efficiency, brand value, and family decision. These are the important factors which affect consumer behavior during SUV purchase.

## Conclusion

As the Indian SUVmarket is growing at a larger pace this study will help the consumers to consider the important factors which affect consumer buying behavior. The main objective of this study is to identify the important factors which affect consumer buying behavior of SUV cars. The study also explores the demographic factors of the consumers for the study. Data is filled with 338 SUV car owners or prospective owners. Study found that $71.7 \%$ are male while $78.3 \%$ are females who filled the data. $67.3 \%$ respondents are unmarried and young (50\%) having age group 18-25. Only $43.4 \%$ population owns the SUV cars and $56.6 \%$ are the prospective buyers. The study found six important factors that affect consumer behavior during SUV purchases. Factors are reach \& influence, service \& maintenance, performance \& comfort, cost efficiency, brand value, and family decision. These are the important factors which affect consumer behavior during SUV purchase. This study is helpful for prospective consumers of Madhya Pradesh in SUV car purchase.
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