



**CHAPTER VI**  
**PRIORITY OF**  
**CUSTOMERS**

## CHAPTER VI

### PRIORITY OF CUSTOMERS

To understand which attribute are given more importance by customers of banks and to prepare a priority list, the customers were asked to assign importance to the various attributes during survey. They were provided with statements and were asked to responds on the basis of their support of agreement (Refer question no. of questionnaire in Annexure 3(1)).Their responses were converted to quantitative value and mean for each attribute was calculated to prepare the priority list.

**Table 6.1: Priority Assigned to Different Attributes by Customers:**

Attributes	Priority	Mean
Trust worthiness	1	1.36
Proper maintenance of transaction	2	1.17
Service charge	3	1.09
Addressing the grievances	4	1.08
Level of ease in applying for products	5	1.07
Wide ATM coverage	6	1.05
Complaint resolution	7	1.04
Core banking facility	8	1.03
Banking instrument delivery	8	1.03
Courteous and friendly staff	9	.98
Knowing the customer and needs	10	.88
Communication new product	11	.84
Employee going extra mile to help	12	.76
Personalized service	13	.66
Number of branches	14	.58
Online banking	15	.53
Phone banking	16	.43
Frequent changes of banking transaction process	17	.40
Changes from average quarterly balance to average monthly balance	18	.30
Body language of bank employee	19	.14

Bill payments through ATM	20	.12
Third party products	21	.06
Credit card facility	22	-.07

It has been felt necessary to find if the importance differ among customers belonging to different demographic groups, it was also necessary to find out presence of difference in importance on the basis of banking service usages pattern. Hence the following analysis using ANOVA has been carried out.

**6.1.1. Test for checking difference of “communication of new products “with respect to customers’ “frequency of visit”:**

Null Hypothesis: There is no difference in importance of customers’ frequency of visit with respect to communication of new products.

After ANOVA has been carried out it has been found that the null hypothesis has been rejected (As  $p=0.00$ ). To find out difference between which groups are significant post hoc analysis (LSD) has been carried out.

$$\mu_1 \neq \mu_3$$

This means that difference in importance of people visit once a month and people visiting thrice a month is significant.

$$\mu_1 \neq \mu_4$$

This means that difference in importance of people visiting once a month and people visiting 4 times a month is significant.

$$\mu_2 \neq \mu_4$$

This means that difference in importance of people visiting twice a month and people visiting four times a month is significant.

$$\mu_3 \neq \mu_4$$

This means that difference in importance of people visiting three times a month and people visiting four times a month is significant.

$\mu_4 \neq \mu_5$

This means that difference in importance of people visiting four times a month and people visiting more than four times a month is significant.

**Table 6.2: Importance on communication of new product with respect to frequency of visit:**

Frequency of visit	N	Means
once in a month	255	.83
twice a month	179	.89
thrice a month	126	.92
4 times a month	31	.29
more than 4 times a month	9	.89
Total	600	.84

This table reveals that

People visiting banks thrice in a month put more priority in banks' communication in new products compared to people visiting banks once in a month.

People visiting banks once in a month put more priority in banks' communication in new products compared to people visiting banks four times in a month.

People visiting banks twice in a month put more priority in banks' communication in new products compared to people visiting banks four times in a month.

People visiting banks thrice in a month put more priority in banks' communication in new products compared to people visiting banks four times in a month.

People visiting banks more than four times in a month put more priority in banks' communication in new products compared to people visiting banks four times in a month.

Hence it can be summarized that the customer who are visit more than once in the branch shows more importance in this attribute.

**6.1.2. Test for checking difference of “courteous and friendly staff” with respect to customers “frequency of visit”:**

Similar analysis reveals the following:

People visiting banks twice in a month put more priority in banks’ staff behavior compared to people visiting banks once in a month.

People visiting banks thrice in a month put more priority in banks’ staff behavior compared to people visiting banks once in a month.

Hence it can be summarized that people who are visiting more in the branch are more concern about this parameter. For them bank employee behavior is important.

**6.1.3. Test for checking difference of “knowing the customer and needs” with respect to customers “frequency of visit”:**

Similar analysis reveals the following:

People visiting banks once in a month put more priority in banks’ attitude towards customer need compared to people visiting banks four times in a month.

People visiting banks twice in a month put more priority in banks’ attitude towards customer need compared to people visiting banks four times in a month.

People visiting banks four times in a month put more priority in banks’ attitude towards customer need compared to people visiting banks twice in a month.

People visiting banks thrice in a month put more priority in banks’ attitude towards customer need compared to people visiting banks twice in a month.

People visiting banks thrice in a month put more priority in banks’ attitude towards customer need compared to people visiting banks four times in a month.

People visiting banks more than four times in a month put more priority in banks’ attitude towards customer need compared to people visiting banks four times in a month.

Hence, it can be summarized that those who visit more frequently in the branch expect their needs are identified and addressed properly. In this attribute expectations are high for those people also who visits once in a month.

**6.1.4. Test for checking difference of “level of ease for applying products” with respect to customers “frequency of visit”:**

Similar analysis reveals the following:

People visiting banks thrice in a month put more priority in banks’ process for applying products compared to people visiting banks once in a month.

People visiting banks four times in a month put more priority in banks’ process for applying products compared to people visiting banks once in a month.

People visiting banks thrice in a month put more priority in banks’ process for applying products compared to people visiting banks twice in a month.

People visiting banks thrice in a month put more priority in banks’ process for applying products compared to people visiting banks four times in a month.

People visiting banks once in a month put more priority in banks’ process for applying products compared to people visiting banks more than four times in a month.

Hence, it can be summarized people who are visit more than once particularly who are visit twice or thrice in a month have more expectation towards simple process for applying any bank products.

**6.1.5. Test for checking difference of “phone banking” with respect to customers’ “frequency of visit”:**

Null Hypothesis: There is no difference in importance of customers’ frequency of visit with respect to phone banking. After ANOVA has been carried out it has been found that the null hypothesis can’t be rejected (As  $p=0.203$ ).

Hence, it can be summarized that people who visit more than 4 times, for them phone banking is not important. Other than this set of people it is important for all other people.

**6.1.6. Test for checking difference of “online banking” with respect to customers “frequency of visit”:**

Similar analysis reveals the following:

People visiting banks twice in a month put more priority in banks' online banking compared to people visiting banks once in a month.

People visiting banks thrice in a month put more priority in banks' online banking compared to people visiting banks once in a month.

People visiting banks four times in a month put more priority in banks' online banking compared to people visiting banks once in a month.

People visiting banks twice in a month put more priority in banks' online banking compared to people visiting banks more than four times in a month.

People visiting banks thrice in a month put more priority in banks' online banking compared to people visiting banks more than four times in a month.

People visiting banks four times in a month put more priority in banks' online banking compared to people visiting banks more than four times in a month.

Hence, it can be summarized that customer who had visited more than 4 times in a month are not give importance on online banking, whereas the customers who had visited twice, thrice and four times in a month are inclined towards it.

**6.1.7. Test for checking difference of “bill payments through ATMs” with respect to customers “frequency of visit”:**

Similar analysis reveals the following:

People visiting banks twice in a month put more priority in banks' facility of bill payments through ATMs compared to people visiting banks once in a month.

People visiting banks thrice in a month put more priority in banks' facility of bill payments through ATMs compared to people visiting banks once in a month.

People visiting banks twice in a month put more priority in banks' facility of bill payments through ATMs compared to people visiting banks four times in a month.

People visiting banks twice in a month put more priority in banks' facility of bill payments through ATMs compared to people visiting banks more than four times in a month.

People visiting banks thrice in a month put more priority in banks' facility of bill payments through ATMs compared to people visiting banks four times in a month.

People visiting banks thrice in a month put more priority in banks' facility of bill payments through ATMs compared to people visiting banks more than four times in a month.

Hence, it can be summarized that customer who had visited twice and thrice in a month feel importance on this parameter. However, people who had visited 4 times and more than 4 times in a month are not showing importance on this parameter.

**6.1.8. Test for checking difference of “body language of bank employee” with respect to customers “frequency of visit”:**

Similar analysis reveals the following:

People visiting banks twice in a month put more priority in banks' employee attitude compared to people visiting banks once in a month.

People visiting banks thrice in a month put more priority in banks' employee attitude compared to people visiting banks once in a month.

People visiting banks four times in a month put more priority in banks' employee attitude compared to people visiting banks once in a month.

People visiting banks twice in a month put more priority in banks' employee attitude compared to people visiting banks four times in a month.

People visiting banks twice in a month put more priority in banks' employee attitude compared to people visiting banks more than four times in a month.

People visiting banks thrice in a month put more priority in banks' employee attitude compared to people visiting banks four times in a month.

People visiting banks thrice in a month put more priority in banks' employee attitude compared to people visiting banks more than four times in a month.

Hence, it can be summarized that customer who had visited more than once are showing importance in this parameter. They are expecting a pleasant behavior from bank employee.



**6.1.9. Test for checking difference of “employee going extra mile to help” with respect to customers “frequency of visit”:**

Similar analysis reveals the following:

People visiting banks twice in a month put more priority in banks’ employee extra care compared to people visiting banks once in a month.

People visiting banks thrice in a month put more priority in banks’ employee extra care compared to people visiting banks once in a month.

People visiting banks four times in a month put more priority in banks’ employee extra care compared to people visiting banks once in a month.

People visiting banks more than four times in a month put more priority in banks’ employee extra care compared to people visiting banks once in a month.

People visiting banks thrice in a month put more priority in banks’ employee extra care compared to people visiting banks twice in a month.

Hence, it can be summarized that the customer who had visited more in the branch are high expectation from employee than those who had visited only once in a month. So frequency of visit has direct impact on this parameter.

**6.1.10. Test for checking difference of “complaint resolution” with respect to customers “frequency of visit”:**

Similar analysis reveals the following:

People visiting banks thrice in a month put more priority in banks’ complaint resolution process compared to people visiting banks once in a month.

People visiting banks thrice in a month put more priority in banks’ complaint resolution process compared to people visiting banks twice in a month.

Hence, it can be summarized that the customer who had visited more in the branch has more concern about complaint resolution. So frequency of visit has impact on the complaint resolution parameter.

**6.1.11. Test for checking difference of “frequent changes of banking transaction process” with respect to customers “frequency of visit”:**

Similar analysis reveals the following:

People visiting banks twice in a month put more priority in banks’ frequency of changing process compared to people visiting banks once in a month.

People visiting banks thrice in a month put more priority in banks’ frequency of changing process compared to people visiting banks once in a month.

People visiting banks four times in a month put more priority in banks’ frequency of changing process compared to people visiting banks once in a month.

People visiting banks more than four times in a month put more priority in banks’ frequency of changing process compared to people visiting banks four times in a month.

Hence, it can be summarized that people who had visited more than once in a month is showing more interest on the process of frequent changes of banking transaction process.

**6.1.12: Test for checking difference of “average quarterly balance to average monthly balance” with respect to customers “frequency of visit”:**

Similar analysis reveals the following:

People visiting banks four times in a month put more priority in banks’ internal transaction process compared to people visiting banks once in a month.

People visiting banks four times in a month put more priority in banks’ internal transaction process compared to people visiting banks twice in a month.

People visiting banks four times in a month put more priority in banks’ internal transaction process compared to people visiting banks thrice in a month.

People visiting banks more than four times in a month put more priority in banks’ internal transaction process compared to people visiting banks four times in a month.

Hence, it can be summarized that customer who had visited four times in a month gives more importance to the changes process of average quarterly balance to average monthly balance..

**6.1.13. Test for checking difference of “trust worthiness” with respect to customers “frequency of visit”:**

Similar analysis reveals the following:

People visiting banks thrice a month put more priority in banks’ trust worthiness parameter compared to people visiting banks once in a month.

People visiting banks thrice in a month put more priority in banks’ trust worthiness parameter compared to people visiting banks twice in a month.

People visiting banks twice in a month put more priority in banks’ trust worthiness parameter compared to people visiting banks four times in a month.

People visiting banks thrice in a month put more priority in banks’ trust worthiness parameter compared to people visiting banks four times in a month.

People visiting banks thrice in a month put more priority in banks’ trust worthiness parameter compared to people visiting banks more than four times in a month.

Hence, it can be summarized that customers who had visited thrice in a month is more concerned about trust factor compared to other groups of visitors.

**6.1.14: Test for checking difference of “addressing the grievances” with respect to customers “frequency of visit”:**

Similar analysis reveals the following:

People visiting banks twice in a month put more priority in banks’ grievances handling aspect compared to people visiting banks once in a month.

People visiting banks thrice in a month put more priority in banks’ grievances handling aspect compared to people visiting banks once in a month.

People visiting banks thrice in a month put more priority in banks’ grievances handling aspect compared to people visiting banks twice in a month.

People visiting banks thrice in a month put more priority in banks’ grievances handling aspect compared to people visiting banks four times in a month.

People visiting banks thrice in a month put more priority in banks' grievances handling aspect compared to people visiting banks four times in a month.

Hence, it can be summarized that customer who had visited twice and thrice in a month is showing more importance for addressing the grievances parameter.

**6.1.15: Test for checking difference of “proper maintenances of transaction” with respect to customers “frequency of visit”:**

Similar analysis reveals the following:

People visiting banks thrice in a month put more priority in banks' proper maintenance of transactions compared to people visiting banks once in a month.

People visiting banks thrice in a month put more priority in banks' proper maintenance of transactions compared to people visiting banks twice in a month.

People visiting banks thrice in a month put more priority in banks' proper maintenance of transactions compared to people visiting banks four times in a month.

People visiting banks thrice in a month put more priority in banks' proper maintenance of transactions compared to people visiting banks more than four times in a month.

Hence, it can be summarized that the customer who had visited more than once in a month are giving more importance in proper maintenances of transaction than customer who had visited once in a month.

**6.1.16: Test for checking difference of “wide ATM coverage” with respect to customers “frequency of visit”:**

Similar analysis reveals the following:

People visiting banks thrice in a month put more priority in banks' wide ATM coverage parameter compared to people visiting banks once in a month.

People visiting banks thrice in a month put more priority in banks' wide ATM coverage parameter compared to people visiting banks twice in a month.

Hence, it can be summarized that the customer who had visited thrice and four times in a month are showing more interest in wide ATM coverage compared to customer who had visited once or twice in a month.

**6.1.17: Test for checking difference of “core banking facility” with respect to customers “frequency of visit”:**

Similar analysis reveals the following:

People visiting banks twice in a month put more priority in banks’ core banking facility compared to people visiting banks once in a month.

People visiting banks thrice in a month put more priority in banks’ core banking facility compared to people visiting banks once in a month.

People visiting banks four times in a month put more priority in banks’ core banking facility compared to people visiting banks once in a month.

Hence, it can be summarized that the customer who had visited more than once in a month are giving more importance on core banking facility compared to the customer who had visited once in a month.

**6.1.18: Test for checking difference of “credit card facility” with respect to customers “frequency of visit”:**

Similar analysis reveals the following:

People visiting banks twice in a month put more priority in banks’ credit card facility compared to people visiting banks once in a month.

People visiting banks thrice in a month put more priority in banks’ credit card facility compared to people visiting banks once in a month.

People visiting banks four times in a month put more priority in banks’ credit card facility compared to people visiting banks once in a month.

People visiting banks more than four times in a month put more priority in banks’ credit card facility compared to people visiting banks once in a month.

People visiting banks four times in a month put more priority in banks' credit card facility compared to people visiting banks twice in a month.

People visiting banks more than four times in a month put more priority in banks' credit card facility compared to people visiting banks twice in a month.

People visiting banks four times in a month put more priority in banks' credit card facility compared to people visiting banks thrice in a month.

People visiting banks more than four times in a month put more priority in banks' credit card facility compared to people visiting banks thrice in a month.

Hence, it can be summarized that the customer who had visited four times and more than four times are showing more importance in credit card facility than those customer who had visited once, twice and thrice in a month.

**6.1.19: Test for checking difference of “personalized service” with respect to customers “frequency of visit”:**

Similar analysis reveals the following:

People visiting banks twice in a month put more priority in banks' personalized service compared to people visiting banks once in a month.

People visiting banks thrice in a month put more priority in banks' personalized service compared to people visiting banks once in a month.

People visiting banks four times in a month put more priority in banks' personalized service compared to people visiting banks once in a month.

People visiting banks more than four times in a month put more priority in banks' personalized service compared to people visiting banks once in a month.

Hence, it can be summarized that people who had visited more than once in a month are showing more importance in personalized service than those people who had visited once in a month.

**6.1.20: Test for checking difference of “service charge” with respect to customers “frequency of visit”:**

Similar analysis reveals the following:

People visiting banks thrice in a month put more priority in banks' service charge compared to people visiting banks once in a month.

People visiting banks thrice in a month put more priority in banks' service charge compared to people visiting banks twice in a month.

People visiting banks thrice in a month put more priority in banks' service charge compared to people visiting banks more than four times in a month

Hence, it can be summarized that customer who had visited more than once are showing importance of service charge, particularly those customer who had visited thrice in a month.

**6.1.21: Test for checking difference of “third party products” with respect to customers “frequency of visit”:**

Similar analysis reveals the following:

People visiting banks twice in a month put more priority in banks' service charge compared to people visiting banks once in a month.

People visiting banks more than four times in a month put more priority in banks' service charge compared to people visiting banks once in a month.

People visiting banks twice in a month put more priority in banks' service charge compared to people visiting banks thrice in a month.

People visiting banks twice in a month put more priority in banks' service charge compared to people visiting banks four times in a month.

People visiting banks more than four times in a month put more priority in banks' service charge compared to people visiting banks thrice in a month.

People visiting banks more than four in a month put more priority in banks' service charge compared to people visiting banks four times in a month.

Hence, it can be summarized that the customer who had visited twice in a month and more than four times in a month gives more importance on third party products.

**6.1.22. Test for checking difference of “number of branches” with respect to customers “frequency of visit”:**

Null Hypothesis: There is no difference in importance of customers' frequency of visit with respect to number of branches.

After ANOVA has been carried out it has been found that the null hypothesis can't be rejected (As  $p=0.882$ ).

Hence, it can be summarized "number of branches" has not any significance impact on "frequency of visit" of customers.

#### **6.1.23. Test for checking difference of "banking instrument delivery" with respect to customers "frequency of visit".**

Similar analysis reveals the following:

People visiting banks once in a month put more priority in banks' product instrument delivery compared to people visiting banks twice in a month.

People visiting banks once in a month put more priority in banks' product instrument delivery compared to people visiting banks thrice in a month.

People visiting banks once in a month put more priority in banks' product instrument delivery compared to people visiting banks four times in a month.

Hence, it can be summarized that people visiting banks once in a month gives more importance on banking instrument delivery compared to the people who are visiting more than once in a month.

The major findings from the above analysis on Importance regarding different attributes by groups visiting the banks at different frequency levels are:

- a) Regarding "number of branches" and "banking instrument delivery", importance is not influenced by frequency of visit.
- b) Customers visiting once in a month put more priority in the following attributes "communication of new product", "knowing the customer and needs", "phone banking", "on line banking", and "complaint resolution".
- c) Customers visiting more than once in a month put more priority in the following attributes "employee behavior", "applying products", "bill payments through ATMs", "body language", employee going extra mile to help", "proper maintain of transactions", and "wider ATM coverage".



**6.2. Next, it has been tried to find out if the importance regarding the same attribute varies within people involved in different occupation:**

**6.2.1: Test for checking difference on importance of “communication of new product” to with respect to customers “occupation”:**

Using the similar method ANOVA has been carried out. After ANOVA has been carried out it has been found that the null hypothesis can't be rejected (As  $p=0.288$ ).

Hence, it can be summarized that different occupation has not any impact on communication of new products.

**6.2.2: Test for checking difference on importance of “courteous and friendly staff” to with respect to customers “occupation”.**

Using the similar method ANOVA has been carried out. After ANOVA has been carried out it has been found that the null hypothesis can't be rejected (As  $p=0.400$ ).

Hence, it can be summarized that different occupation has not any impact on courteous and friendly staff.

**6.2.3: Test for checking difference on importance of “knowing the customer and needs” to with respect to customers “occupation”:**

After ANOVA has been carried out it has been found that the null hypothesis has been rejected (As  $p=0.001$ ). To find out difference between which groups are significant post hoc analysis (LSD) has been carried out.

$$\mu_2 \neq \mu_5$$

This means that difference in importance of service people and pensioner is significant.

$$\mu_3 \neq \mu_5$$

This means that difference in importance of business people and pensioner is significant.

$$\mu_4 \neq \mu_5$$

This means that difference in importance of professional and pensioner is significant.

**Table 6.3: Importance on knowing the customer and needs with respect to occupation:**

Occupation	N	Means
Student	18	.78
Service	256	.93
Business	247	.85
Professional	38	1.03
Pensioner	41	.59
Total	600	.88

This table reveals that

People in service put more priority in banks' attitude towards customer need compared to pensioners.

People in business put more priority in banks' attitude towards customer need compared to pensioners.

Professionals put more priority in banks' attitude towards customer need compared to pensioners.

Hence, it can be summarized that service, business and professional people are showing more importance on knowing the customer and needs parameter compare to pensioner.

**6.2.4: Test for checking difference on importance of “level of ease for applying products” to with respect to customers “occupation”:**

Using the similar method ANOVA has been carried out. After ANOVA has been carried out it has been found that the null hypothesis can't be rejected (As  $p=0.615$ ).

Hence, it can be summarized that there is no significance for different occupation groups for level of ease for applying products.

**6.2.5: Test for checking difference on importance of “phone banking” to with respect to customers “occupation”:**

Using the similar method ANOVA has been carried out. After ANOVA has been carried out it has been found that the null hypothesis can't be rejected (As  $p=0.203$ ).

Hence, it can be summarized that there is no significance for different occupation groups for phone banking attribute.

**6.2.6: Test for checking difference on importance of “online banking” to with respect to customers “occupation”:**

Similar analysis reveals the following:

People in business put more priority in banks' online banking compared to people in service.

People in business put more priority in banks' online banking compared to pensioners.

Professionals put more priority in banks' online banking compared to pensioners.

Hence, it can be summarized that service, business and professionals people are showing more importance in this parameter compare to pensioners.

**6.2.7. Test for checking difference on importance of “bill payments through ATMs” to with respect to customers “occupation”:**

Using the similar method ANOVA has been carried out. After ANOVA has been carried out it has been found that the null hypothesis can't be rejected (As  $p=0.109$ ).

Hence, it can be summarized that there is no significance difference in different occupation groups for bill payments through ATMs parameter.

**6.2.8. Test for checking difference on importance of “body language of bank employee” to with respect to customers “occupation”:**

Similar analysis reveals the following:

Students put more priority in banks' employee behavior compare to people in service.

Students put more priority in banks' employee behavior compared to people in business.

Students put more priority in banks' employee behavior compared to professionals.

Students put more priority in banks' employee behavior compared to pensioners.

People in business put more priority in banks' employee behavior compared to people in service.

People in business put more priority in banks' employee behavior compared to pensioners.

From the analysis it has been found that students are showing more importance of body language of bank employee compared to other groups of customers.

**6.2.9. Test for checking difference on importance of “employee going extra mile to help” to with respect to customers “occupation”:**

Similar analysis reveals the following:

Students put more priority in banks' employee extra care compared to people visiting banks who are pensioner.

People in service put more priority in banks' employee extra care compared to pensioners.

Professionals put more priority in banks' employee extra care compared to pensioners.

Hence, it can be summarized that service, business and professional people are showing more importance in employee going extra mile parameter compared to pensioner people.

**6.2.10. Test for checking difference on importance of “complaint resolution” to with respect to customers “occupation”:**

After ANOVA has been carried out it has been found that the null hypothesis cannot be rejected (As  $p=0.218$ ).

Hence, it can be summarized that complaint resolution has not any significant impact on different occupation groups.

**6.2.11. Test for checking difference on importance of “frequent changes of banking transaction process” to with respect to customers “occupation”:**

Using the similar method ANOVA has been carried out. After ANOVA has been carried out it has been found that the null hypothesis can't be rejected (As  $p=0.342$ ).

Hence, it can be summarized that frequent changes of banking transaction process have not any significance impact for different occupation groups.

**6.2.12. Test for checking difference on importance of “changes from average quarterly balance to average monthly balance” to with respect to customers “occupation”:**

Using the similar method ANOVA has been carried out. After ANOVA has been carried out it has been found that the null hypothesis can't be rejected (As  $p=0.099$ ).

Hence, it can be summarized that changes from average quarterly balance to average monthly balance parameter has not any significance impact for different occupation groups.

**6.2.13. Test for checking difference on importance of “trust worthiness” to with respect to customers “occupation”:**

Using the similar method ANOVA has been carried out. After ANOVA has been carried out it has been found that the null hypothesis can't be rejected (As  $p=0.079$ ).

Hence, it can be summarized that trustworthiness parameter has not any significance impact for different occupation groups.

**6.2.14. Test for checking difference on importance of “addressing the grievances” to with respect to customers “occupation”:**

Using the similar method ANOVA has been carried out. After ANOVA has been carried out it has been found that the null hypothesis can't be rejected (As  $p=0.084$ ).

Hence, it can be summarized that addressing the grievances parameter has not any significance impact for different occupation groups.

**6.2.15. Test for checking difference on importance of “proper maintenance of transactions” to with respect to customers “occupation”:**

Using the similar method ANOVA has been carried out. After ANOVA has been carried out it has been found that the null hypothesis can't be rejected (As  $p=0.217$ ).

Hence, it can be summarized that proper maintenance of transactions parameter has not any significance impact for different occupation groups.

**6.2.16. Test for checking difference on importance of “wide ATM coverage” to with respect to customers “occupation”:**

Similar analysis reveals the following:

Students put more priority in banks' wide ATM coverage compared to people in service.

Students put more priority in banks' wide ATM coverage compared to pensioners.

People in business put more priority in banks' wide ATM coverage compared to people in service.

People in service put more priority in banks' wide ATM coverage compared to pensioners.

People in business put more priority in banks' wide ATM coverage pensioners.

Professionals put more priority in banks' wide ATM coverage compared to pensioners.

Hence, it can be summarized that student and professional people are showing more importance in wide ATM coverage parameter compared to service, business and pensioner people.

**6.2.17. Test for checking difference on importance of “core banking facility” to with respect to customers “occupation”:**

Similar analysis reveals the following:

People in service put more priority in banks' core banking facility compared to students.

People in service put more priority in banks' core banking facility compared to pensioners.

People in business put more priority in banks' core banking facility compared to pensioners.

Professionals put more priority in banks' core banking facility compared to pensioners.

Hence, it can be summarized that service, business and professional people are showing more importance in core banking facility compared to student and pensioner people.

**6.2.18. Test for checking difference on importance of “credit card facility” to with respect to customers “occupation”:**

Using the similar method ANOVA has been carried out. After ANOVA has been carried out it has been found that the null hypothesis can't be rejected (As  $p=0.324$ ).

Hence, it can be summarized that credit card facility has not any significance impact for different occupation group.

**6.2.19. Test for checking difference on importance of “personalized service” to with respect to customers “occupation”:**

Using the similar method ANOVA has been carried out. After ANOVA has been carried out it has been found that the null hypothesis can't be rejected (As  $p=0.234$ )

Hence, it can be summarized that personalized service has not any significance impact for different occupation group.

**6.2.20. Test for checking difference on importance of “service charge” to with respect to customers “occupation”:**

Using the similar method ANOVA has been carried out. After ANOVA has been carried out it has been found that the null hypothesis can't be rejected (As  $p=0.254$ )

Hence, it can be summarized that service charge has not any significance impact for different occupation group.

**6.2.21. Test for checking difference on importance of “third party products” to with respect to customers “occupation”:**

Using the similar method ANOVA has been carried out. After ANOVA has been carried out it has been found that the null hypothesis can't be rejected (As  $p=0.064$ )

Hence, it can be summarized that third party products has not any significance impact for different occupation group.

**6.2.22. Test for checking difference on importance of “number of branches” to with respect to customers “occupation”:**

Similar analysis reveals the following:

Professionals put more priority in banks' number of branches compared to people in service.

People in service put more priority in banks' number of branches compared to pensioners.

Professionals put more priority in banks' number of branches compared to people in business.

People in business put more priority in banks' number of branches compared to pensioners.

Professionals put more priority in banks' number of branches compared to pensioners.

Hence, it can be summarized that professional people are showing more importance in number of branches compared to other occupation groups.

**6.2.23. Test for checking difference on importance of “banking instrument delivery” to with respect to customers “occupation”:**

Using the similar method ANOVA has been carried out. After ANOVA has been carried out it has been found that the null hypothesis can't be rejected (As  $p=0.534$ ).

The major findings from the above analysis on importance regarding different attribute by different occupation groups.

- a) Regarding “communication of new products”, “courteous and friendly staff”, “level of ease”, “phone banking”, “bill payments through ATMS”, “complaint resolutions”, “frequent changes of banking transaction process”, “changes of average quarterly balance to monthly balance”, “trust worthiness”, “addressing the grievances “, “proper maintain of transactions”, “credit card”, “personalized service”, and “banking instrument delivery”, attributes is not any impact on different occupation groups.
- b) Customers who are in service ,business and pensioner assigned more priority on the following attributes “knowing the customer and needs”, “employee going extra mile to help”, “wide ATM coverage”, and “service charge”.
- c) Customers who are professional assigned more priority on “online banking”, “core banking”, and “number of branches”.

**6.3. Next, it has been tried to find out if the importance regarding the same attribute varies within people involved in different Age groups.**

**6.3.1. Test for checking difference on Importance of “communication of new product” to with respect to customers “age group”:**

Using the similar method ANOVA has been carried out. After ANOVA has been carried out it has been found that the null hypothesis has been rejected (As  $p=0.000$ ).To find out difference between which groups are significant post hoc analysis (LSD) has been carried out.

$$\mu_1 \neq \mu_4$$

This means that difference in Importance of 18 to 25 years group and 51 to 60 years group is significant.

$$\mu_2 \neq \mu_3$$

This means that difference in Importance of 26 to 35 years group and 36 to 50 years group is significant.

$$\mu_2 \neq \mu_4$$



This means that difference in Importance of 26 to 35 years group and 51 to 60 years group is significant.

$$\mu_2 \neq \mu_5$$

This means that difference in Importance of 26 to 35 years group and 61 and above age group is significant.

$$\mu_3 \neq \mu_4$$

This means that difference in Importance of 36 to 50 years group and 51 to 60 years group is significant.

$$\mu_4 \neq \mu_5$$

This means that difference in Importance of 51 to 60 years group and 61 and above age group is significant.

**Table 6.4: Importance on communication of new product with respect to age group:**

Age group	N	Means
18 to 25	19	.95
26 to 35	98	.80
36 to 50	331	.89
51 to 60	117	.68
61 and above	35	.94
Total	600	.84

This table reveals that

People who are 18 to 25 years put more priority in banks' communication compared to people that are in 51 to 60 years.

People who are 36 to 50 years put more priority in banks' communication compared to people that are in 26 to 35 years.

People who are 26 to 35 years put more priority in banks' communication compared to people that are in 51 to 60 years.

People that are 61 and above years put more priority in banks' communication compared to people that are in 26 to 35 years.

People who are 36 to 50 years put more priority in banks' communication compared to people that are in 51 to 60 years.

People that are 61 and above years put more priority in banks' communication compared to people that are in 51 to 60 years.

Hence, it can be summarized that apart from "51 to 60" years of age group other age groups are showing more importance on communication of new products.

### **6.3.2. Test for checking difference on importance of "courteous and friendly staff" to with respect to customers "age group":**

Using the similar method ANOVA has been carried out. After ANOVA has been carried out it has been found that the null hypothesis can't be rejected (As  $p=0.751$ ).

Hence, it can be summarized that there is no significance impact on courteous and friendly staff with different age groups of customer.

### **6.3.3. Test for checking difference on Importance of "knowing the customer and needs" to with respect to customers "age group":**

Similar analysis reveals the following:

People who are 26 to 35 years put more priority in banks' attitude towards customer need compared to people who are 18 to 25 years.

People who are 36 to 50 years put more priority in banks' attitude towards customer need compared to people who are 18 to 25 years.

People who are 51 to 60 years put more priority in banks' attitude towards customer need compared to people who are 18 to 25 years.

People who are 26 to 35 years put more priority in banks' attitude towards customer need compared to people who are 51 to 60 years.

People who are 26 to 35 years put more priority in banks' attitude towards customer need compared to people who are 61 and above years.

People who are 51 to 60 years put more priority in banks' attitude towards customer need compared to people who are 36 to 50 years.

People who are 36 to 50 years put more priority in banks' attitude towards customer need compared to people who are 61 and above years.

Hence, it can be summarized that apart from 18 to 25 years of group, other groups are showing more importance in knowing the customer and needs.

**6.3.4. Test for checking difference on Importance of “level of ease for applying products” to with respect to customers “age group”:**

Similar analysis reveals the following:

People who are 26 to 35 years put more priority in banks' process of applying products compared to people who are 18 to 25 years of age.

People who are 26 to 35 years put more priority in banks' process of applying products compared to people who are 36 to 50 years of age.

People who are 26 to 35 years put more priority in banks' process of applying products compared to people who are 51 to 60 years of age.

People who are 26 to 35 years put more priority in banks' process of applying products compared to people who are 61 and above years of age

Hence, it can be summarized that “26 to 35” years of age group are showing more importance in level of ease parameter compared to other age groups.

**6.3.5. Test for checking difference on importance of “phone banking” to with respect to customers “age group”:**

Using the similar method ANOVA has been carried out. After ANOVA has been carried out it has been found that the null hypothesis can't be rejected (As  $p=0.218$ )

Hence, it can be summarized that there is no significance impact on phone banking with different age groups of customer.

**6.3.6. Test for checking difference on Importance of “online products” to with respect to customers “age group”.**

Similar analysis reveals the following:

People who are 18 to 25 years put more priority in banks’ on line banking compared to people who are 61 and above years of age.

People who are 36 to 50 years put more priority in banks’ on line banking compared to people who are 61 and above years of age.

Hence, it can be summarized that “61 and above” years of age group are showing less interest in online banking parameter compared to other age groups.

**6.3.7. Test for checking difference on importance of “bill payments through ATMs” to with respect to customers “age group”:**

Using the similar method ANOVA has been carried out. After ANOVA has been carried out it has been found that the null hypothesis can’t be rejected (As  $p=0.218$ ).

Hence, it can be summarized that there is no significance impact on bill payments through ATMs with different age groups of customer.

**6.3.8. Test for checking difference on Importance of “body language of bank employee” to with respect to customers “age group”:**

Similar analysis reveals the following:

People who are 18 to 25 years put more priority in banks’ employee behavior compared to people who are 26 to 35 years of age.

People who are 18 to 25 years put more priority in banks’ employee behavior compared to people who are 36 to 50 years of age.

People who are 18 to 25 years put more priority in banks’ employee behavior compared to people who are 51 to 60 years of age.

People who are 18 to 25 years put more priority in banks’ employee behavior compared to people who are 61 and above years of age.

People who are 26 to 35 years put more priority in banks' employee behavior compared to people who are 51 to 60 years of age.

Hence, it can be summarized that "18 to 25" years of age group are showing more importance in body language of bank employee parameter compared to other age groups.

**6.3.9. Test for checking difference on Importance of "employee going extra mile to help" to with respect to customers "age group":**

Similar analysis reveals the following:

People who are 18 to 25 years put more priority in banks' employee extra care compared to people who are 61 and above years of age.

People who are 26 to 35 years put more priority in banks' employee extra care compared to people who are 61 and above years of age.

People who are 36 to 50 years put more priority in banks' employee extra care compared to people who are 61 and above years of age.

People who are 51 to 60 years put more priority in banks' employee extra care compared to people who are 61 and above years of age.

From the analysis it has been found that "61 and above" years group are showing less importance on "employee going extra mile to help" parameter, however other groups are showing importance on this parameter.

**6.3.10. Test for checking difference on Importance of "complaint resolution" to with respect to customers "age group":**

Similar analysis reveals the following:

People who are 18 to 25 years put more priority in banks' complaint handling aspect compared to people who are 26 to 35 years of age.

People who are 18 to 25 years put more priority in banks' complaint handling aspect compared to people who are 36 to 50 years of age.

People who are 18 to 25 years put more priority in banks' complaint handling aspect compared to people who are 51 to 60 years of age.

People who are 18 to 25 years put more priority in banks' complaint handling aspect compared to people who are 61 and above years of age.

Hence, it can be summarized that "18 to 25" years age groups are showing more importance in "complaint resolution" parameter compared to other age groups.

**6.3.11. Test for checking difference on Importance of "frequent changes of banking transaction process" to with respect to customers "age group":**

Similar analysis reveals the following:

People that are 18 to 25 years put more priority in banks' transaction oriented changes compared to people who are 36 to 50 years of age.

People that are 18 to 25 years put more priority in banks' transaction oriented changes compared to people who are 51 to 60 years of age.

People that are 26 to 35 years put more priority in banks' transaction oriented changes compared to people who are 36 to 50 years of age.

People that are 26 to 35 years put more priority in banks' transaction oriented changes compared to people who are 51 to 60 years of age.

Hence, it can be summarized that 18 to 25 years group and 26 to 35 years of age groups are showing more importance than other age groups.

**6.3.12. Test for checking difference on Importance of "changes from average quarterly balance to average monthly balance" to with respect to customers "age group":**

Similar analysis reveals the following:

People who are 26 to 35 years put more priority in banks' internal changes compared to people who are 18 to 25 years of age.

People who are 26 to 35 years put more priority in banks' internal changes compared to people who are 36 to 50 years of age.

People who are 26 to 35 years put more priority in banks' internal changes compared to people who are 51 to 60 years of age.

Hence, it can be summarized that “26 to 35” years age group is showing more importance in changes from average quarterly to monthly balance compared to other age groups.

**6.3.13. Test for checking difference on Importance of “trustworthiness” to with respect to customers “age group”:**

Similar analysis reveals the following:

People who are 26 to 35 years put more priority in banks’ trust worthiness compared to people who are 18 to 25 years of age.

People who are 36 to 50 years put more priority in banks’ trust worthiness compared to people who are 18 to 25 years of age.

People who are 51 to 60 years put more priority in banks’ trust worthiness compared to people who are 18 to 25 years of age.

People that are 61 and above years put more priority in banks’ trust worthiness compared to people who are 18 to 25 years of age.

Hence, it can be summarized that all age groups are showing importance in trustworthiness parameter. Comparatively 18 to 25 years age groups are showing less important than other age groups.

**6.3.14. Test for checking difference on Importance of “addressing the grievances” to with respect to customers “age group”:**

Similar analysis reveals the following:

People that are 61 and above years put more priority in banks’ grievance addressing process compared to people who are 18 to 25 years of age.

People that are 61 and above years put more priority in banks’ grievance addressing process compared to people who are 26 to 35 years of age.

People who are 61 and above years put more priority in banks’ grievance addressing process compared to people who are 36 to 50 years of age.

People that are 61 and above years put more priority in banks’ grievance addressing process compared to people who are 51 to 60 years of age.

Hence, it can be summarized that 61 and above years of age group are showing more importance in “addressing the grievances” compared to other age groups.

**6.3.15. Test for checking difference on Importance of “proper maintenance of transactions” to with respect to customers “age group”:**

Similar analysis reveals the following:

People that are 61 and above years put more priority in banks’ maintenance of transaction compared to people who are 18 to 25 years of age.

People that are 61 and above years put more priority in banks’ maintenance of transaction compared to people who are 26 to 35 years of age.

People who are 36 to 50 years put more priority in banks’ maintenance of transaction compared to people who are 51 to 60 years of age.

People that are 61 and above years put more priority in banks’ maintenance of transaction compared to people who are 36 to 50 years of age.

People that are 61 and above years put more priority in banks’ maintenance of transaction compared to people who are 51 to 60 years of age.

Hence, it can be summarized that all the age groups are showing importance in “proper maintenances of transaction” however 61 and above age groups are showing more importance than other groups.

**6.3.16. Test for checking difference on Importance of “wide ATM coverage” to with respect to customers “age group”:**

Similar analysis reveals the following:

People who are 18 to 25 years put more priority in banks’ wide ATM coverage parameter compared to people who are 61 and above years of age.

People who are 26 to 35 years put more priority in banks’ wide ATM coverage parameter compared to people who are 51 and 60 years of age.

People who are 26 to 35 years put more priority in banks’ wide ATM coverage parameter compared to people who are 61 and above years of age.



People who are 36 to 50 years put more priority in banks' wide ATM coverage parameter compared to people who are 51 to 60 years of age.

People who are 36 to 50 years put more priority in banks' wide ATM coverage parameter compared to people who are 61 and above years of age.

People who are 51 to 60 years put more priority in banks' wide ATM coverage parameter compared to people who are 61 and above years of age.

Hence, it can be summarized that less than 50 years age group of people are giving more importance in "wide ATM coverage" compared to above 50 years age group of people.

**6.3.17. Test for checking difference on Importance of "core banking facility" to with respect to customers "age group":**

Similar analysis reveals the following:

People who are 26 to 35 years put more priority in banks' core banking facility compared to people who are 18 to 25 years of age.

People who are 36 to 50 years put more priority in banks' core banking facility compared to people who are 18 to 25 years of age.

People who are 51 to 60 years put more priority in banks' core banking facility compared to people who are 18 to 25 years of age.

People who are 26 to 35 years put more priority in banks' core banking facility compared to people who are 61 and above years of age.

People who are 36 to 50 years put more priority in banks' core banking facility compared to people who are 61 and above years of age.

People who are 51 to 60 years put more priority in banks' core banking facility compared to people who are 61 and above years of age.

Hence, it can be summarized that 18 to 25 years of age group and 61 and above years of age groups are showing less importance in "core banking facility" parameter compared to other age groups.

**6.3.18. Test for checking difference on importance of “credit card facility” to with respect to customers “age group”:**

Using the similar method ANOVA has been carried out. After ANOVA has been carried out it has been found that the null hypothesis can't be rejected (As  $p=0.072$ ).

Hence, it can be summarized that there is no significance difference in different age groups for credit card facility.

**6.3.19. Test for checking difference on importance of “personalized service” to with respect to customers “age group”:**

Using the similar method ANOVA has been carried out. After ANOVA has been carried out it has been found that the null hypothesis can't be rejected (As  $p=0.271$ ).

Hence, it can be summarized that there is no significance difference in different age groups for personalized service.

**6.3.20. Test for checking difference on Importance of “service charge” to with respect to customers “age group”:**

Similar analysis reveals the following:

People who are 26 to 35 years put more priority in banks' service charge compared to people who are 18 to 25 years of age.

People who are 36 to 50 years put more priority in banks' service charge compared to people who are 18 to 25 years of age.

People who are 51 to 60 years put more priority in banks' service charge compared to people who are 18 to 25 years of age.

People that are 61 and above years put more priority in banks' service charge compared to people who are 18 to 25 years of age.

People who are 26 to 35 years put more priority in banks' service charge compared to people who are 51 to 60 years of age.

Hence, it can be summarized that 26 to 35 years group are showing more importance in “service charge” parameter whereas 18 to 25 years group are showing less importance in this parameter.

**6.3.21. Test for checking difference on Importance of “third party products” to with respect to customers “age group”:**

Similar analysis reveals the following:

People who are 18 to 25 years put more priority in banks’ third party products compared to people who are 51 to 60 years of age.

People who are 18 to 25 years put more priority in banks’ third party products compared to people who are 61 and above years of age.

People who are 26 to 35 years put more priority in banks’ third party products compared to people who are 51 to 60 years of age.

People who are 26 to 35 years put more priority in banks’ third party products compared to people who are 61 and above years of age.

People who are 36 to 50 years put more priority in banks’ third party products compared to people who are 51 to 60 years of age.

People who are 36 to 50 years put more priority in banks’ third party products compared to people who are 61 and above years of age.

Hence, it can be summarized that overall consumers are not showing so much importance on this “third party products” parameter, however among all the groups 18 to 25 years showing more importance compared to other age groups.

**6.3.22. Test for checking difference on Importance of “number of branches” to with respect to customers “age group”:**

Similar analysis reveals the following:

People who are 18 to 25 years put more priority in banks’ numbers of branches compared to people who are 61 and above years of age.

People who are 36 to 50 years put more priority in banks’ third party products compared to people who are 61 and above years of age.

People who are 51 to 60 years put more priority in banks’ third party products compared to people who are 61 and above years of age.

Hence, it can be summarized that apart from 61 and above years of age group, other age groups are showing importance on “number of branches” parameter.

**6.3.23. Test for checking difference on Importance of “banking instrument delivery” to with respect to customers “age group”:**

Similar analysis reveals the following:

People who are 36 to 50 years put more priority in banks’ product instrument delivery compared to people who are 18 to 25 years of age.

People who are 51 to 60 years put more priority in banks’ product instrument delivery compared to people who are 18 to 25 years of age.

People who are 36 to 50 years put more priority in banks’ product instrument delivery compared to people who are 26 to 35 years of age.

Hence, it can be summarized that all the age groups are showing importance on “banking instrument delivery” parameter, however “36 to 50” years are showing more importance compared to other age groups.

The major findings from the above analysis on Importance regarding different attributes by different Age groups are:

- a) Regarding “courteous and friendly staff”, “phone banking”, “bill payments through ATMs”, “credit card”, and “personalized service” attributes, importance is not impacted by different Age groups.
- b) People who are age group of 18 to 25 years put more importance on “complaint resolution” and “body language of bank employee”.
- c) People who are age group of 26 to 35 years and 36 to 50 years put more importance on “knowing the customer and need”, “level of ease”, “changes from average quarterly to monthly”, “trust worthiness”, “wide ATM coverage”, “core banking”, and “service charge”.
- d) People who are age group of 61 and above years put more importance on “addressing the grievances”, and “proper maintain of transactions”.