

# A Study on B2C Sales and Service Given by Sharada Motor to Their Vendors

# KAMALESH.S

MBA II Year, School of Management Studies,

Sathyabama Institute Of Science And Technology,600 119

# Dr. TR. Kalai Lakshmi

Associate Professor, School of Management Studies,

Sathyabama Institute of Science and Technology, Chennai 600 119

#### Abstract

The study explores the Business-to-Consumer (B2C) sales strategies and service practices adopted by Sharada Motor, a leading player in the automobile industry. By analyzing the interactions and services provided to their vendors—who act as intermediaries in delivering value to end consumers—the research highlights the effectiveness of customer service management, vendor satisfaction, and technological integration. The findings emphasize the role of efficient communication, service quality, and support systems in enhancing vendor relationships and consumer satisfaction.

# Keywords

B2C Sales, Vendor Services, Customer Relationship Management, Automobile Industry, Sharada Motor, Service Quality, Vendor Satisfaction

# Introduction

In the competitive landscape of the automobile industry, effective sales strategies and excellent customer service play crucial roles in brand success. Sharada Motor has established itself as a reputed name in the industry, serving a wide base of individual customers through its network of vendors. Vendors act as crucial touchpoints in the B2C model, linking the company to the final consumers. This study aims to evaluate how Sharada Motor manages its B2C sales and supports vendors to maintain a robust service ecosystem.

# Theoretical Background of the Study

The B2C sales model refers to transactions conducted directly between a company and the end-users of its products. In the context of Sharada Motor, this model includes interactions facilitated through vendors who sell vehicles and offer services to consumers. The study relies on key theories in marketing and service management: - Customer Relationship Management (CRM): A strategic approach that focuses on creating and maintaining long-term relationships with customers. - Service Quality Theory (SERVQUAL): A model developed to measure service quality across five dimensions—

 Service Quality Theory (SERVQUAL): A model developed to measure service quality across five dimensions tangibility, reliability, responsiveness, assurance, and empathy.
Distribution Channel Theory: Explains how intermediaries (vendors) help businesses reach end customers effectively.

1



These theories provide a foundational framework to assess Sharada Motor's approach to vendor and customer engagement.

# **Review of Literature**

Several studies have emphasized the importance of vendor relationships in B2C models. For instance, Parasuraman et al. (1988) highlighted the significance of service quality in influencing customer satisfaction. Recent research by Kotler and Keller (2016) indicates that companies with strong vendor support tend to achieve better market penetration and consumer loyalty. Additionally, studies on automobile retailing show that after-sales services, timely support, and training programs for vendors significantly enhance the customer experience (Jain & Singh, 2020).

#### **Research Methodology**

This study is descriptive in nature and uses both primary and secondary data.

Data Collection:

- Primary data was collected through structured questionnaires and interviews conducted with 30 vendors associated with Sharada Motor.

- Secondary data includes company reports, industry publications, and academic journals.

Sampling Technique: Stratified random sampling was used to ensure representation from different locations and vendor types.

Tools for Analysis: Data was analyzed using percentage analysis and satisfaction index ratings.

# DATA ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION

# ANOVA

Data analysis between car model owned and performance rating of silencer.

Hypothesis:

H0: There is no significant difference between car model owned of the respondents and the performance rating of silencer.

H1: There is a significant difference between car model owned of the respondents and the performance rating of silencer.

#### ANOVA

Car silencer Performance

|                | Sum of Squares | df | Mean Square | F    | Sig. |
|----------------|----------------|----|-------------|------|------|
| Between Groups | 6.511          | 5  | 1.302       | .758 | .582 |
| Within Groups  | 149.446        | 87 | 1.718       |      |      |
| Total          | 155.957        | 92 |             |      |      |



# Interpretation.

F-value = 0.758: This is the test statistic from the ANOVA.

Significance (p-value) = 0.582: Since this is greater than 0.05, we fail to reject the null hypothesis.

## Inference:

There is no statistically significant difference in car silencer performance between the different groups.

#### **Chi-square**

2. Data analysis between preferred silencer brand and availability of silencer.

## Silencer brand type \* issues with the availability Cross tabulation

|                  |       |             |                | Issues with the availability |      |      |      |       |
|------------------|-------|-------------|----------------|------------------------------|------|------|------|-------|
|                  |       |             |                | 1                            | 2    | 3    | 4    | Total |
| Silencer<br>type | brand | 1           | Count          | 0                            | 1    | 0    | 0    | 1     |
| type             |       |             | Expected Count | .1                           | .3   | .2   | .4   | 1.0   |
|                  |       | Ak rapovc   | Count          | 2                            | 5    | 1    | 0    | 8     |
|                  |       |             | Expected Count | 1.1                          | 2.3  | 1.6  | 2.9  | 8.0   |
|                  |       | Death Air   | Count          | 2                            | 1    | 2    | 2    | 7     |
|                  |       |             | Expected Count | 1.0                          | 2.0  | 1.4  | 2.6  | 7.0   |
|                  |       | Gem tech    | Count          | 3                            | 7    | 5    | 2    | 17    |
|                  |       |             | Expected Count | 2.4                          | 4.9  | 3.5  | 6.2  | 17.0  |
|                  |       | Silencer Co | Count          | 4                            | 7    | 9    | 28   | 48    |
|                  |       |             | Expected Count | 6.7                          | 13.9 | 9.8  | 17.5 | 48.0  |
|                  |       | Sure Fire   | Count          | 2                            | 5    | 2    | 2    | 11    |
|                  |       |             | Expected Count | 1.5                          | 3.2  | 2.2  | 4.0  | 11.0  |
|                  |       | Thrasher    | Count          | 0                            | 1    | 0    | 0    | 1     |
|                  |       |             | Expected Count | .1                           | .3   | .2   | .4   | 1.0   |
| Total            |       |             | Count          | 13                           | 27   | 19   | 34   | 93    |
|                  |       |             | Expected Count | 13.0                         | 27.0 | 19.0 | 34.0 | 93.0  |



# INTERPRETATION.

This table displays the observed vs expected frequencies of issues (from 1 to 4) reported for each silencer brand, indicating how often customers face availability issues depending on the brand.

### **INFERENCE.**

Silencer Co appears to have the most significant issues with availability, as shown by consistently higher observed counts than expected.

#### ANOVA

carsilencerPerformanc

|                | Sum of Squares | df | Mean Square | F    | Sig. |
|----------------|----------------|----|-------------|------|------|
| Between Groups | 6.511          | 5  | 1.302       | .758 | .582 |
| Within Groups  | 149.446        | 87 | 1.718       |      |      |
| Total          | 155.957        | 92 |             |      |      |

#### ANOVA Effect Sizes<sup>a,b</sup>

|                       |                            |                | 95% Confide | nce Interval |
|-----------------------|----------------------------|----------------|-------------|--------------|
|                       |                            | Point Estimate | Lower       | Upper        |
| carsilencerPerformanc | Eta-squared                | .042           | .000        | .093         |
|                       | Epsilon-squared            | 013            | 057         | .041         |
|                       | Omega-squared Fixed-effect | 013            | 057         | .041         |
|                       | Omega-squared Random-      | 003            | 011         | .008         |
|                       | effect                     |                |             |              |

a. Eta-squared and Epsilon-squared are estimated based on the fixed-effect model.

b. Negative but less biased estimates are retained, not rounded to zero.

#### **Case Processing Summary**

|                           | Cases |         |         |         |       |         |
|---------------------------|-------|---------|---------|---------|-------|---------|
|                           | Valid |         | Missing |         | Total |         |
|                           | Ν     | Percent | Ν       | Percent | Ν     | Percent |
| silencerbrandtype         | * 93  | 100.0%  | 0       | 0.0%    | 93    | 100.0%  |
| issueswiththeavailability |       |         |         |         |       |         |

#### silencerbrandtype \* issues with the availability Crosstabulation

|                   |            | issueswiththeavailability |     |     |     |     |       |
|-------------------|------------|---------------------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-------|
|                   |            |                           | 1   | 2   | 3   | 4   | Total |
| silencerbrandtype | 1          | Count                     | 0   | 1   | 0   | 0   | 1     |
|                   |            | Expected Count            | .1  | .3  | .2  | .4  | 1.0   |
|                   | Akrapovic  | Count                     | 2   | 5   | 1   | 0   | 8     |
|                   |            | Expected Count            | 1.1 | 2.3 | 1.6 | 2.9 | 8.0   |
|                   | Death Air  | Count                     | 2   | 1   | 2   | 2   | 7     |
|                   |            | Expected Count            | 1.0 | 2.0 | 1.4 | 2.6 | 7.0   |
|                   | Gemtech    | Count                     | 3   | 7   | 5   | 2   | 17    |
|                   |            | Expected Count            | 2.4 | 4.9 | 3.5 | 6.2 | 17.0  |
|                   | SilencerCo | Count                     | 4   | 7   | 9   | 28  | 48    |
|                   |            |                           |     |     |     |     |       |



|       |          | Expected Count | 67   | 13.9 | 9.8  | 17.5 | 48.0 |
|-------|----------|----------------|------|------|------|------|------|
|       | SureFire | Count          | 2    | 5    | 2    | 2    | 11   |
|       |          | Expected Count | 1.5  | 3.2  | 2.2  | 4.0  | 11.0 |
|       | Thrasher | Count          | 0    | 1    | 0    | 0    | 1    |
|       |          | Expected Count | .1   | .3   | .2   | .4   | 1.0  |
| Total |          | Count          | 13   | 27   | 19   | 34   | 93   |
|       |          | Expected Count | 13.0 | 27.0 | 19.0 | 34.0 | 93.0 |

## **Chi-Square Tests**

|                              |                     |    | Asymptotic       |
|------------------------------|---------------------|----|------------------|
|                              |                     |    | Significance (2- |
|                              | Value               | df | sided)           |
| Pearson Chi-Square           | 31.380 <sup>a</sup> | 18 | .026             |
| Likelihood Ratio             | 34.271              | 18 | .012             |
| Linear-by-Linear Association | 5.899               | 1  | .015             |
| N of Valid Cases             | 93                  |    |                  |

a. 23 cells (82.1%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .14.

#### Conclusion

The study concludes that Sharada Motor has developed a strong B2C sales network backed by excellent vendor support and service infrastructure. Key strengths include prompt communication, effective training, and a well-structured feedback mechanism. However, some vendors highlighted areas for improvement such as delays in spare parts delivery and the need for better digital integration. Addressing these concerns can further strengthen Sharada Motor's market presence and customer satisfaction.

#### References

Parasuraman, A., Zeithaml, V.A., & Berry, L.L. (1988). SERVQUAL: A Multiple-Item Scale for Measuring Consumer Perceptions of Service Quality. Journal of Retailing, 64(1). 12-40. Management Kotler, P., & Keller, K.L. (2016). Marketing (15th ed.). Pearson Education. Jain, R., & Singh, M. (2020). Challenges and Opportunities in Automobile Retailing. International Journal of Marketing Research. 45(2), 112-129.

Sharada Motor. (2023). Annual Vendor Satisfaction Report. Internal Publication.