ISSN: 2278-3369
International Journal of Advances in Management and Economics
Available online at www.managementjournal.info

RESEARCH ARTICLE

Private Label Brand Extension and Consumer Buying Behavior towards Household Cleaning Chemicals

Dhananjy Beura*[1], Tapas Ranjan Moharana[2]

[1]*Department of Business Administration, Centurion University of Technology and Management,* Bhubaneswar,India.

[2]*Department of Marketing, Ravenshaw University, Cuttack, Odisha, India.*

Abstract

Retailing in India is at nascent stage and private label brand or store brand extensions from those retail outlets are almost negligible, less than 5% of the retail business. But now things have changed and private label brands are leading in every segment. In the household cleaning segment also many private label brands are leading the competition. Consumer buying behavior is mainly affected by many determinant factors and this paper aims at understanding and identifying the important determinant factors affecting the consumer buying behavior towards private label brands in household cleaning segments with respect to manufacturer brands. Private label brands are very successful because they offer many advantages to the consumers. Consumers are mainly affected by many internal factors like demographic, social class, family size, lifestyle and many other factors while purchasing household cleaning chemicals. Consumers are also affected by many external factors like brand image, price, packaging, evidence, experience, assortment etc. while buying private label brands of household cleaning chemicals.

Keywords: *Consumer behavior, Empirical study, Private label brands, Household cleaners.*

Introduction

Fast Moving Consumer Goods

The FMCG segment is one of the fastest growing sector in India and an important contributor to India's GDP. This sector comprises of three main segments which include personal care, household care, food and beverages. Personal care comprises of oral care, hair care, toiletries, soaps & cosmetics; household care comprises of fabric wash and household cleaners; and food and beverages include health beverages, soft drinks, cereals, dairy products, bakery products etc.

Private Label Brands

Private label brands are those brands which are owned by the retailers as a form of their extension strategies. These brands are also called as store brands or own label. In today scenario these private label brand has been the biggest challenge for brand managers more than the rival brands. Private label brands are large in developed market. They account for 40% of Wal-Mart sales, 50% of Tesco in developed market (Ac Nilsen report, 2014). This type of brand extension strategy has helped the retailers to have better profit margin and stronger negotiating term with the brand manufacturers. The trend of Pvt. Label brand is catching up fast in India among the Indian retailers such as Shoppers Stop, Future group, Tata's Croma and Aditya Birla retail's More as consumer seek quality products at affordable prices.

Role of Private Label Brand in Indian Retail

Retailing in India is at nascent stage and private label brand extension for those retails are almost negligible, less than 10% of retail business. But Indian market has lot of potential for this type of strategy as compared to any other part of the world like China. Private label brand constitute of 10-12% of organized retail market in India as per (KPMG report 2014).In India there is an increasing trend towards acceptance of Pvt. Label brands and thus penetration is rising rapidly especially in case of apparel, consumer durables, home care and FMCG segment. As food price and other home care products are rising rapidly customers perception of cheaper options is changing and growth in a recession for Pvt. Label brands is permanently sustainable as per (KPMG report, 2014).

The degree of Pvt. Label penetration among major Indian retailers was highest in Trent (90%) followed by Reliance retail (80%), Pantaloon (75%) etc. which is higher than international retailers like Wal-Mart and Tesco. The reason for growth is Pvt. Label brand is higher margin, cheaper price & better bargaining power for the retailers. In the long run the retail can use all these Pvt. Label brands to attract customers. Thus many retailers are considering increasing their Pvt. Label brands significantly as per KPMG report on Indian retail, 2014. According to some researcher Shoppers stop gets 20% of its sales from Pvt. Labels while Future group gets about 24-25% of its sales. Private label brands are growing because of modern retailing concepts and are directly interlinked. Currently Pvt. Label market in India is is estimated at Rs 13 Bn which is 10-12 % of organized retail. According to Technopak's Pvt. Label report 2012, food and grocery segment is a key driver for Pvt. Lables accounting for 20-25% and sometimes even 40% of all categories in Pvt. Labels.

Household Cleaning Market in India

The household care market in India is $ 3.4 bn and is one of the fastest growing segment. According to the household cleaning market valued at Rs400 crore and is growing at 20% per annum. The industry is characterized by low penetration rate and limited number of players making it Oligopolistic organized market. The toiletries and household cleaning market is expected to grow at a CAGR of 17.42% from 2014-19. The dishwashing market has displayed rapid growth over the past five years and majorly dominated by the organized players. The major brands in these segments are Vim, Exo & Pril. Liquid dish wash has been the fastest growing segment. The dish cleaner segment is valued at Rs 44 Crore. Dish wash bars have dominated the over 60% of the market. Dish wash powder consists of 32%. Research shows that 50% & 80% of urban & rural population respectively are still using substitute products like ash, bricks and other detergents for dishwashing procedures.

Floor cleaning market is the second largest with a predominant share of brands like Lizol, Domex and Mr Muscle as major players. These are very less popular in India. Only 3 % of Indian households use floor cleaning products, where as 97% use phenyl or a combination of bleaching powder, detergent and acids. The next segment is toilet cleaner segment due to growing awareness, easier access to range of products through organized retail format and changing lifestyles. Even rural household started preferring toilet cleaner products instead of phenyl and acids. The toilet cleaning market is valued at around Rs 40 Crore only. The penetration level of toilet cleaners is still very low because it has been estimated that most of the people even in urban areas are still using cheap products like acids or phenols to clean their toilets. Liquid soaps consisting of hand wash and body washes is a highly fragmented market with a number of small players operating in the market. However the organized market for hand washes is quite concentrated with major brands being Dettol, Savlon, Lifebuoy and Palmolive among others.

During 2014 the initiative by our Prime Minister Mr Narendra Modi for Swachh Bharat Mission created a lot of awareness about hygiene factor in every segment. The major problem hygiene segment was facing is lack of awareness. This initiative by govt. of India helped the companies like Reckit Benchiser, Unilever, Future group and other pvt label brand owners in hygiene segment as major beneficiary. Reckit Benchiser dominates toilet care space with its brand Harpic enjoying 69% market share in 2013 according to Euromonitor report. It also controls the surface care market with 57% share through brands such as Dettol, Easy of Bang, Lizol and Colin. Euromonitor however said local players and Pvt. Label floor cleaners have started eating market share of established brands such as Dettol. Future bazaar ran a "Safai Mela" during Diwali to promote its own brand Clean mate that already outsells most national brands such as Domex in its stores.

Consumers Buying Behavior in Household Cleaning Industry

The rapid urbanization of Indian population along with rising awareness pertaining to home hygiene is the reason behind growth of home care products. Consumers in India prefer Private Label brand over national brand due to availability & price benefits in that category as per Euromonitor. The rise in personal disposable income along with the changing lifestyle of rural and urban population related to maintenance of hygienic conditions at home have contributed towards the sales of household cleaning products and toiletries in India. According to Ac Nilsen, 2014 report the consumer's desire for germ free, healthy environment is increasing and is driving good sales for household cleaning products. The focus of household products is to keep disease free environment. Private-label success is strongest in commodity driven, high-purchase categories and those where consumers perceive little differentiation as per Nilsen report.

Private Label Brand Penetration India

Private-label growth typically comes at the expense of small- and mid-sized brands, while category leaders remain relatively safe. Retail consolidation and the expansion of the discount format are key drivers for private label growth in developed markets. Private label struggles to gain consumer trust in Asia and the Middle East, where consumers are fiercely brand-loyal. In India modern retail market format penetration is quite low but private label growth is 24% from 2012 to 2014. According to the AC Nilsen report, 2011 the higher number of people attending organized retail stores, leading to the growing density of store chains as they compete to enhance their position. Some 37% of consumers now visit hypermarkets, supermarkets, convenience stores and similar outlets on at least a monthly basis, a seven percentage point surge year on year.

Emerging importance of in store brands: With the growing importance of the shift in shopper behavior and the proliferation of the number of stores, the Indian retailers are increasing their in store brands at a rapid pace.

A Shoppers Trend Study by Nielsen, 2011 found awareness about private labels has gone up from 64 per cent in 2009 to 78 per cent in 2010 across 11 cities in India. The project focuses on the impact and threat of major Indian retailers like Reliance [Food world], Future Group [Big Bazaar], Aditya Birla's [More], Bharti, Trent etc. These are the major retailers who form the bulk of the organized retail or modern trade in India. The modern trade in India is growing at a rate of around thirty percent, thanks to the increasing importance of in store brands.

Indian retailers are concentrating on the sales of in store brands or called as the private labels for the Retail stores. This is also due to the enormous success of the in store brands in the west and the profit margins they were able to get. There are important dynamics to concentrate on why the reason behind Indian retailers focusing on in store brands, What are the advantages in creating store brand private labels, what are the challenges faced in terms of negotiation with the powerful FMCG brands, how it a threat to manufacturer brands and in what sense they have an edge over the national brands etc Penetration of the Indian Retailers

Private Label Brands of Household Cleaning segment

In the non-food category, household cleaners hold the top position, accounting for nearly half (48%) of the private-label sales. Personal care, fabric care and the general category are other segments which contribute significantly to non-food (AC Nilsen report, 2013). In the country's largest retailer Future group's Big Bazaar and Bharti Retail's Easy Day outlets, for example, private labels Clean Mate and Great Value, respectively, top the list of floor cleaner segment. According to market researcher Nielsen's data for July-September 2011 period, the latest available as source in below mentioned table.

Table 1: Private label brands penetration in different retail outlet

Future group	Share(%)	Bharti Retail	Share(%)	Aditya birla retail	Share(%)
Floor cleaner	52	Floor cleaner	50	Hand wash	32
Glass cleaner	52	Packaged Atta	35	Pickles	30
Packaged Atta	42	Packaged Rice	31		
Pure ghee	29	Branded Tea	22		
Spices	22	Salty snacks	20		
Utensil cleaner	20	Branded spices	17		
Packaged rice	16				

In table 2 different private label brands are mentioned which has been promoted by large retail outlets and has achieved significant market share in their respective outlets relative to national brands.

Table 2: Private label brands of household cleaning products in different retail outlets

S.No	Retailer	Private labels	Merchandise details
1.	Aditya Birla(More)	Enrich, 110%, Pestex, Paradise, Germex	Home & Personal care
2.	Spencer's	Smart Choice	Home & Personal needs
3.	Future Group	Clean Mate & Care Mate	Home & Personal care
4.	Reliance Retail	MOPZ, DAZZLE	Floor cleaner, Toilet cleaner

In this context the current research focuses on the factors determining the consumer behavior towards private label brands in household hygiene segment. We would also like to investigate the demographic parameters influence on these brands purchase decision making process. There are numerous brands in branded segment as well in private label brands in this particular segment but there is a need to find out the specific factors which influence the decision making process of any consumer in this segment.

Literature Review

A review of earlier research studies related to the private-label brands have helped to reveal some of the interesting findings. Some of the research studies indicated that the private-brands are no longer seen as cheaper-priced and poor-quality products by modern customers. The massive revolution in the retail sector in the last couple of decades has changed the old concept and transformed these private-label brands into serious market place contenders. They are gaining popularity along with national brands and have taken a major market share from many of the national brands. There has been a tremendous sales growth in recent years and experts feel that the figure will rise up in near future with a much faster pace.

One reason for this growth in market share is that retail chains are increasingly extending their range of products sold under the private-label tags from the basic products to more sophisticated ones. An interesting fact reveals that their growth has been highly uneven across various product categories. A report indicates that private brands are also top sellers in many product categories sold in the supermarkets [1]. Private brands have a higher gross margin opportunity than national brands. Although they are typically priced much lower than national brands [2], lower marketing costs compensate for the lower prices allow them to enjoy higher overall gross margins than national brands [3]. Retailers use these private-label brands as bargaining tools for asking manufacturers for better trading terms such as cheaper prices, more promotional items, quicker deliveries, etc [2, 4, 5].

The modern-day retailers have realized that they cannot simply rely on national brands to draw customers into their stores. Most of the big retailers have taken a "value for money" orientation in the marketing of their private brands rather than competing with national brands on the basis of quality [6]. In order to capture a greater portion of the private-label market, the retailers are expanding their offerings, improving quality, introducing attractive packaging, expanding their distribution networks as well as customer-oriented sales promotion of their brands. Simultaneously improvements in quality, taste, packaging, etc to some extent have also made the customers attracted to them [7]. Previous researches made on customers' attitude and perception on private brands showed that customers rate them below the national brands on basis of certain factors like price, taste, quality, appearance, packaging, promotion, etc.

An important aspect that relates to human consumption is customers' income-pattern. When income is limited, the price-conscious customers buy goods just to satisfy their most basic functional needs rather than fulfilling hedonic needs. These price-sensitive customers generally lack knowledge about different perceived risks involved, less brand-loyal, tend to save money, more attracted to the store-promotional offers and care less about the product-quality. People with higher incomes are less price-conscious and are more likely to buy private-label brands.

Price and quality are the two most important characteristics for purchase of any product and there is a direct link between them. Apart from price, quality is another major determinant in customer purchase decisions [3,8]. Research confirms that quality is the most important factor that drives customers towards national brands [9]. Customers do make quality judgements on basis of price rather than physical product-attributes. Researches also showed that perceived risk is a crucial factor in purchasing private-brands [10]. As Narasimhan & Wilcox [5] mention customers prefer national brands to private-brands if the level of perceived risk in buying those products is high. Thus, purchasing of baby foods or skin-care goods should clearly be seen as more risky than purchasing of cleaning liquids. Several studies [11,12] have shown that the promotions of national brands yield more sales than store brands because national brands can easily attract customers through frequent advertising and promotional exposures.

GAP Analysis

As shown above in the review of literature of previous studies, there are many determining factors towards purchasing the private labels, but there is no specific study to identify determinants for private label household cleaning products purchase, despite of the fact that it's gradually contributing a major market share to the private label brands. So in regard to the gaps existing in the research, the current study aims at understanding the determining factors for the purchase of private label household cleaning brands.

Problem Statement

Understanding and finding out the determinant factors affecting the consumer buying behavior towards private label household cleaning brands.

Research Objectives

- To understand the various factors affecting consumer buying behavior towards pvt. Label brand extension by large retail outlets in household cleaning segment
- To determine the factors affecting consumer buying behavior towards Pvt. Label brands in cleaning segment.
- To find out in particular the effect of consumer demographics such as occupation, family size and social class of consumers on customer choice of cleaning chemicals.

Hypotheses and Research Methods

Hypotheses for the Study

H1: Factors determining consumer behavior towards Pvt. Label brand extension of large retail outlets for household cleaning chemicals have distinct dimensions
H2: The choice of household cleaning brands is dependent on the occupation of consumer
H3: The choice of household cleaning brands is dependent on the educational background of consumer
H4: The choice of household cleaning brand is dependent on the family size of consumer
H5: The choice of household cleaning brand is dependent on the social class of consumer

Research Design

An exploratory study was conducted to

identify the statement of the problem, by interacting with consumers in order to know their interest in private label household cleaning products. There are many factors affecting the consumer buying behavior, but only few of them have a greater impact on the consumer. Convenience sampling was used and the sample size was 220 consumers at major retail outlets in Bhubaneswar and Cuttack city. A questionnaire was used to obtain the data. Factor Analysis was used in the study. A Five Point Semantic Differential Scale was also used in the study as a rating tool with value 1 being Poor and 5 being Excellent.

Pilot Study-Pre Testing

A pilot study was initially conducted for 50 respondents to know the determinants of consumer buying behaviour towards private label branded household cleaning chemicals. The respondents were asked to rate 16 variables in terms of the extent that these variables affect their buying behavior towards private label chemicals. A Five Point Semantic Differential Scale was used in the study as a rating tool with value 1 being Poor and 5 being Excellent. After the Pilot Study was conducted it was reviewed and it was found that all 16 variables to be considered for research. A total of 250 questionnaires were collected and out of these, 50 were dropped due to incomplete data. Finally, 200 questionnaires were used and processed for analysis.

Data Collection

Primary data were collected by survey method through a structured questionnaire. All the consumers with different occupations and age groups who purchased private label household cleaning chemicals were directly interacted with the retail outlets and first hand data were obtained from them.

Data Analysis Methods

Factor analysis was used as the main data analysis method. Along with this method ANOVA was also used for hypothesis testing. All the tests were conducted using SPSS version 15.0.

Factor Analysis

The study explores the important determining factors affecting consumer buying behavior in purchasing private label household cleaning chemical and hence the following 18 variables (as shown in table 2) were selected and Principal Factor Analysis was conducted. The respondents were asked to rate these 18 variables on the extent, they think that these variables affect their buying behavior towards private label household cleaning products.

Table 3: Indentified variables for factor analysis

S.No.	Variables
1.	Product assortments
2.	Visual Merchandising
3.	Brand image of Pvt. Label brands
4.	Brand awareness Pvt. Label brands
5.	Packaging
6.	Quality
7.	Availability
8.	Discount
9.	Performance
10.	Evidence(Certification)
11.	Experience
12.	Store Image
13.	Usage (Easy to use)
14.	Advertising
15.	Store Awareness
16.	Ingredients
17.	Cheaper Price
18.	Offers

The factors extracted should account for at least 60% of variance (factors with eigen values > 1) .The Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin measure of sampling adequacy is to be used to measure the appropriateness of the factor model. Values below 0.5 imply that the factor analysis may not be appropriate. The Barlett's Test of Sphericity (used to examine the hypothesis that the variables are uncorrelated in the population) should be significant which implies that the correlation matrix is not orthogonal, and then it would be appropriate for factoring.

Discussion and Findings

Test of Hypothesis 1

In hypothesis 1, we proposed that factors determining consumer behavior towards Pvt. Label brand extension of large retail outlets for household cleaning chemicals have distinct dimensions. We used exploratory factor analysis (EFA) to identify the latent factors underlying in the 18 variables (depicted in Table: 3) identified in the initial stage of our research. The results of EFA are illustrated as below. The KMO and Bartlett's test value is high at 0.734 which was adequate to conduct factor analysis (see table 4). The communalities of each individual variable which is found to be more than 0.3 indicating all the variables are adequately contributing to the factors extracted.

Table 4 : KMO and Bartlett's Test

Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy.		.734
Bartlett's Test of Sphericity	Approx. Chi-Square	2723.119
	df	153
	Sig.	.000

Table 5 : Total variance explained

Component	Initial Eigenvalues			Extraction Sums of Squared Loadings			Rotation Sums of Squared Loadings		
	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %
1	3.829	21.270	21.270	3.829	21.270	21.270	3.785	21.025	21.025
2	3.491	19.395	40.665	3.491	19.395	40.665	3.321	18.448	39.474
3	2.708	15.044	55.708	2.708	15.044	55.708	2.588	14.380	53.854
4	2.367	13.150	68.858	2.367	13.150	68.858	2.418	13.436	67.290
5	1.871	10.392	79.251	1.871	10.392	79.251	2.153	11.961	79.251

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

Table 6: Rotated component matrix[a]

	Component				
	1	2	3	4	5
Quality	.894				
Performance	.894				
Packaging	.866				
Ingredients	.862				
Usage(easy to use)	.823				
Store awareness		.949			
Brand Image		.937			
Store image		.898			
Brand awareness		.821			
Offers			.951		
Discount			.906		
Cheaper price			.898		
Visual merchandising				.941	
Assortment				.913	
Ambience				.818	
Experience					.911
Advertising					.850
Evidence					.741

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.
Rotation Method: Varimax with Kaiser Normalization.
a. Rotation converged in 5 iterations.

The Factor Analysis was conducted to find out the main determinants of consumer buying behavior towards private label brands with the eighteen variables (see Table 4). Principal component analysis was employed for extracting the factors. The correlation values of the eighteen variables against each other are shown in the Table 5. As depicted in table 6, the exploratory factor analysis results in five distinct dimensions. This suggests that hypothesis 1 is supported. Five factors extracted have eigenvalues more than 1.0. The variance explained after rotation is between 21.02% (max) to 11.96 (min) is quite satisfactory. Total variance explained by all the factors together is 79.25% (>50%) is well acceptable. Table 6 shows the rotated component matrix with 5 iterations.

Naming of the Factors

There are 18 variables mentioned in table 3 out of which assortment, visual merchandising and Ambience are clustered together to be renamed as store atmospheric as they are one of the important criteria for large retail outlets. Store image, Store awareness, brand image and brand awareness are representing the brand identity for reducing the perceived risk of consumer while purchasing these household cleaning chemicals. Cheaper price, discounts and offers are also influencing consumer decision making process and is mentioned under one factor that is sales promotion. Quality, ingredients, performance and packaging together can be renamed as product specifications. Advertising, evidence and experience are major components of brand promotion activities. Factors were named and their constituent variables are given below in table 8

Table 7

Factor number	Name of the Factor	Variables
1.	Store atmospheric	1. Assortment
		2. Visual Merchandising
		3. Ambience
2.	Brand Identity	4. Store Image
		5. Store awareness
		6. Brand Image
		7. Brand awareness
3.	Sales promotion	8. Cheaper Price
		9. Discounts
		10. Offers
4.	Product specifications	11. Quality
		12. Ingredients
		13. Performance
		14. Packaging
		15. Usage(Easy to use)
5.	Brand promotion	16. Advertising
		17. Evidence
		18. Experience

Test of Hypothesis 2

We proposed that the choice of household cleaning brands is dependent on the occupation of consumer. We asked consumers about their occupation and leveled them as employed, unemployed and self-employed. To study the variance of the different factors found in EFA across the different occupational groups, we used multiple One Way ANOVA. Table 8 depicts the result of the ANOVA test. It is evident from the table 8 that while selecting from different retail brands of household cleaning chemicals the perceived importance of factors such as store atmosphere, brand identity and brand promotions significantly depend on the occupation of the consumers. However, perceived importance of the factors like sales promotion and product specifications are independent of their occupation. This implicitly means irrespective of their occupation all consumers give equal importance (no significant Difference) to product specifications and sales promotions.

Table 8: Consumer choice factors and occupation

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Store Atmos	Between Groups	33.894	2	16.947	3.449	.034
	Within Groups	967.901	197	4.913		
	Total	1001.795	199			
Brand Identity	Between Groups	138.460	2	69.230	6.004	.003
	Within Groups	2271.415	197	11.530		
	Total	2409.875	199			
Sales promotion	Between Groups	19.364	2	9.682	1.085	.340
	Within Groups	1757.756	197	8.923		
	Total	1777.120	199			
Product spec	Between Groups	43.021	2	21.511	1.105	.333
	Within Groups	3835.854	197	19.471		
	Total	3878.875	199			
Brand promo	Between Groups	82.248	2	41.124	10.014	.000
	Within Groups	809.032	197	4.107		
	Total	891.280	199			

Test of Hypothesis 3

We proposed that the choice of household cleaning brands is dependent on the educational background of consumer. We asked consumers about their educational background and leveled them as matriculation, Graduate, post graduate and professional education. To study the variance of the different factors found in EFA across the different educational background groups, we used multiple One Way ANOVA. Table 9 depicts the result of the ANOVA test. It is evident from the table 9 that while selecting from different retail brands of household cleaning chemicals the perceived importance of factors such as store atmosphere, brand identity, sales promotions, and product specifications significantly depend on the educational background of the consumers. However, perceived importance of the factors like brand promotion are independent of their educational background. This implicitly means irrespective of their educational background all consumers give equal importance (no significant Difference) to brand promotions.

Table 9 : Consumer choice factors and educational background

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Store Atmos	Between Groups	73.782	3	24.594	5.194	.002
	Within Groups	928.013	196	4.735		
	Total	1001.795	199			
Brand Identity	Between Groups	119.870	3	39.957	3.420	.018
	Within Groups	2290.005	196	11.684		
	Total	2409.875	199			
Sales promotion	Between Groups	105.219	3	35.073	4.112	.007
	Within Groups	1671.901	196	8.530		
	Total	1777.120	199			
Product spec	Between Groups	400.415	3	133.472	7.521	.000
	Within Groups	3478.460	196	17.747		
	Total	3878.875	199			
Brand promo	Between Groups	11.389	3	3.796	.846	.470
	Within Groups	879.891	196	4.489		
	Total	891.280	199			

Test of Hypothesis 4

We proposed that the choice of household cleaning brands is dependent on the family size of consumer. We asked consumers about their family size and leveled them as family members in number 2, 3, 4 and 5 or >5. To study the variance of the different factors found in EFA across the different family size groups, we used multiple One Way ANOVA. Table 10 depicts the result of the ANOVA test. It is evident from the table 10 that while selecting from different retail brands of household cleaning chemicals the perceived importance of factors such as brand identity and sales promotions significantly depend on the family size of the consumers. However, perceived importance of the factors like store atmospheric, Brand promotion and product specifications are independent of their family size. This implicitly means irrespective of their family size all consumers give equal importance (no significant Difference) to store atmospheric, brand promotion and product specifications.

Table 10: Consumer choice factors and family size

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Store Atmos	Between Groups	15.118	3	5.039	1.001	.393
	Within Groups	986.677	196	5.034		
	Total	1001.795	199			
Brand Identity	Between Groups	129.616	3	43.205	3.714	.012
	Within Groups	2280.259	196	11.634		
	Total	2409.875	199			
Sales promotion	Between Groups	112.551	3	37.517	4.418	.005
	Within Groups	1664.569	196	8.493		
	Total	1777.120	199			
Product spec	Between Groups	72.982	3	24.327	1.253	.292
	Within Groups	3805.893	196	19.418		
	Total	3878.875	199			
Brand promo	Between Groups	6.147	3	2.049	.454	.715
	Within Groups	885.133	196	4.516		
	Total	891.280	199			

Test of Hypothesis 5

We proposed that the choice of household cleaning brands is dependent on the social class of consumer. We asked consumers about their social class and leveled them as Lower Middle Class, Middle Class, Upper Middle Class and Upper class. To study the variance of the different factors found in EFA across the different social class, we used multiple One Way ANOVA. Table 11 depicts the result of the ANOVA test. It is evident from the table 11 that while selecting from different retail brands of household cleaning chemicals the perceived importance of factors such as brand identity, sales promotions, store atmospheric, Brand promotion and product specifications are dependent of their social class. This implicitly means irrespective of their social class all consumers give equal importance (no significant Difference) to store atmospheric, brand promotion, product specifications, brand identity and sales promotion.

Table 11: Consumer choice factors and social class of consumers

		Sum of squares	**df**	**Mean square**	**F**	**Sig.**
Store Atmos	Between Groups	62.271	3	20.757	4.330	.006
	Within Groups	939.524	196	4.793		
	Total	1001.795	199			
Brand Identity	Between Groups	129.179	3	43.060	3.700	.013
	Within Groups	2280.696	196	11.636		
	Total	2409.875	199			
Sales promotion	Between Groups	135.276	3	45.092	5.383	.001
	Within Groups	1641.844	196	8.377		
	Total	1777.120	199			
Product spec	Between Groups	194.279	3	64.760	3.445	.018
	Within Groups	3684.596	196	18.799		
	Total	3878.875	199			
Brand promo	Between Groups	150.883	3	50.294	13.314	.000
	Within Groups	740.397	196	3.778		
	Total	891.280	199			

Managerial Implications and Scope for Future Research

The current research identifies the determinants of consumer behaviour towards household hygiene product which will help to explain the reported importance of all the five factors such as store atmosphere, brand identity, sales promotion, product specifications and brand promotions. Managers of large retail stores may have to understand these variables and their interactions before planning brand extension of hygiene products. The results of this research may also be extended to understand the consumer behaviour towards other related product while formulating strategies for their private level brands. The current research will provide adequate insights to the managers and practitioners to understand the demographic variables which will help them to identify the target customers.

However, the research is not free from limitations. The convenience sampling procedure and regional data collection limits the research to generalize the results to other parts of the globe. Future researchers may test the same results for extension of other category of products. The results will help the academia to understand consumer behaviour towards hygiene products. The researchers may also extend the research to test the impact of personality variable and cultural variables [13-25].

Conclusions

In this study it was intended to find out factors related to private level brands of household hygiene chemicals affecting the consumer buying decisions. In this research it was also intended to specifically study the effect of five factors such as such as store atmosphere, brand identity, sales promotion, product specifications and brand promotions along with the influence of demographic factors like occupation, educational background, social class of consumer and family size of the consumer on the demand for private level brands of household hygiene chemicals. It was found that four factors namely store atmosphere, brand identity and brand promotions significantly depend on the occupation of the consumers. However, perceived importance of the factors like store atmospheric, Brand promotion and product specifications are independent of their family size. Irrespective of their social class all consumers give equal importance (no significant Difference) to store atmospheric, brand promotion, product specifications, brand identity and sales promotion. These findings are likely to help brand mangers of private level brands in the household hygiene chemical sector in designing the manufacturing of their products as well as in their marketing strategies.

References

1. Quelch J, Harding, D. (1996) Brands versus private labels: Fighting to win. Harvard Business Review, 74(1):99-109.
2. Ailawadi KL, Borin N, Farris PW (1995) Market power and performance: A cross-industry analysis of manufacturers and retailers. Journal of retailing, 71(3):211-248.
3. Hoch SJ, Banerji S (1993) When do private labels succeed? Sloan Management Review, 34(4):57.
4. Chintagunta PK, Bonfrer A, Song I (2002) Investigating the effects of store-brand introduction on retailer demand and pricing behavior. Management Science, 48(10):1242-1267.
5. Narasimhan C, Wilcox RT (1998) Private labels and the channel relationship: A cross-category analysis*. The Journal of Business, 71(4):573-600.
6. Halstead D, Ward CB (1995) Assessing the vulnerability of private label brands. Journal of Product & Brand Management, 4(3):38-48.
7. Edgecliffe JA (2001) Back to cheap and cheerful Own-Label. Financial Times, 19.
8. Sethuraman R, Cole C (1999) Factors influencing the price premiums that consumers pay for national brands over store brands. Journal of Product & Brand Management, 8(4):340-351.
9. Holt D, Quelch J, Taylor E (2003) Managing the transnational brand: how global perceptions drive value. In Globalization of Markets Colloquium, Harvard Business School.
10. Richardson PS, Jain AK, Dick A (1996) Household store brand proneness: a framework. Journal of retailing, 72(2):159-185.

11. Allenby GM, Rossi PE (1991) Quality perceptions and asymmetric switching between brands. Marketing science, 10(3):185-204.
12. Bronnenberg BJ, Wathieu L (1996) Asymmetric promotion effects and brand positioning. Marketing Science, 15(4):379-394.
13. Baltas G, Doyle P (1998) An empirical analysis of private brand demand recognising heterogeneous preferences and choice dynamics. The Journal of the Operational Research Society, 49(8):790-798
14. Batra R, Sinha I (2000) Consumer level factors moderating the success of private label brands across product categories, Journal of Retailing, 76(2):175-191
15. Chakraborty S (2011) Perceptions and buyer behavior towards private-label colas: An exploratory study to understand the views of the store managers of United Kingdom. IUP Journal of Marketing Management, 10(1):7.
16. Chui CTB, Sidin SM (2005) Satisfying women's status desires: Role of money attitude and consumer vanity in status consumption. Journal of personality and social psychology, 50(4):684-689.
17. Coe B (1971) Private versus national preference among lower and middle-income consumers. Journal of Retailing, 47(3):61-78.
18. Images Retail (2009) “India Retail Report 2009”.
19. Jacob Sarah, “Price-conscious consumers drop top brands, shift to private labels”, The Economic Times, May 2, 2009.
20. Kar Sayantani, “Consumers lead the way”, Business Standard, January 10, 2011.
21. Manzur E, Olavarrieta S, Hidalgo P, Farías P, Uribe R (2011) Store brand and national brand promotion attitudes antecedents. Journal of Business Research, 64(3):286-291.
22. Mishra Supriya, Retail is all about scale: Kisore Biyani, The Economic Times, November 9, 2010.
23. Pepe MS, Abratt R, & Dion P (2011) The impact of private label brands on customer loyalty and product category profitability. Journal of product & Brand management, 20(1):27-36.
24. Quelch JA, Harding D (1996) Brands versus private labels: Fighting to win.
25. Selnes F (1993) An examination of the effect of product performance on brand reputation, satisfaction and loyalty. Journal of Product & Brand Management, 2(4):45-60.