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ABSTRACT
Consumer is the king of any business. Understanding consumer needs and wants is important and foremost task of any marketer. Consumer satisfaction is a judgment made by the consumer. Consumers normally have a general objective of creation and maintaining a collection of goods and services that provide present and future satisfaction. The goods are produced only to meet the needs of the consumer. So that the analysis of consumer behavior is one of the foundations on which future marketing depends. Every producer interested to increase the profitability, loyalty and retention and repeat purchases of the product. Consumers have wide variety of choices in toilet soap and they were influenced by many factors internal and external. The study is focused to identify the factors which influence consumers while purchasing toilet soap and to examine the brand loyalty with regard to toilet soaps.
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1. INTRODUCTION
Consumer preference is an important factor of marketing management. Unless a marketing manager has the knowledge of the factors that affect consumer’s purchasing patterns, consumers purchasing patterns are likely to be influenced by demographic, economic, psychological and sociological factors. They must find out how consumers translate their desires into meaningful technical language. Consumers describe what they want, in terms of product benefits, Functions, characteristics, performance criteria and even manufacturing procedures.

A marketing manager must be aware of the reason, why people buy a Soap. Since consumers differ in their present and future buying requirement, hence the knowledge of buying of different product helps marketers an identify groups, which represents the greatest sales potentials. Marketing management must know, buyers are really seeking their goods and services. Since the ultimate motive of all the marketing activities is based on consumer satisfaction.

1.1 Toilet Soaps- An Introduction
Toilet soap is an important day to day basic requirement of any consumer. It is considered as cleansing and beautifying products which is usually used for cleansing one's body. The toilet soaps market is dominated by several, leading national and global brands and a large number of small brands. The accepted and quality brands are Hamam, Lux, Power, Dove, Rexona, Medimix, Cinthol, Pears, Mysore sandal, and Lifebuoy. The existence of different brands made the consumers difficult to differentiate each brand from others. It is, therefore, very important to find out the impact of brand
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products/services, and to the impression of quality communicated by each person interacting with the firm’s clients.

5. DATA ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION

5.1 Chi-Square Analysis:
The Chi-square analysis is used to find out association between occupation and brand

1. Ho: The Occupation of the respondent has no influence on the and Brand of toilet soap

Table 1: Relationship between Occupation and Brand

| Factor       | Calculated $\chi^2$ Value | Table Value | D.F | Remarks            |
|--------------|---------------------------|-------------|-----|--------------------|
| Brand        | 128.56                    | 51.00       | 36  | Significant at 5% level |

It is found from the above table that the calculated chi-square value is greater than the table value and the result is significant at 5% level. Hence, the null hypothesis is rejected. From the analysis, it is concluded that the occupation of the respondents has influence on the choice of brand of toilet soap

2. Ho: The Income of the respondent does not influence the choice of Brand

Table – 2: Relationships between Brand and Income

| Factor | Calculated $\chi^2$ Value | Table Value | D.F | Remarks            |
|--------|---------------------------|-------------|-----|--------------------|
| Income | 87.44                     | 40.11       | 27  | Significant at 5% level |

It is found from the above table that the calculated chi-square value is greater than the table value and the result is significant at 5% level. Hence, the null hypothesis is rejected. From the analysis, it is concluded that Income of the respondent influence the preference of soap brand.

5.2 Weighted Average Analysis

Table 3: Reasons for Preferring Particular Brand of Soap

| Reasons        | No. of Respondents (X) | W | Total (WX) |
|----------------|------------------------|---|------------|
| Doctor Advice  | 12                     | 4 | 48         |
| Price          | 52                     | 3 | 156        |
| Quality        | 100                    | 2 | 200        |
| Fashion        | 36                     | 1 | 36         |
| Total          | 200                    | 10| 440        |

$$X = \sum WX = 440 \div 10 = 44$$

The weighted average analysis shows that the reason for preferring particular brand of soap is on an average 44 respondents.
5.3 Percentage Analysis
Table 4: Sex Wise Classification

| Particular | No. of Respondents | Percentage |
|------------|--------------------|------------|
| Male       | 96                 | 48         |
| Female     | 104                | 52         |
| **Total**  | **200**            | **100**    |

Source: Primary Data

The above table shows the sex wise classifications of the respondent, out of 200 respondents 48% respondents are male and 52% respondents are female.

Table – 5: Changes Felt By the Respondents

| Particular   | No. of Respondents | Percentage |
|--------------|--------------------|------------|
| Skin colour  | 12                 | 6          |
| Skin softness| 20                 | 10         |
| Freshness    | 68                 | 34         |
| Oil controller| 28                | 14         |
| Body odour   | 20                 | 10         |
| Fragrance    | 52                 | 26         |
| **Total**    | **200**            | **100**    |

Source: Primary Data

The above table highlights the changes felt by the respondents for the use of particular brand of toilet soap. Out of 200 respondents, 34% respondents were said Freshness, 26% of respondents were felt Fragrance, 14% of them are said oil controller, 10% of respondents were felt skin softness, body odour, and 6% of respondents were said skin colour.

Table – 6: Frequent Usage of Toilet Soap

| Particular   | No. of Respondents | Percentage |
|--------------|--------------------|------------|
| Once         | 76                 | 38         |
| Twice        | 96                 | 48         |
| More than twice| 28                | 14         |
| **Total**    | **200**            | **100**    |

Source: Primary Data

The above table depicts the frequent usage of soap, out of 200 respondents 48% of respondents were use twice in a day, 38% of respondents were use once in a day, and 14% of respondents were using more than twice in a day.

Table – 7: Purchase Pattern

| Particular   | No. of Respondents | Percentage |
|--------------|--------------------|------------|
| Weekly       | 44                 | 22         |
| Fortnight    | 104                | 52         |
| Monthly      | 52                 | 26         |
| **Total**    | **200**            | **100**    |

Source: Primary Data

The above table describes 200 respondents out of which 52% of respondents are purchase fort nightly, 26% of respondents are purchase monthly, and 22% of respondents purchase weekly.

Table – 8: Classifications on The Basis of Brand Loyalty

| Brand | No. of Respondents | Percentage |
|-------|--------------------|------------|
| Yes   | 96                 | 48         |
| No    | 104                | 52         |
| **Total** | **200**    | **100**    |

Source: Primary Data

The above table shows that out of 200 respondents, 52% of respondents are not having brand loyalty and 48% of respondents are having brand loyalty while purchasing toilet soap.

Table – 9: The Reason for Not Having Brand Loyalty

| Reasons      | No. of Respondents | Percentage |
|--------------|--------------------|------------|
| High price   | 40                 | 38.46      |
| Non availability | 24             | 23.07      |
| Not satisfaction | 28           | 26.94      |
| Doctor’s advice | 12             | 11.53      |
| **Total**    | **104**            | **100**    |

Source: Primary Data

The above table shows that nearly 38 percent respondents change their brand because of high price, 27 percent respondents change their brand due to dissatisfaction of brand, 23 percent respondents due to non availability of brand, and 12 respondents due to doctor’s advice.

Table – 10: Habit of Comparison

| Brands | No. of Respondents | Percentage |
|--------|--------------------|------------|
| Yes    | 48                 | 24         |
| No     | 152                | 76         |
| **Total** | **200**    | **100**    |

Source: Primary Data

The above table prescribes 200 respondents out of which 76% of the respondents are not comparing their brand with the other brand, and 24% of the respondents only comparing their products with other brands.
Table – 11: Factors on Which Comparison

| Particulars | No. of Respondents | Percentage |
|-------------|--------------------|------------|
| Quality     | 12                 | 25         |
| Availability| 8                  | 17         |
| Price       | 20                 | 41         |
| Free gifts  | 8                  | 17         |
| **Total**   | **48**             | **100**    |

Source: Primary Data

The above table depicts 48 respondents out of which 41% of respondents were comparing their brand with other brands based on price factor, 25% of the respondents were using the factor quality for their comparison and 17% of the respondents were comparing the brands by using the factors brand availability & free gifts.

Table – 12: Respondents Opinion about the Price of the Brand

| Brand Name | High | Low | Reasonable | Total | Percentage |
|------------|-----|-----|------------|-------|------------|
| Hamam      | 4   | 8   | 32         | 44    | 22         |
| Lux        | -   | 4   | 20         | 24    | 12         |
| Power      | 4   | -   | 24         | 28    | 14         |
| Dove       | 8   | -   | -          | 8     | 4          |
| Rexona     | -   | 4   | 12         | 16    | 8          |
| Medimix    | 4   | 4   | 16         | 24    | 12         |
| Cinthol    | 4   | -   | 16         | 20    | 10         |
| Pears      | 8   | -   | 4          | 12    | 6          |
| Mysore sandal | 8 | -   | -          | 8     | 4          |
| Lifebouy   | -   | 8   | 8          | 16    | 8          |
| **Total**  | **40** | **28** | **132** | **200** | **100** |

Source: Primary Data

The above table depicts the respondent’s opinion about the price of the brand, out 200 respondents, 40 respondents gives opinion that the price is high, and 28 respondents feel that the price is low.

Table – 13: Ranking the Brands

| Brand Name | Total | Percentage | Rank |
|------------|-------|------------|------|
| Hamam      | 44    | 22         | I    |
| Lux        | 24    | 12         | III  |
| Power      | 28    | 14         | II   |
| Dove       | 8     | 4          | VII  |
| Rexona     | 16    | 8          | V    |
| Medimix    | 24    | 12         | III  |
| Cinthol    | 20    | 10         | IV   |
| Pears      | 12    | 6          | VI   |
| Mysore sandal | 8 | 4          | VII  |
| Lifebouy   | 16    | 8          | V    |
| **Total**  | **200** | **100**    |      |

Source: Primary Data

The respondents ranked the various brands of toilet soaps based on price, quality and product attributes. The research shows that the Hamam soap is ranked first; seventh rank is given to Mysore sandal and Dove.

6. FINDINGS

- The study shows that 22 percent of the respondents preferred Hamam soap which is the leading toilet soap in Perambalur district and the other 88 percent is shared by all the remaining toilet soap.
- The study reveals the fact that 34 percent of them felt that changes after using the particular brand of soap is freshness.
- The research shows that 52 percent of the respondents purchasing their brand in the frequency of once in fortnight.
- It is found that out of 200 respondents, 52 percent respondents express that they have no brand loyalty.
- 38 percent of respondent’s opinion that they have no brand loyalty due to fluctuation in price level.
- The research shows that 66 percent of respondents felt that the price of their brand is reasonable.
- The chi-square analysis shows that the occupation of the respondents has influence on the choice of brand of toilet soap.
- The chi-square analysis shows that Income of the respondents has influence the preference of particular soap brand.
- The weighted average analysis shows that the reason for preferring particular brand of soap is 44 percent.

7. SUGGESTIONS

- The toilet soap such as Dove, Pears are not popular among the consumer. So, the manufacturer should take necessary steps to popularize the above said brands.
- The price of brands like Hamam, Power, Lux, Medimix and lifebouy can be reduced. So that these brands of toilet soap can be purchased by all level of income group.
- Most of the consumers are concerned about the quality of toilet soap. So manufacturers can take necessary steps to improve the quality brands of toilet soap.
- The FMGC Company needs to focus on its distribution channels, networking, marketing strategies, sales promotion etc to tap the potential segment.
8. CONCLUSION

Consumer preference is one of the important factors of marketing. FMCG companies must find out consumers want and than translate these desires into meaningful technical language. Knowledge of buying behavior of different market segments help marketers to identify buyer who support the company. In toilet soap market generally buyers are of low or reasonable price minded, expecting free gifts, quality and modification, the company should take up some changes in their product to cover more market area and attract more customers and to complete their competitors. FMCG companies should concentrate their innovative strategies and distribution channels to attract the new customers and retain the existing customers.
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