ABSTRACT

Good packaging and eminence product that matches the price over and over again calls for recurring patronage from consumers which allow the firm to hang about in business. Attractive packaging of products creates voluntarily available market for the firm and may reduce on advertising cost. This study examines the result of good packaging of products on consumers’ buying alternative as well as on impulse buying. Data were obtained from the supervision of 100 copies of a structured questionnaire to consumers who come for shopping at market places, supermarkets and high traffic points across the Punjab using deliberate sampling technique. The test results revealed that 79 and 81% of consumers’ decision to purchase a particular product as well as impulse buying was accounted for by the packaging approach of the product, while the chi-square results indicated that attractive packaging inclined consumers’ buying choice and impulse buying (p>0.05).

INTRODUCTION

In this modern era packaging has developed into one of the most sophisticated, holistic and influential example for those who design it and for those people who are considered intermediates for selling product from manufacturer to the end consumer. “Packaging is the container for a product encompassing the physical appearance of the container and including the design, color, shape, labeling and materials used” (Arens, 1996). Most marketing textbooks consider packaging to be an integral part of the “product” component of the 4 P’s of marketing: product, price, place and promotion (Cateora and Graham, 2002). However, as (Jugger, 1999) points out: “Measuring the true impact of packaging is difficult. Packaging changes are never made in isolation: sales promotions and advertising obscure the effect of these changes.” If we share consumer perspective, packaging plays a vital role when products are purchased from the market as both an indication and as a source of pertinent information. Packaging is one of the best alternative that lie with brand owners through which they can enhance value of their products and make them special among lot of alternatives available to consumers. As per (Jugger, 1999) “The right packaging solution is different for each brand. What is important is that it works when placed next to the competition on the shelf”. Packaging today has grown in importance and is regarded as a vital marketing tool. Better packaging results in protection and saved transportation of products, reduces loss, damage and wastage of products and produce. It enhances product value and hence expands markets within and outside the country (Jakhar, 2004). Packaging takes on particular importance because of its increased significance in buying decisions in-store, its presence at the critical moment of purchase decision, and its extensive reach to most purchasers of the product (Orth and Malkowitz 2006; Underwood and Klein 2002). In the modern era, packaging is also utilised as a marketing tool to get the consumer’s attention, and to promote and convey messages about the product’s attributes to consumers whilst still on the shelf or at the point of sale.

Many marketers called packaging the 5th “P”, the other four “P’s” being price, place, product and promotion (Sehrawet & Kundu, 2007). Kotler (2000) defined packaging as all activities of designing and producing the container for a product. Packaging literature reveals that packaging is fulfilling multiple purposes in relation to a firm’s external activity. Primary packaging can either be in the form of sales, or constitutes a sale unit to the final customer. Packaging design is, therefore, an important issue in the growing use of packaging as a marketing tool for self-service, since approximately 73% of products are sold on a self-service bases at the point of sale (Silayoi & Speece, The importance of packaging attributes: a conjoint analysis approach, 2007). The packaging must, therefore, perform many of the sales tasks, including making an overall favorable impression and helping influence impulsive purchasing. This is in contrast to the secondary function of packaging that is used for storage, shipping and supply chain that consumers do not see but that is still necessary in the distribution of the product to trade (Sehrawet & Kundu, 2007). Product packaging gives form to a product. Usually, food engineers use preservatives and ingredient tweaking to extend the shelf life of perishable products. This results in the loss of certain natural flavours, tastes and ingredients, often to the displeasure of consumers. This perhaps has been resolved with the advancements in packaging technologies which has helped to extend product shelf life beyond limits previously considered unfeasible. If not all, most buying decisions are based on information sought by consumers either actively or passively which includes product’s brand name, manufacturer name, and country of origin, graphics, and nutritional information (Peters-Texeira and Badrie, 2007).

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Robert et al.’s (2001) findings on packaging imagery indicates that the effects of pictures on packaging are contingent on the product category, and may be specifically beneficial to those with high levels of experience because it was not possible to manipulate the level of experiential benefits (Underwood, Klein, & Burke, 2001). Good quality product that matches the price often calls for repeated purchase or patronage from consumers which enable the firm to stay in business. Good and attractive packaging of products creates market for the firm than its promotional activity. This is because consumers most times are attracted at first sight to the packaging style of a product (Terblanche, 2006) and according to Best (2002), it creates value by helping customers decision making process. If a firm’s product packaging does not influence consumer buying decision, then such a firm is wasting a lot of money. Companies spend a lot more money on advertising than on packaging, but packaging according to marketing scholars is considered very important because among other benefits, it serves as an advertising medium, thereby helping the firm to cut down on advertisement cost. Packaging has some influence on buyers and the experience with the product determines whether a consumer comes back for more or not (Lifu, 2003). Product packaging is therefore an essential aspect of projecting a firm’s brand’s image, which is
sometimes designed to convey images of high quality, while at other times signaling affordable price (Ulrich et al., 2010).

**HYPOTHESES:** The study hypothesizes that:

Packaging plays an attractive role in consumers’ buying choice with earned income.

Impulse buying action is noticed with packaging innovation

### RESEARCH OBJECTIVES

The research has been carried out on buying behavior factors related to packaging of the product.

The specific objectives are:

1. To find out the Consumer Attitude towards the new or different Packaging.
2. To find out the Attributes in packaging that affect Consumer buying Behavior

This study has been carried out in Punjab State of India. The survey was carried out on 100 respondents. Data was collected face-to-face in the months of October 2011 to February 2012. The respondents were purposely selected to maintain identical distribution in age and gender. There were 61 males and 39 females who were the part of this survey. About 26% of the respondents were from the age group of 15-30 years, 31% were from the age group of 30-45 and 43% of the respondents were of 45-60 years of age. 46% of the respondents were under graduate, 24.5% were graduates and 23.5% were post graduates.

For the purpose of research convenience sampling technique was used. The questionnaire consists of rank question, close-ended questions, a 5 pointLikert scale questions. The data composed through questionnaires was coded and tabulated taken in context with the objective of the study. It was further fairly analyzed by calculating percentages, frequencies and Cross-tabulation techniques. The data was analyzed by means of SPSS in this study.

### DATA ANALYSIS

#### PRIORITY OF RESPONDENTS WHILE PURCHASING A PRODUCT

In this weighted average score method is used where 1 rank is the most preferred rank and 5 is the least preferred rank. As in the various packaging types are ranked. This depicted that majority of the respondent’s feels that protective packaging is most preferred by the respondents as it is the minimum of all and it is given rank 1. Then Eco-friendly is given Rank 2. The Convenience packaging, Reusable packaging and Portable packaging are considered as Rank 3, Rank 4 and Rank 5 respectively. By this it had been interpreted that protective packaging and eco-friendly packaging were most preferred by the customers.

| Packaging Priority      | Rank 1 | Rank 2 | Rank 3 | Rank 4 | Rank 5 | Rank |
|-------------------------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|------|
| Protective packaging    | 59     | 21     | 15     | 0      | 5      | 1    |
| Eco-friendly            | 37     | 47     | 16     | 0      | 0      | 2    |
| Convenience packaging   | 19     | 20     | 40     | 12     | 9      | 3    |
| Reusable packaging      | 13     | 7      | 17     | 16     | 47     | 5    |
| Portable packaging      | 14     | 7      | 14     | 46     | 19     | 4    |

#### ATTRIBUTE THOSE ATTRACTIONS CUSTOMERS TOWARDS PURCHASE OF PRODUCT

This depicts that majority of the respondent’s feels that color is most preferred aesthetic component as it is the minimum of all and it is given rank 1. Then shape & size is given Rank 2. Then material use, attractive background and text & graphics are considered as Rank 3, Rank 4 and Rank 5 respectively. By this it had been interpreted that color, shape & size are most preferred aesthetic components preferred by the customers. Chi Square test is applied on this statement. P value comes out >0.05. So null hypothesis is accepted, which represents that there is no relationship between type of packaging and income of the respondents.

#### IMPORTANCE OF PACKAGING ON IMPULSE BUYING ACTION

The summated score of this statement is 218. It lies between Neutral and Maximum score. So the score depicted that respondents were agreed. The summated score of this statement is 172. It lies between Maximum a Neutral score. It shows that the customers were disagreed to it. The summated score of this statement is 184. It lies between Minimum and Neutral score. It shows that the respondents were strongly agreed to it.

Number of respondents -100

Maximum Score –

Maximum (100*3) – 300
Neutral (100*2) – 200
Minimum (100*1) – 100
Table 2: Type of Packaging * Income Cross Tabulation

| Type of packaging | Income | Count | % within income |
|-------------------|--------|-------|-----------------|
|                   | 1      |       |                 |
| Total             | 1      | 20    | 100.0%          |
| 1                 |        |       |                 |
| Count             | 11     | 34    | 65.4%           |
| % within income   | 55.0%  | 65.4% | 88.9%           |
|                   | 2      | 7     | 0.0%            |
| Total             | 2      | 12    | 12.0%           |
| 3                 |        |       |                 |
| Count             | 7      | 5     | 9.6%            |
| % within income   | 35.0%  | 38.9% | 88.9%           |
|                   | 4      | 0     | 0.0%            |
| Total             | 4      | 3     | 3.0%            |

Table 3: Chi-Square Tests

| Value     | df  | Asymp. Sig. (2-sided) |
|-----------|-----|-----------------------|
| Pearson Chi-Square | 30.454* | 9  | .000 |
| Likelihood Ratio | 34.300 | 9  | .000 |
| Linear-by-Linear Association | 1.214 | 1  | .271 |

N of Valid Cases | 100

a. 10 cells (62.5%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .30.

Table 4: Importance of Packaging on Impulse buying action

| Importance       | SA (3) | A (2) | D (1) | Summated score |
|------------------|--------|-------|-------|----------------|
| Most important   | 40     | 38    | 22    | 218            |
| Important        | 32     | 20    | 48    | 184            |
| Least important  | 22     | 28    | 50    | 172            |
CONCLUSION

Above discussions it is obvious that attractive packing of products appreciably influences consumers’ buying option and impulse buying. It act as a source of advertising to the consumers, which results for organizations to on good and attractive packaging for product quality, so that they could cut down on advertising cost predominantly in this era where the majority consumers shop in supermarkets. However, in order to keep up impulse buying from consumers, firms in the beam of the current fierce market environment have to guarantee quality of their products. In add on to it, embarking on good and fantastic packaging, the worth of the product must as well be made dominant and sustained at a significant level. In order to get sustainable in the present day competitive and computerized market, companies must be able to equilibrium both packaging and quality to meet up the level cost they want as well as to construct consumers’ self-belief and loyalty.
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