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Abstract

Marketers increasingly face challenges in trying to understand the decision-making processes and behaviours of those consumers located at the Bottom of the Pyramid (BOP). It has been proven that 73% of fast-moving consumer goods (FMCG) purchases are made at the point-of-sale, and product packaging has been found to play a strategic role in seven of the ten in-store purchase decision criteria. Packaging is, therefore, an important basis through which companies can differentiate products from the plethora of competing brands. On average, big retailers carry 50 000 items and the typical shopper passes 300 items per minute. The packaging must, therefore, perform many of the sales tasks, making an overall favourable brand impression and experience. The research has attempted to understand the constructs of packaging and brand experience as purchasing decision criteria for FMCG products. The researcher administered 250 surveys with low-income consumers in the Star Hyper supermarket in the mining town of Carltonville. The findings demonstrated how low-income consumers have an appreciation of all product packaging as they often re-use it once the product is consumed. Furthermore, lower income consumers enjoy a greater brand experience with 'premium' product brands when compared to their brand experience levels with what they perceive to be 'cheaper' brand products. Even though a statistical weak relationship between product packaging and brand experience was found, the qualitative findings support the notion of a strong relationship as lower income consumers gain more value/greater brand experience not just out of consuming 'premium' brand products, but also from the use of the packaging for other needs afterwards.
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Introduction

Chapter 1 will address several elements. Firstly, background to the study will be provided. This will be followed by a discussion on the formulation of the problem. Thirdly, the objectives and scope of the study will be presented concluding with an orientation towards the main components of the study.

Chapter 2 presents a review of related literature. This chapter will articulate “BoP consumer behaviour” through a synthesis of the pertinent literature from different bodies of knowledge. The literature is primarily derived from academic, peer reviewed journals. It defines consumer behaviour and the decision-making process as well as presents a critique of the notion of BoP. More importantly, this chapter will refine the packaging and brand experience constructs depicting the need and benefits of this research.

Chapter 3 will lead to the formal development of the hypotheses at the core of the study’s investigation.

Chapter 4 will outline the design and methodological approach to this research study, based on both primary and secondary research techniques.
Chapter 5 will provide the empirical evidence that supports the hypothesis. All analytical results will be presented.

The data analysis and interpretations of the findings, in terms of the context of the study and in light of the theory base, will be conducted in Chapter 6. The relationship between chapters 1, 2 and 3 will be depicted.

Chapter 7 will highlight and bring the results into a comprehensive set of findings that will be meaningful to various stakeholders, and provide recommendations for future research.
1. INTRODUCTION TO THE RESEARCH PROBLEM
1.1 Background

Over two thirds of the world’s population are considered to be low-income earners. The bottom of the global economic pyramid refers to the more than four billion people with per capita incomes below $1500 per annum that live in poor or extremely deprived conditions. Marketers and communicators know little about these consumers who are considered to be at the Base of the Pyramid (BoP). There has been an undue bias towards understanding developed markets, which are driven by competitive pressures and proliferation of choice. The sheer vastness of the low-income market, unfamiliarity with its customers, and the lack of ready means to reach them have all abetted in ensuring that marketers continue to be unaware of what drives them (Mehta, 1998).

It is collectively estimated that people at the BoP have a combined purchasing power of $5 trillion (Subrahmanyan & Gomez-Arias, 2008). Prahalad (2006) categorises consumers into four tiers (see Figure 1). Tiers 3 and 4 form the bottom of the pyramid and consist of four billion people. Traditionally, companies considered poor or low-income groups as an unviable market and hence they were largely ignored (Prahalad, 2006). With over 54 countries in Africa and 900 million consumers speaking over 2 000 languages, Africa is not a homogenous market that companies can merely import or manufacture products for and try to sell to without appreciating the diversity and complexity of their consumers’ needs, challenges, preferences and aspirations (Mahajan, 2008). There has, however, been a paradigm shift, with a recent focus on strategies to better serve this market. Many local and international companies have begun to operate in emerging markets such as Africa (Mahajan, 2008). The attraction of this market for companies increases as their consumer’s progress up the economic pyramid. Furthermore, the pyramid is morphing and by 2020 the
very low-income market is expected to shrink by 24%. Today is when these consumers are forming their opinions and loyalties (Management Agenda, 2007).

**Figure 1: Prahalad’s BoP Model**

In South Africa, almost three million people live on less than R5 a day and about eighteen million people live on under R20 a day. Figure 2 depicts how the number of extremely poor people has declined considerably since 2004. About 20.9 million people can be categorised into Tier 3. They earn in the range of R600 to R4 200 per month. This constitutes over 47% of the South African population and therefore companies cannot afford to ignore this significant category and the preferences of the consumers within it.
Figure 2: Improvement in Income

![Figure 2: Improvement in Income](image)

Figure 2 depicts how South Africans have progressively increased their incomes, and therefore have become more important to retailers.

Grocery purchases comprise between 35% (AMPS, 2008) to 60% (Subrahmanyan & Gomez-Arias, 2008) of a household’s income, stirring South African retailers and manufacturers to compete in trying to capture more market share. Understanding the dynamics of the purchasing decision criteria used by the BoP to select products within a retail store will give a company a competitive edge over competing brands, and in delivering a value proposition that is aligned with the needs of customers.
1.2 Research problem

Given the wide diversity of Africa’s population, consumers’ behaviour is just as complex and multifaceted. The research in question is an attempt to help unpack “why consumers buy what they buy”, or what is referred to as the “the purchasing criteria”.

In mature markets, product packaging has been found to play a strategic role in 7 of 10 ten in-store purchase decision criteria. This research will try, therefore, to evaluate the importance of product packaging as a decision criterion in the context of low-income markets (Bone & Corey, 2000).

R. Fletcher (2005), in “Marketing at the Bottom of the Pyramid”, argues a different mind-set is needed to tap in to the BoP. A standardised ‘Western’ marketing mix offering of the 4 Ps: Product, Price, Promotion and Place alone will not work with this group, whose circumstances warrant a contextualised and specific approach. This research will demonstrate how BoP consumers behave differently. Different preferences, customs and habits are likely to result in different choice. R. Fletcher (2005) gives fresh insight into how Western entrepreneurs do not fully understand the realities on the ground. The examples he cites are of washing clothes in an outdoor stream. He argues that this will require a different type of packaging and soap product formulation to washing clothes in a washing machine that adjusts itself to levels of soiling and colour of garments.

With a rise in brands competing for shelf space and market share, the consumer is left with more choice. Increasingly, consumer-shopping behaviour is being assessed from the holistic perspective of an entire shopping experience. The holistic view requires a retailer to
focus on the consumers’ experience within the store and at the point of sale of the product. Thus, retailers’ focus needs to shift from the store itself, to also the significance that the product range has for shoppers. When consumers browse for different brands, they are exposed to useful product attributes. However, they are also exposed to various specific brand-related stimuli, such as brand-identifying colors, shapes, background design elements, slogans, mascots and brand characters (Brakus, et al., 2009).

In mature markets, it has been proven that product packaging and brand experience influence customer purchase behaviour. However, the influence of product packaging and customers’ brand experience in low-income markets has not been proven thus far.

1.3 Research scope

The scope of this research will be limited to the investigation of the purchasing decision criteria that low-income consumers in South Africa use when doing their grocery shopping. The constructs that will be studied are Packaging as an independent variable (IV); and Brand Experience as the dependant variable (DV). The aim will be to investigate the relationship that IV has on the DV (the control variable will be an FMCG grocery product sold on the shelf in a retail store).
1.4 Importance of this research

The purpose of the intended research is to investigate how product packaging as a purchasing criterion influences the brand experience of BoP consumers. Providing insight into SA BoP consumer preferences of packaging attributes and desired brand experience dimensions will fill the gap in literature and bring greater attention to this significant but understudied market. Manufacturers and large retailers will benefit from these findings, as it will depict the need to go beyond the mentality of merely removing features of the packaging or brand experience to make them cheaper. Companies can embed the new findings of packaging and customer brand experience into their products to innovate bottom up. This may lead to more efficient budget allocation for design and marketing, resulting in greater customer retention and improved brand equity. Even though consumers at the BoP face deprivation, with Western markets being saturated, the effects of the recent 2009 recession on mature markets, and shareholders’ expectation of growth rates maintaining high levels, it is important to remember that BoP customer spend is US$5 trillion (Prahalad, 2001). This makes for a more compelling case for the private sector to take a closer look at this ignored market segment.

1.5 Research objectives

In trying to understand why BoP consumers buy what they buy, the objective of the research will be to investigate the influence of product packaging on the consumers’ brand experience. These findings will shed light on whether preferences in packaging yield a more positive brand experience and, as a result, how companies can better package their products.
1. LITERATURE REVIEW
2.1 Introduction

Chapter 1 of this study focused on BoP theory regarding low-income consumers and their importance as a consumer market. It also discussed the scope and motivation for the study and alluded to the importance of understanding this group’s decision-making criteria.

Chapter 2 focuses on synthesis of consumer behaviour literature. This is followed by a synopsis of the literature on the decision-making criteria of BoP consumers. The argument then refines and investigates decision-making theory constructs such as packaging and its attributes, and brand experience and its respective dimensions.

2.2 BoP consumer behaviour

Belch and Belch (2007) define consumer behaviour as “the process and activities people engage in when searching for, selecting, purchasing, using, evaluating, and disposing of products and services so as to satisfy their needs and desires”.

Figure 3: Black Box model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS</th>
<th>BUYER'S BLACK BOX</th>
<th>BUYER'S RESPONSE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Marketing Stimuli</td>
<td>Environmental Stimuli</td>
<td>Buyer Characteristics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic</td>
<td>Attitudes</td>
<td>Problem recognition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technological</td>
<td>Motivation</td>
<td>Information search</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political</td>
<td>Perceptions</td>
<td>Alternative evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural</td>
<td>Personality</td>
<td>Purchase decision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demographic</td>
<td>Lifestyle</td>
<td>Post-purchase behaviour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural</td>
<td>Knowledge</td>
<td>Product choice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Product</td>
<td></td>
<td>Brand choice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Price</td>
<td></td>
<td>Dealer choice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place</td>
<td></td>
<td>Purchase choice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion</td>
<td></td>
<td>Purchase timing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


The Black Box model (Figure 3) shows the interaction of stimuli, consumer characteristics, the decision process and consumer responses. Stimuli can be distinguished between interpersonal stimuli or intrapersonal stimuli. The black box model emphasises the relationship between the stimuli and the response of the consumer. The marketing stimuli are planned and processed by companies, whereas the environmental stimuli are determined by social factors such as the economical, political and cultural circumstances of a society. The buyer’s black box contains the buyer characteristics and the decision process, which, in turn, determine the buyer’s response (Belch and Belch, 2007). Some behaviour is not voluntary and is affected largely by environmental factors. For instance, product displays and aisles in a retail store dictate how consumers move through the supermarket, adding products to their shopping baskets (Olson, 2005).

After the consumer has recognised a problem, they search for information on products and services that can solve that problem. Belch and Belch (2007) argue that consumers undertake both an internal and an external search. These sources of information include personal sources, commercial sources, public sources and personal experience.

The relevant internal psychological process that is associated with an information search is perception. Perception is defined as “the process by which an individual receives, selects, organises and interprets information to create a meaningful picture of the world” (Sandhusen, 2000). At this juncture, the consumer compares brands and products that are called to mind. Marketing can increase the likelihood that a particular brand is part of the consumer's decision criteria. Consumers judge alternatives in so far as the functional and psychological benefits that they offer. Marketing managers need to understand what
benefits consumers are seeking and, therefore, which attributes are most important in terms of making a decision (Sandhusen, 2000).

Consumer behaviour is also influenced by tradition, culture, sub-culture, locality, royalty, ethnicity, family, social class, reference groups, lifestyle and market mix factors (Sandhusen, Marketing, 2000).

### 2.3 What influences BoP consumer behaviour

#### 2.3.1 Maslow’s Hierarchy of Needs

According to Maslow, there are five core human motives that are satisfied in a hierarchical manner: physiological; safety and security; belonging; self-esteem; and self-actualisation.

**Figure 4: Maslow’s Hierarchy of Needs model:**

- **Physiological**: breathing, food, water, sex, sleep, homeostasis, excretion
- **Safety**: security of body, of employment, of resources, of morality, of the family, of health, of property
- **Love/Belonging**: friendship, family, sexual intimacy
- **Esteem**: self-esteem, confidence, achievement, respect of others, respect by others
- **Self-actualization**: morality, creativity, spontaneity, problem solving, lack of prejudice, acceptance of facts
According to Maslow’s theory, unless lower order needs are satisfied, higher-level needs remain dormant. Looking at Figure 6, much of BoP expenditure is on food. This supports the traditional interpretation of Maslow’s hierarchy. However, BoP individuals have more than mere survival needs. As a result of mobile penetration into BoP markets, grocery stores have become an outlet to purchase many of these higher order needs, such as prepaid airtime for mobile phones. They also have the need to communicate, improve social relationships, widen their knowledge and increase self-esteem. Maslow’s framework is a useful way to categorise basic needs such as non-branded food purchasing, motivation and priorities for those at the BoP. Higher order needs, such as nostalgic grocery brands, cosmetic purchasing and access to finance, might perhaps be explained by other concepts such as social, capital and family systems, as well as compensatory consumption (Subrahmanyan & Gomez-Arias, 2008).

2.4 Social capital and family systems

Social capital refers to norms and networks that enable people to act jointly (Woolcock and Narayan, 2000), including the notion that networks such as family, friends and associates are an important asset and can be called on in a crisis. Communities with a diverse stock of social capital are regarded to be in a stronger position to confront poverty and lead to sustainable development (Collier, 1998). Subsistence consumers are more likely to cope with challenges by trying to satisfy family or communal level needs rather than individual levels needs (Ruth and Hsuing, 2007). Building social capital may well explain why BoP consumers are loyal to local independent stores, which actually carry higher prices than cooperative and chain stores. As consumers in Viswanathan’s (2007) study indicate, building a relationship with neighborhood retailers acts as insurance in that they are able to get credit during times of hardship. So, even if they
know they could get an item cheaper elsewhere, the relationship itself is vital. Long-term relationships that build trust are a key element in these kinds of markets. It appears from the examples cited that rural BoP consumers do have a high level of interdependence and strong networks.

2.5 Compensatory consumption

According to this theory, individuals who cannot fulfill their primary needs, especially regarding self-esteem or self-actualisation, would compensate these desires by alternative means (Gronmo, 1988; Woodruffe, 1997). It posits that low-income households, or those facing racial or ethnic discrimination, will spend heavily on socially visible products to make up for their lack of status in society. Even though this theory was developed from observing consumer behaviour of low-income households in the United States of America (USA), it has relevance to a South African BoP context. When traditional indicators of social status, such as wealth or occupational prestige, are not accessible, people resort to the consumption of status products that are easily seen as symbols of a higher class (Fontes & Fan, 2006). This theory might explain why BoP consumers buy occasional luxury foods for their children instead of nutritional ones, and spend beyond their means on festivities and items like cosmetics.

In Figure 6 following, South Africa’s BoP individually spends approximately an additional 1% of their expenditure on alcohol and tobacco.

The Black Box model and Maslow’s framework therefore provide a helpful framework to understand consumer behaviour, although other motivation theories help explain BoP peculiarities, to better understand this market.
2.6 Grocery shopping behaviour of BoP consumers

Store choice

Social exclusion has received much attention in recent years among governments and policy-makers. While there are many aspects of social exclusion, of particular interest to marketers and consumer behaviourists is the issue of the accessibility of consumer goods and services to socially excluded groups (Piacentini, Hibbert & Al-Dajani, 2001). The retail and consumer behaviour literature describes the household shopping behaviour of disadvantaged consumers in terms of types of shopping trips, shopper motives and what he terms the ‘economic shopper’.

Piacentini, Hibbert & Al-Dajani (2001) explain the emphasis on this aspect of grocery shopping as related to a lack of other opportunities for entertainment or socialising outside the home. Their findings suggested participants on low-incomes very rarely went out to places such as pubs, cinemas or other entertainment venues because they could not afford it. Low-income consumers were also particularly selective in achieving value for their money when doing their main shopping. They therefore made extensive use of discount and independent stores. ‘Smart shopping’ ability was considered to be an important skill by consumers who face the challenge of providing for themselves and family members on a low-income. The findings showed that not all people cope with their limited income and disadvantaged position in the same way, illustrating that low-income individuals are not one homogenous group.

While the broad description of the ‘economic shopper’ and ‘convenience shopper’ may be adequate to guide retail positioning in the market as a whole, the development of interventions to meet the needs of disadvantaged groups requires a more complex
description of their shopping habits and factors that explain why they behave as they do.

Different aspects of deprivation were found to have varying effects on patronage behavior, such as income, age, family situation, social support networks and mobility. This is not, however, an exhaustive list. There is likely to be a range of additional factors relating to disadvantage - such as depression and fear of crime - that influence shopping behaviour.

The research was also restricted to lower income groups within the United Kingdom. The growing footprint of SA retailers makes accessibility of consumer goods less of a problem; rather it is the need to understand why BoP consumers choose some FMCG brands over others. Besides the issue of price, Piacentini et al. do not examine the reasons for product choice (Piacentini, Hibbert & Al-Dajani, 2001).

National and private label brands

National brands are defined as brands of the manufacturer as opposed to private label brands “house brands”, which are developed by wholesalers (Webster, 2000; Kotler & Keller, 2007). A private label brand offers greater value to the consumer in either the same quality at a lower price or lower quality at a much lower price (Kotler & Keller, 2007). Kotler (2005) states that private label brands are the biggest risk facing national brands as they are increasingly offering similar or increased quality at lower prices. Webster (2000) argues that consumers who typically are higher price sensitive are likely to purchase private label brands such as house brands. The research findings will shed more light and reveal if BoP consumers in SA are brand conscious.

Product or brand choice

Previous studies have focused on the main signals that have received the greatest attention in the marketing and economics literature: pricing, branding, physical features and retailer reputation (Dawar & Parker, 1994). Dawar & Parker's study on ‘Marketing Universals as
Signals of Product Quality found that in choosing competing brands, consumers were faced with uncertainty of product performance and, more generally, quality. They argue that signals mostly serve as heuristics in assessing product quality when:

(I) There is a need to reduce the perceived risk of purchase;

(2) The consumer lacks the ability to assess quality;

(3) Consumer involvement is low;

(4) Objective quality is too complex to assess;

(5) There is an information search preference and need for information.

The most prevalent signals studied include brand names or brand advertising; product features or appearance; price and product/retail reputation; store names; warranties or guarantees. Brand names have been found to be more important than price, which is, in turn, more important than physical appearance. Retail reputation or store name has been found to be least consequential in signaling product quality. The relative importance of these signals generally follows the extent to which a particular signal is not shared across competitive products. However, the general nature of these findings is limited. The findings of their study may very well be different for the BoP context. The study sample was limited to studies of consumers from the USA and restricted to signals of quality in electronics products (Dawar & Parker, 1994). These findings cannot necessarily be generalised to the FMCG retail sector for the BoP.

To understand the buying behaviour of low-income consumers, we must go to the factors that influence their buying behaviour for a specific product brand.
A review of the literature highlights a number of other factors that impact on buying behaviour. The eleven factors that are briefly critiqued include: Demographics, culture, geographic location, occupation, exposure to urban lifestyles and media, point of purchase, the use of products, involvement of others in the purchase, retail reputation and price. The main constructs of packaging, brand experience are their dimensions are thereafter synthesised.

The demographics and socio-economic profile: personal characteristics of shoppers are defined by the household size, gender, age and education (Omar, 1996). In the South African context, the BoP in particular has attracted little attention beyond Living Standards Measure (LSM) definitions.

- Influence of culture and tradition perception and buying behaviour: For example, the preference in respect of colour, size and shape is often the result of cultural traditions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. Demographics and socio-economic environment of the consumer</th>
<th>7. The points of purchase of product</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. Cultural environment</td>
<td>8. The way the consumer uses the products</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Geographic location</td>
<td>9. Involvement of others in the purchase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Occupation</td>
<td>10. Retail reputation and marketing efforts to reach out the rural market</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Exposure to urban lifestyles</td>
<td>11. Price and value for money (price image of a brand, reservation price, perceived price, evoked price, and price belief and advertised/comparative price, reference price)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Exposure to media and reach</td>
<td>12: Packaging dimensions, visual (colour, size, design and graphics) and informational (product information, technology)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13. Branding: brand experience (senses, affective, intellectual and behavioural)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
factors. Rural consumer perception of products is strongly influenced by cultural factors (Sales and Marketing Management, 2008).

A.C. Nielson, a leading international consumer research company claims the contrary. It believes that consumers worldwide are likely to have roughly similar responses to FMCG, despite cultural differences (The Nation (2002) in Silayoi & Speece, Packaging and Purchase Decisions, 2004). The author will test in detail how the senses are important determinants of the purchasing criteria.

- Geographic locations: rural consumer behaviour is influenced by the proximity of consumers from feeder towns and industrial projects, which influence the buying behaviour of consumers in the respective clusters of villages (Sales and Marketing Management, 2008).

- Occupation and exposure to urban lifestyles: the frequency and channels though which a consumer is paid may influence their behaviour. Most BoP literature alludes to these consumers being paid small amounts and generally in cash, as they have no bank account (Prahalad & Hart, 2001). Increased exposure and interaction with urban communities has been the trend in recent years.

- The way the consumer uses the products: the manner in which consumers use the product also influences their buying. The example is a lack of access to electricity decreasing the use of washing powders as people consumers wash their clothes in streams or ponds. It is argued that these consumers opt for washing bars and detergent cakes (Sales and Marketing Management, 2008).

- Exposure to media and enlarged media reach, and places of purchase: the author has established that BoP is not a monolithic entity; hence, there are even different
degrees of impoverishment, such as BoP 3 and BoP 4 (Prahalad & Hart, 2001). BoP consumers have varying degrees of access to media stimuli and differ in their requirements from different outlets. Some buy from village shopkeepers (Spaza shops), while others buy from the town that serves as the feeder to the rural area. The mining town of Carltonville is a feeder to the primary catchment area that includes households from Khutsong, Blybank, Welverdiend, Deelkraal, Blyvooruitsig and the residential hostels at the mines (Fernridge, 2007).

A United Kingdom study in grocery purchase behaviour found that 79% of consumers of both national and own label grocery stores perceived television and radio information sources of little help. It is argued that consumers do not think very deeply about brands prior to going into the store. A study conducted by Connoly and Davidson (1996) validates this point of view by concluding that 73% of purchase decisions are made at the point of sale, making this prime sought after real estate by brands trying to capture market share (Silayoi & Speece, The importance of packaging attributes: a conjoint analysis approach, 2007). This creates an even stronger proposition for research into packaging influencing the brand experience to be carried out (Sales and Marketing Management, 2008).

**Involvement of others in the purchase:** in India, there has been a change in recent years. In the past, the head of the family - typically the male - used to make the purchase decision all by himself. Older men were also found to be more loyal to national brands (Omar, 1996). With an increase in literacy and education levels, there is greater access to information, and the involvement of the other members of the family in the purchase decision has been growing in recent years. As a result,
the purchase decision is postponed up until the point of sale (Sehrawet & Kundu, 2007).

- **Marketing efforts to reach out to the rural market:** Over the last several years, many corporate companies have been trying hard to develop a market for their products in the rural and low-income areas. This has brought about some change in the way buyers purchase different products. Developmental marketing has created discriminating buyers and a previously unknown demand in the rural market.

- **Prices:** Price sensitivity is the most recurring determinant cited in BoP and low-income consumer behaviour literature (Chattopadhyay & Laborie, 2005). The US Department of Agricultures (USDA) Economic Research Service (ERS) found that retail food prices varied with the type of store and its locations. Rural, lower income areas have fewer supermarkets and face up to 4% higher prices than those in urban area (US Department of Agriculture, 1985). As a construct, prices are multifaceted. They have been found to take the forms of price image of a brand; reservation price; perceived price; evoked price, and price belief and advertised/comparative price. It has also been established that shoppers evaluate an offer based on a benchmark called reference price (Sinha & Prasad, 2004). Pricing is, however, beyond the scope of this research.

A synopsis of the literature review reveals that there are multitudes of interrelated factors that influence the buying behaviour of low-income consumers, and hence affects their responses to the marketing mix variables, and the reference points they use for purchase decisions. This study, however, focused on two constructs and the relationship between them: product packaging - independent variable; and brand experience – dependant variable.
With the saturation of western markets and the pressure of maintaining growth rates, companies are forced to look at growing they distribution reach in developing countries. They have to reconsider what attributes make the difference and give them a competitive advantage. For some companies, packaging can make this difference. The value of the global packaging market is estimated at US$500 billion, with the food industry accounting for 35% of the global packaging industry (Rundh, 2005). Despite this, it is only recently that packaging has started to attract research into its various elements, its influence on brand choice, and the purchasing decision (Silayoi & Speece, Packaging and Purchase Decisions, 2004).

**Packaging construct:** different researchers point to the cross-functional and multi-dimensional aspects of packaging. The role of packaging has thus evolved from the traditional function of protecting the products through distribution channels against dirt, damage, theft, mishandling and deterioration. This functional role is a basic requirement of all packaging. The most common types of packaging materials are glass, metals, plastics, paper and board. (Silayoi & Speece, Packaging and Purchase Decisions, 2004).

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). Packaging has become important in consumer need satisfaction: in cost savings for BoP and reduction of packaging material usage, leading to a substantial increase in cooperate profits. Packaging plays a strategic role in seven out of the ten in-store purchase decisions, and is, therefore, an important domain through which companies can embed knowledge and
customer preferences to new, innovative product packages (Bone & Corey, 2000).

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.

Packaging is the first point of contact with the brand for a consumer product (Rundh, 2005). 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). On average, urban supermarkets carry 50 000 items and the typical shopper passes 300 items per minute (Rundh, 2005). 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).

**Dimensions of packaging:** consumer decision-making has been defined as a mental orientation characterising a consumer’s approach to making choices. This approach deals with cognitive and affective orientations in the process of decision-making.

Pinya and Mark (2004) argue that FMCG are low involvement products, as consumers do not search extensively for information about the brands, evaluate their characteristics, or make a weighty decision on which brand to buy. They argue that these product lines are low risk and not important. This may be the case for most developed countries, but may not
necessarily be representative of the average BoP consumer in SA, spending 30% of their income on FMCG products (AMPS, 2008), which is fairly substantial given their financial earnings.

**Figure 6: BoP household expenditure in SA**

In terms of monthly Rand value, Bop consumers spend R132 per person on food.

**Figure 7: Rands per person per month**
The packaging elements that follow are also shared by the brand experience construct (DV), as the author will show in subsequent paragraphs. They are particularly important in understanding consumer preferences on FMCG brand products and what makes these products stand out from rival brands on the retail shelf.

Based on previous literature, four main packaging elements are argued to affect the consumer’s purchase decision. These elements broadly fall into two categories: 1) Visual elements consisting of colours, graphics, design size, shape and packaging. These attributes relate to the affective side of decision-making. 2) The information elements relating to the contents provided and technologies used in the packaging, and more likely to address the cognitive side of decision-making, such as educating the customer and the overall image of the brand (Silayoi & Speece, Packaging and Purchase Decisions, 2004).

**Visual Elements**

**Colour and Graphics:**

Food products use a number of indirect communication packaging attributes, such as combining colours. In packaging, colour is seen to be the primary aspect involved in subtle consumer communication. This is the reason cosmetic products are normally in pastel colors, black or gold, to communicate classic elegance. Pharmaceutical products use light colors or a white background to depict cleanliness, purity and efficacy. With cigarettes, white packaging suggests less tar whilst red packaging implies a strong flavor.
Companies entering new emerging markets have to be careful in choosing packaging colours and logos that are culturally appropriate (Gutierrez, 2001). The use of colour is obvious and well-developed and can be effective because of strong brand associations. However, people in different cultures develop their own unique colour affinity (Silayoi & Speece, Packaging and Purchase Decisions, 2004).

Companies also use packaging attributes such as graphics that include layout and the use of powerful product photography, to create an image to help in attracting and sustaining attention (Silayoi & Speece, The importance of packaging attributes: a conjoint analysis approach, 2007). Trademarks, such as the ‘Proudly South African’ nationalist campaign, and the use of texture to convey intrinsic attributes like purity, value, fun, elegance, femininity or masculinity are also important tools. 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). Grossman and Wisenblit (1999) argue that for low involvement products, marketing communications need to have a strong impact, particularly as images affect consumer decisions, making graphics and colour crucial. For many consumers of low involvement, the packaging becomes the product, particularly because of impressions formed on initial contact. Rettie and Brewe (2000) argue that the recall is better for verbal stimuli when the copy is on the right hand side of the package, and better for non-verbal stimuli when it is on the left hand side of the package (Silayoi & Speece, Packaging and Purchase Decisions, 2004).
Packaging design, size and shape:

The package design involves more than the surface aesthetics of the package. It is influenced by the entire marketing program, including the package-product combination, the corporate logo or symbol, the distribution and pricing policy, and the promotional effort.

Communication to the buyer:

All packaging elements communicate something, so the image projected by the package must ‘speak’ to the image being sought for the product (O’Shaughnessy 1995). The package design must depict at once the intended use, method of application, and desired results.

It is imperative for FMCG manufacturers to understand consumer responses to their packaging and integrate the perceptual process into the design. In the design process marketers and designers must take consumers’ past experiences, needs and wants into consideration when developing new line extensions or innovating their products (Silayoi & Speece, The importance of packaging attributes: a conjoint analysis approach, 2007).

In South African townships, Unilever’s Handy Andy household cleaner is sometimes left on the counter for guests to see as a status product (Mahajan, 2008). There has also been primary exploratory research that found Unilever washing powder to also be a status product (Rimmell, 2008).
Attraction of the buyer

Packaging must have enough shelf impact to differentiate itself among a multitude of packages. The packaging must draw attention to its self and stand out from a plethora of competing product packages and brands. This can be done through the effective choice of color, shape, copy, trademark, logo, and other features, as discussed (Sehrawet & Kundu, 2007). For instance, consumers generally perceive more elongated products to be larger. Different sizes also appeal to different consumers. Some products are made cheaper through repackaging in smaller quantities, or removing the packaging at the end of the supply chain.

A recent South African township study on informal trading revealed that “an entrepreneurial revolution of sorts, started by Somali entrepreneurs, has revived the Spaza shops to the extent of the demise of the owner-managed township house shop”. These entrepreneurs have increased the range of products and creatively repackaged products so BoP consumers now have accessibility and no longer have to walk distances of up to 10km.
to buy goods such as cosmetics, spices and groceries. Spaza shops have become sensitive to local consumer needs and have, in some cases, removed all packaging or repackaged products. For instance, the study showed how these entrepreneurs were selling sugar by the spoonful, as opposed to the 500g packet that is too much of an outlay of capital for BoP consumers (Terblanche, 2010).

Figure 9: A female Somali entrepreneur and her fully stocked Spaza shop

According to findings from AMPS SA (2008), the collorory may be true. BoP consumers prefer buying in bulk, therefore contradicting the BoP ‘loose’ sachet debate (Prahalad & Hart, 2001). Using primary surveys in the supermarket, the research questions on packaging will help to triangulate and validate if SA BoP consumers prefer smaller or bulk packages.

Information elements

All necessary information must be clearly visible or implied though the design. This communication may either be direct or subtle. Direct communication describes the product, its benefits and how to use it (Gutierrez, 2001).

Product information

High involvement purchases are less influenced by image and visual response. Written information on the pack can assist consumers in making their decisions carefully as they
consider the characteristics. However, packaging information can ironically create too much confusion or mislead with information. Small font size and dense writing styles on the labels often lead to poor readability. One way consumers reduce this clutter and paradox of choice is by narrowing down choice sets. Pinya and Mark (2004) do not address the challenges BoP individuals face, such as illiteracy or not speaking or understanding the language the information is written in. The brands’ packaging effectiveness will also be verified later by a question regarding the packaging labeling.

Packaging technology

Customers are often prepared to pay slightly more for an enhanced product value, indicating the desire for quality. Technology is a special case relative to the information elements because packaging technology conveys information that is often linked to the consumer’s lifestyle. In other words, technology developed for packaging comes directly from consumer behaviour. Product and packaging development also have constrains on fully meeting consumer and channel criteria. Pinya and Mark (2004) categorise these constrains into ingredients, processing and cost restraints.

They do not mention the various BoP constraints, such as lack of electricity results in less shelf life for some products. Innovation must respond to each segments of society with products that are more efficiently produced, packaged for a longer shelf life, environmentally friendly, and nutritional. In order to survive high growth competitive markets, technology becomes important for developing packaging materials and processes (Silayoi & Speece, Packaging and Purchase Decisions, 2004).

Creating a desire for the package

The packaging can convince the consumer that the product can fulfill a need or satisfy an inner desire. Packaging usually adds value, like the convenience now being offered by
‘microwaveable’ packaged foods. With the increase of educated woman in India there has been an upsurge in purchasing loose to prepackaged and branded products, from tea to ketchup and noodles. Shampoo and packaged biscuits are two good examples of India’s hunger for branded products. Sachets at affordable price points are being pushed by companies like Hindustan Lever Limited (HLL) and Cavin Kare in rural markets (Sehrawet & Kundu, 2007). HLL recognised the BoP consumer’s inability to pay for large packages of salt. Annapurna, therefore, responded by introducing a 200gm low unit price to appeal to these consumers (Prahalad & Hart, 2001). Other examples include special pump dispensers to promote liquid soap over the traditional bar of soap. Advances in packaging technology have kept pace with the demand for convenient packaging.

**Selling the product**

A key to maximising packaging impact is to understand the consumer’s response to packaging. The Director of the Bureau of Entrepreneurship and Enterprise Development, which works with Thai SMEs, believes that packaging is an important area that small entrepreneurs need to develop expertise in (Silayoi & Speece, Packaging and Purchase Decisions, 2004). Packaging must not only sell the product but also create the desire for repeat purchases. This can be in the form of reusable (Timol, 2010) features, special giveaways, or easy dispensing devices, which promote repeat sales and add value. For example, BoP consumers have been found to buy an Energade or Powerade drink that is normally above their budget to keep the packaging bottle and innovative cap for filling up with tap water later (Timol, 2010).
Figure: 10 Powerade bottles are sought after to be used to carry water afterwards

Measuring packaging

Package research primarily assesses the packaging’s physical attributes over its distribution and useful life (protection) functions. Packaging design research operates in psychological involvement with products and their packaging (Stern 1981). The selection of appropriate package design research methodology is dependent on the type of information required when making design decisions.

The available methods are classified into ocular or verbal tests (Stern 1981). Ocular tests are used to determine exactly what a person's eyes see, and how long they dwell on each element that they see. The ocular test only gives an indication of whether the packaging is highly visible on the shelf or not. This is crucial during new product introductions when the consumers are unfamiliar with the product. The consumer’s decision whether to purchase the product or not, however, would be influenced by several other factors. This kind of measurement is beyond the scope of this research, as it is not cost-effective.
Verbal tests usually require less sophisticated instrumentation and are most often used for their flexibility and ease of administration. They can provide valuable insights, both in a qualitative and a quantitative study (Gutierrez, 2001). Conjoint analysis has been widely used in marketing to evaluate customer preferences of products. It has also been frequently applied in examining preferences for food product attributes. Most discussions on the conjoint methodology point out the importance of balancing the number of attributes required to realistically represent the packaging against the need to simplify the representations so that it does not complicate the respondent’s ranking task (Silayoi & Speece, The importance of packaging attributes: a conjoint analysis approach, 2007).

Sehrawat & Kundu (2007) conducted research into the buying behaviour of rural and urban consumers in India. They specifically looked at the impact of packaging on over 1,090 respondents. Over 15 variables were identified and the data was analysed by applying counts, percentages, means and analysis of variance. A comprehensive questionnaire was constructed covering 15 variables related to the packaging. All the responses on variables related to this study were obtained on a 5-point scale. These variables may be seen through Figure 11. The data were collected through a schedule. A multi-stage sampling method was used for the study. The study was conducted in all four administrative divisions of the north-western state of Haryana in India. The survey was administered in eight randomly selected cities/towns and 16 villages across.
Figure 11: Packaging survey conducted in Harvana in India

1. Packaging adds value to the product
2. Packaging helps in buying the product
3. Better-packaged products are better
4. Strong packaging positively influences the buying decision
5. Ease of carriage positively influences the buying decision
6. Light weight packaging positively influences the buying decision
7. Simplicity of packaging positively influences the buying decision
8. Consistency in packaging for different products of the same company positively influences buying decision positively
9. Transparent packaging is preferred
10. Ease of storage positively influences the buying decision
11. Packaging helps in identifying and distinguishing products
12. Packaging helps in avoiding pilferage
13. A label is an important part of packaging
14. Packaging misleads buyers
15. Packaging is an environmental hazard

Sehrawet & Kundu, 2007

It is clear from the literature that packaging plays an important role in consumers’ decision-making of packaged food products. Rising consumer affluence appears to show that consumers are willing to pay more for convenience, appearance, dependability and prestige of better packages (Kotler 2000). The author deduces that the Sehrawet & Kundu (2007) study looked at the BoP consumers’ context in India, and hence the questionnaires’ constructs can be used for the purposes of this research.

The second construct that will be discussed is “Brand experience”.

2.7 Branding vs. the brand experience

Brand experience is a construct that has been studied by a few authors who use different terminology to refer to it. The literature refers to it as ‘brand experience’ or ‘experiential marketing.’
Branding

The branding approach to marketing has changed considerably. Marketing specialists traditionally looked at their campaigns in terms of product, price, promotion and place, giving the status of a commodity. Branding certainly cannot only view products just in terms of their functional features, benefits and quality. This is a given and only the point of entry. This view of branding misses the very essence of a brand as a rich source of sensory, affective and cognitive associations that result in memorable and rewarding brand experiences. Customers want products that have marketing campaigns that appeal to their senses, touch their hearts, and stimulate their minds. They want products, communications and campaigns that they can relate to or that they can incorporate into their lifestyles. They want communications campaigns to deliver an experience. The degree to which a company is able to stage a desirable customer experience will largely determine its success in the global marketplace (Bemd, 1999).

The brand experience

In contrast to its narrow focus on functional features and benefits, experiential marketers view consumers as rational and emotional human beings who are concerned with achieving pleasurable experiences when they consume a brand or visit a retail store. Brakus, Schmitt & Zarantonello (2009) break down the concept into four dimensions, which are differentially evoked by various brands:

1) Sensory experiences (SENSE) through sight, sound, touch, taste and smell;

2) Affective experiences (FEEL) in terms of emotions

3) Intellectual (THINK)

4) Behavioural experiences (ACT) (Bemd, 1999).
Increasingly, consumer shopping behaviour is being assessed from the holistic perspective of an entire shopping experience. The holistic view requires a retailer to focus on the shopping experience within the store, and at the point of sale of the product on the shelf. Thus, the retailer’s focus should not be on the store itself but rather what the store and product range means to the shoppers. This implies that a retailer needs to understand the ‘way in which’ different shoppers perceive the same store. Shopping and service experiences occur when a consumer interacts with a store’s physical environment, its personnel and its policies and practices (Brakus et al., 2009). When consumers browse stores and shops for different brands, they are exposed to useful product attributes. However, they are also exposed to various specific brand-related stimuli, such as brand-identifying colours, shapes, background design elements, slogans, mascots and brand characters. These brand-related stimuli appear as part of a brand’s design, identity and packaging in environments in which the brand is marketed, and so constitute the major source of subjective, internal consumer responses.

Brakus, Schmitt & Zarantonello (2009) conceptualise the brand experience as subjective, internal consumer responses (sensations, feelings and cognitions) and behavioural responses evoked by brand-related stimuli that are part of a brand’s design and identity, packaging, communications and environments. The sensory stimulants that accompany an experience should support and enhance its theme. The more senses an experience engages, the more effective and memorable it can be (Brakus, Schmitt & Zarantonello, 2009).
Measuring brand experience

Brand experiences vary in strength and intensity; that is, some brand experiences are stronger or more intense than others. Some brand experiences occur spontaneously without much reflection and are short-lived. Others occur more deliberately and last longer. Over time, these long-lasting brand experiences, stored in the consumer’s memory, should affect consumer satisfaction and loyalty (Oliver 1997; Reicheld 1996). The twelve item brand experience scale that Brakus, Schmitt & Zarantonello (2009) developed successfully passed various reliability and validity tests, including test–retest reliability and criterion validity.

The brand experience scale displays discriminate validity from some of the most widely used branding measures and scales, including brand evaluations, brand involvement, brand attachment, customer delight, and brand personality. Brand experience has a behavioural impact; it affects consumer satisfaction and loyalty directly and indirectly through brand personality. This could have direct ramifications for the retail store and the individual product line owned by a national brand in terms of its packaging and how this affects brand experience.

**Figure: 12 Brand Experience Scale**

(Brakus, Schmitt & Zarantonello, 2009)
The scale used by Brakus, Schmitt & Zarantonello (2009) is useful not only in academic research but also in marketing practice. As marketers engage in projects to understand and improve the experience their brands provide for their customers, they can use the scale for assessment, planning and tracking purposes. The critique of the scale, however, is that it does not measure whether an experience is positive or negative, but nevertheless, having an experience in and of themselves seems to have value and results in positive outcomes. The research in question will combine the packaging construct that looks at positive and negative preferences and will, when combined, be able to yield more meaningful results. What remains to be seen in BoP consumer behaviour is to what degree product packaging influences brand experience.

2.8 Conclusions: Through an extensive review and synthesis of the literature it is clear that an opportunity exists to empirically test product packaging influence on the customer brand experience.
2. RESEARCH HYPOTHESES
In order to investigate the decision criteria of Base of the Pyramid consumers, the research objectives are combined with the literature, synthesised, and the following research hypotheses are proposed.

3.1 Main Hypothesis 1:

H1$_A$: Grocery packaging will influence customer brand experience.

H1$_0$: Grocery packaging will not influence customer brand experience.

Sub Hypothesis 2:

H2$_A$: Perceptions of Packaging differ across all product categories.

H2$_0$: Perceptions of Packaging do not differ across all product categories.

Sub Hypothesis 3:

H3$_A$: Levels of Brand Experience differ across all product categories.

H3$_0$: Levels of Brand Experience do not differ across all product categories.

According to the (Sehrawet & Kundu, 2007) packaging scale and the brand experience scale (Brakus, Schmitt, & Zarantonello, 2009).
4. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY
4.1 Choice of methodology

The methodology purpose was to help depict the process that the researcher undertook. It aims to provide details and information so future researchers can replicate or improve on the study.

Descriptive research was the choice of method to seek answers that best suited this study. The research design was quantitative in nature; however, the researcher did pre-test the questionnaire qualitatively by getting consumers’ insight into their reasons for buying the product. This process also helped to refine the questionnaire, enhance its readability and minimize the chances of questions being misinterpreted. It also allowed for testing how the questionnaire would translate into other ethnic languages such as Zulu. There has been previous research conducted on the BoP context, none of which looked at the influence of packaging on the brand experience of BoP consumers in the FMCG and retail industries.

4.2 Population and unit of analysis

Approximately 20.9 million people in SA are considered low-income earners. They fall into the LSM 5 segment and earn under R4 200, on average (Eighty20, 2009). The sample population was BoP individuals from the Carltonville area. The total population is approximately 182 000 people, according to Stats SA 2008, of which 54 406 earn under R3 000 a month and can be considered to be BoP (Fernridge, 2007).

The unit of analysis was a BoP consumer choosing their products in a Cartonville supermarket.
The control variable to make the findings more robust was to exclude people over LSM 5. Approximately 19 surveys were discarded due to these individuals not matching the sample population required. The researcher chose Cartonville as the focus area because of the large influx of mining workers who earn under R4 200 (LSM 5), as well as the fact that Cartonville retail outlets act as a feeder to nearby rural settlements such as Khutsong, Blybank, Welverdiend, Deelkraal, Blyvooruitsig and the residential hostels at the mines (Fernridge, 2007).

The general population, therefore, was seen to be under LSM 5. Cartonville is also rather representative of other small, low-income urban nodes in SA, but the results have been generalised. The survey was conducted at an independently-owned supermarket store called Star Hyper (which happens to represent the BoP demographics), located at 14 Ada Street, Carletonville, 2499 (Timol, 2010).

**Figure 13: Map of the Cartonville area**
4.3 Sample size and method

Non-probability sampling was used as there was a high probability of any particular member of the population being chosen to be BoP, and there was no list of all consumers in Cartonville. The actual survey was carried out near the point of purchase (product shelves). The benefits of this included the ability to obtain a large number of completed questionnaires quickly and at a low cost. Three hundred people were asked to take part in the survey. The respondents that chose to participate in the research were qualified in terms of being under LSM 5 (Sanders, Lewis & Thornhill, 2009).

4.4 Data gathering process and research instrument

Mr Timol (2010), Managing Director of Star Hyper, pointed to the fact that his sales cycles were particularly high at the beginning of each month and the middle of the month, but slowed down considerably by the 20\textsuperscript{th} of each month. He alluded to shoppers purchasing different sizes and brands depending on the day of the month and the individuals’ personal cash flow. For instance, mine workers generally visit the store to purchase for themselves, and then again when they purchase in bulk to send goods away. Their purchasing criteria, therefore, differed at different intervals in the month. The sample would have been skewed if the researcher just conducted the survey over one day, so the researcher undertook to conduct the survey on three different days during the month to get an average in the data collection (September- Monday 6\textsuperscript{th}, Saturday 11\textsuperscript{th} and Friday 23\textsuperscript{rd}).
A questionnaire was deployed for the purpose of data gathering. Respondents were randomly approached inside the retail store at the following points of purchase:

1) The refrigerators (dairy section).

2) The tin foods shelves, which were also opposite the maize meal shelves, a key staple food in South Africa.

3) The biscuit shelves.

The questionnaire comprised of two parts:

The first part consisted of questions referring to the demographic profile of the participants to verify that they are fell under LSM 5 and formed part the of BoP consumers in SA. The research context was slightly different to the original context, as more stringent demographic questions were added to make the study more robust in terms of only getting BoP consumers to answer the questionnaire.

The demographic questions covered gender, age, education, occupation, monthly income, ethnic group, first language, family size and status of the family buying unit. The frequency of the purchase was also included.

The second part comprised of a series of statements reflecting the various dimensions that define the behavioural constructs of the study. The questions were taken from two separate studies, namely Brand Experience (Brakus, Schmitt, & Zarantonello, 2009) and Product Packaging (Sehrawet & Kundu, 2007). The questions were simplified slightly in terms of language, while retaining the main construct internally valid.
All statements were measured on a seven-point Likert scale in order to obtain sufficient differences, ranging from strongly disagree (1) to strongly agree (7). To reduce the possibility of respondent bias, some of the statement constructs were reversed and the statements were mixed, irrespective of the construct.

4.5 Method of analysis

Scale reliability and validity

There are two statistical techniques used to test each of these. For reliability, the author looked at Cronbach Alpha (Sanders, Lewis & Thornhill, 2009); and for validity, the author conducted a Factor Analysis (Sanders, Lewis & Thornhill, 2009).

Cronbach Alpha was computed for each of the two scales (Brand Experience and Packaging) in an iterative process designed to identify those statements or variables that gave the most reliable scale. The first round of reliability tests was conducted on all the statements making up the scale. The research then identified statements that were bringing down the alpha. In other words, as part of the analysis it depicted the strength alpha would increase or decrease by if certain statements were removed. Using this as criteria for removing statements from the scale, the researcher was able to improve Cronbach’s Alpha across both scales. A scale with a Cronbach Alpha that greater than 0.6 is usually a reliable scale (Sanders, Lewis & Thornhill, 2009).

Factor analysis

Factor analysis was a useful technique to reduce the total number of variables/statements in the questionnaire in order to represent a smaller number of factors that were used for further analysis (Sanders, Lewis & Thornhill, 2009). A factor-loading score measured the
explains the strength of association for each statement on its corresponding factor. Explained variation was used to give an idea of how well the factors represented the statements. To test validity, a factor analysis on all the statements in each scale was conducted. The results of the factor analysis did not significantly show any issues with how statements were answered.

For the purpose of this analysis, reliability tests were run parallel to the factor analysis tests, to see which mix of statements would generate the best Cronbach alpha; and would load onto a single factor. These single factors were found to represent each of the scales. In short, six statements we identified for each scale that represented the best reliability and which could be reduced to a single factor for further analysis. Only when the factor loadings for the statements were loading high enough on the single factor had the scale passed the validity test. After the scale was found to be reliable and valid, a composite score was created to use for further analysis.

The next step was to use these composite scores, in the form of averages, to conduct the correlation and Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) analysis (Sanders, Lewis & Thornhill, 2009).

Correlation analysis

The Pearson correlation coefficient ($r$) was used to test if a linear relationship exists between two variables. The correlation coefficient is a statistical measure of the association between two numerical variables (Zikmund, 2003). The value of $r$ ranges from +1.0 to -1.0, where a positive $r$ value indicates a direct relationship and a negative $r$ value represents an inverse relationship between two variables. The relationship between brand experience and grocery packaging was tested using a correlation analysis.
ANOVA

ANOVA was used to generalise two sample t-tests to more than two groups. It is a technique used to see how means differ across different categories. One is the numerical variable (the composite scale score); and the other a categorical/qualitative variable (the names of the products). ANOVA was used to compute and compare the mean scores for each product category, and then see if these means were the same across all the different product categories, or if there were significant differences.

The author used ANOVA to see if the levels of brand experience and the perceptions of packaging were the same, or if they varied across all the different products.

4.6 Research limitations

As a result of using non-probability sampling, the results of this inquiry cannot be generalised.

By focusing on a range of behavioural issues and by accessing individuals at the BoP who are highly heterogeneous, the author may have involved the ‘noise’ of significant external factors that may have impacted on the relationships being investigated. Given high illiteracy levels and possible language barriers in the sample population, the researcher also made use of a translator to help explain and administer the survey in several different languages.

The methodology has provided a step-by-step process, which the researcher undertook. This study can therefore, be replicated using the same approach to try and yield similar results, perhaps in other BoP areas around SA.
5. RESULTS
Chapter 5 presents the sample and results of this research by way of tables and figures.

The data are clustered around the research hypothesis by way of descriptive and analytical statistics.

5.1 Response rate

The research made use of a survey deployed in the Star Hyper supermarket in the Carltonville area to deliberately sample low-income consumers under LSM 5. The researcher conducted the surveys during three days during the course of the month (September 2010). It was anticipated that 300 people would be interviewed, however, about 50 people turned down the request to participate and 23 did not want to complete the survey half way through. A further 19 respondents were not BoP consumers. This resulted in 208 completed questionnaires that is large enough to draw statistical findings from.

5.2 Biographical information of respondents

The following is a depiction of the demographics of the sample population surveyed.

Table 1: Gender frequencies of sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Valid %</th>
<th>Cumulative %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>125</td>
<td>60.1</td>
<td>60.1</td>
<td>60.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>39.9</td>
<td>39.9</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 14: Gender demographics
Education

Table 2: Descriptive statistics for education levels amongst sample population:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Valid</th>
<th>Missing</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Range</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non literate</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>22.6</td>
<td>22.6</td>
<td>22.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary school</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>59.1</td>
<td>59.1</td>
<td>81.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matriculate</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3: Frequency of education levels for Sample Population:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Valid %</th>
<th>Cumulative %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non literate</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>22.6</td>
<td>22.6</td>
<td>22.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary school</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>59.1</td>
<td>59.1</td>
<td>81.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matriculate</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 15: Education levels amongst sample population
Occupation

Table 4: Descriptive statistics for Occupation levels amongst samples population

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Valid</th>
<th>Missing</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Range</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>80.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>38.5</td>
<td>38.5</td>
<td>38.5</td>
<td>38.5</td>
<td>38.5</td>
<td>38.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informal work</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>44.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>21.2</td>
<td>21.2</td>
<td>21.2</td>
<td>21.2</td>
<td>21.2</td>
<td>59.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>62.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mining</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>51.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>87.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>27.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>208.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5: Frequency of occupation levels for sample population

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Valid %</th>
<th>Cumulative %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>38.5</td>
<td>38.5</td>
<td>38.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informal work</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>21.2</td>
<td>21.2</td>
<td>59.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>62.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mining</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>87.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 16: Occupation levels amongst sample population
Language

Table 6: Descriptive statistics for language amongst sample population

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Valid</th>
<th>Missing</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Range</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>208</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5.03</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7: Frequency for Languages spoken amongst sample population

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Valid %</th>
<th>Cumulative %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Twana</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>9.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xhosa</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>17.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sotho</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>20.7</td>
<td>20.7</td>
<td>38.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zulu</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td>57.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tsonga</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>26.4</td>
<td>26.4</td>
<td>83.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Sotho</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>98.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 17: Languages spoken amongst sample population
Frequency of purchase

Table 8: Descriptive statistics for frequency of purchase

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Frequency of purchase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>Vali</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>2.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mode</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9: Frequencies of purchase levels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency of purchase</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Valid %</th>
<th>Cumulative %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Every two months</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Every month</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>46.6</td>
<td>46.9</td>
<td>58.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Every two weeks</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>19.7</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td>77.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Every week</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>21.2</td>
<td>21.3</td>
<td>99.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Twice a week</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>99.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-4 times a week</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>99.5</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valid Total</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Total</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 18: Frequency of purchase amongst sample population
5.3 Preparation of data

Cronbach’s Alpha was calculated to test the internal consistency as a measure of reliability for the Brand Experience and Packaging scales. Furthermore, factor analysis was conducted on each scale to investigate its construct validity. The reliability and validity results are summarised, as follows:

**Table 10: Reliability and validity for brand experience construct.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Iteration (N=208)</th>
<th>No. of Statements included</th>
<th>Cronbach Alpha</th>
<th>No. of Factors</th>
<th>Explained Variation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.727</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.742</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>62.67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.815</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>53.80%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All negatively worded statements were reverse coded prior to analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. in Qnr</th>
<th>Statements</th>
<th>Factor Loadings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>This brand makes a strong impression (feeling) on my visual sense.</td>
<td>0.703</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>I find this brand interesting in a sensory (seeing, hearing, touching, smelling and tasting) way.</td>
<td>0.724</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>This brand induces (makes) feelings.</td>
<td>0.748</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>This brand is an emotional brand (I buy it because I feel happy about this brand).</td>
<td>0.823</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>This brand results in bodily experiences (it makes me feel good/happy/sad/brings back memories).</td>
<td>0.783</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.10.</td>
<td>I think a lot when I encounter this brand.</td>
<td>0.600</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 11: Reliability and validity for product packaging construct.

All negatively worded statements were reverse coded prior to analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Iteration (N=208)</th>
<th>No. of Statements Included</th>
<th>Cronbach Alpha</th>
<th>No. of Factors</th>
<th>Explained Variation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0.238</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>63.81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.287</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>58.17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>45.45%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. in Qnr</th>
<th>Statements</th>
<th>Factor Loadings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>Packaging is important.</td>
<td>0.719</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>Packaging helps in buying.</td>
<td>0.906</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>Better packaged products are better.</td>
<td>0.573</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>Strong packaging makes me want to buy.</td>
<td>0.872</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.10</td>
<td>I like packages that are easy to store.</td>
<td>0.374</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.13</td>
<td>Label (name/information/instructions) is an important part of package.</td>
<td>0.400</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.3.1 Recoding of data

As per the literature review, the research focused on two variables: Brand experience and Packaging. The first issue that became apparent prior to running the reliability and validity tests was that most of the statements were positively worded and only a few of them were negatively worded. To get the best scale reliability/validity results, the researcher had to recode the negatively worded statements, which was the first step in this process.

5.3.2 Scale reliability and validity

The alphas were good and were found to be over 0.7, and the factor analyses verified that the scale was valid and reliable as it had higher factor loadings.
5.4 Tests of hypotheses

5.4.1 Hypothesis 1 – Grocery packaging will influence the customer brand experience

Table 12: Correlation analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Brand Experience</th>
<th>Packaging</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brand Experience</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correlation Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>0.091</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Packaging</td>
<td>.117</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correlation Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>0.091</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>208</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- There is a correlation of 0.117 between brand experience and packaging.
- The two-tailed significance is greater than 5% but less than 10%, indicating a weak relationship.

5.4.2 Sub-hypothesis 2 – Perceptions of packaging differ across all product categories

ANOVA results

A one-way ANOVA was conducted to compare the mean packaging scores across the different product categories. The results showed a non-significant effect of mean packaging scores at the p<.05 level for the various product categories [F (18, 188) = 0.98, p = 0.481]. The mean packaging scores are show in the following descriptive table. The majority of the packaging mean scores range between 4.5 and 5, which further indicates that there were no significant differences in the packaging ratings for all the products.
Table 13: Anova results for packaging

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>1.464</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>.081</td>
<td>.983</td>
<td>.481</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>15.553</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>.083</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>17.017</td>
<td>206</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 14: Standard deviation and Confidence intervals for products

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Product</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACE maize 5kg</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4.917</td>
<td>.28868</td>
<td>.08333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White star maize 5kg</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>4.882</td>
<td>.27629</td>
<td>.05221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Koo beans 410g</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>4.820</td>
<td>.22361</td>
<td>.04472</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Koo chalaka 410g</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.950</td>
<td>.10000</td>
<td>.05000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aunt Sally’s beans 410g</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.750</td>
<td>.25635</td>
<td>.09063</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lucky Star pilchards 400g</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.750</td>
<td>.33166</td>
<td>.16583</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clover full cream 2l</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4.700</td>
<td>.44924</td>
<td>.12968</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inkomzai 2l</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4.813</td>
<td>.24456</td>
<td>.06315</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friesland milk</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4.754</td>
<td>.24234</td>
<td>.07307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rama original 500g</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4.807</td>
<td>.26287</td>
<td>.07291</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romi margarine 500g</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4.711</td>
<td>.23688</td>
<td>.07896</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rondo margarine 500g</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.712</td>
<td>.27484</td>
<td>.09717</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stork spread 1kg</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4.620</td>
<td>.32592</td>
<td>.10306</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bakers Tennis biscuits 200grams</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.750</td>
<td>.30166</td>
<td>.12315</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bakers Lemon Creams</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.760</td>
<td>.33615</td>
<td>.15033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bakers Marie biscuits</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4.833</td>
<td>.22361</td>
<td>.07454</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casamia time 150g</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.685</td>
<td>.32367</td>
<td>.12234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casamia Lemon Creams 150g</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.614</td>
<td>.34365</td>
<td>.12989</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casamia Marie biscuits 150g</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4.7214</td>
<td>.34009</td>
<td>.09089</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>4.7812</td>
<td>.28741</td>
<td>.01998</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.4.3 Sub-hypothesis 3 – Levels of brand experience differ across all product categories

This hypothesis was tested by running another one-way ANOVA to compare the mean brand experience scores across the different product categories. The ANOVA table shows a significant effect of the brand experience scores at the p<.05 level for the various product categories [F (18, 188) = 21.796, p = 0.000].

**Table 15: ANOVA results**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Brand Experience</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>75.033</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4.169</td>
<td>21.796</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>35.954</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>.191</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>110.988</td>
<td>206</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Post hoc comparisons were conducted to identify where the significant differences in the brand experience scores lay across all the different product categories.

The following summarises the significant findings.

**Table 16: t test results**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(I) Base Product</th>
<th>(J) Reference Product</th>
<th>Mean Difference (I-J)</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White Star maize 5kg</td>
<td>ACE maize 5kg</td>
<td>-1.45000*</td>
<td>0.15089</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aunt Sally’s beans 410g</td>
<td>Koo beans 410g</td>
<td>-2.09600*</td>
<td>0.17764</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Koo chakalaka 410g</td>
<td>-1.90000*</td>
<td>0.2678</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lucky Star pilchards 400g</td>
<td>-2.02500*</td>
<td>0.2678</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friesland milk</td>
<td>Clover full cream 2l</td>
<td>-1.08864*</td>
<td>0.18255</td>
<td>0.013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romi margarine 500g</td>
<td>Rama original 500g</td>
<td>-1.08376*</td>
<td>0.18963</td>
<td>0.026</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The mean difference with a (*) at the end represents a statistically significant difference in the level of brand experience between the two products. The negative scores indicate that the brand experience level for the base product is lower than the reference product (I – J). The researcher has chosen the five most relevant differences because of the comparison of base products and reference products from the same product category (i.e. maize compared with maize; or dairy with dairy).

These findings can be incorporated with the open-ended comments that were recorded from some of the customers at the point of purchase.

5.5 Qualitative findings

**Figure 19: Comments on product packaging and brand experience**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Product A</th>
<th>Product A Comments</th>
<th>Product B Comments</th>
<th>Product B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><img src="image1" alt="Product A" /></td>
<td>“Soft and fluffy” “Cheap” “We buy to sell in Africa” “I like it so much”</td>
<td>“SA number 1” “Fills me up” “I make good sweet dishes” “My mother likes it” “I just like it” “I like to buy because Go go (grandmother) likes it”</td>
<td><img src="image2" alt="Product B" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="image3" alt="Product A" /></td>
<td>“Sally’s replicates the colour, font and positioning of Koos’ packaging attributes”</td>
<td>“Easy to cook” “Tasty” “Quick cold salad” “Makes me think of mom”</td>
<td><img src="image4" alt="Product B" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Product</td>
<td>“Cheap”</td>
<td>“Healthy”</td>
<td>“Cheap”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chakalaka</td>
<td>“Healthy”</td>
<td>“Cheap”</td>
<td>“Healthy”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lucky Star</td>
<td>“Tin foods are harmful to our health and are bad for us”</td>
<td>“Cheap and easy to cook”</td>
<td>“I love the taste”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friesland</td>
<td>“Friesland has copied and tried to mirror the colour and bottle shape of clover”</td>
<td>“Clover comes in plastic bottles, plastic packet sachets and also a bottle with a screw cap. It’s the leading dairy product.”</td>
<td>“I have always just bought this”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romi</td>
<td>“Notice the similarity in colour and font writing to Rama”</td>
<td>“Rama is the leading product in margarine. It comes in 500g”</td>
<td>“makes me remember my mother”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When compared to the Brand Experience Mean differences table, the comments triangulate and support the findings. The products that are perceived to be cheap have had lower brand experience scores, and few positive comments are made about them.
6. DISCUSSION OF RESULTS
Chapter 6 is a discussion of the descriptive and analytical findings presented in chapter 5. The results are depicted in terms of the research hypothesis and relevant literature reviewed. This chapter will depict the depth of insight into the study’s findings from a BoP context against the theory base.

6.1 The sample

**Insight 1:** The fact that male purchasers are higher in numbers than females is likely to be related to the gender differences in the Carltonville area. It is a mining town and most of the mineworkers are male. The demographic shift does, however support, BoP literature that depicts more women becoming involved in the purchasing decision for the household (Sehrawet & Kundu, 2007).

**Insight 2:** The sample population was largely literate, with a mere 22.6% of people being illiterate. This is very close to SA’s national literacy levels (Eighty20, 2009). Figure 37 is a promotion by Star Hyper in the local newspaper, and the font size and wording are very small. Pinya and Mark (2004) argue that despite people being able to read the product, Star Hyper advertisements suggest that the brand symbol, icon and price are more important in the decision-making process. Future research should evaluate price against branding.

**Figure 20: Example of Star Hyper newspaper promotion**
Insight 3: Unemployment levels seem to be higher than the “national” percentage of unemployment (Eighty20, 2009). It does reiterate though that Star Hyper is catering to BoP individuals often reliant on social grants. The mineworkers also make up 24.5% of the local population, and they are generally migrant labour, preferring to buy products in bulk.

Insight 4: Almost all the products had instruction labels and ingredients written only in English, despite the fact that none of the respondents spoke English as their first language. This poses serious questions about the relevance of the brands and may provide the differentiating factor for a company to capture more market share through a culturally relevant offering for BoP consumers.

Insight 5: With 58% of respondents stating they shopped once a month or every two months, it is evident that bulk purchasing is preferred; with the remaining 19.7% and 21.2% preferring to buy every two weeks and weekly. This reiterates and supports the motivation for the researcher to conduct the survey over three interval periods across the month to get a clearer idea of customer purchasing habits.

The following table is from AMPS SA (2008) and it triangulates to depict the same argument. Despite the ‘BoP Sachet; trend, South Africans overwhelmingly prefer buying in bulk across all income groups (Eighty20, 2009).

**Figure 21: BoP shopping patterns in SA**
6.2 Discussion of packaging and brand experience scales

First, the negatively worded statements were re-coded. Then, reliability (Cronbach Alpha) and validity (Factor Analysis) of all the scales were tested. Once the items were reduced, the composite scores for each scale were generated in the form of averages. These averages were then used to conduct a correlation analysis to see if there was a linear relationship between packaging and the brand experience. They were also used to see how the level of brand experience and perceptions of packaging differed amongst all the various products.

6.3 Hypothesis 1

H1A: Grocery packaging will influence customer brand experience

According to the Packaging scale (Sehrawet & Kundu, 2007) and the Brand Experience scale (Brakus, Schmitt & Zarantonello, 2009)

6.3.1 Discussion of findings on Hypothesis 1

A Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient was computed to assess the relationship between grocery packaging and the brand experience. There was a positive correlation between the two variables: r = 0.117, n = 208, p = 0.091. Overall, the results suggest that a weak correlation exists between grocery packaging and the brand experience, as the p-value was greater than the 5% significance level, but still less than the 10% significance level. Therefore, a weak relationship exists between grocery packaging and brand experience. The Packaging variable and Brand Experience variable are, nevertheless, still important decision-making criteria for BoP consumers, as already proven in previous literature (Sehrawet & Kundu, 2007) (Brakus, Schmitt, & Zarantonello, 2009).

Future recommendations: An in-depth qualitative study may have yielded more insight into the strength of the relationship of packaging and the brand experience, hence new research ought to test this in the context of FMCG products.
6.4 Sub-hypothesis 2

H2_A: Perceptions of Packaging differ across all product categories

According to the packaging scale (Sehrawet & Kundu, 2007) and the Brand Experience scale (Brakus, Schmitt, & Zarantonello, 2009).

6.4.1 Discussion of findings on sub hypothesis Two

A one-way ANOVA was conducted to compare the mean packaging scores across the different product categories. The results showed a non-significant effect of mean packaging scores at the p<.05 level for the various product categories [F (18, 188) = 0.98, p = 0.481]. As a result, the author failed to reject the null hypothesis and concluded that all the means are similar across the different product categories.

Therefore, no significant differences were found. All the respondents had a strong level of agreement with the statements related to packaging. These findings were supported by the literature. In mature markets, product packaging was found to play a strategic role in seven out of the ten in-store purchase decision criteria (Bone & Corey, 2000). These findings have thus added to the packaging and consumer behaviour body of knowledge, as previous research did not look at low-income consumers.

6.5 Sub-hypothesis 3

H3_A: Levels of Brand Experience differ across all product categories

According to the Packaging scale (Sehrawet & Kundu, 2007) and the Brand Experience scale (Brakus, Schmitt & Zarantonello, 2009).
6.5.1 Discussion of findings on sub-hypothesis 3

This hypothesis was tested by running another one-way ANOVA to compare the mean brand experience scores across the different product categories. The ANOVA table shows a significant effect of the brand experience scores at the p<.05 level for the various product categories [F(18, 188) = 21.796, p = 0.000]. As a result, the authors rejected the null hypothesis and concluded that at least one product category had a significantly different brand experience rating compared to all the others.

Therefore, a significant difference was found between the product categories on the level of brand experience. To gain further insight, the author looked at the t-test table (page 57).

Following is a summary of the differences:

- Ace maize was found to have a higher brand experience score than White Star maize
- Across the tin foods sector, Koo beans, Koo chakalaka and Lucky Star pilchards were found to have a higher brand experience score than Aunt Sally's beans
- Clover milk was found to have a higher brand experience score than Friesland milk
- Rama margarine was found to have a higher brand experience score than Romi margarine.

The literature depicted how brand experience varies in strength and intensity; that is, some brand experiences are stronger or more intense than others. Over time, these long-lasting brand experiences, stored in consumer memory, should affect consumer satisfaction and loyalty (Oliver 1997; Reicheld 1996).

These findings contradict the argument put forward by Webster (2000), as he argued that consumers who typically have higher price sensitivity are likely to purchase private label brands, such as house brands. The author’s findings have demonstrated that despite price
being important, low-income consumers are very brand loyal, even if it is for a more expensive brand that is perceived to be better quality. These findings also dispute A.C. Nielson’s claims that consumers worldwide are likely to have roughly similar responses to FMCG, despite cultural differences (The Nation, 2002, in (Silayoi & Speece, Packaging and Purchase Decisions, 2004). The plethora of differences amongst BoP consumers warrants different and relevant offerings from retailers.

6.6 Practical application of research findings

Colour and Graphics

FMCG companies have used a number of indirect communication packaging attributes, such as combining colours for subtle consumer communication. Companies entering new emerging markets must be careful in choosing packaging colours and logos that are culturally appropriate (Gutierrez, 2001). The use of colour is well developed and can be effective due to strong brand associations; however, people in different cultures develop their own unique colour affinity (Silayoi & Speece, Packaging and Purchase Decisions, 2004).

Companies have realised the colour brand association and have been quick to design ‘copycat’ logos that mirror the leading brand in any particular category. The following table depicts the leader in each category and how smaller companies copy the use of colour, font, packaging and labelling to give the next best brand experience at a cheaper price
## Packaging and brand experience analyses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Product range</th>
<th>Packaging attributes and brand experience</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rama</strong></td>
<td>The products are all packed as 500g bars. The colours are mostly bright gold with a blue font. Rama is the leader in the margarine category and smaller companies have tried to copy its brand identity, the font and have made use of similar names, such as Romi and Rondo.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Inkomazi</strong></td>
<td>Inkomazi is the leader in the milk category. Other companies closely resemble its brown label, the beige two-litre bottle and brown cap. The name has also been tampered with, with smaller companies known as Amazi, Anasi and Amasi.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Koo</strong></td>
<td>Koo is the leader in yin foods. There are numerous smaller companies such as Sally’s that have tried to copy Koo’s packaging sizes, its brand logo and the picture of the product.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In an interview with the Managing Director of Star Hyper, Mr Timol, (2010) explained how smaller companies were very successful in using copycat tactics in competing with the traditional leading brands. The product choice that low-income consumers now have ought to force companies to embed customer preferences and differentiate themselves by innovating new packaging and brand experience offerings.
7. CONCLUSION
7.1 Main findings of research

This study has examined the influence of product packaging on brand experience. While the main hypothesis was marginally supported by a statistically weak relationship between product packaging and brand experience, the qualitative findings supported the notion of a strong relationship as lower income consumers derive more value, not just from the ‘premium’ product brands, but also from the use of the packaging for other needs after consuming the product. This was also reiterated by their aversion to packaging that was deemed environmentally hazardous. Furthermore, low-income consumers enjoy a greater brand experience with 'premium' brand products compared to what they perceive to be 'cheaper' brand products.

Therefore, future research should investigate the same constructs through a qualitative study. Caution should also be taken with keeping questions consistent and in the translation of the questionnaire into several languages.

In gathering accurate data, researchers should avoid questioning shoppers directly regarding certain issues such as preference, as they are likely to provide misleading answers. The clutter of the shelf environment, the presence of direct competitors, and the immediacy of the purchase decision can make the findings somewhat misleading.

The research, however, has helped to better understand why BoP consumers buy what they buy. Business development in low-income markets requires entrepreneurs to immerse themselves in the local market, listen, observe and develop a localised mental model and perspective. In mature markets, product packaging has been found to play a strategic role in
seven out of the ten in-store purchase decision criteria and is, therefore, an important domain through which companies can embed knowledge for new, innovative product packaging.

Increasingly, consumers also want more from products than just price or their functional features, benefits and quality. This is a given. Customers want the very essence of a brand as a rich source of sensory, affective and cognitive associations that result in memorable and rewarding brand experiences. Customers want products that have marketing campaigns that are contextual, appeal to their senses, touch their hearts and stimulate their minds. They want products, communications and campaigns that they can relate to or that they can incorporate into their lifestyles. They want communications campaigns to deliver an experience. The degree to which a company is able to stage a desirable customer experience will largely determine its success in the global market place (Bemd, 1999).

In mature markets, it has been proven that product packaging and brand experience influence customer purchase behavior; however, the influence of product packaging and customers’ brand experience in low-income markets has not been proven thus far. This research has filled the gap in BoP consumer behaviour literature, and these findings can help catalyse companies to embed customer knowledge, preferences and desires for memorable experiences into new design packages for brands. Manufacturers and large retailers need to move beyond the mentality of merely removing features of the packaging or brand experience to make them cheaper. They need to reconcile form and functionality and, as a result, transform ‘commodity type products’ into competitive brands using a bottom up approach to business development.
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9. APPENDICES
Dear Respondent

Thank you for your willingness to complete this questionnaire. The purpose of the questionnaire is to determine your preferences in selection of which Product you prefer. These preferences will be analysed to draw conclusions on why shoppers from Carltonville prefer certain product packages and product brands over others. The questionnaire should not take more than 10 minutes to complete and you are entitled to withdraw at any time without penalty.

This is an anonymous and confidential survey. You will not be identified and the answers you provide will be used for research purposes only. By completing this questionnaire, you indicate that you voluntarily participate in this research.

Feel free to speak to me or my Supervisor if you have any questions about the study.

Researcher: Ebrahim Variawa
Phone: 0834077042
Email: e.variawa@gmail.com

Research Supervisor: Dr Jacqueline Chimhanzi
Phone: 011 2096617
Email: jchimhanzi@yahoo.com

Please answer all the questions. There are no right or wrong answers. We are interested in understanding the decision-making factors in selecting a product when you purchase.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Respondent</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>For office use only (V1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Section 1 Q1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic Variables</th>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Ethnic group</th>
<th>Languages read and write</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Black African</td>
<td>Tswana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Coloured</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age (Years)</td>
<td>15-25</td>
<td>White</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26-35</td>
<td>Indian/Asian</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Over 50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Non literate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Primary school</td>
<td>Afrikaans</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Matriculate</td>
<td>Xhosa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>Sotho</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupation</td>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>Zulu</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Informal work</td>
<td>Tsonga</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Business</td>
<td>English</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Farming</td>
<td>Northern Sotho</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mining</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income Monthly in (Rand)</td>
<td>NO answer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Under R1000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R100-1300</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R1301-R1386</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R1387-1564</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R1565-R2116</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R2117-R2580</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R2581-R3627</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R3628-R5990</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family size (no of members)</td>
<td>1-2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6-7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8 or more</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status of family buying unit</td>
<td>Head of family</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Purchaser of most products</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Influence of buying decisions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>User of most products</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category – For office use only</td>
<td>Price</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Competitor price</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description of package – For office use only (visual elements and informational,)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q.4 How often do you buy this product?</td>
<td>Daily 3-4 times a week</td>
<td>Two times a week</td>
<td>Every week</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Daily 3-4 times a week</td>
<td>Two times a week</td>
<td>Every week</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The statements below describe experiences that you may have encountered during or after purchasing this product. Please circle the number to indicate the extent to which you agree with the statement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Brand experience</th>
<th>Packaging</th>
<th>1. Name Of brand:</th>
<th>2. Name of Brand:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This brand makes a strong impression (feeling) on my visual sense.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I find this brand interesting in a sensory (seeing, hearing, touching, smelling and tasting) way.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This brand does not appeal to my senses (seeing, hearing, touching, smelling and tasting).</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This brand induces (makes) feelings.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I do not have strong emotions for this brand.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This brand is an emotional brand (I buy it because I feel happy about this brand).</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I engage in physical actions and behaviours when I use this brand (this product helps me in my daily life).</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This brand results in bodily experiences (it makes me feel good/happy/sad/brings back memories).</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This brand is not action oriented (this product does not help me in my daily life).</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I think a lot when I encounter this brand.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This brand does not make me think.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This brand get me interested and helps me solve problems.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The statements below describe experiences that you may have encountered during or after purchasing this product. Please circle the number to indicate the extent to which you agree with the statement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Brand experience</th>
<th>Packaging</th>
<th>1. Name Of brand:</th>
<th>2. Name of Brand:</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Some what agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Packaging is important.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Packaging helps in buying.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better packaged products are better.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong packaging make me want to buy it.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If the package is easy to carry/pick up, it makes me want to buy it.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simple packaging makes me want to buy it.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Light weight packaging makes me want to buy it.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I like products that are always packaged the same way.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transparent (see-through/clear) packages are better.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I like packages that are easy to store.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Package helps me to identify (know) the product from others.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Package helps to stop stealing.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Label (name/information/instructions) is</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The statements below describe experiences that you may have encountered during or after purchasing this product. Please circle the number to indicate the extent to which you agree with the statement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Brand experience</th>
<th>Packaging</th>
<th>1. Name of brand:</th>
<th>2. Name of Brand:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>an important part of package:</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Packaging misleads buyers (gives wrong information or makes people buy something they do not need):</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>VP14 Q26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Packaging is bad for the environment (earth, nature, trees, plants, water, animals):</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>PV15 Q27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Mean and descriptive stats for the product categories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Product Category</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACE maize 5kg</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4.9250</td>
<td>.20505</td>
<td>.05919</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White star maize 5kg</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>3.4750</td>
<td>.43258</td>
<td>.08175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Koo beans 410g</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>4.4960</td>
<td>.25410</td>
<td>.05082</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Koo chakalaka 410g</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.3000</td>
<td>.00000</td>
<td>.00000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aunt Sally’s beans 410g</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.4000</td>
<td>.22678</td>
<td>.08018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lucky Star pilchards 400g</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.4250</td>
<td>.22174</td>
<td>.11087</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clover full cream 2l</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4.3250</td>
<td>.32509</td>
<td>.09384</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inkomzai 2l</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4.0600</td>
<td>.65553</td>
<td>.16926</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friesland milk</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3.2364</td>
<td>.20136</td>
<td>.06071</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rama original 500g</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4.1615</td>
<td>.37314</td>
<td>.10349</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romi margarine 500g</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.0778</td>
<td>.75627</td>
<td>.25209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rondo margarine 500g</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.3000</td>
<td>.76158</td>
<td>.26926</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stork spread 1kg</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4.0700</td>
<td>.17670</td>
<td>.05588</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bakers’ tennis biscuits 200grams</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.3333</td>
<td>.37238</td>
<td>.15202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bakers’ Lemon Creams</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.4600</td>
<td>.45607</td>
<td>.20396</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bakers Marie biscuits</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4.3000</td>
<td>.46368</td>
<td>.15456</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casamia time 150g</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.2429</td>
<td>.54116</td>
<td>.20454</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casamia Lemon Creams 150g</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.1714</td>
<td>.90132</td>
<td>.34067</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casamia Marie biscuits 150g</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4.0571</td>
<td>.16036</td>
<td>.04286</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>3.9077</td>
<td>.73401</td>
<td>.05102</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>