

Brand Decisions and Brand Influence: A Comparison of Rural and Urban Consumers

Jagwinder Singh and B B Goyal

Abstract - Indian economy has witnessed a significant growth in recent years. Rural India offers a huge potential for marketers who are battling in the saturated urban markets. The study has been carried out in Punjab state of India with a view to understand the differences between rural and urban households in terms of their brand decisions and brand influence on the buying of select durable goods. In-depth interviews have been conducted to look into insights of the consumers' behaviour with the help of a bilingual questionnaire that was served to the respondents. Overall there have been considerable differences between rural and urban consumers for the buying of television and refrigerator. However these differences have been found moderate for the buying of an automobile.

Keywords- Rural, Urban, Households, Durable, Brand.

I INTRODUCTION

One-sixth of the world's population lives in India. Therefore, India is an attractive market (Ling and Dawn, 2004). The economy witnesses increased potential for consumption, increased competition, availability of products both in terms of quality and quantity, and increased level of awareness among consumers. A large urban middle class and upper class, which constitutes one-third of the population, is a huge market for branded goods. The market for branded goods is increasing at 8 per cent per annum and in certain consumer goods, it is increasing at even 12 per cent. The Indian economy is the third largest in Asia. It is expected to grow at 7 per cent. The decrease in import tariffs has allowed large inflow of products from the other nations. Besides this, the Indian companies are entering into strategic alliances with the foreign reputed brands (Kinra, 2006). There is a tremendous potential in the rural areas. However many companies had not been successful in rural areas due to lack of adequate knowledge about rural consumer and consequently failure of the companies to develop sustainable strategies. According to Sinha (2005), rural India in which more than 74 per cent of the population of the country resides; generates one-third of country's GDP, and accounts for 38 per cent of two-wheelers sales of the country. Not all people are engaged in agriculture; about

25 percent have non-farm occupations. Disposable income again is not low. According to report of Ace Global Private Limited (2001) for The Commercial and Economic Section, Embassy of Italy in India, on Overview of Consumer Goods Sector: Market Potential and Prospects for Italian Goods; the rural population is spread all over India in close to 0.6 million villages. Nearly 45 per cent of rural Indians are literate (men 59 per cent, women 31 per cent). The rural share (%) for refrigerators is 25, black and white television 63, washing machine 15, color television 29, scooter 29, and 48 in motorcycle. Due to heavy dependence on agricultural output, rural consumers are highly sensitive to price, prefer small consumption packages, and tend to discount intangible benefits to more functional product attributes. The competition has tremendously increased in urban areas due to the emergence of more players and they are battling for market share in terms of gaining or regaining by reducing prices.

II REVIEW OF LITERATURE

A brand is a set of mental associations, held by the customer, which add to the perceived value of a product or service. These associations should be unique (exclusive), strong (salient), and positive (desirable). In practice, brands have always provided a competitive advantage to companies, which sought to understand the wants of their target market in order to develop a package of attributes to meet these wants (Ind, 2003). Furthermore, brands have been perceived as providing a greater security and a higher level of performance while eliminating alternatives by providing a better overall customization of perceived preferences (Jiang, 2004; Keller, 2003; Temporal and Lee, 2000; Bahmanziari et al, 2003; The Economist, 2005). As a result, consumers more often choose branded products when given the choice between products with similar features and benefits, fully prepared to pay a premium price (Temporal and Lee, 2000; The Economist, 2005). But not only that, now-a-days consumers have also started building an emotional bond with brands, becoming friends with them, and are even said to be seduced to look alike, eat alike and be alike (McFadden and Train, 1996). Temporal and Lee (2000) added that not only mass customization became a reality that brands have to face, but also, because of the global village we are living in, everything physical can be copied with amazing speed, which leaves only a little room for the traditional USP brands that were built on originality. It is important to make a distinction between a decision to buy a car (product) and a decision to buy a particular brand of a car, as the two decisions will be influenced by different considerations. The former decision will be affected by income, liquid asset holding, hire-purchase terms and other

Manuscript received on "January 17, 2010".

Ist Author is Assistant Professor, Dept. of Humanities and Management, Dr B R Ambedkar NIT Jalandhar, India. Ph: 91-98885-03708. Email: jagwinpandher@yahoo.co.in.

IInd Author is Reader, UBS, Panjab University Chandigarh. Ph: 91-94173-07276. Email: ubstd@yahoo.co.in.

economic and sociological factors. The later decision is taken subsequent to the former decision and is influenced by price, size, color, design, capacity, and all other attributes of a durable good, thereby appraising the pros and cons of different brands. The same amount of inter-household and retailer-household discussion will take place for both types of decisions (Downham and Treasure, 1956). The consumers disagree that brand choice is a reflection of 'self image' (Wood, 2007).

Brand serves a different role than other attributes. It lowers the time of choice as the consumers who are familiar with the brand take less time in choosing a brand. Consumers with high knowledge of brands can choose brands from the market with ease. The roles can vary for different products such as search and experience products. In search products like TV or computer, the features of the product may be sufficient for a consumer to reach a quantitative decision in customization but the qualitative aspect of the decision is represented by the brand name. In case of experience products the constituents are non-quantifiable, the quality information available about customization attributes is large, and therefore, in this situation the importance of brand name is reduced. There is a positive and significant effect of brand names in consumers' decision-making during customization process. Brand name has stronger effects in customization of search products than experience products. There is a positive relation in brand name effects and consumers' product knowledge. There is a positive and significant relationship between brand name effects and preference match and further positive and significant relationship between consumers' preference match and willingness to pay premium price. The consumers, if find that the search cost is greater for getting relevant information, may rely on the prior information. In such a situation brand name is not a considerable quality symptom. In case of search products, the acquisition of information regarding the quality of individual attribute is either not easily available or very costly as compared to experience products. Therefore, brand name that represents the composite 'enriched attribute' becomes increasingly important (Jiang, 2004). Gregory (1999) concluded that brand loyalty had the direct relationship with consistency between subjective norms, relative attitudes and actual purchase behaviour. Brand switching behaviour was expected to be lower for cultures that were rated high on uncertainty avoidance. The consumers base of the company consists of three categories of consumers: stayers (who had never switched from the previous brand), satisfied switchers (who switched to other brand for reasons other than dissatisfaction), and dissatisfied switchers (who switched because they were dissatisfied with the previous brand) (Nasir et al, 2006). The consumers' age group of 18-24 years is less brand-loyal (Wood, 2007). Alpert and Kamins (1995) observed that consumers generally had positive perception about the brands, which emerged first and it continued even after the entry of follower brands. The consumers above 46 years of age are not carried away by brand names (de Rada, 1998).

As regards to the relationship between needs and brand loyal behaviour, it was observed that the Chinese consumers

remain loyal to the brand first to satisfy their experiential needs, next social needs and finally functional needs. In case of Korean consumers, functional and social needs were stronger determinants of brand loyalty than experiential needs. Therefore, Korean consumers were more brand-loyal as their two needs – social and functional needs get satisfied to the large extent and at the same time there is fulfillment of experiential needs to the reasonable extent. Further there was a strong positive relationship between volume purchase behaviour and brand loyalty as the brand loyal consumers tend to spend more (Kim et al, 2002). Many companies of consumer products (both durable and non-durable) are making their efforts in rural areas. This is so because of increase in rural purchasing power over the past decade due to increase in support prices for the farm produce. Maharaja Appliances have launched a range of products with 'no frills' especially for rural and semi-urban areas. Sony has also introduced its models in the rural areas. Increase in infrastructure and change in lifestyle due to proliferation of television have changed the buying habits of the rural people (Shivakumar and Arun, 2002). Sharma (2004) examines the human behaviour with respect to urban Indian youth. The study finds association of brands with status; precedence of money and symbols of social stature over everything else; considering smart work as key and hard work obsolete; harboring individualism and selfishness; and adopting contemporary western setting among today's youth. Young consumers are competent consumers and influence consumption choices of the family to the great extent (Gronhoj, 2007). The role of understanding urban markets is also very important, as it will be the benchmark for understanding the unknown behaviour of the rural consumer. Little attention had been paid to rural consumers' buying behaviour (Home, 2002). Urban consumers being more exposed to the advertising messages had been found more brand conscious. Brand recall too of urban consumers was better than rural ones (Sun and Wu, 2004).

III METHODOLOGY ADOPTED

The study, which is descriptive in nature, has been carried out in Punjab state of India in 2008-2009. Three durable goods from three different product categories; Television (entertainment product), Refrigerator (home appliance), and an Automobile (two-wheeler, motorcycle and car/jeep) have been selected for study. A sample of 407 (204 from urban and 207 from rural areas) households across the state have been selected based on non-probability convenience sampling. The data about current ownership or likelihood of purchases in the next 24 months on the select durable goods (television, refrigerator, and any type of automobile) were obtained. In case of additional purchase/replacement or their likelihood in near future about the select items, the respondents were asked to give their responses only to the latest/likely buying. All respondents had been found possessing at least one item of each select product. Rural consumers are those who live in villages and those residing in cities (district headquarters) are urban consumers. The

consumers residing in towns (semi-urban areas) have not been considered in the study.

A household includes the related family members and all the unrelated persons who occupy a housing unit. The households may include either a family or a non-family or both (Louden and Della Bitta, 2002). The study here includes only family households.

In-depth interviews have been conducted to look into insights of the consumers' behaviour with the help of a bilingual questionnaire that was served to the respondents to obtain important information as regards to the prime objectives of the study. Downham and Treasure (1956) has emphasized on indirect questioning and subtle psychological approach to obtain information regarding intrinsic factors. This is so because conventional techniques can take us only up to a point. In understanding cross-cultural differences, depth interviews with the respondents are necessary because such an exploratory research will provide valuable insights regarding the variations across different cultures (Maheswaran and Shavitt, 2000). Ordinal scale has been used which has been converted into 5 point interval scale (1 for strongly disagree and 5 for strongly agree) at the time of data analysis. The questionnaire has been pre-tested before going for final survey. Following hypotheses have been tested in the study.

H₁ Rural and Urban consumers differ in terms of brand decisions.

H₂ Rural and Urban consumers differ in terms of brand influences.

The p-values have been calculated for all the variables statements and on comparing with central value (3 representing indifference to the statement), their significance has been checked at 95% confidence level. Similarly, p-values have also been calculated to observe the significance (95% confidence interval) of differences between the responses of rural and urban consumers. The significant values have been marked as *.

Discriminant analysis has also been carried out to observe the differences between rural and urban consumers. Two-way ANOVA (Analysis of Variance) has been applied to test the independent effects and the interaction effects of habitat (rural or urban) and income, and habitat and select durables.

IV RATIONALE FOR STUDY

In spite of tremendous potential in the rural areas, the marketers of national and international corporations are committing the same mistakes as multinational corporations did while entering into the developing countries with the same practices as that of their own country. The rural consumer is socially, psychologically, and economically different from his urban counterpart. They are significantly different in terms of their lifestyle from their urban counterparts. Therefore, rural India should not be treated as an extension of urban India (Mano Raj and Selvaraj, 2007).

V LIMITATIONS OF STUDY

The sample size is too small to generalize the findings. Moreover only three products (only one product from three categories) have been selected. However there are large number of consumer durables such as washing machines, water purifiers, air conditioners, generator sets, and kitchen appliances etc. There is again a variety of items within a product category and they carry different utilities at different values for different strata of consumers. The study has been carried out in one state and therefore, cannot be generalized for whole of the country. The different states may exhibit different consumption patterns (Halan, 2003).

VI DATA ANALYSIS

The data collected have been presented and analyzed here as under:

A. Television

Though quality is a primary concern for both rural and urban groups while choosing their brands (X₄); yet the brand choice of rural consumers is significantly governed by the price (X₃). The urban consumer on the other side considered the price to the moderate extent while choosing the brand. The concern for quality had been found significantly greater among the urban consumers than the rural consumers. Both the groups had not found following their friends' choice of television brands (X₅). Both the groups had the strong tendencies to stick to the brand once they find a good brand (X₆). However this tendency had been significantly greater in rural consumers as compared to their urban counterparts. The significant differences between behaviors' of the rural and urban consumers could be observed for the variables X₂, X₃, X₄, and X₆ (Table T 1). Two-way ANOVA reveals no interaction between income and habitat of consumers for all the select variables. No differences could be observed among different income groups for all the select variables. There had been significant differences between rural and urban consumers for all other select variables except X₁ and X₅ with the highest F value for X₃ (Table T 1.1). The structure matrix of the discriminant analysis reveals X₃ to be the most discriminating variable followed by X₆ and X₂ (Table T 1.2). Overall, both the groups have distinct behaviors' as the same is revealed from the classification results, according to which, 73.5 % of original groups and 72.7% of cross-validated groups have been found correctly classified.

In terms of the roles of the brands on the consumers' buying of television sets (X₇ to X₁₂), the urban consumers irrespective of price, had strong preferences to buy their favorite brands whereas; the rural consumers had such preferences to the moderate extent (X₇). The tendency to buy the brand of good reputation had been found among both the rural and urban consumers (X₈). However such tendencies had been significantly higher among urban consumers as compared to their rural counterparts. The brand makes a lot of difference for the urban consumers

(X12) whereas; it makes an impact to the moderate extent on the buying of the rural consumers. The rural consumers believed that all the brands of television sets are almost alike quality wise (X9) whereas; the urban consumers did not think so. The urban consumers were most likely to buy the most advertised brands (X10) whereas; the rural consumers are moderately influenced by the advertisements for their brand selections. Both the groups had been found considering the other features of the product important besides brand (X11). However, such tendencies had been found relatively higher among rural consumers as compared to their urban counterparts. There had been significant differences between the behaviors' of rural and urban consumers for all the select variables (Table T 2). Two-way ANOVA reveals no interaction between income and habitat of consumers for all other select variables except X11, where there had been significant interaction. No differences could be observed among different income groups for all other select variables except X8. There had been significant differences between rural and urban consumers for all the select variables with the highest F value for X9 followed by X8 (Table T 2.1).

The structure matrix (Table T 2.2) of the discriminant analysis reveals X9 to be the most discriminating variable followed by X8 and X10. Overall, both the groups have distinct behaviors' as the same is revealed from the classification results, according to which, 82.5 % of original groups and 82% of cross-validated groups have been found correctly classified.

B. Refrigerator

In terms of branding decisions (X1 to X6), it has been observed that both rural and urban consumers had more than one preferred brands of refrigerators (X1). The urban consumers had a strong tendency to change brands for the sake of variety and novelty (X2) whereas; the rural consumers had the same to the moderate extent. Though quality is a primary concern for both rural and urban groups while choosing their brands (X4), yet the brand choice of rural consumers is significantly governed by the price (X3). The urban consumer on the other considered the price to the moderate extent while choosing the brand. Both the groups had not found following their friends' choice of refrigerator brands (X5). Both the groups had the strong tendencies to stick to the brand once they find a good brand (X6). However this tendency is significantly greater in rural consumers as compared to their urban counterparts. The significant differences between behaviors of the rural and urban consumers could be observed for the variables X2, X3 and X6 (Table R 1).

Two-way ANOVA reveals no interaction between income and habitat of consumers for all the select variables. No significant differences could be observed among different income groups for all the select variables. There had been significant differences between rural and urban consumers for variables X2, X3 and X6 with the highest F value for variable X3 followed by X2 (Table R 1.1). The structure matrix (Table R 1.2) of the discriminating analysis also

reveals X3 to be the most discriminating variable followed by X2 and X6. Overall, both the groups have distinct behaviors as the same is revealed from the classification results, according to which, 69.6% of the groups have been found correctly classified. In terms of the influence of the brands on the consumers' buying of refrigerators (X7 to X12), both rural and urban consumers irrespective of price, had strong preferences to buy their favourite brands, regardless of price (X7). This preference had been found significantly greater among the urban consumers as compared to their rural counterparts. The tendency to buy the brand of good reputation had been found among both the rural and urban consumers (X8). However such tendencies had been found significantly higher among urban consumers as compared to their rural counterparts. The brand makes a lot of difference to both rural and urban consumers (X12). However, it had been found making significantly greater difference for the urban consumers than the rural ones. But there had been significant differences in the extent of perceptions of these groups. The rural consumers strongly believed that all the brands of refrigerators are almost alike quality wise (X9) whereas; the urban consumers did not think so. Both rural and urban consumers were most likely to buy the most advertised brands (X10). However, this tendency had been found significantly greater among urban consumers than their rural counterparts had. Both the groups had been found considering the other features of the product important besides brand (X11). However, such tendencies had been found relatively higher among rural consumers as compared to their urban counterparts. There had been significant differences between the behaviors of rural and urban consumers for all the select variables (Table R 2).

Two-way ANOVA reveals no interaction between income and habitat of consumers for all other select variables except X11. No significant differences could be observed among different income groups for all other select variables except X8. There had been significant differences between rural and urban consumers for all the select variables with the highest F value for variable X9 followed by X12 (Table R 2.1).

The structure matrix (Table R 2.2) of the discriminant analysis reveals X9 to be the most discriminating variable followed by X12 and X8. Overall, both the groups have distinct behaviors as the same is revealed from the classification results, according to which, 81% of original groups and 80% of cross-validated groups have been found correctly classified.

C. Automobiles

In terms of branding decisions (X1 to X6), it has been observed that both rural and urban consumers had more than one preferred brands of automobiles (X1). This propensity had significantly been observed among the urban consumers as compared to their rural counterparts. The urban consumers had a strong tendency to change brands for the sake of variety and novelty (X2) whereas; the same had been significantly less among rural consumers. Though quality was a primary concern for both rural and urban

groups while choosing their brands (X4); yet the brand choice of rural consumers was significantly governed by the price (X3). The urban consumer also considered the price to the significantly greater extent while choosing the brand. However comparing with rural consumer, the urban consumer considered the price comparatively less.

Both the groups had been found following their friends' choice of automobile brands (X5) and such tendency had been found significantly greater among the rural consumers as compared to their urban counterparts. Both the groups had significantly less tendencies to stick to the brand once they found a good brand (X6). The significant differences between behaviors of the rural and urban consumers could be observed for the variables X1, X2, X3 and X5 (Table A 1). Two-way ANOVA reveals no interaction between income and habitat of consumers for all the select variables. No significant difference could be observed between different income groups for all the select variables. There had been significant differences between rural and urban consumers for all other select variables except variables X3 and X6 with the highest F value for variable X2 followed by X5 (Table A 1.1). Both the structure matrix and the standardized canonical discriminant function coefficients (Table A 1.2) of the discriminant analysis also reveal X2 to be the most discriminating variable followed by X5 and X3. Overall both the groups have moderately distinct behaviors as the same is revealed from the classification results according to which; 67.4% of the original groups and 66.7% of cross-validated groups have been found correctly classified.

In terms of the roles of the brands on the consumers' buying of automobiles (X7 to X12), both rural and urban consumers irrespective of price, had strong preferences to buy their favourite brands, regardless of price (X7). The tendency to buy the brand of good reputation had been found between both the rural and urban consumers (X8). However, such a tendency had been found higher among urban consumers than rural ones. The brand makes a lot of difference to both rural and urban consumers (X12).

There had been significantly greater agreement among the urban consumers as compared to their rural counterparts. The rural consumers strongly believed that all the brands of a particular category of automobiles are almost alike quality wise (X9) whereas; the urban consumers did not think so. Both rural and urban consumers were most likely to buy the most advertised brands (X10). However this tendency had been found significantly greater among urban consumers than their rural counterparts. Both the groups had been found considering the other features of the product important besides brand (X11). There had been significant differences between the behaviors of rural and urban consumers for all the select variables except X7 and X11 (Table A 2). Two-way ANOVA reveals no interaction between income and habitat of consumers for all other select variables except X10. There had been significant differences between different income groups for all the select variables except X7 and X8. There had not been significant differences between rural and urban consumers for all other select variables except variable X9 (Table A 2.1). The

structure matrix (Table A 2.2) of the discriminant analysis also reveals X9 to be the most discriminating variable. The classification results revealed that 15.9 % of original groups and 65.7% of cross-validated groups have been found correctly classified. In branding decisions, no interaction between habitat and the product categories had been observed for all other variables except X6. There had been significant differences between rural and urban consumers for all the select variables with the highest F value for X2 followed by X3. There had been significant differences between the behaviour of these consumers for the three different select products in terms of select variables X3, X5 and X6, with the highest F value for X6 followed by X5.

In terms of brand influence, there had been an interaction between habitat and the product categories for all the variables with the highest F value for X11. There had been significant differences between rural and urban consumers for all the select variables with the highest F value for X9 followed by X8. There had been significant differences between the behaviour of these consumers for the three different select products in terms of all select variables with the highest F value for X12 (Table T-R-A 1).

VII DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

Following conclusions can be drawn from the study.

A. Brand Decisions

Both rural and urban consumers have more than one preferred brands of the select products. In case of automobiles, this tendency is significantly greater among urban consumers than the rural ones. The urban consumers have a strong tendency to change brands for the sake of variety and novelty whereas; the rural consumers have the same to the moderate extent in case of television and refrigerator. In case of an automobile, this tendency exists to the less extent among rural consumers. Shivakumar and Arun (2002) have also found that rural consumers consider only selected brand before making a purchase decision. The study reveals that brand decisions are taken with equal participation of all family members (including youngsters) in majority of urban households; therefore, the brand loyalty is relatively lesser among urban households as per the revelations of the study conducted by Wood (2007) that found the age group of 18-24 years less brand loyal. Moreover, their role within the household is more pronounced in deciding the brand (Shoham and Dalakas, 2003). Wood (2007) further found that the brand loyalty is more among laggards, probably due to which rural consumers are relatively more brand loyal. Quality is a matter of prime and equal concern for both rural and urban groups while choosing their brands except in case of televisions, where the same is greater among urban consumers than their rural counterparts. The brand choice of rural consumers is significantly governed by the price. The urban consumer on the other side considers the price to the moderate extent while choosing the brand of television and refrigerator whereas; in case of automobile, the urban

consumer considers to the large extent but less than the rural consumer. In case of televisions and refrigerators, both the groups do not follow their friends' choice of brands. Nevertheless, in case of automobiles, both the groups do follow considerably. Moreover, the rural consumers have this tendency to the large extent as compared to their urban counterparts. This is probably due to overweighing of psychological aspects over performance aspects in case of probably low both general and specific self-confidence of rural consumers (Bell, 1967).

Both the groups have the strong tendencies to stick to the brand once they find a good brand in case of televisions and refrigerators. However, this tendency is significantly greater in rural consumers as compared to their urban counterparts. But in case of automobiles, both the groups do not have such tendency. Considering all the select products, there have been differences between rural and urban consumers for all the select variables. Product based differences do exist for price based brand choice, following friends buying, and sticking to a brand on finding a good one. In the later case, the differences vary between rural and urban consumers. Overall, there are considerable differences between rural and urban consumers for the buying of television and refrigerator. However, these differences are moderate for the buying of an automobile.

B. Brand Influence

Both rural and urban consumers irrespective of price, have strong preferences to buy their favorite brands, regardless of price for all other select products except television; where the rural consumers have preference to the moderate extent. These preferences are greater among the urban consumers as compared to their rural counterparts for all other two select products except automobiles where it is at par. The tendency to buy the brand of good reputation exists among both the rural and urban consumers. However, such tendencies are higher among urban consumers as compared to their rural counterparts. This is in conformity to the findings of Sun and Wu (2004) that revealed greater brand consciousness among urban consumers as compared to their rural counterparts. As brand decisions are taken with equal participation of all family members (including youngsters) in majority of urban households, therefore, brand consciousness is relatively greater among urban households as per the revelations made by Gronhoj (2007). There are also differences between different income levels of the habitants for such tendencies in case of television and refrigerator. The rural consumers strongly believe that all the brands of select products are almost alike quality wise whereas; the urban consumers do not think so. There are also differences in the perceptions among the different income levels of habitants in case of the buying of an automobile. Both rural and urban consumers are most likely to buy the most advertised brands for all the select products except television; where such tendency is moderate among the rural consumers. However this tendency is greater among urban consumers than their rural counterparts. In case of an automobile, such differences also exist among

different income groups. However, these differences differ among rural and urban consumers. Similarly, the brand makes a lot of difference to both rural and urban consumers for all the select products except television; where such difference is moderate to the rural consumers. In the other two products as well, urban consumers have greater consideration to brand as compared to their rural counterparts. In case of an automobile, there are differences among different income levels of the habitants to this variable. Both the groups consider the other features of the product important besides brand. However such tendencies had been found relatively higher among rural consumers as compared to their urban counterparts for televisions and refrigerators. These differences between rural and urban consumers vary among their different income groups. In case of automobiles, such considerations are equal between both the habitant groups. However, these vary among different income groups of these consumers' categories. Considering all the select products, there have been differences between rural and urban consumers for all the select variables. However, these differences differ with the product category. Overall, there are significant differences between rural and urban consumers for the buying of television and refrigerators. However, these are moderate for the buying of an automobile.

VIII RECOMMENDATIONS

The rural consumers are more brand-loyal as compared to their urban counterparts. Their decisions are largely decided by price of the brand. However, they have a tendency to stick to the brand provided they find a best suited brand. Therefore, the marketers must take proactive measures in terms of ensuring brand loyalty. The brands should be positioned in such a manner to give feeling among the rural consumers as these have been tailored specific to their requirements. The same measures can also be taken for urban consumers by regularly introducing newer models and raising the quality of the products.

The brand building measures can prove effective for targeting urban consumers for all the products as they have a tendency to buy reputed, most advertised brands. They buy their favorite brands because brands make a lot of difference to them. The brand building measures by the automobile companies will help their penetration into rural markets as well. In case of televisions and refrigerators, they should focus more on the other features relating to the utility and functionality of the products and should offer the same at reasonable prices while approaching the rural markets.

IX REFERENCES

- 1) Ace Global Private Limited (2001), Overview of Consumer Goods Sector: Market Potential and Prospects for Italian Goods, <http://www.ice.gov.it/estero2/india/market.pdf> [Accessed on May 13, 2005].
- 2) Alpert, F. H. and Kamins, M. A. (1995), An Empirical Investigation of Consumer Memory,

- Attitude and Perceptions toward Pioneer and Follower Brands, *Journal of Marketing*, Vol.59 (4), pp 34-45.
- 3) Bahmanziari, T., Pearson, J.M. and Crosby, L. (2003), Is trust important in technology adoption? A policy capturing approach, *The Journal of Computer Information Systems*, Vol. 43 (4), pp 46-54.
 - 4) de Rada, V. D. (1998), A single consumer or different types of consumer: an analysis of social types according to their consumer habits, *British Food Journal*, Vol. 100 (7), pp 326-336.
 - 5) Downham, J. S. and Treasure, J. A. P. (1956), Market Research and Consumer Durables, *The Incorporated Statistician*, Vol. 7 (3), pp 108-117.
 - 6) Gregory, G.D. (1999), Integrating Cultural Influences into Current Theory on Customer Loyalty Formation, *Journal of Brand Management*, Vol.6 (6), pp 393-408.
 - 7) Gronhoj, A. (2007), The consumer competence of young adults: a study of newly formed households, *Qualitative Market Research: An International Journal*, Vol. 10 (3), pp 243-264.
 - 8) Halan, D. (2003), Rural Marketing is a Different Ballgame, *Indian Management*, Vol. 42 (11), pp 60-64.
 - 9) Home, N. (2002), Rural consumers' Patronage Behavior in Finland, *International Review of Retail, Distribution & Consumer Research*, Vol.12 (2), pp. 149-64.
 - 10) Ind, N. (2003), Beyond Branding: How the New Values of Transparency and Integrity Are Changing the World of Brands, Biddles, Guilford, King's Lynn and London.
 - 11) Jiang, P. (2004), The role of brand name in customization decisions: a search vs experience perspective, *Journal of Product and Brand Management*, Vol. 13 (2), pp 73-83.
 - 12) Keller, K.L. (2003), *Strategic Brand Management: Building, Measuring, and Managing Brand Equity*, 2nd ed., Pearson Education, London.
 - 13) Kim, J-O., Forsythe, S., Gu, Q. and Moon, S. J. (2002), Cross-cultural consumer values, needs and purchase behavior, *Journal of Consumer Marketing*, Vol. 19 (6), pp 481-502.
 - 14) Kinra, N. (2006), The effect of country-of-origin on foreign brand names in the Indian market, *Marketing Intelligence and Planning*, Vol. 24 (1), pp 15-30.
 - 15) Ling, S-S. and Dawn, T. P. (2004), Adopters of new food products in India, *Marketing Intelligence and Planning*, Vol. 22 (4), pp 371-391.
 - 16) Loudon, L. L. and Della Bitta, A. J. (2002), *Consumer Behavior*, Tata McGraw-Hill, 4th ed., pp 206-216.
 - 17) Maheswaran, D. and Shavitt, S. (2000), Issues and New Directions in Global Consumer Psychology, *Journal of Consumer Psychology*, Vol. 9 (2), pp 59-66.
 - 18) Mano Raj, A. S. and Selvaraj, P. (2007), Social Changes and the Growth of Indian Rural Market : An Invitation to FMCG Sector, *International Marketing Conference on Marketing & Society* (April 8-10, 2007), IIMK.
 - 19) McFadden, D., and Train, K.E. (1996), Consumers' evaluation of new products: learning from self and others, *The Journal of Political Economy*, Vol. 104 (4), pp 683.
 - 20) Nasir, V. A., Yoruker, S., Gunes, F., and Ozdemir, Y. (2006), Factors Influencing Consumers' Laptop Purchases, *Sixth Global Conference on Business & Economics* (October 15-17, 2006), Gutman Conference Center, USA.
 - 21) Sharma, S. (2004), Understanding urban youth-instant karma, *Indian Management*, Vol. 41 (7), pp 52-54 Vol. 43 (4), pp 72-81.
 - 22) Shivakumar, K. and Arun, G. (2002), Buying Behaviour In The Hinterland, *Indian Management*, Vol. 41 (7), pp 55-57.
 - 23) Sinha, R. (2005), Price Squeeze (Cover Story), http://www.indeconomist.com/150305_msharma.html [Accessed on July 09, 2007].
 - 24) Sun, T. and Wu, G. (2004), Consumption patterns of Chinese urban and rural consumers, *Journal of Consumer Marketing*, Vol. 21 (4), pp 245-253.
 - 25) Temporal, P. and Lee, K.C. (2000), *Hi-tech and Hi-touch Branding: Creating Brand Power in the Age of Technology*, Wiley Eastern, New Delhi.
 - 26) (The) Economist (2005), Leaders: brand new, consumer electronics, Vol. 374 (8409), 15th January, pp 10.
 - 27) Wood, L. (2007), Functional and symbolic attributes of product selection, *British Food Journal*, Vol. 109 (2), pp 108-118.

Table T 1 Brand Decisions (Mean Values).

S. No.	Variables	U	p (1 t)	R	p (1 t)	U-R	p (2 t)
			U		R		
X 1	More than one preferred brand.	3.37	<0.0001	3.20	0.0023	0.16	0.1039
X 2	To change brand for the sake of variety and novelty.	3.39	<0.0001	2.93	0.1677	0.45	<0.0001
X 3	Your choice of brand was/will be largely based on price.	2.93	0.1970	3.78	<0.0001	-0.85	<0.0001
X 4	Quality as a primary concern.	4.02	<0.0001	3.86	<0.0001	0.16	0.0451
X 5	Buying what friends buy.				<0.0001		0.6315
		2.69	<0.0001	2.73		-0.05	
X 6	Stickiness to a brand if find a good one.	3.33	<0.0001	4.03	<0.0001	-0.71	<0.0001

U = Mean Urban, R = Mean Rural, p (1 t) = p value one tailed, and p (2 t) = p value two tailed.

Table T 1.1 Brand Decisions (F ratio).

S. No.	Variables	F ratio		
		R/U (df =1)	IG (df =4)	R/U*IG (df =4)
X 1	More than one preferred brand.	2.793	0.232	1.694
X 2	To change brand for the sake of variety and novelty.	12.513*	0.485	1.340
X 3	Your choice of brand was/will be largely based on price.	43.490*	1.168	0.183
X 4	Quality as a primary concern.	4.825*	0.589	1.131
X 5	Buying what friends buy.	0.249	0.391	1.331
X 6	Stickiness to a brand if find a good one.			
		30.968*	1.192	0.976

*R/U = Rural-Urban, IG = Income Group, and R/U*IG= Two-way interaction between R/U and IG.*

Table T 1.2 Brand Decisions (Discriminant Analysis).

S. No.	Variables	Standardized Canonical Discriminant Function Coefficients	Unstandardized Canonical Discriminant Function Coefficients	Structure Matrix	
1	X 1	-0.196	-0.192	X 3	0.638
2	X 2	-0.355	-0.349	X 6	0.579
3	X 3	0.630	0.593	X 2	-0.358
4	X 4	-0.412	-0.496	X 4	-0.159
5	X 5	0.164	0.163	X 1	-0.129
6	X 6	0.646	0.662	X 5	0.038
	Constant		-1.188		

Table T 2 Brand Influence (Mean Values).

S. No.	Variables	U	p (1 t)	R	p (1 t)	U-R	p (2 t)
			U		R		
X 7	Buying of favourite brand, regardless of price.	3.73	<0.0001	3.08	0.1281	0.65	<0.0001
X 8	Buying a brand of good reputation.	3.89	<0.0001	3.14	0.0168	0.75	<0.0001
X 9	Most of the brands in this product class are all alike quality wise	2.76	0.0024	3.87	<0.0001	-1.10	<0.0001
X 10	Buying of one of the most advertised brands.	3.75	<0.0001	3.09	0.0978	0.66	<0.0001
X 11	Importance of other features than brand.	3.70	<0.0001	4.22	<0.0001	-0.52	<0.0001
X 12	The brand makes a lot of difference to you.	3.67	<0.0001	3.07	0.1968	0.60	<0.0001

U = Mean Urban, R = Mean Rural, p (1 t) = p value one tailed, and p (2 t) = p value two tailed.

Table T 2.1 Brand Influence (F ratio).

S. No.	Variables	F ratio		
		R/U (df =1)	IG (df =4)	R/U*IG (df =4)
X 7	Buying of favourite brand, regardless of price.	30.862*	1.074	1.793
X 8	Buying a brand of good reputation.	42.021*	2.738*	1.078
X 9	Most of the brands in this product class are all alike quality wise	75.561*	0.610	1.031
X 10	Buying of one of the most advertised brands.	27.865*	1.401	1.093
X 11	Importance of other features than brand.	25.578*	0.477	3.65*
X 12	The brand makes a lot of difference to you.	18.089*	1.088	0.172

*R/U = Rural-Urban, IG = Income Group, and R/U*IG = Two-way interaction between R/U and IG.*

Table T 2.2 Brand Influence (Discriminant Analysis).

S. No.	Variables	Standardized Canonical	Unstandardized Canonical	Structure Matrix	
		Discriminant Coefficients	Discriminant Coefficients		
1	X 7	-0.225	-0.214	X 9	0.640
2	X 8	-0.354	-0.404	X 8	-0.496
3	X 9	0.708	0.705	X 10	-0.397
4	X 10	-0.216	-0.222	X 7	-0.359
5	X 11	0.399	0.469	X 11	0.356
6	X 12	-0.192	-0.181	X 12	-0.328
	Constant		-0.681		

Table R 1 Brand Decisions (Mean Values).

S. No.	Variables	U	p (1 t) U	R	p (1 t) R	U-R	p (2 t)
X 1	More than one preferred brand.	3.37	<0.0001	3.20	0.0023	0.16	0.1039
X 2	To change brand for the sake of variety and novelty.	3.39	<0.0001	2.93	0.1677	0.45	<0.0001
X 3	Your choice of brand was/will be largely based on price.	2.89	0.0877	3.76	<0.0001	-0.87	<0.0001
X 4	Quality as a primary concern.	4.02	<0.0001	4.00	<0.0001	0.02	0.8182
X 5	Buying what friends buy.	2.69	<0.0001	2.76	0.0004	-0.07	0.4779
X 6	Stickiness to a brand if find a good one.	3.33	<0.0001	3.65	<0.0001	-0.32	0.0012

U = Mean Urban, R = Mean Rural, p (1 t) = p value one tailed, and p (2 t) = p value two tailed.

Table R 1.1 Brand Decisions (F ratio).

S. No.	Variables	F ratio		
		R/U (df =1)	IG (df =4)	R/U*IG (df =4)
X 1	More than one preferred brand.	2.793	-0.232	1.694
X 2	To change brand for the sake of variety and novelty.	12.513*	0.485	1.340
X 3	Your choice of brand was/will be largely based on price.	45.086*	1.070	0.152
X 4	Quality as a primary concern.	0.435	0.409	1.023
X 5	Buying what friends buy.	0.442	0.367	1.282
X 6	Stickiness to a brand if find a good one.	7.335*	0.658	0.218

*R/U = Rural-Urban, IG = Income Group, and R/U*IG= Two-way interaction between R/U and IG.*

Table R 1.2 Brand Decisions (Discriminant Analysis).

S. No.	Variables	Standardized Canonical	Unstandardized Canonical	Structure Matrix	
		Discriminant Coefficients	Discriminant Coefficients		
1	X 1	-0.265	-0.259	X 3	0.807
2	X 2	-0.459	-0.451	X 2	-0.445
3	X 3	0.812	0.756	X 6	0.319
4	X 4	-0.117	-0.133	X 1	-0.161
5	X 5	0.247	0.244	X 5	0.071
6	X 6	0.242	0.240	X 4	-0.022
	Constant		-1.205		

Table R 2 Brand Influence (Mean Values).

S. No.	Variables	U	p (1 t) U	R	p (1 t) R	U-R	p (2 t)
X 7	Buying of favourite brand, regardless of price.	3.79	<0.0001	3.15	0.0205	0.64	<0.0001
X 8	Buying a brand of good reputation.	4.01	<0.0001	3.42	<0.0001	0.59	<0.0001
X 9	Most of the brands in this product class are all alike quality wise	2.70	0.0003	3.93	<0.0001	-1.23	<0.0001
X 10	Buying of one of the most advertised brands.	3.80	<0.0001	3.47	<0.0001	0.33	0.0005
X 11	Importance of other features than brand.	3.73	<0.0001	4.24	<0.0001	0.51	<0.0001
X 12	The brand makes a lot of difference to you.	3.94	<0.0001	3.19	0.0077	0.75	<0.0001

U = Mean Urban, R = Mean Rural, p (1 t) = p value one tailed, and p (2 t) = p value two tailed.

Table R 2.1 Brand Influence (F ratio).

S. No.	Variables	F ratio		
		R/U (df =1)	IG (df =4)	R/U*IG (df =4)
X 7	Buying of favourite brand, regardless of price.	27.675*	1.126	1.441
X 8	Buying a brand of good reputation.	27.809*	2.397*	0.454
X 9	Most of the brands in this product class are all alike quality wise	86.575*	0.813	0.819
X 10	Buying of one of the most advertised brands.	7.236*	1.549	1.301
X 11	Importance of other features than brand.	25.107*	0.581	3.167*
X 12	The brand makes a lot of difference to you.	30.578*	1.677	0.279

*R/U = Rural-Urban, IG = Income Group, and R/U*IG = Two-way interaction between R/U and IG.*

Table R 2.2 Brand Influence (Discriminant Analysis).

S. No.	Variables	Standardized Canonical Discriminant Function Coefficients	Unstandardized Canonical Discriminant Function Coefficients	Structure Matrix	
1	X 7	-0.333	-0.310	X 9	0.691
2	X 8	-0.231	-0.242	X 12	-0.416
3	X 9	0.750	0.716	X 8	-0.369
4	X 10	-0.057	-0.060	X 7	-0.351
5	X 11	0.400	0.461	X 11	0.348
6	X 12	-0.310	-0.293	X 10	-0.204
	Constant		-0.980		

Table A 1 Brand Decisions (Mean Values).

S. No.	Variables	U	p (1 t) U	R	p (1 t) R	U-R	p (2 t)
X 1	More than one preferred brand.	3.43	<0.0001	3.17	0.0076	0.25	0.0121
X 2	To change brand for the sake of variety and novelty.	3.43	<0.0001	2.82	0.0056	0.61	<0.0001
X 3	Your choice of brand was/will be largely based on price.	3.29	<0.0001	4.09	<0.0001	-0.79	<0.0001
X 4	Quality as a primary concern.	4.07	<0.0001	3.96	<0.0001	0.11	0.1909
X 5	Buying what friends buy.	3.33	<0.0001	3.67	<0.0001	-0.34	0.0007

X 6	Stickiness to a brand if find a good one.	2.69	<0.0001	2.72	<0.0001	-0.03	0.7415
-----	---	------	---------	------	---------	-------	--------

U = Mean Urban, R = Mean Rural, p (1 t) = p value one tailed, and p (2 t) = p value two tailed.

Table A 1.1 Brand Decisions (F ratio).

S. No.	Variables	F ratio		
		R/U (df =1)	IG (df =4)	R/U*IG (df =4)
X 1	More than one preferred brand.	7.957*	0.140	2.117
X 2	To change brand for the sake of variety and novelty.	21.796*	0.383	0.821
X 3	Your choice of brand was/will be largely based on price.	3.841	1.000	0.078
X 4	Quality as a primary concern.	4.461*	0.481	2.371
X 5	Buying what friends buy.	10.394*	0.979	0.473
X 6	Stickiness to a brand if find a good one.	0.166	0.608	1.877

*R/U = Rural-Urban, IG = Income Group, and R/U*IG= Two-way interaction between R/U and IG.*

Table A 1.2 Brand Decisions (Discriminant Analysis).

S. No.	Variables	Standardized Canonical Discriminant Function Coefficients	Unstandardized Canonical Discriminant Function Coefficients	Structure Matrix	
1	X 1	0.283	0.278	X 2	0.721
2	X 2	0.771	0.762	X 5	-0.405
3	X 3	-0.364	-0.133	X 3	-0.349
4	X 4	0.178	0.205	X 1	0.299
5	X 5	-0.475	-0.466	X 4	0.155
6	X 6	-0.311	-0.306	X 6	-0.040
	Constant		-1.167		

Table A 2 Brand Influence (Mean Values).

S. No.	Variables	U	p (1 t) U	R	p (1 t) R	U-R	p (2 t)
X 7	Buying of favourite brand, regardless of price.	3.89	<0.0001	3.71	<0.0001	0.18	0.0880
X 8	Buying a brand of good reputation.	4.05	<0.0001	3.76	<0.0001	0.29	0.0010
X 9	Most of the brands in this product class are all alike quality wise	2.65	<0.0001	3.38	<0.0001	-0.73	<0.0001
X 10	Buying of one of the most advertised brands.	3.84	<0.0001	3.56	<0.0001	0.28	0.0029
X 11	Importance of other features than brand.	3.63	<0.0001	3.69	<0.0001	-0.05	0.5488
X 12	The brand makes a lot of difference to you.	4.04	<0.0001	3.66	<0.0001	0.38	0.0001

U = Mean Urban, R = Mean Rural, p (1 t) = p value one tailed, and p (2 t) = p value two tailed.

Table A 2.1 Brand Influence (F ratio).

S. No.	Variables	F ratio		
		R/U (df =1)	IG (df =4)	R/U*IG (df =4)
X 7	Buying of favourite brand, regardless of price.	2.926	1.980	0.919
X 8	Buying a brand of good reputation.	2.556	1.447	1.403
X 9	Most of the brands in this product class are all alike quality wise	13.646*	3.555*	1.547
X 10	Buying of one of the most advertised brands.	1.577	3.226*	2.423*
X 11	Importance of other features than brand.	2.567	2.480*	1.993
X 12	The brand makes a lot of difference to you.	2.007	2.911*	1.096

*R/U = Rural-Urban, IG = Income Group, and R/U*IG= Two-way interaction between R/U and IG.*

Table A 2.2 Brand Influence (Discriminant Analysis).

S. No.	Variables	Standardized Discriminant Coefficients	Canonical Function	Unstandardized Canonical Discriminant Function Coefficients	Structure Matrix	
1	X 7	-0.155		-0.147	X 9	0.743
2	X 8	-0.249		-0.281	X 12	-0.468
3	X 9	0.766		0.643	X 8	-0.396
4	X 10	-0.246		-0.257	X 10	-0.359
5	X 11	0.377		0.418	X 7	-0.205
6	X 12	-0.396		-0.400	X 11	0.072
	Constant			0.674		

Table T-R-A 1 Two-Way ANOVA (Habitat and Product Categories).

S. No.	Variables	F ratio		
		R/U (df =1)	PC (df =2)	R/U* PC (df =2)
X 1	More than one preferred brand.	11.145*	0.029	0.254
X 2	To change brand for the sake of variety and novelty.	76.233*	0.172	0.751
X 3	Your choice of brand was/will be largely based on price.	66.410*	5.249*	0.051
X 4	Quality as a primary concern.	4.071*	1.011	0.748
X 5	Buying what friends buy.	7.153*	81.885*	2.683
X 6	Stickiness to a brand if find a good one.	38.600*	110.260*	11.643*
X 7	Buying of favourite brand, regardless of price.	65.669*	16.305*	6.669*
X 8	Buying a brand of good reputation.	111.169*	18.576*	6.765*
X 9	Most of the brands in this product class are all alike.	273.069*	10.415*	5.864*
X 10	Buying of one of the most advertised brands.	60.494*	9.254*	4.784*
X 11	Importance of other features than brand.	52.943*	17.302*	9.608*
X 12	The brand makes a lot of difference to you.	94.964*	22.778*	3.220*

*R/U = Rural-Urban, PC = Product Category, and R/U*PC= Two-way interaction between R/U and PC.*