5. SUMMARY OF FINDINGS, SUGGESTIONS AND CONCLUSION

In this chapter the findings, suggestions and conclusion are presented.

5.1. Findings of the Study

Findings of the study are as follows:

5.1.1. Demographic characteristics of the respondents

1. 35 respondents forming 7% the total respondents were aged between 10-20 years, 405 respondents forming 81% the total respondents were aged between 21 to 30 years, 23 respondents forming 4.6% the total respondents were aged between 31-40 years, 17 respondents forming 3.4% the total respondents were aged between 41-50 years and the rest of the 20 respondents forming 4% the total respondents were aged above 51 years. It can be inferred that 81% of the respondents were in the ages of 21 to 30 years and the least category of people were in the ages of 41 to 50 years.

2. The male and female respondents in equal proportion were contacted. 253 respondents forming 50.6% the total respondents were married and 247 respondents forming 49.4% the total respondents were unmarried.

3. 299 respondents forming 59.8% of the total respondents were from nuclear family, 100 respondents forming 20% of the total respondents were from extended nuclear family and rest of the 101 respondents forming 20.2% of the total respondents were from joint family.

4. 15 respondents forming 3% of the total respondents were educated up to school level, 134 respondents forming 26.8% of the total respondents were educated up to graduate level, 237 respondents forming 47.4% of the total respondents were educated up to post graduate level and rest of the 114 respondents forming 22.8% of the total respondents were professionally educated.
5. 201 respondents forming 40.2% of the total respondents were salaried, 141 respondents forming 28.2% of the total respondents were carrying their own business and rest of the 158 respondents forming 31.6% of the total respondents was professional.

6. 161 respondents forming 32.2% of the total respondents had a gross annual income of up to Rs.200,000, 246 respondents forming 49.2% of the total respondents had a gross annual income of Rs. 2,00,001 – Rs. 5,00,000 and rest of the 93 respondents forming 18.6% of the total respondents were earning more than Rs.5,00,000 annually.

5.1.2. Brand of bath soaps preferred by respondents

The bath soap brand Hamam was preferred by 125 respondents forming 25% of the total respondents. So it is the first ranked brand based on preference. Lux and Rexona were preferred by 79 respondents forming 15.8% of the total respondents respectively. So they both get 2.5 ranks respectively. The bath soap brand Pears was preferred by 67 respondents forming 13.4% of the total respondents. It is ranked third based on preference. The bath soap brand Dove was preferred by 56 respondents forming 11.2% of the total respondents. It is ranked fourth based on preference. The bath soap brand Lifebuoy was preferred by 51 respondents forming 10.2% of the total respondents. It is ranked fifth based on preference. The bath soap brand Liril was preferred by 43 respondents forming 8.6% of the total respondents. It is ranked six based on preference.

5.1.3. One way (ANOVA) Analysis of variance between the bath soaps brand preferred and the demographic variables

Hypothesis 1: $H_0$ – The bath soaps brand preferred do not vary with the demographic variables of the respondents at 5%.
The significance of ‘F’ is more than 0.05 for the demographic variables such as age, gender, marital status, family type, educational qualification, occupation and gross annual income, so the null hypothesis is accepted and it is concluded that the bath soaps brand preferred do not vary with all the demographic variables of the respondents at 5%.

5.1.4. Measurement of consumer self confidence

This part explains the three aspects that create self confidence viz., Consideration – Set Formation (CSF), Personal Outcomes Decision Making (PO) and Social Outcomes Decision Making (SO).

5.1.5. Consideration-Set Formation (CSF)

Among the Consumer Self-Confidence construct for Consideration-Set Formation (CSF) the highest characterization is for ‘I can focus easily on a few good brands when making a decision’ with a mean characterization score of 3.09 and the lowest characterization is for ‘I am confident in my ability to recognize a brand worth considering’ with a mean score of 2.19.

Further, among the variables for highest variation in characterization is observed for the statement ‘I know which stores to shop’ with a standard deviation of 1.320 and the lowest variation in characterization is for ‘I trust my own judgment when deciding which brands to consider’ with a standard deviation of 1.137.

5.1.6. One way (ANOVA) Analysis of consideration set formation and demographic variables

Hypothesis 2: H₀ – Consideration set formation do not vary with the demographic variables of the respondents at 5%.

The significance of ‘F’ is more than 0.05 for the demographic variables such as age, gender, marital status, family type, educational qualification, occupation and gross annual income, so the null hypothesis is accepted and it is concluded that
the Consideration set formation do not vary with the demographic variables of the respondents at 5%.

5.1.7. Model of overall Average of Consideration-Set Formation (CSF) from individual CSF variables

The power of the regression model is represented by the $R^2$ is a highly healthy .882 and the F test of the model shows that the significance of the model is high as the significance of F is .000 which is less than .05

The predictors namely, I can focus easily on a few good brands when making a decision, I trust my own judgment when deciding which brands to consider, I am confident in my ability to recognize a brand worth considering, I can tell which brands meet my expectations, and I know which stores to shop are significant at 5% in the estimation of overall Average of Consideration-Set Formation (CSF) constructs.

5.1.8. Chi-square analysis of average of Consideration-Set Formation (CSF) constructs and demographic variables

Hypothesis 3 $H_0$ – There is no association between the demographic variables such as age, gender, marital status, family type, educational qualification, occupation, and gross annual income with the average of Consideration-Set Formation (CSF) constructs at 5%.

The significance of the Pearson chi-square value is more than 0.05, so the null hypothesis is accepted and it is concluded that there is no association between the demographic variables such as age, gender, marital status, family type, educational qualification, occupation, and gross annual income with the average of Consideration-Set Formation (CSF) constructs at 5%.
5.1.9. Measurement of Personal Outcomes Decision Making (PO)

Among the Consumer Self-Confidence construct for Personal Outcomes Decision Making (PO) the highest characterization is for ‘Too often the things I buy are not satisfying’ with a mean characterization score of 3.71 and the lowest characterization is for ‘I often wonder if I’ve made the right purchase selection’ with a mean score of 2.04.

Further among the variables for highest variation in characterization is observed for ‘I never seem to buy the right thing for me’ with a standard deviation of 1.364 and the lowest variation in characterization is for ‘I often wonder if I’ve made the right purchase selection’ with a standard deviation of 1.097.

5.1.10. One way Analysis of personal outcomes decision making and demographic variables

Hypothesis 4: H₀ – Personal outcomes decision making do not vary with the demographic variables of the respondents at 5%.

The significance of ‘F’ is more than 0.05 for the demographic variables such as gender, marital status, family type, educational qualification, occupation and gross annual income, so the null hypothesis is accepted and it is concluded that the Personal outcomes decision making do not vary with the demographic variables of the respondents at 5%.

The significance of ‘F’ is less than 0.05 for the demographic variables viz., age, so the null hypothesis is not accepted and it is concluded that the Personal outcomes decision making do vary with the demographic variables viz., age of the respondents at 5%.

5.1.11. Model of overall Average of Personal Outcomes Decision Making (PO) from individual PO variables

The power of the regression model is represented by the $R^2$ is a highly healthy .901 and the F test of the model shows that the significance of the model is high as the
significance of $F$ is .000 which is less than .05.

The predictors namely, *I often have doubts about the purchase decisions I make, I frequently agonize over what to buy, I often wonder if I've made the right purchase selection, I never seem to buy the right thing for me, and Too often the things I buy are not satisfying* are significant at 5% in the estimation of overall Average of Personal Outcomes Decision Making (PO) constructs.

5.1.12. Chi-square analysis of Average of Personal Outcomes Decision Making (PO) constructs and demographic variables

Hypothesis 5 $H_0$ – There is no association between the demographic variables such as Age, Gender, Marital status, Family Type, Educational Qualification, Occupation, and Gross Annual Income with the Average of Personal Outcomes Decision Making (PO) constructs at 5%.

The significance of the Pearson Chi-Square Value is more than 0.05, so the null hypothesis is accepted and it is concluded that there is no association between the demographic variables such as Age, Gender, Marital status, Family Type, Educational Qualification, Occupation, and Gross Annual Income with the Average of Personal Outcomes Decision Making (PO) constructs at 5%.

5.1.13. Measuring Social Outcomes Decision Making (SO)

Among the Consumer Self-Confidence construct for Social Outcomes Decision Making (SO) the highest characterization is for ‘I have the ability to give good presents’ with a mean characterization score of 2.87 and the lowest characterization is for ‘My friends are impressed with my ability to make satisfying purchases’ with a mean score of 1.38.

Further among the variables for highest variation in characterization is observed for ‘I impress people with the purchases I make’ with a standard deviation of 1.141 and
the lowest variation in characterization is for ‘My friends are impressed with my ability to make satisfying purchases’ with a standard deviation of 0.603.

5.1.14. One way (ANOVA) Analysis of social outcomes decision making and demographic variables

Hypothesis 6: $H_0$ – social outcomes decision making do not vary with the demographic variables of the respondents at 5%.

The significance of ‘F’ is more than 0.05 for the demographic variables such as age, gender, marital status, family type, educational qualification, occupation and gross annual income, so the null hypothesis is accepted and it is concluded that the social outcomes decision making do not vary with the demographic variables of the respondents at 5%.

5.1.15. Model of overall Average of Social Outcomes Decision Making (SO) from individual SO variables

The power of the regression model is represented by the $R^2$ is a highly healthy .847 and the F test of the model shows that the significance of the model is high as the significance of F is .000 which is less than .05.

The predictors namely, *My friends are impressed with my ability to make satisfying purchases, I impress people with the purchases I make, My neighbours admire my decorating ability, I have the ability to give good presents, and I get compliments from others on my purchase decisions* are significant at 5% in the estimation of overall Average of Social Outcomes Decision Making (SO) constructs.

5.1.16. Chi-square analysis of Average of Social Outcomes Decision Making (SO) constructs and demographic variables

Hypothesis 7 $H_0$ – There is no association between the demographic variables such as Age, Gender, Marital status, Family Type, Educational Qualification, Occupation,
and Gross Annual Income with the Average of Social Outcomes Decision Making (SO) constructs at 5%.

The significance of the Pearson Chi-Square Value is more than 0.05, so the null hypothesis is accepted and it is concluded that there is no association between the demographic variables such as Age, Gender, Marital status, Family Type, Educational Qualification, Occupation, and Gross Annual Income with the Average of Social Outcomes Decision Making (SO) constructs at 5%.

5.1.17. Weighted average scores of consideration set formation, personal outcomes decision making and social outcomes decision making variables affecting HUL consumers’ self confidence

Among the three constructs, the highest weighted average score is recorded for personal outcomes decision making with a score of 2.966 followed by consideration set formation with a score of 2.606 and social outcomes decision making (SO) with as score of 2.052. So, personal outcomes decision making has a higher role in affecting HUL consumers’ self confidence.

5.1.18. Factor analysis of Statements for Measuring Consumer Self-Confidence

Four factors were extracted and were named based on their loadings and are shown below.

1. Getting compliments from others on purchase decisions
2. Feels that buys the right thing that are satisfying
3. Confident that right purchase was made and Knowledge of which store to shop
4. No doubt about the purchase decisions made and ability to focus on good brands

5.1.19. Agreement towards the statements for measuring propensity to provide market information

Among the statements describing propensity to provide market information, the highest agreement is for ‘I like introducing new brands and products to my friends’ with a
mean agreement score of 2.78 and the lowest agreement is for ‘I like helping people by providing them with information about many kinds of products’ with a mean score of 1.37.

Further among the statements highest variation is observed for ‘I like introducing new brands and products to my friends’ with a standard deviation of 1.146 and the lowest variation is for ‘I like helping people by providing them with information about many kinds of products’ with a standard deviation of 0.665.

5.1.20. One way (ANOVA) Analysis of variance between propensity to provide market information and demographic variables

Hypothesis 8: $H_0$ – propensity to provide market information do not vary with the demographic variables of the respondents at 5%.

The significance of ‘F’ is more than 0.05 for the demographic variables such as age, gender, marital status, family type, educational qualification, occupation and gross annual income, so the null hypothesis is accepted and it is concluded that the propensity to provide market information do not vary with the demographic variables of the respondents at 5%.

5.1.21. Model of overall average of agreement towards the propensity to provide market information from individual statements

The power of the regression model is represented by the $R^2$ is a healthy .796 and the $F$ test of the model shows that the significance of the model is high as the significance of $F$ is .000 which is less than .05.

The predictors namely, *I like introducing new brands and products to my friends*, *I like helping people by providing them with information about many kinds of products*, *People ask me for information about products, places to shop, or sales, If someone asked where to get the best buy on several types of products, I could tell him or her where to
My friends think of me as a good source of information when it comes to new products or sales, and I know the information about a variety of new products, sales & stores and like to share this information with others. But I don’t necessarily feel that I am an expert on one particular product as predictors are significant at 5% in the estimation of overall average of propensity to provide market information.

5.1.22. Chi-square analysis between average of propensity to provide market information and demographic variables

Hypothesis 9 $H_0$ – There is no association between average propensity to provide market information and demographic variables such as age, gender, marital status, family type, educational qualification, occupation, and gross annual income at 5 %.

The significance of the Pearson Chi-Square Value is more than 0.05, so the null hypothesis is accepted and it is concluded that there is no association between average propensity to provide market information and demographic variables such as age, gender, marital status, family type, educational qualification, occupation, and gross annual income at 5 %.

5.1.23. Overall brand awareness towards HUL

215 respondents forming 43 % agree that they are aware of HUL, 154 respondents forming 30.8 % agree strongly that they are aware of HUL, 90 respondents forming 18 % neither agree nor disagree that they are aware of HUL, 37 respondents forming 7.4 % disagree that they are aware of HUL and 4 respondents forming .8 % strongly disagree that they are aware of HUL

5.1.24. Agreement towards the statements for measuring brand awareness

Among the statements for measuring brand awareness, the highest agreement is for the statement ‘I am aware of HUL I know the symbol of brand HUL looks like’ with a mean agreement score of 4.36 and the lowest agreement is for ‘Able to distinguish
between logos/symbols of HUL compared with other brands. When I think of soap, variety of HUL is the one of the brand that comes to mind’ with a mean score of 3.64.

Further, among the statements highest variation is observed for the statement ‘HUL offers variety of soaps that I am very familiar with that I am aware of HUL’ with a standard deviation of 1.034 and the lowest variation is for ‘I know the varieties of bath soaps offered by HUL’ with a standard deviation of 0.858.

5.1.25. One way (ANOVA) Analysis of variance between brand awareness and demographic variables

Hypothesis 10: $H_0$ – brand awareness does not vary with the demographic variables of the respondents at 5%.

The significance of ‘F’ is more than 0.05 for the demographic variables such as age, gender, marital status, family type, educational qualification, occupation and gross annual income, so the null hypothesis is accepted and it is concluded that the brand awareness does not vary with the demographic variables of the respondents at 5%.

5.1.26. Model of overall average of brand awareness from individual brand awareness statements

The power of the regression model is represented by the $R^2$ is moderately healthy .590 and the $F$ test of the model shows that the significance of the model is high as the significance of $F$ is .000 which is less than .05.

The predictors namely, I am aware of HUL, I know the benefits offered by each variety of soaps, Able to distinguish between logos/symbols of HUL compared with other brands, When I think of soap, variety of HUL is the one of the brand that comes to mind and HUL offers variety of soaps that I am very familiar with are significant at 5% in the estimation of overall average of brand awareness from individual brand awareness statements.
The predictors namely, *I know the symbol of brand HUL looks like, I know the fragrances of bath soaps offered by HUL, I know the varieties of bath soaps offered by HUL, I can quickly recall the symbol/logo of HUL, I can recognise HUL among other competing brands and I have seen a lot of advertisements of HUL* are not significant at 5% in the estimation of overall average of brand awareness from individual brand awareness statements.

5.1.27. Agreement towards the statements for measuring brand image

Among the statements for measuring brand image, the highest agreement is for the statement ‘I feel HUL has good reputation’ with a mean agreement score of 4.26 and the lowest agreement is for ‘This brand sometime make harsh environment’ with a mean score of 3.34.

Further among the statements highest variation is observed for ‘This brand is preferred by upper class consumers’ with a standard deviation of 1.015 and the lowest variation is for ‘I feel HUL is the market leader’ with a standard deviation of 0.746.

5.1.28. Factor analysis of statements for measuring brand image

Seven factors were extracted and were named based on their loadings and are shown below.

1. Offering large varieties
2. Fragrance based varieties
3. Social acceptance
4. Adventurous nature of the brand
5. Fashionable nature of the brand
6. Caters to all segments
7. Reputed brand
5.1.29. Agreement towards the statements for measuring perceived quality

Among the statements for measuring perceived quality, the highest agreement is for ‘HUL has modern looking’ with a mean agreement score of 4.17 and the lowest agreement is for ‘Employees in call centre of HUL who give you personal attention’ with a mean score of 3.69.

Further among the statements highest variation is observed for ‘Sales counter staff is never too busy to respond to your request for choosing HUL products’ with a standard deviation of 0.974 and the lowest variation is for ‘I HUL products are visually appealing’ with a standard deviation of 0.735.

5.1.30. Factor analysis of statements for measuring perceived quality

Three factors were extracted and were named based on their loadings and are shown below.

1. Helpful, prompt sales counter staff
2. Visually appealing packages
3. Modern looks

5.1.31. Agreement towards the statements for measuring brand loyalty

Among the statements for measuring brand loyalty, the highest agreement is for ‘HUL has a good reputation’ with a mean agreement score of 3.71 and the lowest agreement is for ‘I am still willing to use in HUL, even if the price is high’ with a mean score of 3.26.

Further among the statements highest variation is observed for ‘I am being satisfied with this brand’ with a standard deviation of 1.421 and the lowest variation is for ‘I am intent to use HUL when service required’ with a standard deviation of 1.024.
5.1.32. One way (ANOVA) Analysis of variance between brand loyalty and demographic variables

Hypothesis 11: \( H_0 \) – brand loyalty does not vary with the demographic variables of the respondents at 5%.

The significance of ‘F’ is more than 0.05 for the demographic variables such as age, gender, marital status, family type, educational qualification and occupation and income, so the null hypothesis is accepted and it is concluded that the brand loyalty does not vary with the demographic variables of the respondents at 5%.

The significance of ‘F’ is less than 0.05 for the demographic variables viz., Gross Annual Income, so the null hypothesis is accepted and it is concluded that the brand loyalty does vary with the annual income of the respondents at 5%.

5.1.33. Model of brand loyalty from individual brand loyalty variables

The power of the regression model is represented by the \( R^2 \) is moderately healthy .937 and the F test of the model shows that the significance of the model is high as the significance of F is .000 which is less than .05.

The predictors namely, I consider myself to be loyal to HUL, HUL has a good reputation, HUL has high level of attachment with the customer, I am always interest in learning more about HUL, I would be willing to purchase more compared with other brands, I would recommend HUL to others, I am still willing to use in HUL, even if the price is high and I never had bad experience with this brand are significant at 5% in the estimation of brand loyalty from individual brand loyalty variables.

The predictors namely, Bath soaps of HUL would be my first choice, HUL has a name you can trust, I am intent to use HUL when service required, I would like to induce
other people to use with HUL and I am satisfied with this brand are not significant at 5% in the estimation of loyalty from individual brand loyalty variables.

5.1.34. Correlation between age and income of respondents with brand preference constructs

Correlation was computed between age and consideration set formation (CSF), it was found to be .014 which means that there is mild positive correlation between age and consideration set formation. Correlation between gross annual income and consideration set formation was .008, which means that there is very mild positive correlation between gross annual income and consideration set formation. So age has slightly higher positive correlation than gross annual income.

Correlation was computed between age and personal outcomes decision making (PO), it was found to be -.043 which means that there is mild negative correlation between age and personal outcomes decision making. Correlation between gross annual income and personal outcomes decision making was .009, which means that there is very mild positive correlation between gross annual income and personal outcomes decision making. So, gross annual income has slightly higher correlation age of the respondents.

Correlation was computed between age and social outcomes decision making (SO), it was found to be .003 which means that there is mild positive correlation between age and social outcomes decision making. Correlation between gross annual income and social outcomes decision making was .002, which means that there is very mild positive correlation between gross annual income and social outcomes decision making. So age has slightly higher positive correlation than gross annual income of the respondents.

Correlation was computed between age and propensity to provide market information, it was found to be .056 which means that there is mild positive correlation between age and social propensity to provide market information. Correlation between
gross annual income and propensity to provide market information was -.029, which means that there is mild negative correlation between gross annual income and propensity to provide market information. So, age has slightly higher correlation than gross annual income of the respondents.

Correlation was computed between age and overall brand awareness of HUL, it was found to be -.061 which means that there is mild negative correlation between age and overall brand awareness of HUL. Correlation between gross annual income and overall brand awareness of HUL was .043, which means that there is mild positive correlation between gross annual income and overall brand awareness of HUL. So, gross annual income has positive correlation than age of the respondents.

Correlation was computed between age and brand loyalty, it was found to be .092 which means that there is mild positive correlation between age and brand loyalty. Correlation between gross annual income and brand loyalty was .103, which means that there is mild positive correlation between gross annual income and brand loyalty. So, gross annual income has slightly higher correlation than age of the respondents.

5.1.35. Ranking based on the brand preference variables

1. Based on the brand awareness score for Hamam is high about 4.32. It is inferred that the Hamam is having high level of brand awareness. Frequency of Advertisements for Hamam is high with different types of media. Positive word of mouth for Hamam is high.

2. Compared with brand wise, Brand image is the second dimension for measuring the brand preferences of various Bath soaps. Based on that brand image score for Hamam is high about 4.26 which inferred that the Hamam is having high level of brand image. Frequency of Advertisements for Hamam is high with different types of media.
Positive word of mouth for Hamam is high. Hamam is having positive brand image in the market.

3. Perceived quality is the third dimension for measuring the brand preferences of various Bath soaps. Based on that perceived quality scores, first rank assigned to Hamam is high about 4.25. It is inferred that the Hamam is having high level of perceived quality assumed by the respondents. Frequency of Advertisements for Hamam is high with different types of media. Positive word of mouth for Hamam is high. Hamam is having positive perception towards the quality in the market.

4. Brand preference has four dimensions for measuring the brand preference of various Bath soaps. Based on that Brand preference scores, first rank assigned to Hamam is high about 4.24. It is inferred that the Hamam is having high level of Brand preference assessed from the respondents. Frequency of Advertisements for Hamam is high with different types of media. Positive word of mouth for Hamam is high. Hamam is having positive perception towards the quality in the market.

5.1.36. Theoretical contributions of the study as model fitness for measuring the Brand Preferences

1. AMOS (Analysis of Movement of Structure) graphically exhibits the relationship between the determinants of brand preferences of bath soaps. The Researcher identified that four major dimensions are used to determine the brand preferences. Brand awareness is measured by using 12 variables. Perceived quality is measured by using 18 variables. Brand image is measured by using 31 variables. Brand loyalty is measured by using 13 variables. So, 74 variables used to determine the brand preferences of bath soaps.
2. This graphics exhibits the regression and covariance relationship among the variables and dimensions. High value of error term used to eliminate the variable from the model for determining brand preferences of bath soaps.

3. Regression weights show the influence between the determinants and its impact. Brand awareness is the mediating factor for determining the brand preference. Brand awareness has high influence in determining the brand preference by 0.810. Brand loyalty influences the brand preference by 0.0790, the brand image influenced brand preference by 0.766 and perceived quality has significant impact on determining the brand preference of bath soaps by 0.753. From the above table, it is inferred that these four dimensions are significant in their impact for determining the brand preference of bath soaps.

4. Covariance estimates the variation between two dimensions. Perceived quality is having variance with brand image by 1.303 and brand awareness by 1.132. These variances are to be recorded as high compared to all variances in the study. All other dimensions have significant impact in determining the inter-dimensional relationship.

5. The RMSEA value if less than .05. Which indicates the low level approximation of error in this model and it is close fit the model in relation to the degree of freedom. P close value used to test the hypothesis with the model and degree of freedom. Hence it is inferred that this model significantly fit for measuring the brand preference of bath soaps perfectly.
5.2. Suggestions of the Study

1. When the preference among the bath soap brand was analysed, it is found that the bath soap brand Hamam comes out as top ranked brand. Hence researcher finds fit to suggest that the company takes all marketing strategies to retain its preference level. The same applies to other preferred brands.

2. The highest factor loading is observed for the factor viz., Getting compliments from others on purchase decisions with regard to customer self confident. So the company has to produce products that receive complements from others.

3. Among the factors loaded for brand image, the highest loading is observed for HUL is offering large varieties. So HUL must research and introduce more varieties to retain its brand image.

4. The highest factor loading is observed for the factor viz., Helpful prompt sales counter staff with regard to perceived quality. So the same service level must be maintained.

5. Almost 25% of the respondents are using Hamam, it is compared with all the other bath soaps available with HUL. But, only 9% of the respondents are using Liril. So, the organisation must reduce its cost and provide more number of fragrances that should attract the customers.

6. Based on ranking of HUL bath soaps centered on brand awareness, Hamam got first rank. Majority of the respondents are having high awareness for using Hamam. But, Dove got only the seventh rank. So, the organisation must try to increase the awareness and benefits of Dove.
7. Respondents ranked based on the image of the brand in the market, Hamam was the first rank. But Dove got seventh rank. Dove seems to be having negative image in the market with respect to fragrance and price. So, the organisation must try to concentrate on this brand to improve the positive side in the market.

5.3. Conclusion of the Study

The Fast Moving Consumer Goods has strongly striven towards globalization, which increasingly affects the policy at local, regional and global levels. The present study has made a systematic effort on studying consumer brand preference towards bath soaps of HUL by analysing the factors that influence brand choice of the customers and revealed the impact of brand preference dimensions. There is a cut throat competition in the market on price front and so they have to find out better quality and low cost products.

Researcher identified four major dimensions that are used to determine the brand preferences. Brand awareness is measured by using 12 variables. Perceived quality is measured by using 18 variables. Brand image is measured by using 31 variables. Brand loyalty is measured by using 13 variables. So, 74 variables are used to determine the brand preferences of bath soaps.

Brand awareness is dominating as the mediating factor for determining the brand preference. Brand awareness has high influence to determine the brand preference. Brand loyalty, brand image and perceived quality have significant impact on determining the brand preference of bath soaps. Finally the researcher concludes that this research has significantly identified the factors influencing the brand preference of bath soaps of HUL.
5.4. Directions for future research

This research has been conducted only in agriculture and fisheries based district (Nagapattinam) in Tamil Nadu, which implies that future studies can be conducted in other parts of India by replicating the model obtained from this study. The understanding of brand preference dimensions of HUL Bath soaps will help FMCG companies to develop brand positioning strategies, to introduce new variants for the brands and to extend the brand to other categories.

Further this study can be extended to other brands of other companies and the brand preference pattern of the consumers may be identified. The future researchers can also study the impact of Human Personality on Brand Personality dimensions for Bath soap brands of the Indian FMCG players.
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