



## **A STUDY ON BRAND AWARENESS AND PREFERENCE OF RURAL CONSUMERS TOWARDS FMCG GOODS IN RURAL MARKETS WITH REFERENCE TO CHICKABALLAPUR DISTRICT**

**Prof.Lakshmi Narayana.K**

*Assistant Professor, Department of MBA, Centre for Post Graduate Studies-Bangalore Region, VIAT-Visvesvaraya Technological University-Belagav, Muddenahalli, Chickaballapur, India.*

**Dr.Binoy Mathew**

*Associate Professor, Department of MBA, Centre for Post Graduate Studies-Bangalore Region, VIAT-Visvesvaraya Technological University-Belagav, Muddenahalli, Chickaballapur, India.*

### **Abstract**

*With more than 6, 38,588 villages and more than 72.2% of the population, rural India has become a massive consumer goods market. FMCG has emerged as a major product category in rural consumption. Companies marketing FMCG to rural consumers cannot merely extend their general marketing strategies to rural markets. Instead, they need to devise rural specific strategies. The purpose of this study is to examine the brand awareness in rural area and to study the interest of consumers in branded products of Fast Moving Consumer Goods (FMCG). The brand awareness is showing increasing tendency everywhere and Chickaballapur Region of Karnataka State is not an exception to it. To examine the validity of this general statement that is being discussed day in and day out by the researcher, market managers, producers, consumers, advertisers, etc., Research Paper on brand awareness in rural area of Fast Moving Consumer Goods in Chickaballapur Region of Karnataka State is taken up.*

**Keywords: Brand Awareness, Rural Market, Consumer Preference, FMCG's.**

## **1. INTRODUCTION**

### **1.1 Fast Moving Consumer Goods (FMCG)**

Fast Moving Consumer Goods (FMCG) satisfies the elemental and day-to-day household needs other than grocery, ranging from packaged foodstuff, dairy products, cooking oil, bread, butter, cereals, beverages like tea & coffee, pharmaceuticals, confectionery, biscuits, glassware, stationary items, watches, toiletries, detergents, shampoos, skin care products, cosmetics, toothpaste, dish washing liquid, shaving cream, razor, batteries, shoe polish, energy drinks, soft drinks, clothing, furniture and household accessories to electronic goods like cell phones, laptops, computers, digital cameras etc. that are usually categorized as Fast Moving Consumer Electronics or FMCEs.

A major portion of the monthly budget of each household is spent on FMCG products. The introduction of sachets made rural people who are traditionally not accustomed for bulk purchase, to buy branded FMCG products like Rs1/- shampoo, nut powders, oils, detergents, cleaning powders & liquids, tooth pastes, etc. in rural shops. This changed the pattern of buying from traditional products to branded products. The Fast Moving Consumer Goods (FMCG) sector is a corner stone of the Indian economy. This sector touches every aspect of human life. The FMCG producers have realized that there is ample opportunity for them to enter into the rural market. Today we notice this shift towards branded FMCGs in rural areas as a result of Socio Economic & Political changes in the last 5 years. This has made rural areas more viable markets even compared to urban areas. The Socio Economic and Political changes contributed to a great extent for changes in the life styles of countryside people who patronized branded FMCG products. The Government policies to promote education in rural areas enhanced their brand awareness due to the presence of at least one higher education pursuing student in their family or neighbouring family. The different Government policies are also being helpful for rural people contributed in enhancing people's income followed by a change in their lifestyles resulted in patronizing the branded products. According to the National Council of Applied Economic Research (NCAER) about 70 per cent of Indian population living in villages, India has perhaps the largest potential rural market in the world. It has as many as 47,000 haats (congregation markets), compared to 35,000 supermarkets in the US. And of the total FMCGs demand in India, nearly 53 per cent comes from the rural market. At present Indian FMCG sector is worth

Rs.1300 billion and expected to be around a whopping value of Rs. 4000 to Rs. 6000 billion by 2020. Henceforth FMCG and its closest companion Retail sector, both are likely to create most of the jobs in India in the coming years primarily in functions like marketing, sales, advertising, supply chain, logistics, human resources, product packaging and development, finance, operations, general management, supervising and so on.

## 1.2 Brand Awareness and Customer Preferences

Brand awareness is the degree of familiarity among consumers about the life and availability of the product. It is measured as ratio of niche market that has former knowledge of brand. Brand awareness includes both brand recognition as well as brand recall. Brand recognition is the ability of customer to recognize prior knowledge of brand when they are asked questions about that brand or when they are shown that specific brand, While brand recall is the potential of customer to recover a brand from his memory when given the product class/category, needs satisfied by that category or buying scenario as a signal. In other words, it refers that consumers should correctly recover brand from the memory when given a clue or he can recall the specific brand when the product category is mentioned. It is generally easier to recognize a brand rather than recall it from the memory.

Consumer preferences are defined as the subjective (individual) tastes, as measured by utility, of various bundles of goods. They permit the consumer to rank these bundles of goods according to the levels of utility they give the consumer. Note that preferences are independent of income and prices. Ability to purchase goods does not determine a consumer's likes or dislikes. This is used primarily to mean an option that has the greatest anticipated value among a number of options. Preference and acceptance can in certain circumstances mean the same thing but it is useful to keep the distinction in mind with preference tending to indicate choices among neutral or more valued options with acceptance indicating a willingness to tolerate the status quo or some less desirable option.

## 2. REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Marketing scenario in India changed with market liberalization policies after 1990's (Gopaldaswamy, 1997). Most of the Indian rural markets are 'Virgin' in nature and they are now opening for most of the packaged goods (Habeb-Ur-Rahman, 2007) and for a number of product categories (Bijapurkar, Rama 2000). Rural marketers have to differentiate themselves on quality and value for money (Anand & Krishna, 2008). For this purpose, they need to understand the factors that influence the rural purchase of FMCG (Krishnamoorthy, 2008). Various factors influence the purchase decisions of customers (Blackwell and Talarzy, 1977). Available literature mentions that packaging (Pandey, 2005; Venkatesh, 2004), brand name (Narang, 2001; Bishnoi & Bharti, 2007; Sahoo & Panda, 1995), quality (Rashmi & Venu Gopal, 2000; Kumar & Madhavi, 2006), price (Sarangapani & Mamatha, 2008) and promotions (Bhatt & Jaiswal, 1986) influence the rural purchase. Opinion leaders also influence the rural consumption behaviour (Sayulu & Ramana Reddy, 1996). In the process, retailers have emerged as key influencers of rural purchase of FMCG (Ying Zhao, 1994).

The two important measure of brand awareness is brand recognition and recall. (Hoyer and Brown, in 1990.) **Kapferer, in 1988** says "top of mind awareness is critical as it captures the 'consideration set' in a given purchase situation. (Laurent, Kapferer and Roussel, 1995) Study on recall of pictorial advertisements as compared to non-pictorial advertisements indicate how much more effective they are rural consumers as compared to urban consumers. (Velayudhan, 2002) In some studies, brand preference has been equated with brand loyalty (e.g., Rundle-Thiele and Mackay 2001). In other studies, it has been evaluated as a precursor to brand loyalty (e.g., Odin et al. 2001). **Ben-Akiva et al. (1999)** define preferences as "comparative judgments between entities." Additional reasons (other than promotions) why consumers may purchase other brands despite a stated brand preference include a desire to try and learn more about different brands in the category; changing needs or situations; variety seeking; and changes in the available alternatives due to new products or improvements to existing products (Coulter et al. 2003). **Alba and Hutchison (1987)** propose that experts are more likely to search for new information because (a) expertise increases awareness of the existence of potentially acquirable information and (b) familiarity reduces the cost of information acquisition. **Schmidt and Spreng (1996)** further postulate that knowledge increases the perceived ability to search and therefore should decrease the perceived costs of search. Greater knowledge has been shown to be positively related to increased involvement with a

category (e.g., **Raju et al. 1995**). **Dunn et al. (1978)** viewed advertising from its functional perspectives; **Morden (1991)** is of the opinion that advertising is used to establish a basic awareness of the product. Those views of **Etzel et al. (1997)** coincide with the simple but all-embracing definitions of Davies (1998) and Arens (1996). **Aaker (2000)** regarded brand awareness as a remarkably durable and sustainable asset. **Yee and Young (2001)**, aimed to create awareness of high fat content of pies, studied consumer and producer awareness about nutrition labeling on packaging.

**Chen (2001)** expressed a different thought on brand awareness that it was a necessary asset but not sufficient for building strong brand equity. **Beverland (2001)** analyzed the level of brand awareness within the New Zealand market for zespri kiwi fruit.

### 3. OBJECTIVE OF THE STUDY

The objective of the study is to understand the buying perception of the rural consumer towards FMCG Products. For this, the objectives of the Research Work are as under:

1. To study the perception of the rural consumer towards FMCG products.
2. To examine the brand preference and awareness of rural consumer towards FMCG products.
3. To study the attributes of brand preference.
4. To study the impact of media on brand awareness & Preferences.

### 4. HYPOTHESIS OF THE STUDY

The main aim of the study is to test the following hypothesis:

<b>H1</b>	There is significant difference between male and female attitudes towards brand.
<b>H2</b>	There is significant difference among different age groups attitude towards brand.
<b>H3</b>	There is significant difference among different Academic Qualification attitudes towards brand.
<b>H4</b>	There is significant difference among different income group attitudes towards brand.
<b>H5</b>	There is significant difference among male and female attitudes towards brand awareness through Media.

### 5. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

#### 5.1 Population of Study

Chickaballpura District. The study is confined to 10 villages of 3 Talukas of Chickaballpura District, Karnataka State. It is basically a rural oriented region and about 70 percent of population living in villages. Chickaballpura District comprises of Many Talukas namely Bagepally, Chickaballapura, Gudibande, Gowribidanur, Chinthamani, Etc. Due to paucity of time and financial constraints only 10 villages of 3 Talukas namely Bagepally, Chickabaallapur, Gowribidanur are chosen for survey.

#### 5.2 Data Collection

The methodology of the study is based on the primary as well as secondary data. The study depends mainly on the primary data collected through a well-framed and structured questionnaire to elicit the well-considered opinions of the respondents.

#### 5.3 Sampling

The sampling method chosen is simple random sampling which is a type of probability sampling. In all 100 respondents are chosen from different age groups classifying them on the basis of literacy with the help of structured & unstructured interviews & discussions with these respondents the information for this survey is gathered.

The information gathered through the questionnaires will be analyzed with the help of SPSS software by using the Tabular Presentation, t-test and Analysis of Variance (ANOVA).

## 6. DATA ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION

### 6.1 The Demographic Profile of Respondents

Demographic Profile of the Respondents				
Sl.No	Variables	Details	No. of Respondents	%
1	Gender	Male	50	50
		Female	50	50
2	Age	Below 20	8	8
		Between 20-30	25	25
		Between 30-40	40	40
		Above 40	27	27
3	Academic Qualification	Up to School	34	34
		Up to Graduate	40	40
		Up to Post Graduation	22	22
		Professional	4	4
4	Monthly Income	5,000-10,000	24	24
		10,000-15000	21	21
		Above 15000	22	22
		Dependant Respondent (No Income Group)	33	33
5	Types of Products Preferred	Prefer Brand	25	25
		Prefer Non Brand	37	37
		Prefer Quality of Product over Brand	38	38

*Source: Primary Data*

### 6.2 Brand Awareness in Rural Market

Brand Awareness In Rural Market									
Shampoo	%	Washing	%	Soap	%	Tea	%	Toothpaste	%
Garnier	64	Nirma	78.9	Lux	95.8	Taj Mahal	78	Colgate	97
Chik	67	Wheel	85.3	Dettol	82.1	Tata Tea	90	Pepsodent	91
Vatika	72	Surf excel	70.5	Lifebuoy	89.5	Maharani	50	Babool	65
Lux	73	Rin	87.4	Rexona	56.8	Agni Tea	65	Cibaca	61
Pantene	80	Arial	53.7	Centhol	65.3	Brooke bond	61	Dabarlal	67
Sunsilk	81	Tide	75.8	Dove	52.6	Red Label	62	Vicco	46
Clinic plus	87	Hanko	41.1	Hamam	62.1	Lipton Taza	44	Close-Up	82
<b>Avg</b>	<b>75</b>	<b>Avg</b>	<b>70.3</b>	<b>Avg</b>	<b>72.02</b>	<b>Avg</b>	<b>64</b>	<b>Avg</b>	<b>73</b>

*Source: Primary Data*

**Interpretation:** It has been concluded from the above table that the average awareness of the respondents in the rural market is 75%, in case of shampoo, in case of washing powder the average awareness of the respondents is

70.3% , in case of soap the average awareness of the respondent is 72.02%, in case of Tea it is 64% and in case of Toothpaste the average awareness is 73%.

6.3 Brand Preference In Rural Market										
Ranks	Shampoo		Washing		Soap		Tea		Toothpaste	%
	Category	Weight Score	Category	Weight Score	Category	Weight Score	Category	Weight Score	Category	Weight Score
5	Pantene	3.4	Surf excel	3.4	Dettol	3.6	Tata Tea	4.06	Colgate	4.21
4	Vatika	3.05	Rin	3.05	Lux	3.59	Taj Mahal	3.17	Pepsodent	3.6
3	Lux	3.02	Wheel	3.02	Lifebuoy	3.29	Brooke bond	3	Dabarlal	2.51
2	Garnier	3.01	Arial	2.76	Centhol	2.65	Agni Tea	2.84	Babool	2.49
1	Chik	2.53	Nirma	2.75	Rexona	2.31	Maharani	2.16	Cibaca	2.21
Source: Primary Data										

**Interpretation :** From the above table we can see that in case of the shampoo category the respondents give 1<sup>st</sup> rank to pantene, 2<sup>nd</sup> to Vatika, 3<sup>rd</sup> to Lux, 4<sup>th</sup> to Garnier and 5<sup>th</sup> to Chik. In case of washing powder the respondent's gives 1<sup>st</sup>, 2<sup>nd</sup>, 3<sup>rd</sup>, 4<sup>th</sup>, 5<sup>th</sup> rank to Surf, Rin, Wheel, Arial, Nirma respectively. In case of soap the respondents give 1<sup>st</sup> to Dettol, 2<sup>nd</sup> to Lux, 3<sup>rd</sup> to Lifebuoy, 4<sup>th</sup> to Centhol and 5<sup>th</sup> to Rexona. In case of Tea the respondents give 1<sup>st</sup> rank to Tata tea, 2<sup>nd</sup> to Taj Mahal, 3<sup>rd</sup> to Brook Bond, 4<sup>th</sup> to Agni and 5<sup>th</sup> to Maharani tea. In case of category toothpaste the respondents give 1<sup>st</sup> to Colgate , 2<sup>nd</sup> to Pepsodent, 3<sup>rd</sup> to Dabarlal, 4<sup>th</sup> to Babool and last rank to the Cibaca.

#### 6.4: Attributes of Brand Preference in Rural Market

Factors	Weighted Score	Rank
Quality	5.72	1
Price	5.31	2
Easy Availability	4.34	3
Family Liking	4.16	4
Advertisement	3	5
Variety	2.76	6
Credit	2.66	7

**Interpretation :** From the above table no 8.4 it is inferred that the respondents give 1st rank to Quality, 2<sup>nd</sup> to Price, 3<sup>rd</sup> to Easy Availability, 4<sup>th</sup> to Family Liking, 5th to Advertisement, 6th to Variety & 7th rank to Credit Facility Allowed by the Shop-keeper for brand preference.

## 7. INTERPRETATION THROUGH INFERENCE ANALYSIS (T-Test And ANOVA)

To analyze the impact of brand across demographics, the following hypothesis has been tested through T- test and Anova.

### 7.1 Gender V/S Brand

**H0-** There is no significant difference between male and female attitudes towards brand.

**Ha-** There is significant difference between male and female attitudes towards brand.

<b>T-Test : Test of Significance Between Brand Preference &amp; Gender of The Respondents</b>				
<b>Gender</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>Std. Deviation</b>	<b>Std. Error of Mean</b>
Male	50	1.72	0.751	0.107
Female	50	2.04	0.781	0.111

<b>Attitude</b>	<b>Levene's Test for Equality of Variances</b>		<b>t-test for Equality of Means</b>		
	<b>F</b>	<b>Significance</b>	<b>T</b>	<b>DF</b>	<b>Sig. 2 Tailed</b>
<b>Equal Variance Assumed</b>	0.328	0.568	0.208	98	0.04
<b>Equal Variance not Assumed</b>			0.208	97.901	0.04

**Interpretation:** The above table indicate that Significant value is 0.040 which is less than ( $P < 0.05$ ), hence the null hypothesis is rejected and we may conclude that there is a significant difference between male and female attitude towards brand.

### 7.2. Age V/S Brand

**H<sub>0</sub>:** There is no significant difference among different age groups attitude towards brand.

**H<sub>A</sub>:** There is significant difference among different age groups attitude towards brand.

<b>Test of Significance Between Brand Preference &amp; Different Age of Respondents</b>					
<b>Variable</b>	<b>Sum of Squares</b>	<b>DF</b>	<b>Mean Square</b>	<b>F</b>	<b>Sig.</b>
<b>Between Groups</b>	4.883	3	1.628	2.769	0.046
<b>Within Groups</b>	56.247	96	0.588		
<b>Total</b>	61.13	99			

**Interpretation:** The above table indicate that Significant value is 0.046 which is less than ( $P < 0.05$ ), hence the null hypothesis is rejected. There is a significant difference between different age groups attitudes towards brand.

### 7.3 Academic Qualifications V/S Brand

**H<sub>0</sub>:** There is no significant difference among different Academic Qualification attitudes towards brand.

**H<sub>A</sub>:** There is significant difference among different Academic Qualification attitudes towards brand.

<b>Test of Significance Between Brand Preference &amp; Academic Qualification of Respondents</b>					
<b>Variable</b>	<b>Sum of Squares</b>	<b>DF</b>	<b>Mean Square</b>	<b>F</b>	<b>Sig.</b>
Between Groups	6.626	3	2.209	3.932	0.011
Within Groups	53.934	96	0.562		
Total	60.56	99			

**Interpretation:** The above table indicate that Significant value is 0.011 which is less than ( $P < 0.05$ ), hence the null hypothesis is rejected. Thus, there is a significant difference between different Academic Qualification attitudes towards brand.

### 7.4 Monthly Income Vs Brand

**H<sub>0</sub>:** There is no significant difference among different income group attitudes towards brand.

**H<sub>A</sub>:** There is significant difference among different income group attitudes towards brand.

Test of Significance Between Brand Preference & Monthly Income of Respondents					
Variable	Sum of Squares	DF	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	1.826	3	0.609	0.995	0.399
With in Groups	58.734	96	0.612		
Total	60.56	99			

**Interpretation:** The above table indicate that Significant value is 0.399 which is greater than ( $P > 0.05$ ), hence the null hypothesis is accepted. There is no significant difference between different income group attitudes towards brand. Thus, we may conclude that only income does not affect the attitude towards brand.

### 7.5 Correlation between Media and Brand Preference

**H<sub>0</sub>:** There is no significant relation between Media and Brand Preference.

**H<sub>A</sub>:** There is significant relation between Media and Brand Preference.

Correlation Analysis Between Brand Preference & Different Media			
	Brand Preference		Role of Media
Brand Preference	Pearson Correlation	1	0.185
	Sig. 2 Tailed		0.406
	N	100	100
Role of Media	Pearson Correlation	0.185	1
	Sig. 2 Tailed	0.406	
	N	100	100

**Interpretation:** The above table indicate that Significant value is 0.046 which is less than ( $P < 0.05$ ), hence the null hypothesis is rejected. There is a positive impact of media on brand preference.

## 8. CONCLUSION

The brand awareness in rural areas particularly in respect of beauty care and health care products is showing an increasing tendency. (Most of the people both from illiterate & literate groups prefer branded products with the belief that quality is assured as the manufacturers are reputed companies. For Ex: Colgate Tooth Paste, Head & Shoulder shampoo). People are not worried about the price of the product. They are showing willingness to spend higher price when they realize that they can afford to spend. Since the usage of branded products of reputed companies will elevate their status as well as stature in that village.

This change in the attitude to spend more on the highly priced branded products (Example: Dove Soap, Gornour Hair Oil) among high income groups in rural areas clearly suggests that there is an ample scope for such products to capture the markets in this areas by increasing the supply of these products. The marketing agencies are advised to conduct health awareness programs by educating the people about the need to use the health care products to arrest tooth decay, hair fall, dry skin, etc. These products can be made more popular and acceptable among the rural people.

## 9. REFERENCES

1. Anand and Hundal, B.S. (2008), "Perceptions of consumers towards promotional schemes for durables: a study in Punjab", The ICFAI University Journal of Consumer Behavior, Vol.3 No. 2, 17-31.
2. Anand, Sandeep and Krishna, Rajnish (2008), "Rural brand preference determinants in India", In Conference on Marketing to Rural Consumers – Understanding and tapping the rural market potential, IIMK, pp. 1-5.

3. Arens, F. William (2006), *Contemporary Advertising*, 10 e, McGraw-Hill/Irwin, New York.
4. Bhatt, Rajeshwari G. and Jaiswal, M. C. (1986), "A study of an advertising impact and consumer reaction", *Indian Journal of Marketing*, Vol.18, pp. 9-16.
5. Bijapurkar, Rama (2000), "The Marketing in India, *The Economic Times*, September 18, pp. 6.
6. Bijoor, Harish (2005), "Creating brand strategies for rural India", *Deccan Herald*, July, 4.
7. Bishnoi, V.K. and Bharti (2007), "Awareness and consumption pattern of rural consumers towards home and personal care products", In *Conference on Marketing to Rural Consumers*, IIM K, pp. 93-106.
8. Dhunna, Mukesh (1984), "An analysis of consumer behavior—a case study of soft drinks", *Indian Journal of Marketing*, Vol.14, pp. 26-28.
9. FICCI Technopak (2009), *FMCG Sector The Road Ahead*, Massmerize, *Conference on Fast Moving Consumer Goods*, pp. 3-12.
10. Jha, Mithileshwar (2003), "Understanding rural buyer behavior", *IIMB Management Review*, Vol.15 No. 3, pp. 89-92.
11. Kashyap, Pradeep and Raut, Siddharth (2007), "The Rural Marketing Book, Biztantra.
12. Khatri, M (2002), "Challenges in rural marketing, *Strategic Marketing*, July-Aug, 2002.
13. Kothari, C.R. (2004), *Research Methodology Methods and Techniques*, 2e, New Age International (P) Ltd., New Delhi, pp. 152-232
14. Kotler, P., Keller, K. L., Koshy, A. and Jha, Mithileshwar (2009), *Marketing Management A South Asian Perspective*. 13 ed., Pearson Education, New Delhi.
15. Krishnamoorthy, R (2008), *Introduction to Rural Marketing*, Himalaya Publishing House, Mumbai.
16. Krishnamurthy, Jagadeesh (2009), "The challenges and opportunities of marketing in rural india, *Events Faqs Newsletter (EF)*, December, pp. 14-18.
17. Kumar, S.A. and Madhavi, C. (2006), "Rural marketing for FMCG, *Indian Journal of Marketing*, Vol.36 No. 4, pp. 19-38.
18. Kumar, Sanjeev and Bishnoi, V.K. (2007), "Influence of marketers' efforts on rural consumers and their mindset: a case study of Haryana", *The ICFAI Journal of Brand Management*, Vol. 4 No. 4, pp. 28-50.
19. Luck, D.J. and Rubin, Ronald S. (2007), *Marketing Research*, 7 e, Prentice Hall of India Pvt. Ltd., New Delhi.
20. Malhotra, Naresh K. (2007), *Marketing Research An Applied Orientation*, Prentice Hall of India Pvt. Ltd., New Delhi
21. McClave, T. James, Benson, P. George and Sincich, Terry (2008), *Statistics for Business and Economics*, 10 ed., Pearson Education Inc, New Jersey, USA, pp. 10-11.
22. Mitra R. and Pingah, V. (2000), "Consumer aspirations in marginalized communities: a case study in Indian villages", *Consumption Markets and Culture*, Vol. 4 No. 2, pp. 125-144.
23. Narang, R. (2001), "Reaching out to the rural markets of Uttar Pradesh", *Indian Management Studies Journal*, Vol. 5, pp. 87-103.
24. Nielsen White Paper (2012), *Emerging Consumer Demand: Rise of the Small Town Indian*, Nielsen White Papers, India.
25. Pandey, D.P. (2005), "Education in rural marketing". *University News*, vol. 43, pp. 7–8.
26. Prahalad C. K. (2005), *The Fortune at the Bottom of the Pyramid*, Wharton School Publishing.
27. Ramana Rao, P.V. (1997), "Rural market problems and perspective", *Indian Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 27, pp. 17–19.
28. Ramanathan, V. (2007), "Retailing channel enhancement strategies adopted by FMCG companies in South Indian rural markets", *The ICFAI Journal of Management Research*, Vol.6 No. 11, pp. 64-70.
29. Sahoo, S.K. and Panda, J.P. (1995), "The rural market and rural marketing in India: challenges and strategies", *Indian Journal of Commerce*, Vol.18, pp. 185.
30. Sarangapani, A. and Mamatha, T. (2008), "Rural consumer: post purchase behavior and consumer behavior", *The ICFAI Journal of Management Research*, Vol.7 No. 9, pp. 37-67.
31. Sayulu, K. and Ramana Reddy, V.V. (1996), "Socio-economic influences on rural consumer behaviour – an empirical study", *Management Researches*, Vol. 3, pp. 41-51.





32. Sehrawet, Mahavir and Kundu, Subhash C. (2007), "Buying behaviour of rural and urban consumers in India: the impact of packaging", *International Journal of Consumer Studies*, Vol. 31 No. 6, pp. 630-638.
33. Shapiro, B.P., Rangan, V.K., Moriarty, R.T. and Ross, Elliot (1987), "Manage customers for profits (not just sales)", *Harvard Business Review*, Vol. 65 No.5.
34. Simon, J.L. and P. Burstein. (1985), *Some Principles of Measurement*. New York.
35. Random House. Singh, H., Singh, P., Badal, O, Singh, S., and Sen, C. (2008), "Problems and prospects of food retailing in the state of Uttar Pradesh (India)", *Journal of Services Research*, Vol.8 No. 2, pp. 91-99.
36. Sinha, M. (2008), "Walk their walk and talk their talk: the mantra of success in the hinterland", *The ICFAI University Journal of Marketing Management*, Vol. 7 No. 4, pp. 7-23.
37. Technopak Perspective (2009), A quarterly report by CII-Technopak, Vol. 2., pp. 1-23.
38. Vaswani et al. (2005), "Rural Marketing in Development Paradigm, International Conference on Marketing Paradigms for Emerging Economies, IIM-A, Jan 12-13.
39. Velayudhan, S. (2002), *Rural Marketing-Targeting the Non-urban Consumer*, Response Books, Sage Publications India (P) Ltd., New Delhi, Venkatesh, G. (2004), "Technology, Innovation and rural development", *IIMB Management Review*, Vol.16 No. 4, pp. 23-30.
40. Young, C. and Robinson, M. (1992), "Visual connectedness and persuasion", *Journal of Advertising Research*, Vol.32 No. 2, pp. 51-59.
41. Zhao, Y. (1994), *Price dispersion and retailer behavior*, Doctoral dissertation, University of California, Berkeley.