PACKAGING: YOU'RE SALESMAN ON THE SHELF

Pallavi Patil
Faculty, Sinhgad Institute of Management, Pune.

Abstract
The study is intended to measure the impact of packaging and labeling on retailers and consumer buying behavior. Further it also investigates the mediation of brand image for the relationship of packaging and labeling with consumer buying behavior. Study was carried out with the help of statistical analysis of data obtained from questionnaire. Study revealed theimportance of buyer attraction in package design and unimportance of environmental considerations. Similarly customers are more likely to give weightage to branded product than to the package and shape of package is the significant attribute of communication through product packaging.

Keywords: Brand communication, Brand Image, Buyer attraction, Marketing Mix, Package Design, Packaging.

INTRODUCTION
Products are always protected by packaging which is a material around the product to protect it from any sort of damages, contain information about the brand, quality and how to use that product is known as packaging. According to previous studies (Bloch, 1995: Madden, Hewett & Roth, 2000; Underwood et al., 2001;, Silayoi&Speece, 2004; Silayoi&Speece, 2007; Butkeviciene, Vila &Ampuero, 2007; Stravinskiene&Rutelione, 2008) attraction towards the packaging is more to be seen in young generation due to several reasons. Consumers of all ages are involved in the category of consumers, who get attracted to the products due to its packaging, but young generation particularly of age group of 17-30 years old males and females consumers to get approximate results. According to Rundh (2005) packaging has a great impact as far as brand is concerned, and people are more attracted because of the brand and they got a perception about a product in advance. Packaging is also used for the marketing of that product. It is actually one of the most important marketing tools for any product.Labeling give message to consumer that the product has those kinds of features you want and I am best from the other brands of the same products. (K,Rita 2009). Sometimes labeling and packaging make in a very good manner that consumer think that he or she really needs that kind of product. Many consumers think that this product doesn't have seen before and so many questions are raised at the time of purchasing like the quality of product, it may have some side effects. Labeling is anything written on the packaging or product or anything else ranging from simple tag or a designed graphics. It is possible that a label only contain brand name of the product or it could contain all the information about the ingredients and use of the product (Kotler, 2001). According to the FDA (1998), a label of the product must contain at least brand name of the product, ingredients, its manufacturer's name and address, net weight and other nutrition facts about the product. If label of the product is not in a proper way or not clear to the consumers then there is possibility that consumer will not purchase that type of product. Many companies use packaging and labeling as a tool to attract the buyers towards the product and to increase their sales. (Butkeviciene et al. (2008). People are ready to pay more for the products who have good brand name as compare to those products which don't have good brand image. For the success of any organization brand name is very important, (Randall 1997). Authors believe that in this age of globalization and competition role of brand is imperative to increase the market share.

PROBLEM STATEMENT
The study is to investigate the role of packaging and labeling on retailor and consumer buying behavior.

OBJECTIVES OF STUDY
1. To explore the relationship of labeling and packaging on retailor and consumer buying behavior.
2. To explore that if brand image mediates the relationships of packaging on consumer buying behavior.
3. To explore that if brand image mediates the relationships of labeling on retailor and consumer buying behavior.
4. To explore the impact of all above said relationships.

PRACTICAL IMPLICATIONS
The study would help to understand the exact role of the packaging and labeling with respect to consumer buying behavior. Accordingly marketers may choose the strategies. The role brand image is also being considered so marketers would come to know that how long brand image is creating the impact on consumer decisions while they are taking packaging into consideration.

REVIEW OF LITERATURE
Packaging is used to communicate with the consumer (Butkeviciene et al. (2008). Packaging is the only thing that communicate a message about the product to buyer in the store" (Gonzalez et al., 2007). It is used to protect the product from

damages during shipping and transferring product from one place to another (Wells et al,2007). Consumers are sensitive and don't want such packaging which carries germs or infections as consumers are used to check/evaluate it by appearance of the products and ensuring the quality of the product before making a purchase decision (Grundvag&Østli, 2009).

According to Kotler (2001) "A label might carry only the brand name or a great deal of information". Before purchase consumer seeks the information and one of the sources of such information is label particularly in nutrition (Caswell and Padberg, 1999). The color, style, design and other interesting material as a label not only distinguishing the brand form other competing brands but also increase the likelihood of purchase (Rocchi and Stefani, 2005). Consumers are interested in the authenticity of the product before the purchase which is defined as "the fact being original" (McLeod, 1999). Olson and Jacoby, (1973) identified the label as an extrinsic cue that is an attribute not included in the physical products. Label could create the authenticity in the product by providing such information as quality, specification, ingredients etc. (Halewood and Hannam, 2001; Marianna, 1997). Keller, (1993) defined that brand image refers to a particular frame of reference by which the consumer is associating a particular brand. A good image enhances the value of the brand in the eyes of the consumer by increasing its likeability/desirability and differentiating it from other competing brands (Hsieh, Pan, and Setiono, 2004). The outcome of the favorable image is the increase in loyalty, equity, cosumer buying behavior and overall performance of brand (Koo, 2003; Keller, 1993: Hsieh et al., 2004, Roth, 1995). Brand image is measured in terms of benefits a brand is offering or some attributes the brand is having or the usage of the brand (et al., 2001; Malhotra's 1981; ; Roth, 1995).

Consumer behavior includes the number of processes, stages of decision making, and activities in which customer/consumer make decision of buying, using and disposing off the products after usage or fulfillment of needs (Blackwell et al. 2006). Consumer behavior is a decision making process in which people make their purchase and other decisions keeping in view the available resources which are efforts, time and money (Schiffman and Kanuk, 2000). The decision is based on consumer preferences and consumer has his/her own preferences which may differ from each other (Blackwell et al., 2006). As brand name or image increases the value of the brand in the eyes of the customers so they are purchasing a particular brand again and again (Gabbott and Hogg, 1998).

HOW PACKAGING CAN INFLUENCE CONSUMER BUYING BEHAVIOR
Together with promoting, pricing and advertising, packaging is one of the main marketing strategies used by companies in order to sell their products. Put the same quantity of one product in two boxes, one a plain white cardboard box and the other one in an attractive, colourful box, position them side by side on a supermarket shelf and sell them at exactly the same price, guess which one will sell? This is a simplified example to show you that packaging does influence customer behavior.Marketers must carefully study consumers and if they want a product to be successful, adapt the packaging to their target consumers: you can have equally attractive packaging that will appeal differently to different kinds of consumers. A child will go for a popular cartoon character on a cereal box while a mother will more likely buy a product which is clearly labeled as being nutritional (which can cause family frictions in the weekly undertaking of grocery shopping). It is also important to consider the quantity in which to pack a product: if you target older people who are likely to be living alone or in couple, sell them a product that is packaged in small quantities: they will be more likely to buy a pack of 2 slices of ham than a bargain bumper-pack that will probably go out of date before they get to eat it all. Practicality of use is also important: the mother of young children will choose a product that is easy to open for her children's lunch-box, whereas a bachelor won't mind if a jam-jar is difficult to open. There are a lot of variables to consider when deciding on the right packaging for a product and the main thing for a company to remember when choosing a package is that it must be adapted to consumer's needs.

PACKAGE DESIGN
Consumer packaging serves to contain and communicate. A product's "packaging mix" is the result of several requirements that determine how a package accomplishes those two basic functions. Robert D. Hisrich identified eight major package requirements that dictate the mix. A package must: protect the product, be adaptable to production-line speeds, promote or sell the item, increase the product's density, help the consumer use the product, provide reusable value to the user, satisfy legal requirements, and keep packaging-related expenses low. Two classes of package design criteria are functional requirements and sales requirements.

FUNCTIONAL REQUIREMENTS
Package design must meet five groups of functional criteria:
1. In-home,
2. Instore (or warehouse)
3. Production
4. Distribution and safety
5. Legal

PRODUCT LABELING

The label is the text printed on a product package or, in the case of items like clothing, attached to the product itself. Legally, labels include all written, printed, or graphic material on the containers of products that are involved in interstate commerce or held for sale. The main body of legislation governing packaging and labeling is the Fair Packaging and Labeling Act of 1966. It mandates that every product package or label specify on its "principal display label" (the part of the label most likely to be seen by consumers) the following information:

1. The product type
2. The producer or processor's name and location
3. The quantity (if applicable)
4. The number and size of servings (if applicable).

Furthermore, several restrictions apply to the way that the label is displayed. For example, mandatory copy required by the act must be in boldface type. Also, if the company is not listed in the telephone book, the manufacturer's or importer's street address must be displayed.

Other information required by the act relates to specific foods, toys, drugs, cosmetics, furs, and textiles. For instance, under the act labels for edible products must provide sodium content if other nutritional information is shown. They must also show ingredients, in descending order from the one of highest quantity to the one of least quantity. Certain food items, such as beef, may also be required to display qualitative "grade labels" or inspection labels. Likewise, "**informative labeling**" may be required for products such as home appliances. Informative label requirements mandate information about use, care, performance capability, life expectancy, safety precautions, gas mileage, or other factors. Certain major home appliances, for example, must provide the estimated cost of running each make and model for one year at average utility rates.

US government has passed significant new labeling legislation, the Nutrition Labeling and Education Act of 1990, which became effective in the mid-1990s. This act is intended primarily to discourage misleading labeling related to health benefits of food items. Specifically, many package labels subjectively claimed that their contents were "low-fat," "high-fiber," or possessed some other health virtue when the facts indicated otherwise. Basically, the new laws require most food labels to specify values such as calorie and cholesterol content, fat and saturated fat percentages, and sodium levels.

SALES REQUIREMENTS

In additional to functional requirements, product packaging must be designed in a way that will appeal to buyers. The four principal merchandising requirement areas are:

1. Apparent size.
2. Attention drawing power.
3. Impression of quality.
4. Brand-name readability.

PACKAGING STRATEGY

One of the most critical roles for packaging is promoting products. Indeed, just as ease-of-use and readability are elements of the strategic packaging mix, packaging is an important part of a company's strategic marketing mix. Most packages for consumer products are designed for one of three purposes:

- To improve the packaging of an existing product
- To add a new product to an existing product line
- To contain an entirely new product.

Time pressure

Time pressure frequently affects shopping decisions. Participants agreed that when shopping under relatively high time constraints, they spend less time making any given purchase. They described shopping under time pressure as making quick decisions without careful evaluation. This made them purchase fewer products than intended and led to unplanned purchases. It was more difficult to make decisions, especially when considering multiple brands or product attributes. They made most decisions quickly at the point of sale.

RESEARCH FRAMEWORK

Pursuing the aim of this study, the importance of various visual and verbal elements of package for consumer's decisions was surveyed in literature. When all functions and environments are considered simultaneously, packaging becomes a socio-scientific endeavor. When viewed this way, packaging is not just a means to protect or contain the product, but has the potential to impact the decisions of consumers, and the lives of those interfacing with it. Researchers have synthesized this

concept into a tool referred to as   The Packaging Matrix. Based on the careful investigation of available literature the study would circle around the following framework.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

In the current study work after exhaustively surveying the literature above framework was devised. In the above framework the dependent and independent variables were jotted down and the questionnaire involving dependent and independent variables was administered to the representative set of population. And the data collected through survey was analyzed by using multiple regression analysis. The questionnaire was rated on the five point Likert scale. The ratings ofquestionnaire ranged from strongly agree to strongly disagree. The strongly disagree was allotted the scale of 1 and strongly agree was allotted the scale of 5. The respondents were asked to fill the questionnaire which involved 20 parameters that comprised package design, liking of package, communication through package and usability of package. The questionnaires were administered online as well as to seek responses.

Sampling Design
Sampling Population: Sampling population consisted of the different users of packaging who use the packaging in their day to day life.
Sampling Elements: Individual respondents were the sampling elements.
Sampling Size: 103 respondents for questionnaire
Data Collection
Self-designedquestionnaires were administered to gauge the preferences of respondents. The questionnaires were rated on the 5 point Likert scales with 1 for strongly disagree and 5 for strongly agree.
Tools used for Data Analysis
Following tools were used for data analysis:
a) Reliability test to measure the reliability of questionnaire.
b) Multiple regression analysis

Hypotheses for relationships between package design and buyer attraction, communication to the buyer, convenience in handling, salability of product, green aspect.
   H0: Significant linear relationship does exist between package design and buyer attraction.
   H1: Significant linear relationship exists between package design and buyer attraction
   H0: Significant linear relationship does not exist between package design and communication to the buyer
   H1: Significant linear relationship exists between package design and communication to the buyer.
   H0: Significant linear relationship does not exist between package design and convenience in handling.
   H1: Significant linear relationship exists between package design and convenience in handling.
   H0: Significant linear relationship does not exist between package design and salability of product.
   H1: Significant linear relationship exists between package design and salability of product.
   H0: Significant linear relationship does not exist between package design and green aspect.
   H1: Significant linear relationship exists between package design and green aspect.
Hypotheses for relationships between liking for package and brand country of origin,colour connotation, symbol connotation and size.
   H0: Significant linear relationship does not exist between liking for package and brand
   H1: Significant linear relationship exists between liking for package and brand
   H0: Significant linear relationship does not exist between liking for package and country of origin.
   H1: Significant linear relationship exists between liking for package and country of origin.
   H0: Significant linear relationship does not exist between liking for package and colour connotation
   H1: Significant linear relationship exists between liking for package and colour connotation
   H0: Significant linear relationship does not exist between liking for package and symbol connotation
   H1: Significant linear relationship exists between liking for package and symbol connotation
   H0: Significant linear relationship does not exist between liking for package and size
   H1: Significant linear relationship exists between liking for package and size
Hypotheses for the relationships between communication through the package and independent variables like information, shape, brand image and symbols/logos.
   H0: Significant linear relationship does not exist between communication through the package and information.
   H1: Significant linear relationship exists between communication through the package and information.
   H0: Significant linear relationship does not exist between communication through the package and shape.
   H1: Significant linear relationship exists between communication through the package and shape.

H0: Significant linear relationship does not exist between communication through the package and brand image.
H1: Significant linear relationship exists between communication through the package and brand image.
H0: Significant linear relationship does not exist between communication through the package and symbols/logos.
H1: Significant linear relationship exists between communication through the package and symbols/logos.

Hypotheses for the relationship between usability of package and ease of handling, disposability and protection.
H0: Significant linear relationship does not exist between usability of package and ease of handling.
H1: Significant linear relationship exists between usability of package and ease of handling.
H0: Significant linear relationship does not exist between usability of package and disposability
H1: Significant linear relationship exists between usability of package and ease of disposability
H0: Significant linear relationship does not exist between usability of package and protection
H1: Significant linear relationship exists between usability of package and protection.

The above listed hypotheses are tested for their level of significance for the acceptance and rejection of hypothesis.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS
Cronbach Alpha statistic was calculated to assess the reliability of the questionnaire and to find the inter item reliability. The Cronbach Alpha value comes out to be 0.703 which is greater than 0.7 so it can be concluded that questionnaire was reliable enough as an instrument to test the preferences of the respondents

Table -1: Reliability Statistic

Cronbach's Alpha	Cronbach's Alpha Based on Standardized Items	N of Items
.703	.719	20

Table -2: Item Statistic for Attributes

	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
Package Design	4.09	.702	103
buyer attraction	2.67	1.061	103
Communication	4.03	.692	103
Convenience	2.84	1.194	103
Salability	2.83	1.061	103
Environmental factors	2.72	1.451	103
Liking	2.42	.891	103
Brand	3.81	.929	103
Country of Origin	3.67	.706	103
Colour	3.71	.956	103
Symbols/ Logos	3.82	1.144	103
Size	2.63	1.102	103
Communication	3.73	.819	103
Shape	3.81	.768	103
Brand Image	4.02	.852	103
usability	3.35	.801	103
Ease of handling	2.54	1.092	103
Information	3.35	1.289	103
Disposability	3.81	1.164	103
Protection	4.22	.839	103

The table above shows that package design, communication through the package, brand image and protection are the factors that were given the highest weightage by the respondents. Also the inter item correlation matrix shows that package design is highly correlated to convenience in handling of package and usability of package. It is also found that package design is negatively correlated to salability and brand which indicates towards the case that a branded product can be given less weightage on package design and also if product is highly saleable then less importance can be given to package design.

Also it was learnt from the inter item correlation matrix that liking for a package is highly correlated to buyer attraction and usability of the package which suggest that the reuse of the package like the water bottles prompts user to choose that package. Communication through the brand is highly correlated to shape of the package. Similarly the matrix showed that usability of the package has highest correlation to the ease of handling of the package and also the practical findings reveal that in case of creams or viscous products the shape of opening had been broadened for the product to flow easily thus increasing the ease of handling. Table below shows the coefficients obtained:

Table – 3, Model Summary for Package Design

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square
1	.824(a)	.679	.621

a. Predictors: (Constant), Environmental Factors, Communication, Convenience, Salability, Buyer Attraction
b. Dependent Variable: Package Design

The adjusted R^2 value tells us that this model accounts for approximately 68% variance in the package design- relatively good model.

Table- 4 ANOVA for package design

Model	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Regression	54.443	5	10.889	40.936	.000(a)
Residual	25.770	97	.266		
Total	80.213	102			

a.
Predictors: (Constant), Environmental Factors, Communication, Convenience, Salability, Buyer Attraction
b. Dependent Variable: Package Design

The above table reports an ANOVA, which assesses the overall significance of our model. As $p<0.05$, the model is significant

Table- 5: Coefficient for Package Design

Model	Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
	Beta		
(Constant)	2.254	4.921	.000
Buyer Attraction	.313	3.019	.003
Communication	.171	1.892	.061
Convenience	.295	3.185	.002
Salability	-.260	-.265	.791
Environment Factors	.106	1.179	.241

A. Dependent Variable: Package Design

The standardized Beta coefficients give a measure of the contribution of each variable to the model. A large value indicates that a unit change in this variable has large effect on the dependent variable. The t and sig. value give a rough indication of the impact of each predictor variable. The table above shows the statistical relationship between the dependent variable package design and independent variables. The relationship can be established as

*Package design = **2.254** + **0.313** Buyer Attraction + **0.173** Convenience in handling*As per the table shown above significance value or p value for buyer attraction<0.05 and also the value is beta is significantly positive so null hypothesis is rejected and alternate hypothesis is accepted thus showing that significant linear relationship exists between package design and buyer attraction. Yoghurt pots: one plain pot and one bright/cheerful looking pot. The mothers were told that both pots contained the same healthy ingredients, but that the bright pot was slightly more expensive. Despite the price premium, 88% of the mothers said they would choose the bright pot as their children would be more likely to eat it [10]. The significance value for communication is > 0.05 at 95% confidence level so null hypothesis could not be thereby showing that no linear relationship exists between package design and communication. The table also shows that significance value for convenience

is <0.05 at 95%confidence level and it suggests the rejection of null hypothesis and acceptance of alternate hypothesis which conveys that significant linear relationship exists between convenience and package design suggesting that packages must be designed so that they are convenient to handle. From the table shown above it can be seen from the value of coefficient that package design and salability of product are negatively related so it can be concluded that highly selling product can be compromised on its packaging also since the significance level of salability is >0.05 then the null hypothesis can be accepted suggesting thatno significant relationship exists between package design and salability. It is evident from the table that significance value of environmental factors >0.05 so it suggests the non-rejection of null hypothesis that depicts that no significant relationship exists between package design and environmental factors. Also the value of coefficient for environmental factor is 0.106 which is too less to have an impact thus suggesting that Indian context the people are less inclined towards the environmental issues. On the basis of the multiple regression model shown above for package design it can be concluded that buyer attraction is the most significant aspect of package design and from the analysis above it can be summarized that people place environmental factors at relatively lower level of significance. If we think something tastes or works better because of its packaging, is there any difference than if it really does? Perception of a food product, for example, has been shown to be affected by a variety of factors including taste, odor, information from labeling and images, attitudes, memory from previous experience, price, prestige, nutritional content, health belief, familiarity and brand loyalty.

Multiple Regressions analysis and discussion for Liking for Package

Table – 6, Model Summary for liking of package

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square
1	.805(a)	.648	.609

a. Predictors: (Constant), Size, Countryof Origin, Symbols, Logos, Brand, Colour
b. Dependent Variable: Liking
The adjusted R2 value tells us that this model accounts for approximately 65% variance in the liking package - relatively good model.

Table - 7 ANOVA for liking of Package

Model	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Regression	58.435	5	11.687	34.783	.000(a)
Residual	32.614	97	.336		
Total	90.049	102			

a. Predictors: (Constant), Size, Countryof Origin, Symbols, Logos, Brand, Colour
b. Dependent Variable: Liking
The above table reports an ANOVA, which assesses the overall significance of our model. As p<0.05, the model is significant.

Table – 8, Coefficient For Liking For Package

Model	Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
	Beta		
Constant)	2.362	4.134	.000
Brand	-.313	-3.186	.002
CountryofOrigin	-.054	-.538	.592
Colour	.194	1.652	.028
Symbols/ Logos	.000	-.002	.998
Size	.367	3.785	.000

a. Dependent Variable: Liking
The multiple regression model for liking for package can be given as:
Liking for package = **2.362**- **0.313** *Brand +* **0.194** *Colour+* **0.367** *Size*

From the table shown above the significance value for brand<0.05 at the 95% level of confidence so the null hypothesis is rejected and alternate hypothesis is accepted thereby corroborating that significant linear relationship exists between liking for package and brand. But at the same time it shows that liking for a package and brand are negatively related to each

other.Country of origin had the significance value>0.05 so null hypothesis could not be rejected that no significant relationship exists between country of origin and liking for package.As far as the colour is concerned we can see that the significance value is<0.05 so null hypothesis is rejected and alternate hypothesis which postulates that significant linear relationship exists between liking for package and colour so customers will like the colourful products. Symbols and logos do not seem to have an impact over the liking for package and also the significance value is >0.05 which suggests the non-rejection of null hypothesis which postulates that no significant relationship exists between symbols/ logos and liking for package suggesting that customers get more attracted by colours and size rather than symbols and logos.

In the regression model shown above the size of package had significant impact over the liking for package and it is positively related to liking. Also the significance value for size is <0.05 at 95% confidence level so null hypothesis is rejected and alternate hypothesis is accepted thereby stating that significant linear relationship exists between liking for a package and size of package which indicates the popularity of miniaturization of products in the form of shampoosachets or deo sticks etc.Packaging in different serving sizes can extend a product into new target markets or help to overcome cost barriers. In developing markets such as South Africa, the pack size can mean the difference between the success or failure of a brand in the informal sector. Smaller packages and portions are usually priced at a lower absolute level making the product more readily affordable to a greater proportion of the population. Some examples of success in this regard include smaller Sunlight and Omo packs servings which have increased the penetration of these brands substantially. The popularity of single cigarettes and smaller packs for analgesics has proven that   good things really do come in small packages.Where smaller packages are not available, entrepreneurial individuals often buy the product and transfer it into smaller non-branded packaging for resale which completely nullifies all the branding benefits of the original pack.In more developed countries, brands that don‘t offer smaller or single-size servings make themselves immediately unsuitable for those living in smaller or single households that do not desire family-size packs. On the other hand, larger packs can extend the category to a more social environment.

For example, the 5l juice bottle expanded the fruit juice category from individual and home consumption to social and catering purposes. The popularity of quart size beer is another example to this the larger size means that the cost per volume is cheaper and more affordable for the masses.

Multiple Regression Analysis for Communication through the Package

Table - 9 Model summaries for communication through package.

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square
1	.864(a)	.746	.714

a. Predictors: (Constant), Symbols/ Logos, Information, Shape, Brand, Image
b.DependentVariable:Communication
The adjusted R^2 value tells us that this model accounts for approximately 75% variance in the communication through - relatively good model.

Table - 10 ANOVA for communication Through Package

Model	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Regression	59.483	4	14.871	77.052	.004(a)
Residual	18.905	98	.193		
Total	78.388	102			

The above table reports an ANOVA, which assesses the overall significance of our model.As $p<0.05$, the model is significant.
a. Predictors: (Constant), Symbols/Logos, Information, Shape, Brand Image
b. Dependent Variable: Communication

Table - 11 Coefficient For communication through package

Model	Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
	Beta		
(Constant)	2.214	4.311	.000
Information	.178	1.522	.031
Shape	.300	3.121	.002
Brand Image	.019	.158	.022
Symbols/ Logos	-.057	-.561	.576
Constant)	2.214	4.311	.000

a.DependentVariable: Communication

The multiple regression model for communication aspect of packaging can be given as:

Communication through package = **2.214** + **0.178** *Information* + **0.300** *Shape* + **0.019** *Brand Image*

From the table shown above it is evident that information is positively correlated to the communication and the value of significance is less<0.05 at 95% significance level so the null hypothesis is rejected and alternate hypothesis is accepted thereby stating that significant positive relationship exists between communication through the package and information furnished by the package but at the same time it can be seen that value of coefficient for information is relatively less than shape and brand image which suggests that information should not be too much to cause the clutter on the package. Furthermore, Grossman and Wisenblit found that informational elements tend to be less important than visual in low involvement product decisions: so graphics and colour become critical so it can be inferred that information plays a vital role in a packaging of products but it should be at the optimum level. The shape has the most profound impact on communication through the package as it is evident from the value 0.300 which is highest among all dependent variables. Also the significance value suggests the acceptance of alternate hypothesis thus establishing a positive linear relationship between the communication aspect of package and shape of package. Brand image of product also has significant impact over the communication through the package which is evident from the value of coefficient for brand image which is 0.019. Also the significance value is <0.05 which suggests the acceptance of alternate hypothesis and rejection of null hypothesis. The package thus communicates to the customers through its brand image. Symbols and logos don not have significant relationship with communication aspect as it is evident from the value of significance which is >0.05 and also the coefficient of symbols/ logos is negative so it does not impact the customers to the greater extent.

Multiple Regression Analysis for Usability of the Package

Table -12 Model summary for usability of the package

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.850(a)	.722	.681	.698

.a. Predictors: (Constant), Protection, Disposability, Ease of Handling

b. Dependent Variable: Usability

The adjusted R^2 value tells us that this model accounts for approximately 68% variance in the Usability of the package – relatively a good model.

Table – 13, ANOVA for usability of package

Model	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Regression	Regression	47.232	3	15.744	85.565
Residual	Residual	18.186	99		
Total		65.417	102		

a. Predictors: (Constant), Protection, Disposability, Ease of handling

The above table reports an ANOVA, which assesses the overall significance of our model. As p<0.05, the model is significant.

Table- 14 Coefficient for usability of package

Model	Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
	Beta		
(Constant)	1.818	3.911	.000
Ease of handling	.477	5.371	.000
Disposability	.063	.720	.473
Protection	.118	1.322	.039
(Constant)	1.818	3.911	.000
Ease of handling	.477	5.371	.000

a. Dependent Variable: Usability

The multiple regression model for liking can be given as:
Usability of Package = **1.818** *+* **0.477** *Ease of handling +* **0.118** *Protection*

From the multiple regression table shown above it can be seen that significance value for ease of handling of package is< 0.05 at 95% significance level so the null hypothesis is rejected and alternate hypothesis is accepted which postulates that the significant relationship exists between usability of product and ease of handling ,Also the value of coefficient whichis highest among dependent variables shows that it has got highest impact on usability which further suggests that the marketers now a day devise the packages in such a way so that the handling of product inside package becomes easy. Example can be the larger diameter caps for creams, face wash and tooth pastes that are viscous in nature. Also from the table above the significance value for disposability is >0.05 at the confidence level of 95% so the null hypothesis is accepted which postulates that significant linear relationship does not exists between usability of package and disposability which is related to environmental factors. So it can be interpreted in Indian contexts that disposability is not given due weightage when usability is weighed against disposability. The significance value for protection is <0.039 which is lower than 0.05 so null hypothesis is rejected and alternate hypothesis is accepted thereby reaffirming that significant linear relationship exists between usability of package and protection which suggests that the products such as medicines are packaged in such a way so as to protect it from damage from light or environment.

PACKAGING STRATEGY BASED ON FINDINGS
The packaging today has become the vital tool to make the products the Face in the crowd rather than face of the crowd . It has become the most significant aspect to position the products in the market in an effective manner. The multiple regression analysis of different packaging attributes resulted in surfacing of very important information regarding the packaging parameters. The buyer attraction emerged as the important factor which signals towards the scenario when the packages need to be attraction driven rather than information driven.   In most cases, our experience have been that pack designs are more likely to influence the consumer perception of the brand than advertising. The communication aspect of package was marginally significant so the package as a means to communication as per this research does not carry that significant weight so the more importance should be given to the attracting capability of the package. It was said by Jugger [20] that   Brand purchases are being made or broken in the final five seconds'. So it is very important to decide which attributes of packaging needs to be highlighted and which needs to be downplayed. The study revealed that in Indian context the respondents were not environment conscious to a great extent and the environmental factors pertaining to package design were of less significance so the packages must be designed in such a ways that more effort should be made to produce more environmental friendly packages so balance the low environmental concern. Size emerged as a very important factor thus indicating towards the variation of packages sizes available for a particular product. We can take examples of shampoo sachet, deodorant sticks, small sized toothpaste packages or even more of FMCG products. We find that variation of size make the affordability of product adjustable as per the income level and standard of living. Packaging in different serving sizes can extend a product into new target markets or help to overcome cost barriers. In developing markets such as South Africa, the pack size can mean the difference between the success and failure of a brand in the informal sector. Smaller packages and portions are usually priced at a lower absolute level – making the product more readily affordable to a greater proportion of the population. The popularity of single cigarettes and smaller packs for analgesics has proven that   good things really do come in small packages . Where smaller packages are not available, entrepreneurial individuals often buy the product and transfer it into smaller non-branded packaging for resale – which completely nullifies all the branding benefits of the original pack. In more developed countries, brands that don't offer smaller or single-size servings make themselves immediately unsuitable for those living in smaller or single households that do not desire family-size packs. On the other hand, larger packs can extend the category to a more social environment For example; 5l Coca Cola bottle expanded the beverages category from individual and home consumption to social and catering purposes. The popularity of quart size beers

is another example where the larger size means that the cost per volume is cheaper and more affordable for the masses. Shape is also very important attribute as it is evidenced form this research and this signals towards the fact that previous shape of package can become important marketing tool. In case of coca cola or other soft drinks, the bottle is the package so the shape of the bottle becomes its brand identity. If we analyze the shapes of different soft drinks like Pepsi or sprite or fruit juices, we can see that different companies have got different shape of bottle. So the shape of package can become an innovative marketing tool creating an iconic brand image through different shaped packages. Instead how we feel about the package is often transferred to how we feel about the product itself. In essence, for consumers the product is the package and the product combined. In this manner the shape of the package must be designed in such a way so as to enable the product to cut through the clutter on shelf space and create its own distinct identity.

The ease of handling also emerged as a very important tool in packaging attributes. The replacement of tin pack of toothpaste with flexible, soft plastic pack, broadening of caps of face wash, shaving cream so that the package can stand upside down, innovation of liquid soap dispenser is the testimony to the fact that more and more effort should be focused on making the package easy to handle and use by the customer. The protection was also given weightage by the respondents so the packages must be designed in such a way that protection from external factors like ultra violet radiations or sunlight is retained and product preservation can be maintained.

REFERENCES
1. Ampuero, O. and Vila, N., Consumer Perceptions of Product Packaging, *Journal of Consumer Marketing*, pp. 100-112, 2006. Retrieved on February 23, 2006, from the EBSCO database.
2. Anonymous, Product packaging: Empty Promises?*Consumer Policy Review*, Nov/Dec, pp. 206-211, 2000.
3. Balabanis, G. and Craven, S., Consumer Confusion from Own Brand Look-alikes: An Exploratory Investigation, *Journal of Marketing Management*, 13(4), pp. 299- 313, 1997.
4. Bloch, P. H., Seeking the ideal form: product design and consumer response, *Journal of Marketing*, 59 (July), pp. 16-29, 1995.
5. Bone, P. F. and Corey, R. J., Packaging Ethics: Perceptual Differences among Packaging Professionals, Brand Managers and Ethically- Interested Consumers,*Journal of Business Ethics*, 24(3), pp. 199-213, 2000.
6. Butkeviciene, V., Stravinskiene, J. and Rutelione, A., Impact of consumer package communication on consumer decision making process,*InzinerineEkonomika-Engineering Economics (1)*, pp. 57-65, 2008.
7. Clarke, B. and Sweeny, B., *Marketing and the Law*. 2nd Ed. Sydney: Butterworths, 2000.
8. Cramphorn, S., Packaging to the Rescuel, *Admap Magazine*, December 2001, Issue 423, 2001.
9. Grossman, R. P., &Wisenblit, J. Z., What we know about consumers color choices,*Journal of Marketing Practice: Applied Marketing Science*, 5 (3), pp. 78-88, 1999.
10. Blackwell, R. D., Miniard, P. W. & Engel, J. F. (2006). Consumer behavior.Mason:Thomson. Caswell, J.A. and D.I. Padberg. (1999).Towarda More Comprehensive Theory of Food Labels. American Journal of Agricultural Economics. 74:460-468
11. FDA. (1998).An FDA Guide to Dietary Supplements. American Journal of Agricultural Economics. 32:28-35.
12. Gabbott, M. & Hogg, G. (1998). Consumers and services. Chichester: John Wiley & Sons. Gonzalez M. P.,
13. Thorhsbury S., &Twede D. (2007). Packaging as a tool for productdevelopment: Communicating value to consumers. Journal of Food Distribution Research, 38 (1), 61-66.
14. Halewood, C., Hannam, K. (2001). Viking heritage tourism: authenticity and commodification. Annals of Tourism Research, 28, 3: 565-580
15. Hines, J., Hungerford, H. and Tomera, A. (1986-87): Analysis and synthesis of research on responsible environmental behavior, Journal of Environmental Education, 18, 1-8.
16.]Hsieh, M. H., Pan, S. L., &Setiono,R. (2004).
17. Product-, corporate-, and country-image dimensions and purchase behavior: A multicountry analysis. Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science, 32(3), 251–270.
18.]K Rita (2009), impact of package elements on consumer purchase, Kaunotechnologies ,universalities ,Lietuva ,ekonomikairvadyba.
19. Keller,K.L.(1993). Conceptualizing, measuring, and managing customer-based brand equity. Journal of Marketing, 57(1), 1–22.
20. Koo, D. M (2003). Inter-relationships among store images, store satisfaction, and store loyaltyamong Korea discount retail patrons. Asia Pacific Journal of Marketing and Logistics, 15(4),42–71.
21. Malhotra, N. K. (1981). A scale to measure self-concepts, person concepts, and product concepts. Journal of Marketing Research, 18(4), 456–464.
22. Butkeviciene, V., J. Stravinskiene and A. Rutelione (2008). 'Impact of consumer package communication on consumer decision making process', InzinerineEkonomika-EngineeringEconomics(1), pp. 57-65.