

The Relationship Between Packaging and Consumers Purchase Intention: A Case Study of Nestlé Nigeria Product

Olawepo, G. T.^[a]; Ibojo, B. O.^{[a],*}

^[a] Lecturers, Business Administration Department, Ajayi Crowther University, Oyo, Nigeria.

* Corresponding author.

Received 14 November 2014; accepted 19 January 2015
Published online 28 February 2015

Abstract

This study investigated the effects of packaging on consumer purchasing intention, using Nestle Nigeria Plc as a case study. The objectives are to assess the degree to which packaging influence consumers purchase intention, to determine the rate at which packaging creates attention, to know if package attracts customers attention to particular brand, enhances its image and influences consumer's perceptions about the product, and to examine the effect of poor packaging on purchase intention of consumers and level of market share of an organisation.

Survey research design was adopted for this study. Primary and secondary sources of data were used. The primary data include a structured questionnaire used to elicit information from the target respondents who were customers of Nestle Nigeria Plc. while the secondary data encompass the use newspapers, books, journals or periodicals, a total of 325 respondents were selected for the study using random sampling technique. Multiple regression analysis and t-test were used to test the hypotheses that were generated for the study at 0.01 significant levels.

The findings showed that that 1% shift in packaging (as a whole) will result in 88.9% shift in consumer purchase intention. Also there is significant relationship between picture quality and customer purchase intention. The study reveal that a 1% shift in picture quality will result in 85.2% shift in customer purchase intention. The analysis further shows that labelling, colour combination and picture quality (as an elements of packaging) will jointly and independently predict consumer purchase intention given the respective results, Picture quality ($\beta = .563$, P

$< .01$), Colour combination ($\beta = .292$, $P < .01$), Labelling ($\beta = .329$, $P < .01$), in the analysis based on the findings of the study, it was concluded that packaging is an engine that propel uniqueness of a product in the market, the picture quality and other attributes of packaging stand out amongst other products so as to draws attention of customers. More so, packaging attracts consumers' attention particularly when consumers are not very familiar with the brands.

Key words: Consumer; Packaging; Relationship; Consumer purchase intention

Olawepo, G. T., & Ibojo, B. O. (2015). The Relationship Between Packaging and Consumers Purchase Intention: A Case Study of Nestlé Nigeria Product . *International Business and Management*, 10(1), 72-81. Available from: <http://www.cscanada.net/index.php/ibm/article/view/5540>
DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.3968/5540>

INTRODUCTION

There are various product variables such as sizes, features, varieties, brand name, quality e.t.c However, product packaging has various attributes that can attract and increase consumer purchase intention. This attributes include the colour, designs, shapes etc. These help consumers to identify the products and differentiate the products from competitors' products. More so, it helps in attracting and sustaining the consumers' attention. The uses of packaging as a strong variable of product can be seen as a vital tool used for communicating the attractiveness of product to the respective and identified target market.

The globalization of the world has made necessary for manufacturers to present their products in an attractive manner in order not to only differentiate their products from the competitors' products but also as an instrument of attraction. The need to package products also necessitates

an edge or competitive advantage of providing products to the end consumers. It is a well known fact that one basic variable for creating consumer attention is packaging. This tool has helped in projecting the image of products in the global market.

The competitive nature of the business environment has increased the effectiveness of the role of packaging in projecting the attractiveness and the nature of consumers purchase intention. This has made it vital for firms to package their products in a way that will present the uniqueness and the attractiveness of the product among various competitive products. The business environment is dynamic in nature therefore necessitating the need for producers and manufacturers to be dynamic in packaging and repackaging of their products, taken into consideration the life style of consumers. The need for business and marketing oriented organization to consider the vitality of the competitive global market also paves the way for continuous re-evaluation of their packaging attributes. This will help in creating competitive advantage of the products in the global market. Therefore, packaging can be seen as driving tool for stimulating and creating impulsive buying behaviour which can aid in increasing consumer purchase intention.

According to Rundh (2005) package attracts consumer's attention to particular brand, enhances its image, and influences consumer's perceptions about the product. Also package imparts unique value to products (Underwood, Klein Burke, 2001; Silayoi (2004), works as a tool for differentiation, i.e. helps consumers to choose the product from wide range of similar products, stimulates customers buying behaviour (Wells, Farley Armstrong, 2007). Thus package performs an important role in marketing communications and could be treated as one of the most important factors influencing consumer's purchase decision. In this context, seeking to maximize the effectiveness of package in a buying place, the researches of package, its elements and their impact on consumer's buying behaviour became a relevant issue.

A class of researchers investigated all possible elements of package and their impact on consumer's purchase decision (Silayoi, 2004; Silayoi, 2007; Butkeviciene, Stravinskiene Rutelione, 2008), while others concentrate on separate elements of package and their impact on consumer buying behavior (e.g., Vila Ampuero, 2007; Madden, Hewett Roth, 2000; Underwood et al., 2001; Bloch, 1995). Moreover some researchers investigate impact of package and its elements on consumer's overall purchase decision (e.g., Underwood et al., 2001), while others – on every stage of consumer's decision making process (e.g., Butkeviciene et al., 2008).

Consumer preferences and consumer buying behaviour are the major issues that should be taken into account when designing the package for a particular product. In spite of factors such as new technology or material development, consumer's choices and desires are the

important elements that drive the marketing process. Stewart (2004) explained that, consumers are the key actors in planning and implementing packaging of a particular product. He further stated that, the key issue for packaging design is to understand the consumers.

Packaging is an instrument used by many organisations to penetrate new and existing markets. In addition, packaging becomes a critical factor in the consumer decision-making process because it communicates to consumers at the time they are actually deciding in the store. How they perceive the subjective entity of products, as presented through communication elements in the package, influences choice and is the key to success for many food products marketing strategies.

Finally, package's overall features can underline the uniqueness and originality of the product. Quality judgments are largely influenced by product characteristics reflected by packaging, and these play a role in the formation of brand preferences. If the package communicates high quality, consumers frequently assume that the product is of high quality. If the package symbolizes low quality, consumers transfer this "low quality" perception to the product itself (Underwood et al., 2001; Silayoi, 2004). The package becomes the symbol that communicates favorable or unfavorable implied meaning about the product which justifies the end of purchase intention. The abundance of scientific literature on this issue do not provide unanimous answer concerning impact of package elements on consumer's buying behaviour. Also, diversities of the results in this area depend not only on research models constructed and methods employed, but on the context of the research too. Thus, there is the necessity to investigate this issue in more detail.

1. OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

The primary objective of this study is to examine the relationship between packaging and consumer purchase intention.

The study focused on the following specific objectives.

- To assess the degree at which packaging influence consumers purchase intention.
- To explore the relationship between packaging and consumers purchase intention.
- To determine the rate at which packaging creates attention.
- To examine the effect of poor packaging on purchase intention of consumers and level of market share of an organization.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

This aspect attempts to examine the diverse views of various writers on "the relationship between packaging and consumer's purchase intention".

2.1 Packaging

Packaging is the container for a product – encompassing the physical appearance of the container and including the design, colour, shape, labelling and materials used” (Arens, 1996). Packaging can be defined quite simply as an extrinsic element of the product (Olson Jacoby, 1972).

Kotler (2003), defines packaging as all the activities of designing and producing the container for a product. Packaging can be defined as the wrapping material around a consumer item that serves to contain, identify, describe, protect, display, promote and otherwise make the product marketable.

Packages are found to attract attention (Under wood et al., 2001; Garber et al., 2000; Goldberg et al., 1999; Schoormans, 1997). Pictures on packages are emphasized to attract attention; particularly when consumers are not very familiar with the brands (Under wood et al., 2001).

Jahre (2004), asserted that, packaging is the technology and art of preparing a commodity for convenient transport, storage and sale. Packaging provides many pertinent marketing and managerial functions such as protection, promotion and user convenience. Packaging may be viewed as an integral part of the product and is the first point of contact with the brand especially consumer product (Rundh, 2005). Packaging may likely influence and smoothly lead consumers to form associations on the first sight of a package which may trigger favourable or unfavourable purchase intention about a brand of alcoholic beverage at the point of sale and/or consumption.

Packaging is not useless; consumers sometimes think that packaging is an incidental part of the product. In reality, packaging fulfils essential functions as to conserve, protect, transport products, provide information and facilitate handling until the products reaches its final consumer (OptimEco.ca, 2008).

2.2 The Role of Packaging on Consumer Behaviour

Ayu (2012) defined consumer behaviour as the consumer’s decision with respect to the acquisition, consumption, and disposition of goods, services, time, and ideas by human decision-making units. Thus, the company needs to understand the products or service which consumer needs and wants, which consumer must do to purchase and consume it, and what influences purchase and consumption. There are some factors that offered the factor that influences on consumer behaviour, which are cultural, social, personal, and psychological

Furthermore, Mutil (2012) opined that in nowadays competitive environment, the role of packaging has changed due to increasing self-service and changing consumers’ lifestyle. Firms’ interest in package as a tool of sales promotion is growing increasingly. Package becomes an ultimate selling proposition stimulating impulsive buying behaviour, increasing market share and reducing promotional costs.

According to Rundh (2005), package attracts

consumer’s attention to particular brand, enhances its image, and influences consumer’s perceptions about product. Also package imparts unique value to products.

However, Underwood, Klein Burke (2001) and Silayoi (2004) posited that, packaging works as a tool for differentiation, i.e. helps consumers to choose the product from wide range of similar products, stimulates customers buying behaviour (Wells, Farley Armstrong, 2007). Thus package performs an important role in marketing communications and could be treated as one of the most important factors influencing consumer’s purchase decision.

More so, Rita (2009), explained package attracts consumer’s attention to particular brand, enhances its image, and influences consumer’s perceptions about the product.

In addition, (Underwood, Klein Burke, 2001; Silayoi Speece, 2004), asserted that packaging works as a tool for differentiation, i.e. helps consumers to choose the product from wide range of similar products, stimulates customers buying behaviour. Thus package performs an important role in marketing communications and could be treated as one of the most important factors influencing consumer’s purchase of package, its elements and their impact on consumer’s buying behaviour became a relevant issue.

Finally, basing on theoretical analysis of package elements and their impact on consumer’s purchase decision empirically reveal the elements having the ultimate effect on consumer choice.

2.3 Impact of Packaging on Consumers’ Purchase Intention

Paul (2012) opined that shopping under time pressure and making unplanned purchases preclude consumers giving detailed consideration to package elements and the number of comparisons that can be made. Consumers do not tend to search extensively for information about the brands when purchasing products (with some exceptions), carefully evaluate product features and then make a conscious decision on which brand to buy. Instead purchases of products are characterised by a large proportion of people who make routine purchases. How consumers perceive the subjective entity of products, as presented through communication elements in the package, influences their choice and is the key to success for many products’ marketing strategies.

Academic studies on the influence of packaging on the purchase decision and its effect on brand and product perceptions have provided empirical evidence on the following key aspects:

- **Identification:** The appearance of the package has an impact on consumers concerning the identification of brands. For example, consumers identify more easily those brands whose new packages are designed with colours that are similar to the original packages. Attention: Packages attract attention primarily through colours and shape, with pictures on packages

attracting attention particularly in cases when consumers are less familiar with a brand.

- **Communication:** Package appearance can also influence the evaluation of the core product. For instance, while pictures of the core products on packages are not found to have an improved impact on the evaluation of the brand, pictures (including overall graphics of the packaging design) can have a positive impact on brand beliefs and attitudes towards the package supporting the view that brand identity and image can be enhanced if not created through packages.
- **Impact on attitudes:** Appearances have an impact on attitudes concerning brands and packages as well as purchase intentions. Consumers are influenced by non-verbal signs (e.g. colour) when they are under time pressure. In these purchase situations consumers process the appearance of the package instead of evaluating verbal information on the package. Overall, in regard to non-verbal signs, no significant evidence is found that pictures (and other important non-verbal signs in the form of colours, size and shape, and layout) result in improved brand evaluations.

3. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.1 Research Design

The chosen designs for this study is: research survey i.e. the collection of primary data through the use of questionnaires from Ajayi Crowther University Students in Oyo, Oyo State, Nigeria on Nestlé Nigeria product as a case study and thereafter apply statistical software i.e. Statistical Package for Social Science to examine the relationship that exist between packaging and consumer purchase intention.

3.2 Study Population / Sample

For the purpose of this research study, the target population were the entire students in Ajayi Crowther University in Oyo, who are the consumers of Nestlé Nigeria Plc products. As a result, 350 students were randomly selected from the entire population to enable the researchers have sufficient knowledge of what is obtained in the entire population.

3.3 Sampling Method / Sample Size

A sample size of student 25 students each from the thirteen (13) departments spread across the three (3) Faculties namely; Social and Management Science (SMS), Faculty of Natural Sciences (FNS) and Humanities but 25 was added to SMS because of the population. Three hundred and fifty (350) questionnaires were administered to the respondents.

3.4 Data Collection

This involves the use of primary and secondary sources of data. The primary source involves the use of questionnaire while the secondary data incorporates the use of journals, periodicals and the internet.

3.5 Data Collection Instrument

The main research instruments used in gathering the necessary information from the sources of data used is questionnaire method. The questionnaire is divided into two (2) sections, Section A is designated to obtained general information relating to personal data of the respondents. The section B consist of 20 questions designed to obtain information as relating to relationship that exist between packaging and consumer's purchase intention.

3.6 Methods of Data Analysis

This involves the use of descriptive and inferential statistics. The descriptive statistics incorporate the use of tables and percentages while the inferential statistics give room for the use of regression and multiple regression analysis.

3.7 Hypotheses of the Study

In line with this research study, the hypotheses are:

Hypothesis One

Ho: There is no significant relationship between packaging and consumer purchase intention.

H₁: There is a significant relationship between packaging and consumer purchase intention.

Hypothesis Two

Ho: There is no significant relationship between picture quality and customer purchase intention.

H₁: There is a significant relationship between picture quality and customer purchase intention.

Hypothesis Three

H₀: Labelling, colour combination and picture quality will not jointly and independently predict Consumer Purchase Intention.

H₁: Labelling, Colour combination and Picture quality will jointly and independently predict Consumer Purchase Intention.

4. DATA PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS

4.1 Data Presentation and Analysis

In this aspect, the results of the analyses carried out were presented based on the hypotheses stated.

Table 1
Showing the Descriptive Statistics of Demographics

	Sex	Frequency	Percentages (%)
	Male	152	49.4
	Female	156	50.6
	Total	308	100
	Age	Frequency	Percentages (%)

To be continued

Continued

Sex	Frequency	Percentages (%)
18 - 25	287	93.2
26 – 35	21	6.8
36 - 45	0	0
Total	308	100
Marital Status	Frequency	Percentages (%)
Single	307	99.7
Married	1	0.3
Divorced	0	0
Total	308	100
Level	Frequency	Percentages (%)
100	138	44.8
200	22	7.1
300	104	33.8
400	44	14.3
Total	308	100
Faculty	Frequency	Percentages (%)
SMS	104	33.8
FNS	102	33.1
Humanities	102	33.1
Total	308	100
Departments	Frequency	Percentages (%)
Business Administration	23	7.5
Banking Finance	24	7.8
Economics	24	7.8
Mass Communication	23	7.5
Accounting	22	7.1
English	25	8.1
History	23	7.5
Computer Science	21	6.8
Bio Chemistry	24	7.8
Industrial Chemistry	25	8.1
Physics Electronics	25	8.1
Micro Biology	24	7.8
Geology	25	8.1
Total	308	100

Note. Source: Researcher's field survey, 2014.

Table 2
Nestlé Products Draws Attention of Final Consumers

Response	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Strongly disagree	0	0	0	0
Disagree	0	0	0	0
Undecided	6	1.9	1.9	1.9
Agree	77	25.0	25.0	26.9
Strongly agree	225	73.1	73.1	100.0
Total	308	100.0	100.0	

Note. Source: Researcher's field survey, 2014.

Table 3
The Packaging of the Nestlé Products Influences Customer's Purchase Intention

Response	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Strongly disagree	0	0	0	0
Disagree	0	0	0	0
Undecided	6	1.9	1.9	1.9
Agree	108	35.1	35.1	37.0
Strongly agree	194	63.0	63.0	100.0
Total	308	100.0	100.0	

Note. Source: Researcher's field survey, 2014.

Table 4
The Packaging of Nestlé Products is Unique Compared with Other Competitors Products

Response	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Strongly disagree	0	0	0	0
Disagree	0	0	0	0
Undecided	6	1.9	1.9	1.9
Agree	104	33.8	33.8	35.7
Strongly agree	198	64.3	64.3	100.0
Total	308	100.0	100.0	

Note. Source: Researcher's field survey, 2014.

Table 5
The Packaging is Attractive

Response	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Strongly disagree	0	0	0	0
Disagree	0	0	0	0
Undecided	6	1.9	1.9	1.9
Agree	150	48.7	48.7	50.6
Strongly agree	152	49.4	49.4	100.0
Total	308	100.0	100.0	

Note. Source: Researcher's field survey, 2014.

Table 6
The Colour Combination on the Packaging Draws Customer's Attention

Response	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Strongly disagree	0	0	0	0
Disagree	0	0	0	0
Undecided	6	1.9	1.9	1.9
Agree	160	51.9	51.9	53.9
Strongly agree	142	46.1	46.1	100.0
Total	308	100.0	100.0	

Note. Source: Researcher's field survey, 2014.

Table 7
The Colour Combination Can Easily be Remembered

Response	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Strongly disagree	0	0	0	0
Disagree	0	0	0	0
Undecided	0	0	0	0
Agree	110	35.7	35.7	35.7
Strongly agree	198	64.3	64.3	100.0
Total	308	100.0	100.0	

Note. Source: Researcher's field survey, 2014.

Table 8
The Colour Combination Makes the Product Stand out Among Other Competitive Products

Response	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Strongly disagree	0	0	0	0
Disagree	0	0	0	0
Undecided	0	0	0	0
Agree	156	50.6	50.6	50.6
Strongly agree	152	49.4	49.4	100.0
Total	308	100.0	100.0	

Note. Source: Researcher's field survey, 2014.

Table 9
The Font Used on the Packaging is Legible and Can be Understood by Customers

Response	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Strongly disagree	0	0	0	0
Disagree	0	0	0	0
Undecided	0	0	0	0
Agree	180	58.4	58.4	58.4
Strongly agree	128	41.6	41.6	100.0
Total	308	100.0	100.0	

Note. Source: Researcher's field survey, 2014.

Table 10
The Font Used on the Product Attracts Attention from Distance

Response	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Strongly disagree	0	0	0	0
Disagree	0	0	0	0
Undecided	0	0	0	0
Agree	144	46.8	46.8	46.8
Strongly agree	164	53.2	53.2	100.0
Total	308	100.0	100.0	

Note. Source: Researcher's field survey, 2014.

Table 11
The Font Used in Writing Ingredient Composition of the Products is Legible and Could be Easily Interpreted by Customers

Response	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Strongly disagree	53	17.2	17.2	17.2
Disagree	142	46.1	46.1	63.3
Undecided	18	5.8	5.8	69.2
Agree	72	23.4	23.4	92.5
Strongly agree	23	7.5	7.5	100.0
Total	308	100.0	100.0	

Note. Source: Researcher's field survey, 2014.

Table 12
The Picture Quality of the Product Packaging Draws Attention of Final Customers

Response	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Strongly disagree	39	12.7	12.7	12.7
Disagree	98	31.8	31.8	44.5
Undecided	18	5.8	5.8	50.3
Agree	115	37.3	37.3	87.7
Strongly agree	38	12.3	12.3	100.0
Total	308	100.0	100.0	

Note. Source: Researcher's field survey, 2014.

Table 13
The Standard of the Picture Quality of the Product is Appetizing

Response	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Strongly disagree	42	13.6	13.6	13.6
Disagree	97	31.5	31.5	45.1
Undecided	32	10.4	10.4	55.5
Agree	94	30.5	30.5	86.0
Strongly agree	43	14.0	14.0	100.0
Total	308	100.0	100.0	

Note. Source: Researcher's field survey, 2014.

Table 14
The Picture of the Product Packaging Reflect the Fact that it is High in Protein

Response	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Strongly disagree	29	9.4	9.4	9.4
Disagree	95	30.8	30.8	40.3
Undecided	24	7.8	7.8	48.1
Agree	127	41.2	41.2	89.3
Strongly agree	33	10.7	10.7	100.0
Total	308	100.0	100.0	

Note. Source: Researcher's field survey, 2014.

Table 15
The Packaging of the Product in a Refill Format in Conjunction with Different Affordable Sizes Appeal to Purchase Intention of Customers

Response	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Strongly disagree	37	12.0	12.0	12.0
Disagree	44	14.3	14.3	26.3
Undecided	41	13.3	13.3	39.6
Agree	154	50.0	50.0	89.6
Strongly agree	32	10.4	10.4	100.0
Total	308	100.0	100.0	

Note. Source: Researcher's field survey, 2014.

Table 16
The Products are Packaged in a Unique Manner that Could Aid Storage and Preservation

Response	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Strongly disagree	36	11.7	11.7	11.7
Disagree	131	42.5	42.5	54.2
Undecided	37	12.0	12.0	66.2
Agree	71	23.1	23.1	89.3
Strongly agree	33	10.7	10.7	100.0
Total	308	100.0	100.0	

Note. Source: Researcher's field survey, 2014.

Table 17
There Exist Significant Relationship Between Packaging of the Products and Purchase Intention of Consumers

Response	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Strongly disagree	97	31.5	31.5	31.5
Disagree	43	14.0	14.0	45.5
Undecided	53	17.2	17.2	62.7
Agree	74	24.0	24.0	86.7
Strongly agree	41	13.3	13.3	100.0
Total	308	100.0	100.0	

Note. Source: Researcher's field survey, 2014.

Table 18
The Packaging Shows that the Products are Enriched with Quality

Response	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Strongly disagree	38	12.3	12.3	12.3
Disagree	47	15.3	15.3	27.6
Undecided	41	13.3	13.3	40.9
Agree	94	30.5	30.5	71.4
Strongly agree	88	28.6	28.6	100.0
Total	308	100.0	100.0	

Note. Source: Researcher's field survey, 2014.

Table 19
Modification of the Products Increase Customer's Purchase Intention

Response	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Strongly disagree	40	13.0	13.0	13.0
Disagree	48	15.6	15.6	28.6
Undecided	25	8.1	8.1	36.7
Agree	153	49.7	49.7	86.4
Strongly agree	42	13.6	13.6	100.0
Total	308	100.0	100.0	

Note. Source: Researcher's field survey, 2014.

Table 20
Packaging of Various Sizes Gives Room for Increased Customer Purchase Intention

Response	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Strongly disagree	44	14.3	14.3	14.3
Disagree	119	38.6	38.6	52.9
Undecided	34	11.0	11.0	64.0
Agree	78	25.3	25.3	89.3
Strongly agree	33	10.7	10.7	100.0
Total	308	100.0	100.0	

Note. Source: Researcher's field survey, 2014.

Table 21
Packaging Increases the Rate of Sales Volume

Response	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Strongly disagree	29	9.4	9.4	9.4
Disagree	41	13.3	13.3	22.7
Undecided	117	38.0	38.0	60.7
Agree	86	27.9	27.9	88.6
Strongly agree	35	11.4	11.4	100.0
Total	308	100.0	100.0	

Note. Source: Researcher's field survey, 2014.

4.2 Test of Hypotheses

4.2.1 Hypothesis One

H₀: There is no significant relationship between Packaging and consumer purchase intention.

H₁: There is a significant relationship between Packaging and consumer purchase intention.

Table 24
Showing Multiple Regression Analysis Between Labelling, Colour Combination, Picture Quality and Consumer Purchase Intention

Variables	F- Ratio	Sig of P	R	R ²	Adj R ²	B	t	P
Picture quality						.563	8.036	.000
Colour Combination	392.315	.000	.895	.801	.800	.292	2.608	.000
Labelling						.329	3.561	.000

Table 24 showed that the *linear combination* of Labelling, Colour combination and Picture quality and Consumer Purchase Intention was significant. $F = 392.315$; $R = .895$, $R^2 = .801$, $Adj. R^2 = .800$; $P < .01$). The independent/predictor variables jointly accounted for a variation of about 80.1% in Consumer Purchase Intention. The following shows the various *relative contributions* and levels of significance of the independent variables: Picture quality ($\beta = .563$, $P < .01$), Colour combination ($\beta = .292$,

Table 22
Showing Pearson's Correlation Between Packaging and Consumer Purchase Intention

Variable	Mean	Std. Dev.	N	R	P	Remark
Consumer purchase intention	3.047980	.9187783	308	.889**	.000	Sig
Packaging	3.037485	.8923938				

Note. ** Sig. at .01 level

It is shown in Table 22 that there is a significant relationship between Packaging and consumer purchase intention ($R = .889$ **, $N = 308$, $P < .01$). By implication, it can be deduced that a 1% shift in packaging will result in 88.9% shift in consumer purchase intention. Hence, it could be deduced that Packaging influence consumer purchase intention in the study.

4.2.2 Hypothesis Two

H₀: There is no significant relationship between picture quality and customer purchase intention.

H₁: There is a significant relationship between picture quality and customer purchase intention.

Table 23
Showing Pearson's Correlation Between Picture Quality and Consumer Purchase Intention

Variable	Mean	Std. Dev.	N	R	P	Remark
Customer purchase intention	3.047980	.9187783	308	.852**	.000	Sig
Picture quality	2.9383	1.11450				

Note. ** Sig. at .01 level

It is shown in the Table 23 that there is a significant relationship between picture quality and customer purchase intention. ($R = .852$ **, $N = 308$, $P < .01$). By implication, it can be deduced that a 1% shift in picture quality will result in 85.2% shift in customer purchase intention. Hence, it could be deduced that customer picture quality influence customer purchase intention in the study.

4.2.3 Hypothesis Three

H₀: Labelling, colour combination and picture quality cannot jointly and independently predict Consumer Purchase Intention.

H₁: Labelling, Colour combination and Picture quality can jointly and independently predict Consumer Purchase Intention.

$P < .01$), Labelling ($\beta = .329$, $P < .01$) respectively. It can be concluded that all independent variables, (Labelling, Colour combination and Picture quality) will jointly and independently predict Consumer Purchase Intention.

4.3 Discussion of Findings

Nestlé Nigeria Plc is one of the leading food manufacturing companies in Nigeria and the largest food company in the world measured by revenues with the

aim of enhancing life with good food beverages that not only tastes delicious but are also healthy and nutritious (*StudyMode.com*).

Table 1 shows that Ajayi Crowther University Oyo has greater number of female than the male students. The table also shows that majority of the respondents were within the age range of 18-25. The findings from the table shows that 99.7% of the respondents were single leaving 0.3% of them married. It also shows that the highest numbers of the respondents were 100 level students, followed by 300 level students, 200 level students and 400 level respectively. Table 2 shows that majority of the respondents agreed to the fact that Nestlé products package draws their attention and attract them. Table 3 shows that majority of the students agreed to the fact that the packaging of Nestlé product influences their intention to purchase. Table 4 shows that the respondents acknowledged the uniqueness of Nestlé products compared with other competitor's product. Table 5 shows the result shows that the consumers of Nestlé products find the packaging very attractive. Table 6 shows that majority of the students believed that the colour combination on the packaging of Nestlé products triggers their purchase intention. Table 7 shows that the respondents were of the fact that the colour combination on Nestlé product can easily be remembered. Table 8: majority strongly agreed to the fact that the colour combination of the products makes it stand out among other competitive products. Table 9 shows that majority of the respondent strongly agreed that the font used on the packaging of Nestlé products is legible and can easily be understood. Table 10 shows that 53.2% of the students strongly agreed and 46.8% of the students agreed that the font used on the product attracts attention of consumers from distance. Table 11 shows that majority strongly agreed that the font used in writing ingredient composition of the products is legible and could be easily interpreted by customers. Table 12 shows that the respondents agreed that the picture quality of the product packaging draws their attention. Table 13; majority of the respondent disagreed that the standard of the picture quality is appetizing despite the fact that they believed the product's colour combination makes the product standout among other competitive products. Table 14 shows that 41.2% of the students of Ajayi Crowther University Oyo agreed while only a few disagreed that the picture of the product packaging reflect the fact that it is high in protein. Table 15 majority here agreed that the packaging of the product in a refill format in conjunction with different affordable sizes appeal to purchase intention of customers, this respond shows that majority of the students purchase the product in the refill pack. Table 16: majority disagrees while to an extent some agreed that Nestlé products are packaged in a unique manner that could aid storage and preservation. Table 17 shows that majority of the respondents are of the divergent opinion that there is a significant relationship between

packaging of Nestlé products and their purchase intention. Table 18 shows that majority of the opinions agreed that the packaging shows that the Nestlé products are enriched with quality. Table 19 shows that to a large extent the respondents agreed to the fact that modification of the Nestlé products increase customer's purchase intention. Table 20 shows the extent to which the respondent agreed/ disagreed that packaging of various sizes gives room for increased customer purchase intention, 38.6% disagreed, 14.3% strongly disagreed, 11.0% undecided, 25.3% agreed, 10.7% strongly agreed. This shows that size of products does not necessarily determine their purchase intention. Table 21 shows that majority of the respondent do not have a clear-cut answer whether packaging increase the rate of sales volume or not. Hypothesis one, shows that there is a significant relationship between Packaging and consumer purchase intention ($R = .889^{**}$, $N = 308$, $P < .01$). By implication, it can be deduced that a 1% shift in packaging will result in 88.9% shift in consumer purchase intention. Hypothesis two shows that that there is a significant relationship between picture quality and customer purchase intention. ($R = .852^{**}$, $N = 308$, $P < .01$). By implication, it can be deduced that a 1% shift in picture quality will result in 85.2% shift in customer purchase intention. This implies that customer picture quality influence customer purchase intention in the study. Hypothesis three showed that the *linear combination* of Labelling, Colour combination and Picture quality and Consumer Purchase Intention was significant. $F = 392.315$; $R = .895$, $R^2 = .801$, $Adj. R^2 = .800$; $P < .01$). The independent/predictor variables jointly accounted for a variation of about 80.1% in Consumer Purchase Intention. The *relative contributions* and levels of significance of the independent variables are: Picture quality ($\beta = .563$, $P < .01$), Colour combination ($\beta = .292$, $P < .01$), Labelling ($\beta = .329$, $P < .01$) respectively. It can be concluded that all independent variables, (Labelling, Colour combination and Picture quality) will jointly and independently predict Consumer Purchase Intention. The findings show that packaging has impact on consumer's purchase intention.

CONCLUSION

It had been established from the study that there is a significant relationship between packaging and consumer's purchase intention. It was deduced from the analysis that 1% shift in packaging (as a whole) will result in 88.9% shift in consumer purchase intention. Also there is significant relationship between picture quality and customer purchase intention. The study reveal that a 1% shift in picture quality will result in 85.2% shift in customer purchase intention. The analysis further shows that labelling, colour combination and picture quality (as an elements of packaging) will jointly and independently predict consumer purchase intention given the respective results, Picture quality ($\beta = .563$, $P < .01$), Colour

combination ($\beta = .292, P < .01$), Labelling ($\beta = .329, P < .01$), in the analysis. The study therefore concludes that Packaging influence consumer purchase intention.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the findings and conclusion of this study, the researchers hereby recommended that:

- Since packaging has become a primary vehicle for communication and branding of any product, companies are enjoined to design high quality package.
- There should be evaluation and re-evaluation of the quality of their packages in order to explore all the opportunity accrued to packaging concept through policy formulation and implementation.
- In addition, proper monitoring and funding of such programme should be ex-rayed in order to identify loop-holes therein so as to enhance the achievement of primary objectives of packaging in arresting consumers attention.
- Managers must be advised and encouraged to engage the service of a qualified analyst and marketing strategist in the process of packaging.

REFERENCES

- Ayu, K., & Harimukti, W. (2012). Analyzing the factors that affecting consumer's purchase intention. *Journal of Consumer Research, 16*(4), 461-471.
- Emily, M. (2010). Importance of packaging branding in marketing of color meaning and preferences. *Journal of International Marketing, 8*(4), 90-107.
- Fandos, C., & Flavian, C. (2006). Intrinsic and extrinsic quality attributes, loyalty and buying intention: An analysis for a PDO product. *British Food Journal, 108*(8), 646-662.
- Ghosh, A. (1990). *Retail management*. Chicago: Dryden Press.
- Grewal, D., Krishnan, B., Baker, J., & Borin, N. (1998). The effect of store name, brand name, and price discount on consumers' evaluations and purchase intention. *Journal of Retailing, 74*(3), 331-352
- Halim, W. Z., & Hamed, A. B. (2010, June). Consumer purchase intention at traditional restaurant and fast food restaurant. Retrieved from <http://www.studymode.com/essays/Consumer-Purchase-Intention-At-Traditional-Restaurant-341785.html>
- Jahre, M., & Hatteland, C. J. (2004). Packages and physical distribution: Implications for integration and standardization. *International Journal of Physical Distribution and Logistics Management, 34*, 123-139.
- Jang, Y. J., & Bonn, M. A. (November 11, 2011,). *Consumer purchase intentions of organic wines*. Retrieved from <http://scholarworks.umass.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article>
- Joann R. H. (2009). Packaging as a marketing tool. *Journal of Business Management Review, 5*, 60-63.
- Jonathan, A. (2010). *Effective packaging – An essential tool for success* (3rd. ed.). New York: Harper Row.
- Keller K. L. (2001). Building customer-based brand equity. *Marketing Management, 10*(2), 14-19.
- Kim, J. O., & Jin, B. H. (2001). Korean consumers' patronage of discount stores: Domestic vs. multinational discount stored shoppers' profile. *Journal of Consumer Marketing, 18*(3), 236-255.
- Kotler, P. (2003). *Marketing management* (9th ed.). Upper Saddle River, New Jersey: Prentice Hall.
- Liang, L. (2008). Packaging as a strategic tool University of Halmstad school of business and engineering. *Journal of International Marketing, 8*(4), 90-107.
- Mitul, M. D., & Bhavesh, J. P. (2012). Role of packaging on consumer buying behaviour. *Global Journal of Management and Business Research, 12*(10).
- Parul, S. (2013). Key factors that influence consumer buying decision. *Greener Journal of Internet, Information and Communication Systems, 1*(2), 40-43.
- Peter, J. P., & Olson, J. C. (2010). *Consumer behaviour marketing strategy* (9th ed.). Singapore: McGraw-Hill/Irwin.
- Pinya, S. & Mark S. (2010). Packaging and purchase decisions: An exploratory study on the impact of involvement level and time pressure. *International Business Economics Research Journal, 9*(10).
- Rita, K. (2009). Impact of package elements on consumer purchase. *Journal of Brand Management, 13*(2), 115-133.
- Rundh, B. (2005). The multi-faceted dimension of packaging. *British Food Journal, 107*(9), 670-684.
- Silayoi, P., & Speece, M. (2004). Packaging and purchase decisions: An exploratory study on the impact of involvement level and time pressure. *British Food Journal, 106*(8), 607-628.
- Siti N. J., Pan E. L., & Mohaini M. N. (2006) Consumers' Perceptions, Attitudes and Purchase Intention towards Private Label Food Products in Malaysia. *Asian Journal of Business and Management Sciences, 2*(8), 73-90.
- Underwood, R. L., Klein, N. M. & Burke, R. R. (2001). Packaging communication: Attentional effects of product imagery. *Journal of Product Brand Management, 10*(7), 403-422.
- Wells, L. E., Farley, H., & Armstrong, G. A. (2007). The importance of packaging design for own-label food brands. *International Journal of Retail Distribution Management, 35*(9), 677-690.
- Zeithaml, V. A. (1988). Consumer perceptions of price, quality and value: A means-end model and synthesis of evidence. *Journal of Marketing, 52*(3), 48-62.

APPENDIX

Model Summary^b

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Durbin-Watson
1	.895 ^a	.801	.800	.0953900	1.948

Note. a. Predictors: (Constant), labelling, picture quality, colour combination

b. Dependent Variable: consumer purchase intention

ANOVA^a

Model	Sum of Squares	DF	Mean Square	F	Sig.	
1	Regression	256.389	3	85.463	392.315	.000 ^b
	Residual	2.766	304	.009		
	Total	259.155	307			

Note. a. Dependent Variable: consumer purchase intention

b. Predictors: (Constant), labelling, picture quality, colour combination

Coefficients^a

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	
	B	Std. Error	Beta			
1	(Constant)	-.030	.019		-1.538	.125
	Picture quality	.464	.006		8.036	.000
	Colour combination	.249	.008		2.608	.000
	Labelling	.306	.010		3.561	.000

Note. a. Dependent Variable: consumer purchase intention

Descriptive Statistics

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Consumer purchase intention	308	1.0000	5.0000	3.047980	.9187783
Packaging	308	1.0000	5.0000	3.037485	.8923938
Picture quality	308	1.00	5.00	2.9383	1.11450
Colour combination	308	1.0000	5.0000	2.949134	1.0795081
Labelling	308	1.00	5.00	3.2029	.98679
Valid N (listwise)	308				

Correlations

		Consumer Purchase Intention	Packaging	Picture Quality	Colour Combination	Labelling
Consumer purchase intention	Pearson Correlation	1	.889**	.852**	.773**	.863**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000	.000	.000	.000
	N	308	308	308	308	308
Packaging	Pearson Correlation	.889**	1	.797**	.827**	.808**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000		.000	.000	.000
	N	308	308	308	308	308
Picture quality	Pearson Correlation	.852**	.797**	1	.388**	.534**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000		.000	.000
	N	308	308	308	308	308
Colour combination	Pearson Correlation	.773**	.827**	.388**	1	.799**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000		.000
	N	308	308	308	308	308
Labelling	Pearson Correlation	.863**	.808**	.534**	.799**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000	
	N	308	308	308	308	308

Note. **. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).