Full Length Research

Discernment and Approach of Customers and Dealers about Tupperware Products

Dr. N. Srividhya, Professor, Villupuram

SRI MANAKULA VINAYAGAR ENGNEERING COLLEGE, Pondicherry
(23/12, Thayumanavar Street, Villupuram)

Awareness is the collection, identification, organization, and interpretation of sensory information in order to represent and understand the environment. All awareness involves signals in the nervous system, which in turn result from physical stimulation of the sense organs. For example, vision involves light striking the retinas of the eyes, smell is mediated by odor molecules and hearing involves pressure waves. Perception is not the passive receipt of these signals, but can be shaped by learning, memory, and expectation. Perception involves these "top-down" effects as well as the "bottom-up" process of processing sensory input. The "bottom-up" processing is basically low-level information that's used to build up higher-level information (i.e. - shapes for object recognition). The "top-down" processing refers to a person's concept and expectations (knowledge) that influence awareness. This study is an attempt to identify the awareness and approach towards Tupperware products among consumers and dealers. Tupperware products are more likely among the various cadres of customers. It is an attempt to measure the awareness about Tupperware products.

Keywords: Awareness, Discernment, Knowledge, Influence

INTRODUCTION

For over 60 years, Tupperware has been creating a niche for itself in the business world, making a difference to the lives of millions through its innovative storage products and extremely attractive business opportunity. In recent years, Tupperware has made tremendous inroads into becoming a true global entity. In 2000, Tupperware acquired Dallas-based BeautiControl, followed by the acquisition of the Sara Lee Corporation's direct selling business in 2000. These advancements brought an increasing product diversity to brand Tupperware. In order to reflect this diversity, Tupperware Corporation changed its name to Tupperware Brands Corporation in 2005.These acquisitions were in line with the Company's corporate strategy to add premium consumable items to their product category mix. They also boosted the Company's global portfolio to eight champion brands and changed the Tupperware Brands Corporation into a multi-brand, multi-category, direct sales conglomerate with a worldwide sales force of over 2 million. Despite the success and astounding growth of Tupperware Brands,

the Company's mission and passion to enlighten, educate and empower customers and their families tops the priority list.

Enlighten - To share insights & provide products and knowledge that makes life simpler and more enjoyable for families.

Educate - To provide smart, simple solutions that enable customers to save time, money and effort while leading active and healthy lives.

Empower - To better the lives of women by giving them the confidence to live with respect in the society and becoming independent.To date, the Tupperware Brands portfolio of direct selling companies incorporates Tupperware, BeautiControl, NaturCare, Nutrimetics, Fuller Cosmetics, Nuvo, Avroy Shlain and Swissgarde - each with their own product lines, sales methods and structures for the markets.

OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

1. To find the awareness of Tupperware products among consumers and dealers.
2. To analyze the factors which affect the consumer's Behaviour to go for purchase decision.
3. To identify the level of users and non – users of Tupperware products.
4. To evaluate the brand loyalty of Tupperware products among the consumers.
5. To determine the overall awareness and fulfillment of users and non- users of the Tupperware products.

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

McDaniel, S.W. & Rylander, D.H. (1993)1 in the article titled "Strategic Green Marketing" stated that Green marketing is taking shape as one of the key business strategies of the future. The increasing environmental consciousness makes it incumbent on consumer marketers not just to respond to, but to lead the way in, environmental programs. Consumer marketers should: recognize a product's environmental implications; analyze the changing consumer and political attitudes while recognizing the role that companies can play in protecting the environment.

Polonsky, et al., (1998) In the paper titled "Developing Green Products: Learning from Stakeholders "discussed the research which focused on US and Australian

markets' perceptions of stakeholders' potential to influence the green new product development (NPD) process and what strategies can be used to involve stakeholders in this process. The findings suggest that marketers believe some stakeholders with "high" influencing abilities should be involved in the green NPD process, although it appears that in practice, firms use very basic methods to include these stakeholders.

Clare D'Souza, et al., (2006) focused a study on Green products and corporate strategy: an empirical investigation. The purpose of the study is to examine the influence of multiple factors on the green purchase intention of customers in Australia. The results indicate that customers' corporate perception with respect to companies placing higher priority on profitability than on reducing pollution and regulatory protection were the significant predictors of customers' negative overall perception toward green products. The present findings contributes to an understanding of the antecedents of green purchasing and highlight that green customers rely more on personal experience with the product than the information provided by the marketer.

The positive relationship between manifest satisfaction and true brand loyalty is stronger than the positive relationship between latent satisfaction and true brand loyalty. In other words, a moderator effect of the amount of elaboration upon the relationship between consumer satisfaction and true brand loyalty is expected and found.

STATEMENT OF PROBLEM

At present in this competitive business world the plastic industries has more than lot of brands in the battle field facing stiff competition in every segment's targeted. Even Tupperware is also facing stiff competition even more years of heritage.(4) In this stage it has to identify its competitors in this market by bringing brand awareness in minds of consumers also it has to come up with the consumer behavior and customer perception. Through this study, the main problem that it studies is to find out the customer preference and customer perception towards Tupperware and its products and the awareness of brand among the consumers of Puducherry.

RESEARCH HYPOTHESES

H1: There is no significant relationship between Income and Tupperware users of the customers and dealers.
H2: There is no significant relationship between Age group and use of Tupperware products.
H3: There is no significant relationship between Incomes and how often they spend money per month to purchase Tupperware products.

Table 1: Socio Economic Status Of Respondents

Sl. No	STATUS	NO. OF RESPONDENTS	PERCENTAGE
GENDER			
1	MALE	46	31
2	FEMALE	104	69
AGE GROUP OF THE RESPONDENTS			
1	20-30 YEARS	51	34
2	31-40YEARS	75	50
3	41-50YEARS	21	14
4	51 & ABOVE YEARS	3	2
EDUCATIONAL QUALIFICATION			
1	LESS THAN GRADUATION	20	14
2	GRADUATION	44	29
3	POST GRADUATION	86	57
MARITAL STATUS			
1	MARRIED	53	35
2	UNMARRIED	97	65
FAMILY SYSTEM			
1	NUCLEAR SYSTEM	95	63
2	JOINT FAMILY	55	37
IF MARRIED (WORKING STATUS OF THE FAMILY)			
1	BOTH ARE EMPLOYED	32	61
2	SINGLE	21	39
MONTHLY INCOME OF THE RESPONDENTS			
1	10,000-20,000	35	23
2	20,001-30,000	59	39
3	30,001-40,000	42	29
4	40,001 & above	14	9
DO YOU USE PLASTIC CONTAINER FOR STORAGE?			
1	YES	118	79
2	NO	32	21
AWARENESS OF PLASTIC CONTAINERS BRANDS			
1	CUTTING EDGE	4	3
2	MODI CARE	7	5
3	REAL LIFE	12	8
4	TUPPERWARE	127	84
CAME TO KNOW ABOUT TUPPERWARE PRODUCTS			
1	ADVERTISEMENT	27	18
2	PARTY PLAN	19	12
3	INTERNET	16	11
4	WORD OF MOUTH	88	59
SPEND PER MONTH			
1	LESS THAN RS. 1000	52	35
2	RS. 1000 TO 2000	29	19
3	ABOVE RS. 2000	39	26
LAST PURCHASED TUPPERWARE PRODUCT			
1	TABLEWARE	13	9
2	MICROWAVE CONTAINERS	19	13
3	REFRIGERATOR CONTAINERS	30	19
4	LUNCH AND OUTDOOR CONTAINERS	58	39

SOURCE: PRIMARY DATA

Table 2: Showing the relationship between income and Tupperware users

	Monthly income * Use of Tupperware Products Cross tabulation			
		Use of Tupperware Products		
		Yes	No	Count
Monthly Income	10000 – 20000	28 (23.3%)	7(23.3%)	35 %(23.3%)
	20001 – 30000	49(40.8%)	10(33.3%)	59(39.3%)
	30001 - 40000	30(25%)	12(40%)	42(28%)
	40001 and above	13(10.8%)	1(3.3%)	14(9.3%)
	Total	120(100%)	30(100%)	150(100%)

Source: primary data

Table 3: Showing there is no significant relationship between age and users of Tupperware products

	AGE* USE OF TUPPERWARE PRODUCTS CROSS TABULATION			
		USE OF TUPPERWARE PRODUCTS		TOTAL
		YES	NO	
AGE	20 – 30 YEARS	40(33.3%)	11 (36.75%)	51 (34%)
	31 – 40 YEARS	61 (50.8)	14(46.7)	75(50%)
	41 – 50 YEARS	16(13.3%)	5(16.7)	21(14%)
	51 AND ABOVE	3(2.5%)	0	3(2%)
	TOTAL	120(100%)	30(100%)	150(100%)

Source: Primary data.

H4: There is no significant relationship between Employed statuses and use of Tupperware products.
H5: There is no association between Gender, Employed status and Spend money per month.

For this descriptive study a structured questionnaire was prepared and data was collected with a sample size of 150 customers and dealers. In order to prove the hypotheses various scientific advanced tools are used. They are percentage analysis, cross tabulation analysis, two way anova and factor analysis.   The results and analysis of the data are,

The table 1 states that majority of the respondents are female members because they are the attracted persons use plastic products in the home. Particularly people in the age group of 31 to 40 use maximum Tupperware products in order to satisfy the needs of the family and friends and the respondents are highly qualified (PG) because they are aware about the usage of products. Majority of the respondents live in a nuclear family and they use more of plastic containers that too Tupperware products because of its variety and design.   It is remarkable through word of mouth from friends and relatives the respondents came to know about the Products, and even though many good variety of products are available in the open market Tupperware places high in the minds of respondents.   The respondent's opinion is that rather than microwave or refrigerator containers they prefer lunch and outdoor containers because of its tight seal and light weight. It is

very helpful to carry their lunch in their office bag itself. This table clearly signifies the socio economic status of respondents and the opinion of customers before making any purchase.

Table 2 cross tabulation analysis clearly indicates that there is no significant relationship between the income and uses of Tupperware products. People with less income groups also invests in Tupperware products. So there is no relation between income and users of Tupperware products. It categorizes the level of users of Tupperware products and it finalizes that there is no relationship between the monthly income and the use of Tupperware products. Even though respondents earn less income they go for purchases of Tupperware products. They don't feel to spend for purchases is not a very big expenses.   It specifies the success of the product and its variety, color, package, etc.

Table 3 elucidates that there is no significant relationship between age and users of Tupperware products. Because whatever the age group of customers people are interested to use this products because of its color, flexibility, light weight, moreover with the concept of green marketing. The study further states that people in the age group of 31 to 40 prefers most the Tupperware products because majority of the respondents are salaried people.

Table 4 discloses that there is no significant relationship between income and how often they spend for purchasing Tupperware products. It clearly positions that people are ready to spend some amount for

Table 4: Showing there is no significant relationship between Incomes and how often they spend money per month to purchase Tupperware products.

MONTHLY INCOME	MONTHLY INCOME * SPEND MONEY PER MONTH CROSS TABULATION			
	SPEND MONEY PER MONTH			
10000 – 20000	13(25%)	8(27.6%)	7(17.9%)	28 (23.3%)
20001 – 30000	21(40.4)	10(34.5%)	18(46.2%)	49(40.8%)
30001 - 40000	10(19.2)	10(34.5%)	10(25.6%)	10(25%)
40001 AND ABOVE	8(15.4)	1(3.4%)	4(10.3%)	13(10.8%)
TOTAL	52(100%)	29(100%)	39(100%)	120(100%)

Source: Primary data.

Table 5: Showing there is no significant relationship between Employed statuses and use of Tupperware products.

EMPLOYED STATUS	USE OF TUPPERWARE PRODUCTS		TOTAL
	YES	NO	
PUBLIC SECTOR	8 (6.7%)	8(26.7%)	16(10.7%)
PRIVATE SECTOR	73 (60.8%)	6 (20%)	79 (52.7%)
SELF EMPLOYED	28 (23.3%)	12 (40%)	40 (26.7%)
GOVT. SERVICE	11 (9.2%)	4 (13.3%)	15(10%)
TOTAL	120 (100%)	30 (100%)	150 (100%)

Source – Primary Data

purchases of Tupperware products. There are habitual users for Tupperware products. Even though people earn less income they are attracted towards the color and the features of Tupperware products. They buy at least water bottles for their use. So, it obviously shows there is no relationship between income and spending amount for purchases of Tupperware products.

Table 5 explains that there is no significant relationship between employed status and use of Tupperware products. It proves that people are highly employed with high salary or people earning with low salary they buy depending upon their needs and wants. So, it says that respondents purchase the products for their needs but is positions that purchasing the product is a luxury and it shows a status representation.

The Table 6 analysis clearly depicts the relationship between gender and employment of the users of Tupperware products. There is a positive association between the two variables taken for this analysis. There is significant main effect for gender. Male (m=2) spend significantly higher than females (m=1.84), $F(1,149)=0.149,P=.700$. There is a marginally significant main effect for employment. Result shows that those in public sector (m=2.13) spend higher than those in private sector (m=1.66) $F (3,149) = 4.770, P=0.004$. There is a significant gender by employment interaction despite the lack of statistical significance, spend money per month between males and females did not differ in the 2nd and 3rd category, in the public sector females (m=2.33) spend

more than did males (m=1.59) and in the government sector category male (m=3.00) spend more than did females (m=0.145), $F (3,149) =1.835.P=0.145$.

Barlett's test of Sphericity (Table 7) is significant, thus the hypothesis that the intercorrelation matrix involving these 15 variables is an identity matrix is rejected. Thus from the perspective of Bartlett's test, factor analysis is feasible. As Bartlett's test is almost always significant, a more discriminating index of factor analyzability is the KMO. For this data set, it is **.**523, which is very large, so the KMO also supports factor analysis.

Kaiser's rule of retaining factors with Eigenvalues larger than 1.00 was used in this analysis as the default. As the Eigenvalues for the first two principal components (no distinction is made in deciding dimensionality by SPSS in the principal component and common factor analysis) with Eigenvalues of 2.452 and 1.646 were retained.

In the Principal Components Output, the Rotated Component Matrix gives the correlation of each variable with each factor. From the contribution of the variables One might come up with a variety of other names that are equally descriptive. You will note that the results of the Common Factor analysis are much the same with loadings that are a bit smaller. One might argue that the two methods, therefore, give the in this case.

Table 6 : There is no association between Gender, Employed status and Spend money per month.

Employment	Public sector		Private sector		Self employed		Govt. Sector		Total	
Gender	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
Male	1.50	.707	1.83	.778	2.27	.786	3	.0	2	.805
Female	2.33	1.033	1.58	.785	2.41	.870	1.89	.928	1.84	.895

Levene's Test of Equality of Error Variances
Dependent Variable: spend money per month

F	df1	df2	Sig.
1.574	7	112	.150

Tests the null hypothesis that the error variance of the dependent variable is equal across groups.

a. Design: Intercept + gender + employment + gender * employment

Tests of Between-Subjects Effects
Dependent Variable: spend money per month

Source	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Corrected Model	15.086[a]	7	2.155	3.240	.004
Intercept	189.586	1	189.586	284.992	.000
gender	.099	1	.099	.149	.700
employment	9.519	3	3.173	4.770	.004
gender * employment	3.661	3	1.220	1.835	.145
Error	74.506	112	.665		
Total	519.000	120			
Corrected Total	89.592	119			

a. R Squared = .168 (Adjusted R Squared = .116)

Multiple Comparisons
Dependent Variable: spend money per month
 Tukey HSD

(I) employment	(J) employment	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound
1	2	.47	.304	.418	-.32	1.26
	3	-.23	.327	.893	-1.08	.62
	4	.03	.379	1.000	-.95	1.02
2	1	-.47	.304	.418	-1.26	.32
	3	-.70*	.181	.001	-1.17	-.23
	4	-.43	.264	.359	-1.12	.25
3	1	.23	.327	.893	-.62	1.08
	2	.70*	.181	.001	.23	1.17
	4	.27	.290	.796	-.49	1.02
4	1	-.03	.379	1.000	-1.02	.95
	2	.43	.264	.359	-.25	1.12
	3	-.27	.290	.796	-1.02	.49

Based on observed means.
 The error term is Mean Square (Error) = .665.
*. The mean difference is significant at the .05 level.

Homogeneous Subsets

Spend money per month

Tukey HSD

employment	N	Subset
		1
2	73	1.66
4	11	2.09
1	8	2.13
3	28	2.36
Sig.		.092

2. employment

Dependent Variable: spend money per month

employment	Mean	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval	
			Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Public sector	1.917	.333	1.257	2.576
Private sector	1.703	.103	1.499	1.907
Self employed	2.342	.158	2.030	2.655
Government sector	2.444	.319	1.813	3.076

1. gender

Dependent Variable: spend money per month

gender	Mean	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval	
			Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Male	2.150	.217	1.719	2.580
Female	2.053	.122	1.812	2.295

3. gender * employment

Dependent Variable: spend money per _month

gender	employment	Mean	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval	
				Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Male	Public sector	1.500	.577	.357	2.643
	Private sector	1.826	.170	1.489	2.163
	Self employed	2.273	.246	1.785	2.760
	Government sector	3.000	.577	1.857	4.143
Female	Public sector	2.333	.333	1.674	2.993
	Private sector	1.580	.115	1.351	1.809
	Self employed	2.412	.198	2.020	2.804
	Government sector	1.889	.272	1.350	2.428

Post Hoc Tests

Multiple Comparisons

Dependent Variable: spend money per month
Tukey HSD

(I) employment	(J) employment	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound
1	2	.47	.304	.418	-.32	1.26
	3	-.23	.327	.893	-1.08	.62
	4	.03	.379	1.000	-.95	1.02
2	1	-.47	.304	.418	-1.26	.32
	3	-.70*	.181	.001	-1.17	-.23
	4	-.43	.264	.359	-1.12	.25
3	1	.23	.327	.893	-.62	1.08
	2	.70*	.181	.001	.23	1.17
	4	.27	.290	.796	-.49	1.02
4	1	-.03	.379	1.000	-1.02	.95
	2	.43	.264	.359	-.25	1.12
	3	-.27	.290	.796	-1.02	.49

Based on observed means.
The error term is Mean Square(Error) = .665.
*. The mean difference is significant at the .05 level.

Homogeneous Subsets

Spend money per month

Tukey HSD

employment	N	Subset
		1
2	73	1.66
4	11	2.09
1	8	2.13
3	28	2.36
Sig.		.092

CONCLUSION

This study is mainly focused on the customer's perception on Tupperware products in Puducherry region. Most of the customers are very trustworthy to the Tupperware products, especially to the product like lunch and outdoor containers. Even though they do not come across abundant advertisements as linked to the other plastic brands.

Tupperware product is doing well because of their brand name. Dealers have taken part to sell the product not to promote the products .In this survey maximum of the consumers are purchasing the Tupperware products because of the good quality of the products, gorgeous colors, hygiene, and light weight to carry from one place to another. Housewives' prefer Tupperware products mainly like Table ware, Microwave containers, Refrigerator containers, Lunch and outdoor containers etc., Tupperware products are concentrating more on women and children. Tupperware promoters required to promote their products through adequate advertisements in the market position, because there is a tough competition with the local plastic products like Cutting edge, Modicare, Real life etc. Totally according to the conclusion that in Puducherry region, majority of the customers to prefer Tupperware products. While the non-users also aware about the Tupperware products. These products have got good market position with the help of its affordable price, good quality, and hygiene they maintain.

Today there are number of models of Tupperware available in the market and they differ in price, quality,

Table 7.

Rotated Component Matrix[a]		
particulars	**Component**	
	1	**2**
art_technology	.503	.321
ideal_forgifts	.024	.585
available_attractivecolours	.555	-.226
providing_goodvalue_for_money	-.317	.424
guests_in_tupperwareproducts	.651	-.029
occupy_alotof_shelf_space	-.121	.334
orginal_flavourfor_long	.744	.073
proof_of_purchase	.029	.311
demonsstrated_inthe_home_party	.416	.474
Products are_ very_ expensive	.521	-.262
I have no _ inhabitation	.107	.645
Suit the _ kitchen _requirements	.456	.034
non_toxixand_odorless	.160	.169
Carry from _ one place to another	-.294	-.013
Parents feel_ very safe_ while their_ children _handle the_ products	.121	-.155

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.
Rotation Method: Varimax with Kaiser Normalization.

a. Rotation converged in 3 iterations.

Component Transformation Matrix		
Component	**1**	**2**
1	.995	.096
2	-.096	.995

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.
Rotation Method: Varimax with Kaiser Normalization.

capacity, type etc., in the present marketing era, it can be easily said that all the middle class people are also using the Tupperware. Main usage of product is avoiding the spoil of foods. Customers prefer this product even though the price is very high.

REFERENCES

1. Bloemer, J.M.M. and kasper, H.D.P.(1995)   The complex Relationship between consumer satisfaction and Brand Loyalty. Journal of Economic Psychology, 16,311-329.
2. JonesMicheal A, Suh Jaebeom, Transaction- specific satisfaction and overall satisfaction: an empirical analysis. J Serv Mark 2000; 14(20; 147-59.
3. Patterson Paul G. Johnson Lester W, Spreng Richard A modeling the determinants of customer satisfaction for business -to- business professional services. Acad Mark Sci 1997; 25(1): 4-17.
4. Pessmier, E,A, 1995 "A New way to Determine Buying Decisions, "Journal   of   Marketing,   24:41.46 Brandchannel.com   (2006)   (Http:www.brand channel.com), 18 August 2006.
5. Reichheld, F.F., 1996. The Loyalty Effect: The Hidden Force behind Growth, profits and Lasting Value Harvard Business School Press, Boston, MA.
6. Reichheld, F.F and W.E Sasser, 1990. Zero defection: quality comes to service. Harvard Business Review 68:105-116