

Anti-Consumption Brand Behavior: A Study of Indian FMCG Sector

Punam Mishra*

Institute of Management, JK Lakshmi Pat University, Jaipur, India

Received 2 April 2018; Accepted 28 April 2018

Abstract

The advent of Internet and rapid development of both highly sophisticated information and communication technology have made the world a global village in a real sense. However, as consumers nowadays expect more from brands, customer satisfaction is not enough and may not necessarily lead to brand loyalty. Customers may share the information and ideas about a brand based on either positive or negative experiences impacting the decision making of other customers and also significantly influencing the brand identity and image. In this era of cut throat competition, negative consumer brand-relationship is more common than positive ones. Consumers may also experience extremely negative emotions towards brands that might result in anti-consumption of a brand. The Indian FMCG industry has undergone a significant change since liberalization (1991). It is required to identify whether consumer have accepted the new brands in the sector or not. The marketers have to strengthen their strategy to motivate the consumer buying behavior and reduce the anti-consumption behavior of the consumer. This study is an attempt to identify important factors influencing anti-consumption brand behavior in FMCG sector in India.

© 2018 Published by ITMSOC Working Group.

Keywords: Customer Satisfaction, Negative Consumer, Brand-Relationship, Anti-Consumption, FMCG Sector.

1. Introduction

BRANDING has been around for centuries as a means to distinguish the goods or services of one producer from those of other. Brand can be assumed to be a bundle of functional and emotional values. This “holistic” view of the brand is distinct from the traditional “product centric” view of the brand [1].

For hundreds of years, marketers are in search of a magic potion that would guarantee brand loyalty and perpetual profits for their companies [2]. This magic potion can be used to develop and provide the desired product to customers, thereby satisfying their unmet needs. However, as consumers nowadays expect more from brands, customer satisfaction is not enough and may not necessarily lead to brand loyalty [3]. In this era of cut throat competition, negative consumer brand-relationship is more common

than positive ones. Depending on the customer experiences, an information with opinions about brand shared by the customers could be positive or negative, also impacting the decision making of other customers and significantly influencing the brand identity and image [4].

The advent of Internet and rapid development of highly sophisticated information and communication technology have made the world a global village in a real sense. Consumers are not passive recipients of information anymore but rather collectively express their opinion about the rights and wrongs of a brand through a variety of online platforms in the form of anti-brand communities. Negative emotions towards brands can make anti-consumption of a brand more apparent and relevant phenomenon. Negative expressions for a brand can also impact the customer loyalty, purchase decisions, and frequency of product usage.

Consumers may also experience extreme negative emotions towards brands that might result in anti-consumption of a brand. Anti-consumption of brand (brand avoidance) has been defined

*Corresponding author.

Email address: punammishra@jkl.u.edu.in (Punam Mishra)

Table 1. KMO and Bartlett's Test.

Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy		.805
Bartlett's Test of Sphericity	Approx. Chi-Square	14301.468
	Df	595
	Sig.	.000

Table 2. Total Variance Explained.

Component	Initial Eigenvalues			Extraction Sums of Squared Loadings			Rotation Sums of Squared Loadings		
	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %
1	6.847	23.612	23.612	6.847	23.612	23.612	6.457	22.265	22.265
2	5.567	19.196	42.808	5.567	19.196	42.808	4.923	16.976	39.241
3	4.370	15.071	57.878	4.370	15.071	57.878	4.797	16.540	55.781
4	3.690	12.722	70.601	3.690	12.722	70.601	3.918	13.167	68.948
5	1.839	6.340	76.941	1.839	6.340	76.941	2.218	7.993	76.941
6	.847	3.173	80.114						
7	.792	2.631	82.745						
8	.715	2.456	85.201						
9	.647	2.001	87.202						
10	.508	1.403	88.605						
11	.451	1.212	89.817						
12	.411	1.123	90.940						
13	.351	1.016	91.956						
14	.326	.956	92.912						
15	.301	.863	93.775						
16	.283	.785	94.560						
17	.257	.655	95.215						
18	.208	.619	95.834						
19	.199	.575	96.409						
20	.194	.502	96.911						
21	.170	.471	97.382						
22	.158	.448	97.830						
23	.145	.418	98.248						
24	.121	.346	98.594						
25	.087	.300	98.894						
26	.079	.262	99.156						
27	.071	.234	99.390						
28	.060	.206	99.596						
29	.053	.152	99.748						
30	.044	.080	99.828						
31	.023	.067	99.895						
32	.017	.053	99.948						
33	.009	.032	99.980						
34	.005	.019	99.999						
35	.000	.001	100.000						

as a rejection of brand which consumers avoid due to its questionable quality, corporate practices related to human rights, and

environmental/social issues [5] except its unavailability, inaccessibility, and expensiveness.

Table 3. Rotated Component Matrix.

	Factors				
	1	2	3	4	5
I avoid this brand because it is inconvenient to use	.935				
I avoid this brand because of poor functionality	.895				
I avoid this brand because it has number of defects	.851				
I avoid this brand because it doesn't deliver its promises	.830				
I avoid this brand because the brand doesn't appear to be original	.736				
I avoid this brand because it's is not able to distinguish itself from other brands	.742				
I avoid this brand for I believe the brand has not stayed true to itself over a period of time	.642				
I avoid this brand because I believe it is priced too high as compared to its quality		.906			
I avoid this brand the brand appears to be cheaper than its price		.872			
I avoid this brand because it's not value for money		.864			
I avoid this brand as it charges premium but offers poor features		.844			
I avoid this brand because I haven't heard about it		.807			
I avoid this brand for it charges higher prices due to its market power		.796			
I avoid this brand because it belongs to a country I do not have a good opinion about			.944		
I avoid this brand because it belongs to a country involved in an unfriendly relationship with my country			.914		
I avoid this brand because it takes away profits to its home country			.908		
I avoid this brand because I believe local made products are superior to this one			.887		
I avoid this brand for promoting westernization			.847		
I avoid this brand for it destroys our cultural values			.785		
I avoid this brand because it acts irresponsibly towards its customers			.780		
I avoid this brand because this brand's ways of working are controversial as per me			.749		
I avoid this brand because it causes environmental Degradation			.698		
I avoid this brand because of its careless attitude towards society			.664		
I avoid this brand because it does not match with my personality				.882	
I avoid this brand because it does not reflect who I am				.868	
I avoid this brand because it symbolizes the kind of person I would never want to be				.859	
I avoid this brand because it is linked to group of people I do not identify with				.773	
I avoid this brand because it is not approved in my social circle				.756	
I avoid this brand for not giving me a unique identity				.708	
I avoid this brand as it makes me feel like a part of the crowd				.692	
I avoid this brand as its values are in conflict with my personal values				.685	
I avoid this brand because I feel unsafe while using unknown brands				.676	
I avoid this brand because it tries to compete with my favourite brand					.847
I avoid this brand because it tries to copy my favourite brand					.785
I avoid this brands because I often notice people comparing it with my favourite brand					.737
Factor1. Quality and Reliability; 2 Price/Quality Relationship; 3. Ethnocentrism and Moral Values; 4. Undesired Self-image; and 5. Oppositional Brand Loyalty					

Consumer activism has become the buzzword and consumers are no longer afraid of expressing their concerns and avoidance to brands, which can result in financial losses and tarnishing of brand.

According to India Brand Equity Foundation (IBEF), the

FMCG sector in India has grown at an annual average of about 11% over the last decade. The overall FMCG market is expected to increase at CAGR of 14.7% to touch 110.4 billion USD during 2012-2020, with the rural FMCG market anticipated to increase at a CAGR of 17.7% to reach 100 billion USD during 2012-2025.

Food products is the leading segment, accounting for 43% of the overall market. Personal care (22%) and fabric care (12%) come next in terms of market share.

Growing awareness, easier access, and changing lifestyles have been the key growth drivers for the consumer market. The Government of India's policies and regulatory frameworks (e.g., relaxation of license rules) and approval of 51% foreign direct investment (FDI) in multi-brand and 100% in single-brand retail are some of the major growth drivers for the consumer market. This has increased intense competition among non-durable brands (e.g., FMCG) as consumers have a larger choice of alternatives. Therefore, the level of anti-consumption of an FMCG brand has increased.

While many researches have been done on the brand loyalty, brand attachment, brand satisfaction, and even on brand love, brand avoidance still remains an unexplored area. This paper is an attempt to identify the factors that influence the consumer's decision in anti-consumption of brand, especially in FMCG sector.

2. Literature Reviews

Consumer buying decision consists of different stages. During each stage, a consumer eliminate the available choices and creates an "evoked set" to make the final choice [6–8]. Many research has focused on various factors which help a brand to be a part of "evoked set" rather than to find the reasons of brand rejection by consumers.

Few researchers have identified the reasons for brand rejections including the negative prior experience, negative brand belief, and dissatisfaction with the quality of the brand apart from pro-social aspects [9, 10]. The studies revealed that the consumers try to avoid those brands which are not going to enhance their self-concepts or may result into undesired self [11].

Consumers sometimes avoid a brand because of ideological discontent with an organization or country [12, 13]. Anti-consumption of a brand is also a result of brand's explicit commercialism, violation of human rights or the environment, or involvement of unethical business practices [14]. Rejection of a brand occurs due to mismatch of the brand with the social role and status of the consumer [15]. Consumer also avoid a brand due to the risk associated with the product quality or the use of product [16].

The review of literature shows that anti-consumption (brand avoidance) can be caused by not only uni-dimensional reason but also multi-dimensional reasons for avoiding a particular brand.

Therefore, a gap still remains, this study is an attempt to identify the new insights of anti-consumption of brand that can help the brand managers to devise better branding strategies in the time of blues.

3. Rationale and Objective of The Study

The Indian FMCG industry has undergone a significant change since liberalization (1991). It is required to identify whether consumer have accepted the new brands in the sector. The marketers have to strengthen their strategy to motivate the consumer buying behavior and to reduce the anti-consumption behavior of the consumer. Various factors influencing the avoidance of a brand have to be identified. Therefore, the objective of study is to identify the important factors influencing anti-consumption behavior in FMCG sector in India. This study will help the marketers to formulate an effective business strategy to attract and motivate the consumers.

4. Research Methodology

Descriptive research design was adopted for the study. The review of literature resulted in formulation of a questionnaire consisting of 54 statements. These 54 statements were presented to 30 experts for vetting purpose. Vetting of 50 statements led to the final selection of 41 statements which represented various reasons for anti-consumption of an FMCG brand.

To ensure the internal consistency of the questionnaire developed, a reliability statistics was run. Having been applied to 41 statements, the reliability statistics resulted in the Chronbach's Alpha of 0.725. It was found that six statements (items) having the low "Corrected Item-Total Correlation" would least contribute to the Chronbach's Alpha. Therefore, in the questionnaire, a statement elimination was used to improve the overall reliability from 0.725 to 0.805. while the number of statements decreased from 41 to 35.

The questionnaire was administered to 300 consumers. A 5-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree) was used to collect the customer's anti-consumption behavior. Factor analysis was used to identify the major reasons of brand avoidance. SPSS version 20 was used to tabulate and analyze the data.

5. Analysis and Findings

On the identified 35 statements factor analysis was performed and effort was made to find the major factors influencing anti-consumption of a brand. Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) measure of sampling adequacy was used to find out the sampling adequacy. High KMO value (0.805) as shown in Table 1 demonstrates that the factor analysis will be useful with the data. Bartlett's test of sphericity indicates whether the correlation matrix is an identity matrix. Table 1 shows very small significant value of Bartlett's test, which indicates that there is significant relationship among variables, as well as factor analysis can be conducted between these factors.

Out of the thirty five anti-consumption brand factors, five major factors were extracted through rotated component matrix (Table 3). Five factors including Quality and Reliability; Price/Quality Relationship; Ethnocentrism and Moral Values; Undesired Self-image; and Oppositional Brand Loyalty were found to explain 76.94% of the major factors delivering anti-consumption buying behavior of customers (Table 2).

The major factors influencing the brand avoidance will be describe as follows.

5.1. *Quality and Reliability*

Consumers avoid a brand because of its inconvenience uses, poor functionality, and many defects. Consumers not only have a doubt about the originality of the product and brand differentiation, but also consider that the brand could not fulfill the promises over a period of time.

5.2. *Price-Quality Relationship*

Before taking the purchase decision consumer look at the price. They avoid a brand due to its improper price-quality relationship. They feel that the brand is either priced too high as compared to its quality or appears to be cheaper than its price.

5.3. *Ethnocentrism and Moral Values*

This important factor is considered by consumers. Consumers would not consider the brands having an unfriendly relationship with their own country. They also avoid the brands trying to destroy their native/cultural values and to promote the westernization. If the brand do not consider the long-term benefits of the environment and has a careless attitude towards society then also it has no place in the “share of pocket” of consumer.

5.4. *Undesired Self-image*

By the consumers, this factor is considered to avoid any brand. The consumers do not purchase the products of a particular brand, considering that the brand does not match with their personalities or symbolizes the kind of person whom they need not to be. They also avoid a brand which is not approved in their social circle or does not provide any unique identity.

5.5. *Oppositional Brand Loyalty*

Consumers will not consume a brand that tries to copy or competes with their favorite brands.

6. Conclusion and Implications

The reasons of anti-consumption brand behavior were found to be the inability of these brands to satisfy the customers on parameters like functional, ethical, identity mismatch and value deficiency issues, etc.

There is not much of literature available that concludes why such behavior is formed. Close monitoring of some anti-brand communities may help to understand the dynamics of such behavior. These communities can help managers to reach out to displeased consumers and turn the negativity and emotional outburst experiences that in turn can protect themselves against brand misrepresentation.

There are various strategies that could be recommended to companies according to the results of this study. The brands need to give importance to their moral/ethical value and concerns related to satisfy consumer’s expectations besides their ethnocentric attitudes. Brands need to emphasize on its value for money factor as it is the most critical setback for the consumers according to the study. Brands should bring more transparency into their operations and adding more towards social responsibility to regain consumer’s loyalty.

Since consumers resist their products or brands not only individually but also collectively creating online anti-brand communities on internet, ignoring “electronic negative word of mouth” might negatively affect their sustainability in the long run due to consumer activism and online anti-brand communities favoring confrontation against these brands. Thus, not only on operational level, but they should integrate their concern for personnel relations, society’s health, sustainable resources, environment, company culture into their main policies and convey their social and environmental consciousness through several media means such as their websites, internet advertisements, brand loyalty fan page. This integration of the values related to society, environment and health could provide positive outcomes both for the companies themselves and the society at large. Furthermore, in order to avert possible negative reactions of consumers supporting anti-branding, global MNCs should also consider their consumers’ attitudes and define their brand management strategies in accordance with consumers’ sensitivities for environment, health and ethnocentrism.

References

1. Ambler T, Styles C. Brand development versus new product development: Towards a process model of extension decisions. *Marketing Intelligence & Planning*. 1996;14(7):10–19. Available from: <http://tiny.cc/10pczy>.
2. Bogomolova S, Nenycz-Thiel M. Why Not? The reasons for not considering a brand by non-brand users. In: ICAR. Sydney, Australia; 2008. .
3. Oliver RRLRRL, Oliver RRLRRL. A cognitive model of the antecedents and consequences of satisfaction decisions. *Journal of Marketing Research*. 1980;17(4):460–470. Available from: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3150499>.

4. Karakaya F, Barnes NG. Impact of online reviews of customer care experience on brand or company selection. *Journal of Consumer Marketing*. 2010;27(5):447–457.
5. Lee MSW, Motion J, Conroy D. Anti-consumption and brand avoidance. *Journal of Business Research*. 2009;62(2):169–180.
6. Desai KK, Hoyer WD. Descriptive Characteristics of Memory-Based Consideration Sets: Influence of Usage Occasion Frequency and Usage Location Familiarity. *Journal of Consumer Research*. 2000;27(3):309–323.
7. Narayana C, Markin R. Consumer Behavior and Product Performance: An Alternative Conceptualization. *Journal of Marketing*. 1975;39(4):1–6.
8. Nedungadi P. Recall and Consumer Consideration Sets: Influencing Choice without Altering Brand Evaluations. *Journal of Consumer Research*. 1990;17(3):263. Available from: <https://academic.oup.com/jcr/article-lookup/doi/10.1086/208556>.
9. Angry Customers don't Come Back, They Get Back: The Experience and Behavioral Implications of Anger and Dissatisfaction in Services. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*. 2003;31(4):377–393.
10. Winchester M. Negative brand beliefs and brand usage. *International Journal of Market Research*. 2008;50(3):355–376.
11. Winchester M. Negative brand beliefs and brand usage. *International Journal of Market Research*. 2008;50(3):355–376.
12. Friedman M. Consumer Boycotts in the United States, 1970-1980: Contemporary Events in Historical Perspective. *Journal of Consumer Affairs*. 1985;19(1):96–117.
13. Tulluck G. Exit, Voice and Loyalty : Responses to Decline in Firms, Organizations, and States. *Journal of Finance*. 1970;25(5):1194–1195. Available from: <http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=bth&AN=4662164&site=bsi-live>.
14. Sandikci Ö, Ekici A. Politically motivated brand rejection. *Journal of Business Research*. 2009;62(2):208–217.
15. Hogg MK. Anti-Constellations: Exploring the Impact of Negation on Consumption. *Journal of Marketing Management*. 1998;14(1-3):133–158. Available from: <http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1362/026725798784959354>.
16. Garretson JA, Clow KE. The influence of coupon face value on service quality expectations, risk perceptions and purchase intentions in the dental industry. *Journal of Services Marketing*. 1999;13(1):59–72.

Biography



Punam Mishra is Assistant Professor of Marketing and Chairperson of BBA Program at Institute of Management, JK Lakshmipat University, Jaipur. She is Post-Graduate with Marketing Specialization and has been awarded Ph.D. from University of Rajasthan, Jaipur. Dr. Mishra has designed and conducted training programmes/sessions on the topics related with marketing and communication skills. Her areas of interest for Research, Training and Consultancy include Sales Management, Consumer Behavior, Integrated Marketing Communication, Customer Engagement, Branding, and Digital Marketing.