

A STUDY OF EXPLORATORY BUYING BEHAVIOR TENDENCIES IN FMCG SECTOR

Anukool M. Hyde^{1*}, Devendra Jain², Sunil Kumar Verma³ & Ankita Jain⁴

¹Associate Professor and Head –HR at Prestige Institute of Management and Research Indore (MP), India

²Research Scholar at DAVV, Indore (MP), India

³Assistant Professor at Prestige Institute of Management and Research Indore (MP), India

⁴Assistant Professor at Shri Vaishnav Institute of Management, Indore (MP), India

*Corresponding Author Email: anukool_h@rediffmail.com

ABSTRACT

Globalization is a boon both to producers and consumers. Companies, indeed, owe to it for their sprawling businesses as consumers are being served with assorted platter of goods and service every fortnight. Consumers are being provided with increasing amount of decision-relevant information in their purchasing environment. Consumer Behavior is a very wide area in the field of Marketing and an ever evolving concept. Human being is unpredictable in nature hence difficult to predict behavior of consumers. Variety seeking is one of the most common psychological heuristics where consumers make decisions. Yet little is known about the effects of information, which also significantly influences consumers' choices of behavior. This study will highlight role of Information seeking behavior, product acquisition behavior and variety seeking behavior in Fast-moving consumer goods (FMCG) sector. The exploratory behavior of consumers involves product acquisition and information seeking which occurs as a response to stimuli from the environment. The paper also determines the effect of demographic variables on the exploratory behavior of consumers. Data has been collected from 263 respondents and for data analysis normality test, reliability test, *t*-test and one way ANOVA has been used.

Key words: *Variety seeking behavior, product acquisition behavior, Information seeking behavior, exploratory behavior*

INTRODUCTION

The concept of consumer buying behavior has been an important area of research. Consumer buying has been defined as the search, identifying alternatives, purchase and post purchase activity. The consumer buying in FMCG sector includes searching for products on the basis of information which can be procured from both internal as well as external sources. The internal sources of information include information from past experience and perception of individual. External sources of information include information from friends and family, reference groups, advertisements etc. After information search, the individual selects the alternatives on the basis of choice criteria. Then the individual purchases the product and finally he is either satisfied or dissatisfied with the purchase.

FMCG products include food and beverages, Personal care products, home care products, Over-the-counter (OTC) products. These products are consumed on a daily basis and do not require much processing of information. But the consumers behavior in today's

scenario, play an important role in selling of a product. Thus their behavior is changing and they search and process information before purchasing any products. Therefore information seeking behavior is very important for consumers.

Even consumers look for wide array of products because they like to try new products. This occurs due to number of stimuli from the environment like advertisements, sales promotion and others. But this variety seeking behavior is often associated with the risk of trying new products which can be psychological risk, financial risk etc. The risk taking can be reduced by the information processing. If the information processing is more, then risk can be reduced.

Exploratory purchase behavior refers to the switching pattern of consumers to try new and varied products. These types of consumers are highly innovative and risk takers and are very low on brand loyalty. The source of this exploratory purchase behavior is the consumer's motivation, response to stimuli, perception of the individual towards products, problem solving

behavior and individual characteristics. But main reason of this behavior is the response of the consumer towards the environment stimuli. The marketers need to study the adoption of new products by the consumers in order to develop new and varied products. This is because consumer's needs are varied and they respond to different stimuli differently.

Definition

Both 'brand loyalty' and 'variety seeking' are concepts with a long history in the marketing literature. Although these seem to be conflicting concepts, both are of high managerial importance. Companies aim to make their customers more committed, loyal, or at least habitual buyers of their brands. But it is sometimes more desirable to attract consumers who prefer variety. Only in this way it is possible to sell new products and to snatch away customers from competitors. Afterwards, one can again focus on making these customers more loyal to brands.

According to Assael (1995) brand loyalty is 'repeat buying because of commitment to a certain brand'. So, they claim that one can also be loyal to more than one brand (Dyson, Farr, and Hollis (1996). Keller (1993), in his definition, focused on the involvement needed for brand loyalty. The view of brand loyalty adopted here is that it occurs when favorable beliefs and attitudes for the brand are manifested in repeated buying behavior. Giddens and Hofmann (2002) add to the brand loyalty concept that it serves as a base of purchase habits. Thus we define brand loyalty as the repeated purchasing of one or more brands, with which one is involved because they fit one's preferences and wishes best. Information seeking behavior refers to the way people search for and utilize information. The term was coined by Wilson in his 1981 paper, on the grounds that the then current 'information needs' was unhelpful as a basis for a research agenda, since 'need' could not be directly observed, while how people behaved in seeking information could be observed and investigated. In 2000, Wilson described information behavior as the totality of human behavior in relation to sources and channels of information, including both active and passive information-seeking, and information use. He described information seeking behavior as purposive seeking of information as a consequence of a need to satisfy some goal. Information seeking behavior is the micro-level of behavior employed by the searcher in

interacting with information systems of all kinds, be it between the seeker and the system, or the pure method of creating and following up on a search.

According to Assael (1995) variety seeking only occurs when the involvement with a certain brand (but not necessarily with the decision) is rather low. Further, decision making under variety seeking is rather extended: consumers search for information about the different brands before they make a choice. Brand loyalty is opposite of variety seeking in two aspects. First, decision making is habitual. Second, brand involvement is high. Consumers make purchases with little deliberation because of past satisfaction and a strong commitment to the brand as a result. Inertia occurs when consumers choose a certain brand habitually (like brand loyalty) but without high brand involvement. Extended decision making occurs when consumers have high brand loyalty, but cannot rely on their habits (e.g. because they have to choose among more than one highly appreciated brand). In what follows, we explore whether it is possible to enhance variety seeking among inert purchasers. The latter will repurchase the brand if it achieves a certain minimum level of satisfaction. Assael (1995) and others refer to this process as spurious loyalty, because repetitive purchases may make it appear as if the consumer is loyal to the brand while actually no such loyalty exists.

As one of the most prevalent psychological phenomena, variety seeking has been frequently discussed in marketing research fields such as consumers' decision making (Barrett & Salovey, 2002; Connolly & Ordóñez, 2003). Greater variety seeking is attributed to forces operating in the simultaneous choices as opposed to sequential consumption strategy, including uncertainty about future preferences and a desire to simplify the decision. In the case of simultaneous choice, people take into account real or imagined preference and desire for variety (e.g., Simonson, 1990). The literature posits that variety seeking is closely related to psychological theories in the following aspects: (1) people prefer to choose a more diverse consumption bundle that can be explained from diversification heuristic and exaggerating anticipated satiation in psychology (Fox, Ratner, & Lieb, 2005). (2) Variety seeking displays greater risk seeking and freedom seeking (Levav & Zhu, 2009). Since aggregate risk of the portfolio will be

less than its components separately, people prefer variety seeking to hedge the potential risk. (3) Variety seeking means people pay more attention to the impact of choices on their future tasks. Psychological explanation to this future tendency is that people have greater visibility of consequences when they are combined (Kahneman & Lovallo, 1993). (4) Myopic discounting and immediacy effect in psychology can explain consumers' tendency to put more weight on the delayed consequences (Kirby & Herrnstein, 1995).

Exploratory and Risk Taking Behavior has been found to be related to Optimum Stimulation Level (OSL) (Joachimsthaler and Lastovicka, 1984; Steenkamp and Baumgartner, 1992). This concept has its origins in Psychology and stipulates that each individual has a preferred level of stimulation regarding environmental stimuli. Thus, individual behavior will often be motivated by the need to increase or decrease novelty, ambiguity and complexity which constitute the environmental stimulation level (Raju, 1980).

Risk related issues were identified as constituting a culturally sensitive consumer behavior dimension. Since Bauer (1960) proposed that consumer behavior could be viewed as "an instance of risk taking", the concept of risk has been widely studied in Marketing (Gemunden, 1985; Akaah and Korgaonkar, 1988). Risk related issues seem to be particularly culture-sensitive: research on frameworks of culture has identified the dimension of risk as a distinguishing facet among cultures. Hofstede (1984) and Steenkamp (2001) included uncertainty avoidance in their cultural frameworks. Clark (1990) proposed relation to risk as one consumer dimension of his national character framework. Moreover, risk research in Marketing has focused on perceived risk and the negative outcomes associated with it. Focus has been on whether consumers perceive risk in particular buying or consuming decisions and how they deal with that risk.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Ju (2015) describes the role of information seeking in reducing the variety seeking behavior of consumers. For the consumer to become more variety seeking they should be provided less amount of information whereas in case of brand loyal consumers more amount of information needs to be provided by organizations. It was also found that consumers who are novice having less information are more variety seekers than the

experienced persons.

Dalal and Dauce (2013) describes that variety seeking is a part of the exploratory behavior of consumers. The consumers who are more variety seeking are less brand loyal. It was also indicated that customers who are variety seekers are less brand loyal. There is considerable relation between novelty seeking, exploratory buying and consumption of consumers.

Helm and Landschulze (2013) had described how age is related to the variety seeking behavior among consumers of FMCG products. They said that with increasing age of consumers the desire to switch to alternative brands decreases while the desire to switch to familiar brands within product category increases. While the young consumers are more variety seekers as compared to the old consumers. This also occurs due to the less amount of risk taking behavior in the old consumers as compared to the young ones.

Sapra and Mor (2012) had argued that desire for exploration among consumers is significant in explaining consumer buying behavior. They explained that there is a significant amount of stimulation present in every individual which is known as optimum stimulation level (OSL).

Rashmi (2010) had deduced the effect of demographic characteristics on information search behavior in FMCG sector. Age, income and education are negatively related to the amount of information search. Even marital status was negatively correlated with amount of information search. Only occupation was significantly correlated with amount of information search.

Tellis, Yin and Bell (2009) had suggested that the consumer innovativeness which involves variety seeking is also influenced by the demographic variables. They found that age, income, mobility, education and gender were significant predictors of innovativeness in global consumer. Family size was not correlated with innovativeness. Caraballo and Burt (2011) argued that employment status and age had an influence on the variety seeking behavior of consumers in FMCG market.

Choi, *et al.*, (2006), specify that consumption of products connotes attributes, motivation, and social pattern. Personality traits like, impulse buying and variety seeking have drawn significant attention from consumer researchers because of their wide spread

prevalence across a broad range of product categories.

Simonson (1990) defines the effect of variety seeking as the tendency to choose more diversity during simultaneous than during sequential choice. As people take into account real or imagined preference interactions between goods when they choose simultaneously. Meanwhile there is a prevailing tendency that people prefer to take “one bite on every product”, thus overall desire for variety is sort of human nature. Although firms can benefit from occupying more market segments by providing various products, variety may still backfire because consumers tend to give up studying the overload information (Gourville & Soman, 2005; Chernev, 2003). Extensive researches also show that variety seeking closely relates to other domains of consumer behavior such as impulse buying, ethical behavior, cultural studies (Punj 2011; Van Trijp, *et al.*, 2003). The understanding of variety seeking is also deepened from extending the research contexts into emerging markets (Grünhagen, Dant, & Zhu, 2012) and various purchasing situations (Choi, Kim, & Yi, 2006). One representative example is that people will prefer more equal mixes of virtues and vices when making simultaneous, as opposed to sequential, choices (Loewenstein *et al.*, 1998). In this case, the combination of vices and virtue can be interpreted as a more various bundles compared to an isolation choice. Researches also connect variety seeking with business strategies such as positioning and pricing (Raju & Venkatesan, 2010).

Hoyer and Ridgway (1984) suggest that variety seeking behavior among consumers is an extension of the exploratory buying behavior. This variety seeking behavior is normally a part of exploratory purchase behavior tendency. This behavior arises as a result of individual, product related characteristics, decision strategies, situational and normative variables, dissatisfaction with the current brand.

OBJECTIVES

1. To study the impact of gender on exploratory buying behavior tendencies in FMCG.
2. To study the impact of age on exploratory buying behavior tendencies in FMCG.
3. To understand the impact of marital status on exploratory buying behavior tendencies in FMCG.
4. To understand the impact of type of family on exploratory buying behavior tendencies in FMCG.
5. To study the impact of occupation on exploratory buying behavior tendencies in FMCG.
6. To study the impact of income on exploratory buying behavior tendencies in FMCG.
7. To study the impact of education on exploratory buying behavior tendencies in FMCG.

Hypotheses

- H₀₁: There is no significant impact of gender on exploratory buying behavior tendencies in FMCG.
- H₀₂: There is no significant impact of age on exploratory buying behavior tendencies in FMCG.
- H₀₃: There is no significant impact of type of family on exploratory buying behavior Tendencies in FMCG.
- H₀₄: There is no significant impact of occupation on exploratory buying behavior tendencies in FMCG.
- H₀₅: There is no significant impact of income on exploratory buying behavior tendencies in FMCG.
- H₀₆: There is no significant impact of gender on exploratory buying behavior tendencies in FMCG.
- H₀₇: There is no significant impact of education on exploratory buying behavior tendencies in FMCG.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Universe- Universe of the study is Madhya Pradesh-India.

Type of Research- Research is Descriptive in nature.

Sampling technique- Convenient sampling technique has been used for data collection.

Sampling Unit- Respondents were students, housewives, employees and self-employed from Pan India.

Sample Size- Questionnaire was sent to the respondents through social media and hard copy of the questionnaire was also administered on respondents. After confirming completeness of the filled questionnaire 263 questionnaires were considered for data analysis.

Tools for Data Collection- Data has been collected from a Scale of Exploratory Buying Behaviour Tendencies (EBBT) of Baumgartner and Steenkamp (1996). Scale has two parts i.e. Exploratory Acquisition of Products (EAP) and Exploratory Information Seeking (EIS). Since study was on FMCG segment, one item was deleted.

Tools for Data Analysis- Data has been analyzed by Normality test, Reliability test, t test and ANOVA.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Kolmogorov- Smirnov Statistic tests the hypothesis that the data normally distributed. A low significance value less than 0.05 indicates that the distribution of the data differs significantly from a normal distribution. After conducting this test, it was found that the assumption holds good for the data. The data is normality distributed (1.082) (see Table 1).

Table 1: One-Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test

		VAR00001
N		263
Normal Parameters ^a	Mean	54.1217
	Standard Deviation	7.09212
Most Extreme Differences	Absolute	0.067
	Positive	0.067
	Negative	-0.042
Kolmogorov-Smirnov Z		1.082
Asymptotic Significance (2-tailed)		0.193
Test distribution is Normal.		

Reliability test has been made for testing the reliability of Quality of work life, with the help of Coefficient (Cronbach Alpha). Reliability of data is (0.618) (see Table 2) which is acceptable, according to different theory of reliability value above 0.6 is appropriate, low value below the 0.5 implies that reliability may not be appropriate.

Table 2: Reliability Statistics

Cronbach's Alpha	No of Items
0.618	19

Since *p* value is 0.165 (see Table 3) which is more than 0.05 (at 5% level of significance) which means that null hypothesis is accepted. It can be further said that there is no significant difference in the perception of males and females towards EBBT in FMCG. Zukerman (1988) developed a biochemical explanation for the same regarding age and gender. He reviewed some research which explains that OSL (Optimum Stimulation Level / Exploratory) Tendencies is significantly negatively correlated with the level of the enzyme monoamine oxidase (MAO) and females have higher levels of MAO than males at all spans of life. It can be inferred that there is no impact of gender on Exploratory buying behavior.

Table 3: Impact of gender on Exploratory buying behavior

Independent Samples Test										
		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
		F	Sig.	T	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
									Lower	Upper
VAR00001	Equal variances as summed	1.943	0.165	-0.547	259	0.585	-0.58385	1.06797	-2.68687	1.51917
	Equal variances not assumed			-0.499	80.037	0.619	-0.58385	1.16958	-2.91137	1.74367

Since *p* value is 0.982 (see Table 4) which is more than 0.05 (at 5% level of significance) which indicates that null hypothesis for family is accepted. It can be conferred that there is no significant difference in the perception of respondents with respect to family type in FMCG towards EBBT. Tellis, Yin, and Bell (2009)

found that Family size is not significant in EBBT. The importance of this result is that it holds across a wide variety of countries and occurs despite a literature that has obtained ambiguous results on this issue. There is no impact of family size on exploratory buying behavior.

Table 4: Age wise results

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
		F	Sig.	T	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
									Lower	Upper
VAR00001	Equal variances assumed	0.084	0.773	-1.335	261	0.183	-1.18164	0.88525	-2.92478	0.56150
	Equal variances not assumed			-1.320	224.971	0.188	-1.18164	0.89534	-2.94597	0.58269

Since *p* value is 0.773 (see Table 5) which is more than 0.05 (at 5% level of significance) which indicates that null hypothesis for age is accepted. It can be conferred that there is no significant difference in the perception

of respondents with respect to age in FMCG towards EBBT. Im, Bayus, & Mason, (2003) also supported the findings of Robertson that age does not have impact on OSL.

Table 5: Results on the basis of Marital Status

Independent Samples Test										
		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
		F	Sig.	T	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
									Lower	Upper
VAR00001	Equal variances assumed	2.977	0.086	0.178	259	0.859	0.16667	0.93568	-1.67584	2.00917
	Equal variances not assumed			0.169	149.365	0.866	0.16667	0.98832	-1.78623	2.11956

Since *p* value is 0.086 (see Table 6) which is more than 0.05 (at 5% level of significance) which says that null hypothesis is accepted. It can be said that there is no significant difference in the perception of married and unmarried people towards EBBT in FMCG sector. Steenkamp *et al.* (1992) found in the study that there is

low impact of marital status on Exploratory Tendencies. EBBT does not depend on marital status as it all depends on individual characteristics, emotions and external stimuli and other stimuli. It can be inferred that there is no impact of marital status on exploratory buying behavior.

Table 6: Results on the basis of Family type

Independent Samples Test										
		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
		F	Sig.	T	Df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
									Lower	Upper
VAR00001	Equal variances assumed	0.001	0.982	-0.228	260	0.819	-0.20679	0.90529	-1.98943	1.57585
	Equal variances not assumed			-0.226	203.995	0.821	-0.20679	0.91308	-2.00707	1.59349

Since *p* value is 0.387 (see Table 7) which is more than 0.05 (at 5% level of significance) which says that null hypothesis is accepted. It can be said that there is no significant difference in the perception of people with respect to occupation towards EBBT in FMCG sector. In this study occupation does not affect EBBT

because an individual has an inherent quality of exploring buying behavior. It does not matter whether the individual is employed, self employed, house wife or a student. There is no impact of marital status on exploratory buying behavior.

Table 7: Results on the basis of Occupation

ANOVA							
VAR00001	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.		
Between Groups	152.852	3	50.951	1.013	0.387		
Within Groups	13025.254	259	50.291				
Total	13178.106	262					

Multiple Comparisons							
Dependent Variable: VAR00001							
	(I) VAR00002	(J) VAR00002	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
						Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Tukey HSD	Student	Employed	-0.42685	0.98203	0.972	-2.9662	2.1125
		Business	-0.92875	1.38949	0.909	-4.5217	2.6642
		Housewife	3.30909	2.36655	0.502	-2.8103	9.4285
	employed	Student	0.42685	0.98203	0.972	-2.1125	2.9662
		Business	-0.50190	1.32367	0.981	-3.9246	2.9208
		Housewife	3.73594	2.32851	0.378	-2.2851	9.7570

LSD	Business	Student	0.92875	1.38949	0.909	-2.6642	4.5217
		Employed	0.50190	1.32367	0.981	-2.9208	3.9246
		Housewife	4.23784	2.52750	0.338	-2.2977	10.7734
	housewife	Student	-3.30909	2.36655	0.502	-9.4285	2.8103
		Employed	-3.73594	2.32851	0.378	-9.7570	2.2851
		Business	-4.23784	2.52750	0.338	-10.7734	2.2977
	Student	Employed	-0.42685	0.98203	0.664	-2.3606	1.5069
		Business	-0.92875	1.38949	0.504	-3.6649	1.8074
		Housewife	3.30909	2.36655	0.163	-1.3510	7.9692
employed	Student	0.42685	0.98203	0.664	-1.5069	2.3606	
	Business	-0.50190	1.32367	0.705	-3.1084	2.1046	
	Housewife	3.73594	2.32851	0.110	-0.8493	8.3212	
Business	Student	0.92875	1.38949	0.504	-1.8074	3.6649	
	Employed	0.50190	1.32367	0.705	-2.1046	3.1084	
	Housewife	4.23784	2.52750	0.095	-0.7392	9.2149	
housewife	Student	-3.30909	2.36655	0.163	-7.9692	1.3510	
	Employed	-3.73594	2.32851	0.110	-8.3212	0.8493	
	Business	-4.23784	2.52750	0.095	-9.2149	0.7392	

Since p value is 0.387 (see Table 8) which is more than 0.05 (at 5% level of significance) which says that null hypothesis for income is accepted. It can be said that there is no significant difference in the perception of people with respect to income towards EBBT in FMCG sector. Ghosh Dastidar & Datta (2009) found that there is no impact of income on Exploratory

Tendencies. People who do not have good amount of money in their hands may explore about products whether they would be purchasing the products in future. There are people who do not purchase products at all but they seek information as a curiosity. There is no impact of income on exploratory buying behavior.

Table 8: Results on the basis of Monthly Income

ANOVA							
VAR00001							
		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	
Between Groups		124.303	3	41.434	0.822	0.483	
Within Groups		13053.803	259	50.401			
Total		13178.106	262				
Multiple Comparisons							
Dependent Variable: VAR00001							
	(I) VAR00004	(J) VAR00004	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
						Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Turkey HSD	upto 30000	30000-60000	0.70402	1.03560	0.905	-1.9738	3.3819
		60000-90000	-1.09561	1.41012	0.865	-4.7419	2.5506

	30000-60000	above 90000	1.68738	1.62897	0.729	-2.5248	5.8995	
		upto 30000	-0.70402	1.03560	0.905	-3.3819	1.9738	
		60000-90000	-1.79964	1.52830	0.642	-5.7515	2.1522	
		above 90000	0.98335	1.73229	0.942	-3.4960	5.4627	
	60000-90000	upto 30000	1.09561	1.41012	0.865	-2.5506	4.7419	
		30000-60000	1.79964	1.52830	0.642	-2.1522	5.7515	
		above 90000	2.78299	1.97908	0.497	-2.3345	7.9005	
	above 90000	upto 30000	-1.68738	1.62897	0.729	-5.8995	2.5248	
		30000-60000	-0.98335	1.73229	0.942	-5.4627	3.4960	
		60000-90000	-2.78299	1.97908	0.497	-7.9005	2.3345	
	LSD	upto 30000	30000-60000	0.70402	1.03560	0.497	-1.3352	2.7433
			60000-90000	-1.09561	1.41012	0.438	-3.8724	1.6811
above 90000			1.68738	1.62897	0.301	-1.5203	4.8951	
30000-60000		upto 30000	-0.70402	1.03560	0.497	-2.7433	1.3352	
		60000-90000	-1.79964	1.52830	0.240	-4.8091	1.2098	
		above 90000	0.98335	1.73229	0.571	-2.4278	4.3945	
60000-90000		upto 30000	1.09561	1.41012	0.438	-1.6811	3.8724	
		30000-60000	1.79964	1.52830	0.240	-1.2098	4.8091	
		above 90000	2.78299	1.97908	0.161	-1.1142	6.6801	
above 90000		upto 30000	-1.68738	1.62897	0.301	-4.8951	1.5203	
		30000-60000	-0.98335	1.73229	0.571	-4.3945	2.4278	
		60000-90000	-2.78299	1.97908	0.161	-6.6801	1.1142	

Since *p* value is 0.366 (see Table 9) which is more than 0.05 (at 5% level of significance) which says that null hypothesis is accepted. It can be said that there is no significant difference in the perception of people with respect to qualification towards EBBT in FMCG sector. School/college going students enquire about displayed products or go for window shopping

irrespective of future intention of purchase. Having a highest education of degree will not affect EBBT as it is a human tendency to procure information and exploring acquisition of products. Even uneducated person can explore acquisition of products and explore information also. There is no impact of education on exploratory purchase behavior.

Table 9: Results on the basis of Education/Qualification

ANOVA							
VAR00001							
		Sum of Squares	<i>Df</i>	Mean Square	<i>F</i>	Sig.	
Between Groups		217.331	4	54.333	1.082	0.366	
Within Groups		12960.776	258	50.236			
Total		13178.106	262				
Multiple Comparisons							
Dependent Variable: VAR00001							
	(I) VAR00004	(J) VAR00004	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
						Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Turkey HSD	HSC	Diploma	-1.26389	3.44401	0.996	-10.7251	8.1974
		Graduate	2.22587	2.53086	0.904	-4.7268	9.1786

		PG	0.49861	2.42811	1.000	-6.1718	7.1690
		Doctorate	2.19111	2.75520	0.932	-5.3779	9.7601
	Diploma	HSC	1.26389	3.44401	0.996	-8.1974	10.7251
		Graduate	3.48975	2.66514	0.686	-3.8318	10.8113
		PG	1.76250	2.56777	0.959	-5.2916	8.8166
		Doctorate	3.45500	2.87904	0.751	-4.4542	11.3642
	Graduate	HSC	-2.22587	2.53086	0.904	-9.1786	4.7268
		Diploma	-3.48975	2.66514	0.686	-10.8113	3.8318
		PG	-1.72725	1.06654	0.486	-4.6572	1.2027
		Doctorate	-0.03475	1.68314	1.000	-4.6586	4.5891
	PG	HSC	-0.49861	2.42811	1.000	-7.1690	6.1718
		Diploma	-1.76250	2.56777	0.959	-8.8166	5.2916
		Graduate	1.72725	1.06654	0.486	-1.2027	4.6572
		Doctorate	1.69250	1.52427	0.801	-2.4949	5.8799
	Doctorate	HSC	-2.19111	2.75520	0.932	-9.7601	5.3779
		Diploma	-3.45500	2.87904	0.751	-11.3642	4.4542
Graduate		0.03475	1.68314	1.000	-4.5891	4.6586	
PG		-1.69250	1.52427	0.801	-5.8799	2.4949	
LSD	HSC	Diploma	-1.26389	3.44401	0.714	-8.0458	5.5181
		Graduate	2.22587	2.53086	0.380	-2.7579	7.2096
		PG	0.49861	2.42811	0.837	-4.2828	5.2800
		Doctorate	2.19111	2.75520	0.427	-3.2344	7.6167
	Diploma	HSC	1.26389	3.44401	0.714	-5.5181	8.0458
		Graduate	3.48975	2.66514	0.192	-1.7584	8.7380
		PG	1.76250	2.56777	0.493	-3.2939	6.8189
		Doctorate	3.45500	2.87904	0.231	-2.2144	9.1244
	Graduate	HSC	-2.22587	2.53086	0.380	-7.2096	2.7579
		Diploma	-3.48975	2.66514	0.192	-8.7380	1.7584
		PG	-1.72725	1.06654	0.107	-3.8275	0.3730
		Doctorate	-0.03475	1.68314	0.984	-3.3492	3.2797
	PG	HSC	-0.49861	2.42811	0.837	-5.2800	4.2828
		Diploma	-1.76250	2.56777	0.493	-6.8189	3.2939
		Graduate	1.72725	1.06654	0.107	-3.730	3.8275
		Doctorate	1.69250	1.52427	0.268	-1.3091	4.6941
Doctorate	HSC	-2.19111	2.75520	0.427	-7.6167	3.2344	
	Diploma	-3.45500	2.87904	0.231	-9.1244	2.2144	
	Graduate	0.03475	1.68314	0.984	-3.2797	3.3492	
	PG	-1.69250	1.52427	0.268	-4.6941	1.3091	

Managerial Implications

The above study has significant implications for Marketing Managers because the consumer behavior is changing significantly. The results show that there is no significant difference between consumers of different gender, age groups, income groups, marital status and even occupation. This occurs because the consumers explore for variety on the basis of information given and the internal optimum stimulus level. This is normally similar in all the individuals and hence the response is similar irrespective of the gender, age, income, occupation or marital status. The marketers need to provide the much needed information to make some of the consumers brand loyal towards their products. Because in the FMCG sector most of the products are very similar in nature and brand loyalty is very less among consumers. Hence it becomes essential to determine how the variety seeking behavior can be reduced. This study can be useful to the marketers of FMCG to segment the market according to the demographics of consumers and frame marketing strategy accordingly.

CONCLUSION

The exploratory buying behavior tendencies among consumers with reference to FMCG sector is particularly related with the risk taking and variety seeking behavior of consumers. This tendency makes the consumer to explore more varieties of products and services. The consumer makes decision whether or not to stick to the same brand. This differs normally according to the various demographic variables. But in this information age the differences across various demographic variables had blurred leading the consumers to behave in a rather similar way and adopt diverse products and services. So the marketers need to devise a new strategy to curb this variety seeking behavior among consumers by offering some loyalty programs which build loyal consumers and offering information in a capsule to make the consumers aware that their brand is the only solution to their problems.

REFERENCES

Akaah, I. P. & Korgaonkar, P. K. (1988). A conjoint investigation of the relative importance of risk relievers in direct marketing. *Journal of Advertising Research*. 28(4), pp 38-44.

- Assael, H. (1995). *Consumer Behavior and Marketing Action*. (South-Western Publishing Cincinnati (Ohio), pp 151.
- Barrett, L. F. & Salovey, P. (Eds.). (2002). *The wisdom in feeling: Psychological processes in emotional intelligence*. UK: Guilford Press
- Bauer, R. A. (1960). Consumer behavior as risk taking. *Dynamic Marketing for a Changing World - Proceedings of the 43rd Conference of the American Marketing Association*. R. S. Hancock, 389-98. Chicago: American Marketing Association.
- Caraballo, N. & Burt, S. (2011). Determining how and why consumer purchasing of grocery and household products varies. *African Journal of Business Management*. 5(16), pp. 6917-6926.
- Chernev, A. (2003). Product Assortment and Individual Decision Processes. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 85(1), pp 151-162.
- Choi, J., Kim, B. K., Choi, I., & Yi, Y. (2006). Variety seeking tendency in choice for others: Interpersonal and intrapersonal causes. *Journal of Consumer Research*. 32(4), pp 590-595.
- Clark, T. (1990). International marketing and national character: A Review and proposal for an integrative theory. *Journal of Marketing*, 54(4), pp 66-80.
- Connolly, T., & Ordóñez, L. (2003). *Judgment and decision making*. John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Dalal, A. & Dauce, B. (2013). Does variety seeking Explain travelers Consumption Behavior in International Context. *International Journal of Innovative Research and Studies*. 2(9), pp 597-609.
- Dyson, P., Farr, A. & Hollis, N. (1996). Understanding, Measuring, and Using Brand Equity. *Journal of Advertising Research*. 36(6), pp 9-21.
- Fox, C. R., Ratner, R. K. & Lieb, D. S. (2005). How subjective grouping of options influences choice and allocation: Diversification bias and the phenomenon of partition dependence. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General*. 134(4), pp 538.
- Gemunden, H. G. (1985). Perceived risk and information search: A systematic meta-analysis of the empirical evidence. *International Journal of Research in Marketing*. 2(2), pp 79-100.
- Ghosh Dastidar, S. & Datta, B. (2009). Demographic Differences in Consumer Exploratory Tendencies: An

- Empirical Examination. *IIMB Management Review*. 21(4), pp 297-312.
- Giddens, N. & Hofmann, A. (2002). Brand Loyalty. (Missouri Value Added Development Center, University of Missouri), pp 2.
- Gourville, J. T. & Soman, D. (2005). Over choice and assortment type: When and why variety backfires. *Marketing Science*. 24(3), pp 382-395.
- Grünhagen, M., Dant, R. P. & Zhu, M. (2012). Emerging consumer perspectives on American franchise offerings: Variety seeking behavior in China. *Journal of Small Business Management*. 50(4), pp 596-620.
- Helm, R. & Landschulze, S. (2013). How does consumer age affect the desire for new Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum. pp 173-194.
- Hofstede, G. (1984) Culture's consequences: international differences in work-related values. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications; [Abridged edition].
- Hoyer, W. D. & Ridgway, N. M. (1984). Variety Seeking As an Explanation for Exploratory Purchase Behavior: a Theoretical Model. *Advances in Consumer Research*, 11(1), pp 114
- Im, S., Bayus, B. L. & Mason, C. H. (2003). An Empirical Study of Innate Consumer Innovativeness, Personal characteristics, and New-Product Adoption Behavior. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*. 31(1), pp 61-73.
- Joachimsthaler, E. A. & Lastovicka, J. L. (1984). Optimal Stimulation Level-Exploratory behavior Models. *Journal of Consumer Research*. 11(3), pp 830-835.
- Ju, X. (2015). Consumers variety seeking from an Information perspective. *International Business Research*. 8(3), pp 42-51.
- Kahneman, D. & Lovallo, D. (1993). Timid choices and bold forecasts: A cognitive perspective on risk taking. *Management Science*. 39(1), pp 17-31.
- Keller K. L. (1993). Conceptualizing, measuring, and managing customer-based brand equity. *Journal of Marketing*, 57(1), pp 1-22.
- Kirby, K. N. & Herrnstein, R. J. (1995). Preference Reversals Due to Myopic Discounting of Delayed Reward. *Psychological Science*, 6(2), pp 83-89.
- Levav, J. & Zhu, R. J. (2009). Seeking freedom through variety. *Journal of Consumer Research*. 36(4), pp 600-610.
- Loewenstein, G., Prelec, D. & Shatto, C. (1998). Hot/cold intrapersonal empathy gaps and the prediction of curiosity. Working paper, Carnegie Mellon University.
- Punj, G. (2011). Impulse buying and variety seeking: Similarities and differences. *Journal of Business Research*. 64(7), pp 745-748.
- Raju, P. S. & Venkatesan, M. (1980) Exploratory Behavior in the Consumer Context: a State of the Art Review. *Advances in Consumer Research*. 7th eds. Jerry C. Olson, Ann Arbor, MI : Association for Consumer Research, pp 258-263.
- Raju, P. S. (1980). Optimum stimulation level: Its relationship to personality, Demographics, and exploratory behavior. *Journal of Consumer Research*. 7(3), pp 272-282.
- Rashmi, A. (2010). Effect of Demographic Characteristics on Information Search Behaviour of Consumers. *Journal of Management and Information Technology*. 2(1), pp 70-80.
- Sapra, G. & Mor, K. (2012). Demographic Variables: Optimum Stimulation Level. *SCMS Journal of Indian Management*. 9(3), pp 61-70.
- Simonson, I. (1990). The effect of purchase quantity and timing on variety-seeking behavior. *Journal of Marketing Research*. 27(2), pp 150-162.
- Steenkamp, J. (2001). The role of national culture in international marketing research. *International Marketing Review*, 18(1), pp 30-44.
- Steenkamp, J. B. & Baumgartner, H. (1992). The Role of Optimum Stimulation Level in Exploratory Consumer Behaviour. *Journal of Consumer Research*. 19(3), pp 434-448.
- Tellis, G., Yin, E. & Bell S. (2009). Global Consumer Innovativeness: Cross-Country Differences and Demographic Commonalities. *Journal of International Marketing, American Marketing Association*, 17(2), pp 1-22.
- Van Trijp, H. C. M., Hoyer, W. D. & Inman, J. J. (1996). Why Switch? Product Category Level Explanations for True Variety Seeking Behavior. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 33(3), pp 281-292.
- Zuckerman, M. (1988). Behaviour and Biology: Research on Sensations and Reactions to the Media. In L. Donohew, H. E. Sypher, and E. T. Higgins (Eds.), Communication, Social Cognition, and Affect.