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ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to determine the factors affecting consumer perception of Kenyan manufactured fast moving goods in East African Community, a case of laundry detergents products. The study was guided by the following objectives: To determine consumer perception of Kenyan manufactured fast moving consumer goods by the East African community and to determine factors that influence consumer perception of Kenyan manufactured products in the EAC. A descriptive survey design was used for the study. The target population for the study were consumers of Kenyan manufactured fast moving consumer goods from Kenya, Uganda, Tanzania, Rwanda and Burundi. A convenience sampling was used and sample size for each country was fifty (50) respondents per country giving a total of 250 respondents. Out of the targeted 250 respondents, 190 responded. Primary data was collected using semi-structured questionnaires. Descriptive statistics such as measures of central tendency, dispersion, percentages and frequencies distributions were used to describe and summarize data. Data Analysis was aided by the use of Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS). On the perception of Kenyan manufactured fast moving consumer goods, the case of laundry detergent products, the study found that different detergents such as Omo, Sunlight, Ariel, Persil and Toss were consumed in the five Nations, with Omo as the most consumed. Regarding the factors influencing the perception of Kenya manufactured products, a case of laundry detergent products; majority of the respondents indicated that the products were fairly expensive. On the perceived quality of the products, majority of the respondents perceived the products to be of good quality. Regarding the country of origin, most of the respondents agreed that they rather buy laundry products made in Kenya because they could always trust in quality, availability and other attributes. On the risks associated with the products, the study found the respondents disagreed with the statements that the risks of using the products from Kenya was that the products may not work well, that the products may harm them and that they did not like the products from Kenya. The study also found that the respondents strongly disagreed with the statement that buying Kenyan products will make them lose money and that buying products from Kenya will make their friends laugh at them.
The study concluded that the East African Community market perceived laundry detergents products manufactured in Kenya to be of good quality and value as evidenced by the fact that they use the products and that they have good reasons for consuming them. On the factors influencing the perception of these laundry detergents products, the study concluded that consumers perceived the prices charged on the products to be reasonable and that the perceived quality of these products as good quality. The country of origin of these products did not affect their consumer perception and there was no perceived risk associated with the use of these laundry detergent products. The study recommended that that Kenyan manufacturers dealing in these laundry detergents products in particular and fast moving consumer goods in general, to increase their marketing expenditure so as to create more awareness of their products in the East African Community market in order to increase their sales. The study further recommended that another study be done on the challenges facing the trading of the Kenyan manufactured consumer goods in East African community market.
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CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background to the Study
Kenya belongs to various regional blocks. One such block is the East African Community (EAC), which is a regional inter-governmental organization comprising of the Republics of Kenya, Uganda, the United Republic of Tanzania, Republic of Rwanda and Republic of Burundi with its headquarters in Arusha, Tanzania.

East African Community has a total population of 133.5 million (2010) with a Gross Domestic Product of $74.5 billion (2009). This can be seen as huge customer base which potentially provides Kenya with a great opportunity to increase her export to the community and as such generate enough foreign exchange to fund her developmental goals; most of which are captured in Vision 2030.

While Kenya remains a major exporter to the EAC with positive trade balance with all the four trading partners (table 1 of the appendices), the trade potential of the Community is still large and Kenya needs to rethink its strategies so as to fully exploit the trade opportunities thereof.

One of the areas where Kenyan policy makers need to focus on is the understanding of how the customers (current and potential) perceive Kenyan manufactured fast moving consumer goods. With this knowledge, the marketers can therefore come up with strategies of how to correctly target customers and position Kenyan manufactured fast moving consumer goods in the community, in such a way as to increase the sales of these products.

This study therefore aims at investigating customer perception of Kenyan manufactured fast moving consumer goods within the community as well as determining the factors that influence the perception of Kenyan Manufactured fast moving consumer goods.
1.1.1 Concept of Perception

Perception is the process of interpreting sensations and giving meaning to stimuli (Zikmund and D’Amico, 1995). This process occurs because people constantly strive to make sense of the world and when faced with a new sensation or data, seek patterns or concepts that may relate new bits of information to each other and to past experience. The duo further asserts that perception is the interpretation of reality and each of us view a reality from a different perspective.

Kibera and Waruingi, (1988), summarize perception as the process, which attributes meaning to incoming stimuli through the human senses. Therefore, it constitutes of two factors, the stimuli and the individual factors.

Individuals receive information or stimuli, by hearing, seeing, touching, tasting and smelling. How they organize and interpret these stimuli with regards to decision-making process depends on their involvement in the decision-making process, their abilities to experience sensations, the context in which they encounter the stimuli, their intelligence, thought process and even their moods. These factors combine to create a mental phenomenon known as selective perception- that is, the tendency of each individual to screen out certain stimuli and to color or interpret the other stimuli with meanings drawn from personal backgrounds.

The knowledge of the perceptual process is essential since the manner in which users of a product or services interpret the information is affected by their cognitive understanding that they have established in their minds. Further, perception is important to marketers since it involves the institution of the users’ feelings about a particular stimuli and helps in developing strategies towards meeting that which the users perceive as important (Njoroge, 2003).

According to Ries and Trout (1981), there is no objective reality, facts or best products. Rather what exist in the world of Marketing are perceptions in the mind of customers or prospects. This calls to question the excessive emphasis on fact about best products and suggests that the only effective way for evaluating products is from the customer’s perspective.
Perception therefore determines the position a product occupies in customer’s mind relative to competing products. It signifies the way the brand is defined by consumers along important tangible and intangible attributes. Since consumers are overloaded with information about product, they tend to position products in their minds in order to simplify purchase decisions.

This point is further illustrated by Arens and Bovee (1994) when they assert that the average adult is exposed to over 300 ads a day, but notices only a handful and remembers even fewer.

1.1.2 Kenyan Manufacturing Sector

According to Soderbom (2001), like many other African countries, Kenya’s early independence years saw an industrial strategy that relied heavily on import substitution, effectively subsidizing manufacturing at the expense of the agricultural sector. At first this appeared to work relatively well, with real income doubling in nine years, 1963 – 1972, which amounted to an average annual growth rate of about 8 percent, well above the population growth rate of 3.4 percent. In the 1970s the government intensified the degree of import substitution and as a result the share of manufacturing in the modern sector of the economy increased from 8% in the 1970 to 13% in 1980 (Gerdin, 1997).

A turning point in Kenya’s industrial policy came with the introduction of structural adjustment programs in the early 1980s. By 1985, the economy had regained a measure of stability and the years 1986 – 90 saw stable per capita growth, on average 3% per year. At the end of the 80s, it thus seemed as though the shift in policy in a somewhat more liberal direction was beginning to pay off. In the early 90s, however, the economy went into another period of economic decline, partly due to international events and partly to a slippage in macroeconomic management (Bigsten, 2001).

Despite the turbulent business environment mentioned earlier, the Kenyan manufacturing sector has been resilient in recent years. According to the Kenya Economy survey for 2004, the manufacturing sector grew by 1.4 % in 2003 from 1.2% in 2002. The value of output in the manufacturing sector rose by 6.1 % to Ksh 726.7 billion in 2003 from 684.7 billion in 2002. Growth was recorded in motor vehicle assembly, fish processing, fats and oils, confectionery and chocolate, miscellaneous foods subsector, drugs and medicines, perfumed
and toiletries, petroleum produce and non-metallic products. In 2003, employment in the export processing zones (EPZ) accounted for 14.9% of the total employment in the manufacturing sector. The number of manufacturing companies under the EPZ increased by 15 to 69 in 2003. Investments by the EPZ in the manufacturing sector increased by 23.6% from Ksh 12.7 billion in 2002 to Ksh 15.7 billion in 2003.

According to the Kenya association of manufacturers (KAM) which is Kenya’s leading representative organization for Industry, the Manufacturing sector is divided into sixteen industrial sectors, with a total membership of 525 as at September 2005. Fourteen of those sectors are involved in production processes while the other two offer essential services to the formal industry. This is by no means the entire membership of the Kenyan Manufacturing sector, since there are numerous open-air small and micro scale productive activities in towns and rural trading sectors.

According to Ikiara et al. (2001) traditional artisanal production in the informal sector is dominated by small undertakings employing less than 10 workers. These are in most cases unregistered and use production methods; which require limited specialization and management capacity. A large proportion of their output is directed towards satisfying basic needs, namely the provision of low-income consumer goods and services. Such items include clothing, furniture, foodstuff and motor vehicle repairs.

While data on this sub-sector are not adequate, there is little doubt that it is one of the fastest growing sectors and a major source of employment in the country. A distinctive feature of the manufacturing sector in Kenya is therefore the co-existence of the modern sector comprising mainly of small, medium, and large enterprises, alongside the informal sector.

1.1.3 Kenyan Manufactured Fast Moving Consumer Goods (Fmcg)

The East African Community has created an expanded market for Kenyan goods and services with Uganda being the leading export market for Kenya and Tanzania and Rwanda also being major export destinations for Kenyan exports. The leading exports from Kenya to EAC countries include manufactured goods, fuel and lubricants and machinery and other equipments (Kenya National Trade Policy, 2009).
According to Aosa (1992) the biggest market for Kenyan manufactured products is East Africa Community. Manufacturing in Kenya is heavily oriented towards production of consumer goods. However, there is little production of intermediate and capital good. Some of the manufacturing output consists of basic food necessities but there is also the production of sophisticated consumer goods comparable to those produced in advanced countries (Hazlewood, 1979).

This research therefore focuses on the consumer goods, also known as Fast Moving Consumer goods (FMCG) which according to Engdegard (2004), are those goods that are price-sensitive; mass-use goods that are consumable, packaged and branded.

Kotler (2003) views FMCGs as tangible goods normally consumed in one or a few uses, like beer and soap. According to Stanton (1985), FMCGs are referred to as convenience goods. These are goods that the consumer is willing to accept any of the several substitutes and thus will buy one; which is most accessible.

These goods include groceries, tobacco products, inexpensive candy, drug sundries such as toothpaste and shaving accessories and stable hardware items such as light bulbs and batteries. Stanton (1985) further asserts that FMCGs must be readily available and accessible in any shopping area. They typically have a low unit price, are not bulky and are not greatly affected by fad and fashion. Fast moving consumer goods are generally similar, and the consumer is therefore willing to accept any of several substitutes (Kotler 2003).

The following are listed by Kenya Association of Manufacturers as FMCGs produced in Kenya. They are; Batteries, Beverages, Chemicals, Confectioneries, Foods, Healthcare, household, hygiene, Stationary and tobacco.

1.1.4 Laundry Detergents

Bronze (1999), defines Laundry detergent, or washing powder, as a substance that is a type of detergent (cleaning agent) that is added for cleaning laundry. In common usage, "detergent" refers to mixtures of chemical compounds including alkylbenzenesulfonates, which are similar to soap but are less affected by "hard water." Most detergent is delivered in powdered form.
Modern detergent formulations consist of three main ingredients, which are: builders (50% by weight, approximately), the alkylbenzenesulfonate surfactant (15%), and bleaches (7%) (Smulders et al., 2002).

Builders are water softeners. These chemical compounds are agents that remove calcium ions by complexation or precipitation. Typical builders are sodium carbonate, complexation agents, soap, and zeolites. They function by sequestering or precipitating the problematic ions. One of the most common builders is sodium triphosphate, which is used on very large scale for this application.

The main targets of bleaches are of vegetable origin include chlorophyll, anthocyanin dyes, tannins, humic acids, and carotenoid pigments. Most bleaches in laundry detergents are oxidizers, e.g., sodium perborate or sodium hypochlorite. In addition, other agents are added as "bleach activators", to enhance the effectiveness of the bleaching agent; a popular one is tetraacetylene diamine.

The laundry detergent market in Kenya is a mature, highly product differentiated and competitive market. The main laundry detergent brands in Kenyan market are OMO, Toss, Ariel, Persil and Sunlight. However, new entrants have also entered the market and are achieving some marginal share of the market. Some of these new entrants are: Gental, Jex, Pride and Foma (Mulei, 2005).

The main positioning strategies used by most of the competing detergent brands are based on product characteristics. OMO is positioned on its functional benefit of stain removal; Toss is positioned on gentleness on fabric and hands which sunlight is positioned on natural color retention.
1.1.5 East African Community

Kenya, Tanzania and Uganda have had a history of co-operation dating back to the early 20th century including the customs union between Kenya and Uganda in 1917, which the then Tanganyika joined in 1927, the East African high commission 1948 -1961), the East African Common Services Organization (1961 -1967) and the East African Community (1967 – 1977).

Inter-territorial co-operation between the Kenya Colony, the Uganda Protectorate and the Tanganyika Territory was first formalized in 1948 by the East African High Commission. This provided a customs union, a common external tariff, currency and postage, and also dealt with common services in transport and communications, research and education.

Following independence of Kenya, Uganda and Tanzania, these integrated activities were reconstituted and the High Commission was replaced by the East African Common Services Organization, which many observers though would lead to a political federation between the three territories. The new organization ran into difficulties because of lack of joint planning and fiscal policy, separate political policies and Kenya’s dominant economic position.

In 1967 the East African common Services Organization was superseded by the East African Community. This body aimed to strengthen the ties between the members through a common market, a common customs tariff and a range of public services so as to achieve a balanced economic growth within the region.

In 1977, the East African Community collapsed after ten years. Causes of the collapse included demands by Kenya for more seats than Uganda and Tanzania in the Decision-making organs, disagreements with Ugandan dictator Idi Amin, and systems of socialism in Tanzania and capitalism in Kenya.

On 30th November 1993, a treaty for East African Co-operation was signed which established a tri-partite Commission for Co-operation and a process of re-integration was embarked on. In 1999, the East African Community was finally revived.

The Treaty for Establishment of the East African Community was signed on 30th November 1999 and entered into force on 7th July 2000 following its ratification by the original three

The Vision of EAC is a prosperous, competitive, secure, stable and politically united East Africa; and the Mission is to widen and deepen Economic, Political, Social and Culture integration in order to improve the quality of life of the people of East Africa through increased competitiveness, value added production, trade and investments.

1.2 Statement of the Problem

The deepening and expansion of regional integration and bilateral trade agreements have widened the scope of trade opportunities for the Kenyan businesses. Kenya therefore, has the potential to become a more competitive player in the region and global economy if factors affecting competitiveness are addressed (“Kenya National Trade Policy,” 2009 – 1). The study of perception of Kenyan manufactured fast moving consumer goods by the East African Community consumers was therefore key in understanding the competitiveness of Kenya.

Several studies have been done on the perception of foreign and domestic manufactured products. For instance, the much lauded work of Gary Baumgartner (1978) who researched on the perception of foreign products in France. Okechuku & Onyemah (1999) studied the Nigerian consumer attitudes towards foreign and domestic products. Locally, a number of research have been done on perception, for instance, Angatia (2003), Sikasa (2004), Kiilu (2005), Mumenyia (2005), Agesa (2006) and Khasiani (2006). However, to the researcher’s knowledge, no similar research has, been done on the perception of Kenyan manufactured Fast Moving Consumer Goods in the East African Community market. This study therefore, attempted to answer the following research questions.

1. How are Kenyan manufactured fast moving consumer goods perceived by the East African Community consumers?

2. What factors influence the consumer perception of Kenyan manufactured fast moving consumer goods (FMCG) in the East African Community?
1.3 Research Objectives

1. To determine consumer perception of Kenyan manufactured fast moving consumer goods by the East African community.

2. To determine factors that influence consumer perception of Kenyan manufactured products in the EAC.

1.4 Significance of the Study

The results of this study may be of great use to firstly; the researchers and academic community as it contributes to the understanding of consumer perception of Kenyan manufactured fast moving consumer goods, in the East Africa Community. Secondly, the study may help the Kenyan business community to understand how consumers in the EAC perceive Kenyan manufactured fast moving consumer goods, knowledge of which may help improve on the products in order to increase general consumer appetite for them. Lastly; the results of the study may be of help to the government especially the ministry of trade as it would help in understanding the expectations of the EAC market.
CHAPTER TWO: LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Introduction
According to Ries and Trout (1981), there is no objective reality, facts or best products. Rather what exist in the world of Marketing are perceptions in the mind of customers or prospects. This calls to question the excessive emphasis on fact about best products and suggests that the only effective way for evaluating products is from the customer’s perspective. In this chapter therefore, literature on meaning and importance of perception, measurement of perception as well as factors affecting consumer perception are reviewed.

2.2 Meaning and Importance of Perception
According to Kotler et al. (1999), a person’s buying choices are influenced by four major psychological factors – motivation, perception, learning, beliefs and attitudes. He further adds that perception depends not only on the physical stimuli but also on the stimuli’s relation to the surrounding field and on conditions with the individual. Perception can be defined as the process of receiving organizing and assigning meaning to information or stimuli detected by our five senses. It is an approximation of reality. Our brain attempts to make sense out of the stimuli to which we are exposed. What we perceive is the meaning we give to something sensed (Kotler, 2000). It has further been said that the perception is the critical activity that links the individual consumer to group, situation, and marketer influences (Hawkins et al, 1992).

Kotler (2000) further alludes that people can emerge with different perceptions of the same object because of the pre-perceptual processes; selective attention, selective distortion and selective retention. According to Loudon et al. (1979), in selective attention, consumers tend to screen out some stimuli and notice some because people are exposed to tremendous amount of daily stimuli. What an individual chooses to notice depends on his/her situation in terms of the needs, what he anticipates or stimuli with large deviations. On the other hand, Loudon et al. (1979) describe selective distortions as the tendency to twist information into personal meaning and interprets information in a way that will fit our preconceptions. He further describes selective retention as a process in which people forget much of what they learn but retain information that supports their attitudes and beliefs.
Information processing is a series of activities by which stimuli are transformed into information and stored (Hawkins et al., 1992). The processing of information has four major steps: exposure, attention, interpretation and memory. The first three constitute the perception process. Exposure occurs when a stimulus such as a billboard comes within the range of a person’s sensory receptor nerves, such as vision. Attention occurs when the receptor nerves pass the sensation on the brain for processing. Interpretation is the assignment of meaning to the received sensations. Memory is the short term use of the meaning for intermediate decision making or the longer term retention of the meaning.

According to Hawkins et al. (1992) the four steps suggest a linear flow from exposure to the memory. However these processes occur virtually simultaneously and are clearly interactive. That is, our memory influences the information we are exposed to, attend to, and the interpretations we assign. At the same time, memory itself is being shaped by the information it is receiving.

In today’s market place, perception becomes important because when consumer makes his buying decision, he evaluates the benefits he perceives from a particular product or service and compares them with the costs. The value a customer perceives when buying and using a product or a service go beyond usability.

There is a set of emotional values as well, such as social status, exclusivity, friendliness and responsiveness or the degree to which personal expectations and preferences are satisfied. Similarly, the costs perceived by the consumer, normally comprise more than the actual price. They also include costs of usage, the lost opportunity to use another offering, potential switching costs etc. Hence the customer establishes an equation between perceived benefits and perceived costs of one product and compares this to similar equations of other products or services.

Moreover, if the customers’ circumstances change, their needs and preferences often change too. In the external environment, the offerings of the competitors, with which a customer
compares a product or a service, will change, thus altering his perception of the best offer around.

Research on the impact of market share as relates to the perceived quality of a product (Hellofs et al, 1999) shows that, depending on the nature of the product or service and the customers’ preferences; increasing market share can have positive or negative effects on how a customer perceives the product or service.

Zeithaml et al. (1996) suggest that to find out customers’ feelings, on product or service in research, one needs to incorporate several behavioural intention questions to identify signals that are potentially of higher validity and richer diagnostic value than the overall service quality or customer satisfaction variable.

Since these questions are to find out potential future actions, they indicate changes in the demand and market trends. Byrnes (2005) even suggests that you earn more customer loyalty when you do a good job fixing a service problem than if there had been no problem at all. The point is to meet or exceed customers’ expectations, not to achieve some ideal level of product or service delivery. They have to explain to the customer how this particular product or service can deliver more value than those from the competitors.

2.3 Consumer Perception and Purchasing Behaviour

Consumer perceptions of price, quality and value are considered pivotal determinants of shipping behaviours and product choice (Bishop et al., 1984). They are the key factors affective consumer perception. Majority of consumer factors correlated with attitude can be classified in one of three categories; personality, perceptual and socioeconomic (Batra and Sinha, 2000). Consumer perceptual variables that have been identified include price-quality perception, perceived quality, value consciousness, price consciousness, perceived price fairness, smart shipper self perception, familiarity with products, brand loyalty, perceived risk associated with purchase, risk averseness and general deal proneness (Garretson et al., 2002).
Significant attention has been given to consumer perception toward price and quality of products since these factors have been identified as two of the most important reasons for purchasing product (Hoch, 1996). Price and quality should be examined jointly since the concepts are interrelated. Lichtenstein et al. (1993) viewed price in relation with quality when they posited multidimensional aspects of price. For example, purchasing at the lowest price may be the best choice for some consumers, however, for others, price with respect to quality may be more important.

Richardson et al., (1996) noted that it is uncertain whether the individual perceptual factors (personality, perceptual and socioeconomic factors) increase product preferences, product attitude, or product proneness since previous studies used the terms interchangeably. As a result, it is unclear whether the factors increase product purchase intention whether directly or indirectly increase intention via a positive product attitude.

2.4 Measurement of perception

In consumer behaviour, perception research has been used to study a wide range of marketing strategy issues. Schiffman et al. (1992), confirms that perception research is undertaken to ascertain the likelihood that consumers will accept a proposed new product idea, to gauge why a firm’s target audience has not reacted more favourably to its revised promotional theme or to a learn how target customers are likely to react to a proposed change in the firm’s packaging and label.

A variety of techniques have been devised to measure perception. One of the commonly used scaling techniques is Likert Scale which was developed by likert in 1932. Usually the individual is asked not only if they agree or disagree to the statement, but also to indicate the extent to which they agree by choosing one of the following five categories: strongly agree, agree, neutral/don’t agree, Disagree and strongly disagree. This produces a numerical score and a value is given to each category. The likert scale is one of the techniques used in this study to measure perception of Kenyan manufactured fast moving consumer goods by the east African community consumers. Njuguna (2000) used similar techniques to study attitudes of customers towards electricity efficiency.
Semantic differential scale is another technique that was developed by Osgood et al. (1957). It comprises of a number of semantic scales based on bipolar adjectives (e.g., good/bad, hot/cold, etc). The respondents are asked to rate a concept in terms of a positioning between +3 and -3. Proponents of the technique identified three main clusters of similar scales, which they labelled: Evaluation, Potency and Activity. This accounted for nearly 50% of the total meaning of the concept – irrespective of the concept, the adjectives used or the respondents interviewed, (Williams, 1997). It is further alluded that semantic differential can be used to develop graphic consumer profiles of the concept under study (schiffmann et al., 1992).

2.5 Factors Affecting Consumer Perception

Consumer perception is affected by several factors which are; perceived price, perceived quality, country of origin or country of manufacture and perceived risk. Below is a critical look at each of the above factors.

2.5.1 Perceived Price

How a consumer perceives a price as high, as low, as fair has a strong influence on both purchase intentions and purchase satisfaction. Consider the perception of price fairness for example. There is some evidence that the customers do pay attention to the prices paid by other customers and that the differential pricing strategies used by some marketers are perceived as unfair by customers not eligible for the special prices. No one is happy knowing he or she paid twice as much for an air ticket or a theatre ticket as the person in the next seat. Perceptions of price unfairness affect consumer’s perception of the product value, and ultimately, their willingness to patronize a store or a service.

According to Assael (2004), consumers’ price perceptions may appear to be a simple matter of determining a product price based on an ad or on observation in store. However, it is not that simple because consumers have certain expectations about what prices are or should be. This price is known as a reference price.

Shiffman and Kanuk (2009) goes on to define a reference price as any price that a consumer uses as a basis for comparison in judging another price. Reference prices can be external or internal. An advertiser generally uses a higher external reference price in an ad offering a
lower sales price, to persuade the consumer that the product advertised in really a good buy. Internal reference prices are those prices retrieved by a consumer from memory.

A study showed that the consumer’s reference points include past prices, competitors’ prices and the cost of goods sold. The study also showed that these reference points do not adequately reflect the effects of inflation on costs, and that consumers attribute price differentials to profit and fail to consider vendor costs.

Another study showed that when consumers encounter prices that are significantly different from their expectations, they engage in dissonance reduction. That is, they seek additional information to justify the high price or they trivialize their own expectations by, for example, saying that their expectations were unrealistic because it has been a while since they last were in the market to buy the product in question.

2.5.2 Perceived quality

There are various academics definitions of the concept of perceived quality. According to Aaker and Joachimsthaler (2000), perceived quality is “a special type of association, partly because it influences brand associations in many contexts and partly because it has been empirically shown to affect profitability.” As Zeithaml (1988) said that perceived quality is “the consumer’s judgment about a product’s overall excellence or superiority.” Zeithaml (1988) emphasized that perceived quality is (1) different from objective or actual quality, (2) a higher level abstraction rather that a specific attribute of a product, (3) a global assessment that in some cases resembles attitude, and (4) a judgment usually made within a consumer’s evoked set. Similarly, the definition of perceived quality by Aaker (1991) is “the customer’s perception of the overall quality or superiority of the product or service with respect to its intended purpose, relative to alternatives.” In fact, the perceived quality is different from actual or objective quality, product-based quality, and manufacturing quality (Aaker, 1991). It can be viewed as the difference between overall quality and undetected quality.

Although there are a lot of definitions from many scholars, each of the definition has a shared common meaning; that is, perceived product quality is the consumer’s perception of overall components of product--both tangible and intangible characteristics. It may also include
performance, features, reliability, conformance, durability, serviceability, and aesthetics etc. Above all, it is different from the actual quality.

Consumers often judge the quality of a product or a service on the basis of a variety of information cues that they associate with the product. Some of these cues are intrinsic to the product or a service, others are extrinsic. Either singly or together, such cues provide the basis for perceptions of product and service quality.

Cues that are intrinsic concern physical characteristics of the product itself, such as size, colour, flavour, or aroma. In some cases, consumers use physical characteristics (e.g. flavour of ice cream or cake) to judge product quality. Consumers like to believe that they base their evaluations of product quality on intrinsic cues, because that enables them to justify their product decisions (either positive or negative) as being “rational” or “objective” product choices. More often than not, however, they use extrinsic characteristics to judge quality. For example, though many consumers claim they buy a brand because of its superior taste, they are often unable to identify that brand in blind taste tests. One study discovered that the colour of a powdered fruit drink product is a more important determinant than its label and actual taste in determining the consumer’s ability to identify the flavour correctly (Shiffman and Kanuk, 2009).

### 2.5.3 Country of origin/Country of manufacture

Country of origin or Country of Manufacture refers to information pertaining to where a product is made. Marketers are particularly interested in the perceived image associated with the country of origin (Parasuraman and Pisharodi, 1994).

This image has been defined as “the overall perception consumers form of products from a particular country, based on their prior perceptions of the country’s production and marketing strengths and weaknesses” (Roth and Romeo, 1992). Since Scholar’s (1965) seminal study, many studies have acknowledged that consumers have significantly different perceptions about products made in different countries, and that these general perceptions have important effects on consumers’ evaluation of the products manufactured in a particular country.
Studies in the country of origin literature have identified different processes that explain how country of origin influences product evaluations. One process falls within the framework of the Fishbein model (Fishbein and Ajzen, 1975). That is, beliefs about a product’s attributes precede and influence the formation of attitude towards the product. According to this view, when consumers engage in product evaluation, they base their evaluation on various descriptive, inferential or informational cues. Such cues can be intrinsic (such as colour, design, specifications, etc.) or extrinsic (such as price). Research has shown that intangible, extrinsic cues are often used by consumers as surrogate indicators when there are missing and/or difficult intrinsic cues. For example, price may be used to evaluate the quality of a product when other information is lacking (Gerstner, 1985; Olson and Jacoby, 1972). Other extrinsic cues include those that are controlled by the firm, such as guarantees, warranties, brand reputation (Jacoby et al., 1977), seller reputation (Shapiro, 1982), promotional messages (Klein and Leffler, 1981), and those that are controlled by third parties, such as product rating services and government standard-setting agencies (Corell, 1988).

Country of origin can serve as a controllable extrinsic cue in the sense that sourcing and location decisions are made by the firm. In contrast to the multi-attribute model conceptualization of the effect of country of origin on consumer evaluation, a second school of thought has focused on a “halo” effect model which suggests a reciprocal linkage from affect (evaluations) to beliefs (Beckwith and Lehmann, 1975; Han, 1989; Zajonc, 1980). According to this model, beliefs about a product can be influenced by overall evaluations.

Such a conceptualization has been applied in the study of country of origin as an image variable, which is defined as some aspect of the product which is distinct from its physical characteristics, but which is nevertheless identified with the product (Erickson et al., 1984; Johansson et al., 1985; Narayana, 1981). Country of origin is found to influence belief formation rather than attitude (evaluation) in some studies, although the effects of country of origin are not identical across all product attributes (Erickson et al., 1984). Johansson et al. (1985), in particular, noted the existence of a persistent “halo” effect in ratings on specific product attributes.
Regardless of the direction of the influence of country of origin, empirical evidence suggests that country of origin perceptions may result from stereotyping (i.e. a positive relationship between country image and levels of economic development) and home country biases (Bannister and Saunders, 1978; Nagashima, 1970; Schooler, 1965; Yaprak, 1978). International marketers are concerned with the effect of country of origin because consumers may evaluate a product based on their perception of the country of origin. As new foreign markets emerge, knowledge about country of origin images in those markets will enable marketers to make wiser decisions. However, to date, it is unclear whether such findings hold for the EAC consumers.

2.5.4 Perceived risk and perception of foreign products.

One theory in consumer behaviour which seems particularly appropriate to the study of foreign product perception is the theory of perceived risk (Baumgartner, 1978). Consumer perceptions of risk have been widely dealt with in the past literature and have been shown to shape all purchase decisions to varying degrees, and thereby influence consumer behaviour (e.g., Bauer, 1960; Bettman, 1973; Chaudhuri, 1997; Cox, 1967; Cunningham, 1967; Mitchell, 1992; Mitchell, 1999). A purchase decision involves risk when the consequences connected with the decision are uncertain and some results are more desirable than others (Kogan & Wallach, 1964).

A situation where the only possible result is a sure loss of some magnitude is not risk, since there is no variance among the possible results. Kogan and Wallach (1964) describe the concept of risk as having two dimensions: (a) the chance aspect, where the focus is on probability, and (b) the danger aspect where the emphasis is on severity of negative consequence. Although many refinements to the definition of risk have been proposed, including expected value theory and expected utility theory, risk remains a subjectively determined expectation of loss by the consumer; thus the term, perceived risk (Cunningham, 1967).

It is theorized that when perceived risk falls below an individual’s acceptance value, it has little effect on intended behaviour and is essentially ignored (Greatorex and Mitchell, 1993). On the other hand, an extremely high level of perceived risk can cause a consumer to
postpone or avoid a purchase entirely. The extent of the exposure depends on the importance or magnitude of the goal, the seriousness of the penalty for not attaining the goal, and the amount of means committed to achieving the goal (Cox, 1967). Perceived risk is usually measured as a multidimensional construct: physical loss, financial loss, psychological loss, time loss, performance risk, and social risk (Jacoby and Kaplan, 1972).

Generally, perceived risk is conceptualized as a typical influence that is addressed during the early stages of the consumer buying process (Zeithaml & Bitner, 2003). The consumer buying process is often described as a five-stage linear process (Blackwell, Miniard & Engel, 2003): stage one -- need recognition, stage two -- information search, stage three -- alternatives evaluation, stage four -- purchase decision, and stage five -- post-purchase behaviour. In the need recognition stage, consumers first perceive risk when they recognize the need for a product or service. In the presence of uncomfortable levels of perceived risk, consumers apply risk reduction strategies during the second and third stages, such as reliance on personal recommendations (Cunningham, 1967), seeking additional information about a product or service (Cox, 1967), a preference for national brands (Bauer, 1960), and the security of warranties (Dowling & Staelin, 1994). It is generally assumed that these practices are sufficient for mitigating risk, and risk is seldom studied beyond the information search stage.
CHAPTER THREE: RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.1 Research Design
A descriptive survey design was used for the study. According to Douglas and Pamela (1998), a study concerned with the finding out who, what, which and how of a phenomenon is referred to as a descriptive design. Descriptive research was most appropriate method since consumer perception could not be directly observed. The researcher dealt with the relationships between non-manipulated variables in a natural setting. Randomization method was used to estimate error when inferring population characteristics from observations of samples. Similar design has been used by Kiilu (2004) and Chemayiek (2005).

3.2 Population of the Study
The target population for the study were consumers of Kenyan manufactured fast moving consumer goods from Kenya, Uganda, Tanzania, Rwanda and Burundi. According to Central Intelligence Agency (CIA) World Factbook 2011, Kenyan population estimate 40 046 566, Uganda’s population is estimated at 33 398 682, Tanzania at 41 892 895. Rwanda 11 055 976 and Burundi at 9 863 117 habitants. www.theodora.com (2011).

3.3 Sample size and Sampling procedure
A convenience sampling was used and sample size for each country was fifty (50) respondents per country giving a total of 250 respondents. The sample size was determined by the rule of thumb that a sample size of at least 30 is deemed to be large. Similar assumption was made by Kiilu (2005) and similar sample size was used by Baumgartner (1978) and Chemayiek (2005). A larger sample size was constrained by time and financial limitations. The samples were drawn from the capital cities of the East African Community-member countries. These cities are; Nairobi in Kenya, Kampala in Uganda, Dar es Salaam in Tanzania, Kigali in Rwanda and Bujumbura in Burundi.

3.4 Data Collection Method
Primary data was collected using semi-structured questionnaires. The questionnaires were both in English; for the predominantly English speaking countries in the community and French for Burundi which is a French speaking country. The questionnaires were divided into
three parts; part one dealt with background information of the respondents. The second part dealt with consumer perception of Kenyan manufactured laundry detergents and finally part 3 dealt with factors influencing consumer perception.

The validity was ensured by having objective questions included in the questionnaire. This was achieved by pre-testing the instrument to be used to identify and change any ambiguous or offensive questions and technique. Reliability was ensured by pre-testing the questionnaire using 10 respondents in Nairobi area. These ten (10) respondents were not included in the actual data collection. Seven pre-test instruments were returned. An ambiguity was detected in one of the questions, which was corrected.

The questionnaires were administered by paid, trained research assistants to respondents at their place of work, shopping malls or on the streets and the respondents are expected to respond to them as the research assistants were waiting.

Although the questionnaires were administered in the major cities, the assumption made was that these respondents are a representation of all states in each country. This assumption was based on results of similar research by Okechukwu & Onyemah, (1999).

3.5 Data Analysis
Data analysis was done to determine the factors affecting consumer perception of Kenyan manufactured fast moving goods in East African Community. The responses were coded to facilitate statistical analysis by use of descriptive statistics. A five point likert scale was used to measure the respondents’ degree of agreements with regard to the particular variables of the study. The responses were coded with figures of 1 to 5 representing various levels of agreements.

Descriptive statistics such as percentages, frequencies, means and standard deviations were used to analyze the data. This analysis was aided by Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS). Bar graphs, tables and pie charts were used to present the findings of the study. This was due to their ability to bring relative form to the otherwise abstract nature of the influences under investigation in research.
CHAPTER FOUR:
DATA ANALYSIS, PRESENTATION AND INTERPRETATION

4.1 Introduction

The purpose of this study was to determine the factors affecting consumer perception of Kenyan manufactured fast moving goods, case of laundry detergent products, in East African Community. The study targeted 250 respondents from five countries out of which 190 responded giving a response rate of 76%. The findings therefore, were based on 76% response rate.

4.2 Background Information of the Respondents

This section presents data on respondents’ age, gender, city and highest academic qualification.

4.2.1 Distribution of the Respondents by Age

The respondents were first asked to indicate their age bracket. The study found that 37% of the respondents were between 31-40 years. 28% were between 21-30 years, followed by 24% who were between 41-50 years, while 11% were above 50 years. From the findings of the study, it can be said that most of the respondents interviewed were middle aged, and therefore, were considered to be aware of different laundry products manufactured in Kenya. The findings of the study were as presented in table 4.1

Table 4.1: Distribution of the Respondents by Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21-30</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-40</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-50</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above 50</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.2.2 Distribution of the respondents by Gender

The respondents were asked to indicate their gender. The study found that 65% of the respondents were female while 35% were male. From the findings of the study, it can be said that most of the respondents interviewed were women who mostly use the detergents which were the focus of this study. The researcher therefore perceived the information gathered on the use of detergents reliable considering the number of female respondents. The findings of the study were as presented in Table 4.2.

Table 4.2: Distribution of the Respondents by Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.2.3 Distribution of the Respondents by City

The respondents were asked to indicate the Cities where they came from. 26% of the respondents interviewed came from Nairobi Kenya. 25% were from Kigali Rwanda, 18% were from Kampala Uganda, 17% were from Dar es Salaam Tanzania and 14% were from Bujumbura Burundi. From the findings of the study, it can be said that the response used for the study were representative enough for the five countries in which the study was carried out. The findings of the study were as presented in Table 4.3.
Table 4.3: Distribution of the Respondents by City

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nairobi</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kampala</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dar es salaam</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kigali</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bujumbura</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>190</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.2.4 Distribution of the respondents by Level of Education

The respondents were asked to indicate their levels of education. The study found that 77% of the respondents were had attained college certificates or University degrees, followed by 17% who were secondary school graduates, while 6% were primary school graduates. From the findings of the study, it can be said that most of the respondents interviewed were learned hence their consumption of products were influenced by different factors which was the concern of this study. The researcher therefore perceives the information collected for the study to be reliable in determining the factors affecting consumer perception of Kenyan manufactured fast moving goods, a case of laundry detergents, in East African Community. The findings of the study were as presented in Table 4.4.

Table 4.4: Distribution of the respondents by Level of Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Qualification</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University/College</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>190</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.3 Consumer Perception of Kenyan Manufactured fast moving Consumer Goods by the East African community

In this section, the researcher sought to get information on the use of different detergents manufactured in Kenya and the reasons why the respondents chose to use the detergents.

4.3.1 Use of Detergents made in Kenya

The study sought to establish the use of different detergents manufactured in Kenya. The study found that 56% of the respondents indicated that they used Omo. The study also found that 17% indicated that they use sunlight, 11% indicated that they use Ariel, 9% indicated that they use Persil and 6% indicated that they use Toss. From the findings of the study, it can be said that different detergents manufactured in Kenya are consumed in the East African Community market. According to Kotler et al (1999), a person’s buying choices are influenced by four major psychological factors – motivation, perception, learning, beliefs and attitudes. He further adds that perception depends not only on the physical stimuli but also on the stimuli’s relation to the surrounding field and on conditions with the individual. Thus the consumption of the products is perceived to result from the positive perception of the products. The findings of the study were as presented in Table 4.5.

Table 4.5 Use of Detergents made in Kenya

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Detergent Used</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Omo</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ariel</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunlight</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persil</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toss</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.3.2 Reasons for the Choice of the Detergents

To test on the reasons for using different detergents, the respondents were asked to indicate the level of their agreement with different reasons on the use of the products. This was tested on a five point likert scale of 1-5; where 1 represented ‘Strongly Disagree’, 2 represented ‘Disagree’, 3 represented ‘Neither agree nor disagree’, 4 represented ‘Agree’ and 5 represented ‘Strongly Agree’.

The scores ‘Strongly Disagree’ was taken to be equivalent to mean score ranging from 0.0 to 1.0, ‘Disagree’ with mean score ranging from 1.1 to 2.0, ‘Neither agree nor disagree’ with a mean score ranging from 2.1 to 3.0, ‘Agree’ with a means score ranging from 3.1 to 4.0 and ‘Strongly Agree’ with a means score ranging from 4.1 to 5.0. A standard deviation of >1 shows that there was a significant difference in the responses given by the respondents. The results are as presented in the Table 4.6.

**Table 4.6 Reasons for the Choice of the Detergents**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>It is well packed</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>4.07</td>
<td>.051</td>
<td>.706</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Its quality and the price is just right</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>.067</td>
<td>.923</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It cleans off all dirt and stains</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>4.02</td>
<td>.060</td>
<td>.823</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is gentle on fabric</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>4.01</td>
<td>.049</td>
<td>.674</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is economical to use</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>4.02</td>
<td>.050</td>
<td>.690</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It has fresh smell</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>.077</td>
<td>1.058</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is gentle on hands</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>.079</td>
<td>1.092</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It retains color</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td>.079</td>
<td>1.085</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It removes stains</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>4.07</td>
<td>.059</td>
<td>.813</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It makes washing easy</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>.079</td>
<td>1.086</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The findings on Table 4.6 shows that the respondents strongly agreed with the reasons that: the detergent are well packed, cleans off all dirt and stains, gentle on fabric, economical, has fresh smell and that they remove stains (mean score between 4.1 to 5.0). The study also found that the respondents agreed with the reasons that the quality and price of detergents are just and right, gentle on hands, retains colour and that it makes washing easy (mean score between 3.1 to 4.0). From the findings of the study, it can be said that the major reasons for the choice of the detergents is based on their quality, effectiveness and the cost of using them. According to Bishop et al, (1984), consumer perceptions of price, quality and value are considered pivotal determinants of shipping behaviours and product choice. The findings by Garretson et al. (2002) further supports the findings of the study by asserting that consumer perceptual variables that have been identified include price-quality perception, perceived quality, value consciousness, price consciousness, perceived price fairness, smart shipper self perception, familiarity with products, brand loyalty, perceived risk associated with purchase, risk averseness and general deal proneness.

4.4 Factors Influencing Consumer the Perception of Kenyan Manufactured Products in the EAC

In this section, the researcher sought to find out the perception of different factors on the use of laundry products manufactured in Kenya.

4.4.1 Perception of Price

The respondents were first asked to give their perception on the price of the products. 49% of the respondents indicated that the products were fairly expensive, followed by 34% who indicated that there was a good bargain on the prices of the products. 13% indicated that the products were expensive while 4% indicated that the prices were too expensive. From the findings of the study, it can be said that the consumers perceived the prices charged on the Kenyan fast moving manufactured products with respect to laundry detergent products, to be reasonable. According to Assael (2004), consumers’ price perceptions may appear to be a simple matter of determining a product price based on an advertisement or on observation in store. Thus the price of the products affects purchasing behaviour with regard to a product depending on his/her perception. The findings of the study were as presented in Table 4.7.
Table 4.7: Perception of Price

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Laundry Detergents made in Kenya are</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Too expensive</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expensive</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairy expensive</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good bargain</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.4.2 Perception of Quality

The respondents were also asked to indicate their perception on the quality of the products. According to the findings, 54% of the respondents indicated that the products were of good quality, followed by 26% of the respondents who indicated that the products were of excellent quality while 19% indicated that the products were of fair quality. The findings of the study were as presented in Table 4.8.

Table 4.8 Perception of Quality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quality</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Excellent Quality</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good Quality</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair Quality</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor Quality</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.4.3 Country of Origin

To establish whether the county of origin of the products affected the perception of the products, the respondents were asked to indicate their level of agreement with different statements with regard to the country of origin of the products.
This was tested on a five point likert scale of 1-5; where 1 represented ‘Strongly Disagree’, 2 represented ‘Disagree’, 3 represented ‘Neither agree nor disagree’, 4 represented ‘Agree’ and 5 represented ‘Strongly Agree’.

The scores ‘Strongly Disagree’ was taken to be equivalent to mean score ranging from 0.0 to 1.0, ‘Disagree’ with mean score ranging from 1.1 to 2.0, ‘Neither agree nor disagree’ with a mean score ranging from 2.1 to 3.0, ‘Agree’ with a means score ranging from 3.1 to 4.0 and ‘Strongly Agree’ with a means score ranging from 4.1 to 5.0. A standard deviation of >1 shows that there was a significant difference in the responses given by the respondents. The findings of the study were as presented in Table 4.9.

Table 4.9: Country of Origin

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effect of the County of Origin</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I’d rather buy laundry products made in Kenya because I can always trust in quality, availability and other attributes</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>.054</td>
<td>.744</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I’d rather buy laundry products made in my own country whether they are of good or bad quality, expensive or fair price</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>1.65</td>
<td>.079</td>
<td>1.086</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I’d rather buy laundry products made in Europe because I can always trust in quality, availability etc</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td>.079</td>
<td>1.086</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The findings on Table 4.9 shows that the respondents agreed with the statement that they would rather buy laundry products made in Kenya because they could always trust in quality, availability and other attributes. A study by Roth and Romeo, (1992) found that consumers have significantly different perceptions about products made in different countries, and that these general perceptions have important effects on consumers’ evaluation of the products manufactured in a particular country. It was also found that the respondents disagreed with the statements that they would rather buy laundry products made in their own country whether they are of good or bad quality, expensive or fair price (mean score 1.65) and that they would rather buy laundry products made in Europe because they can always trust in
quality and their availability (mean score 1.79). From the findings of the study, it can be said that the country of origin of the products did not have much effect on the perception of the laundry products manufactured in Kenyan. In support to these findings, a study done by Erickson et al. (1984) found that country of origin is found to influence belief formation rather than attitude (evaluation) in some studies, although the effects of country of origin are not identical across all product attributes.

4.4.4 Perceived Risks

On the perceived risks, the respondents were asked to indicate their level of agreement with different statements on the risks with regard to the use of the products. This was tested on a five point likert scale of 1-5; where 1 represented ‘Strongly Disagree’, 2 represented ‘Disagree’, 3 represented ‘Neither agree nor disagree’, 4 represented ‘Agree’ and 5 represented ‘Strongly Agree’.

The scores ‘Strongly Disagree’ was taken to be equivalent to mean score ranging from 0.0 to 1.0, ‘Disagree’ with mean score ranging from 1.1 to 2.0, ‘Neither agree nor disagree’ with a mean score ranging from 2.1 to 3.0, ‘Agree’ with a means score ranging from 3.1 to 4.0 and ‘Strongly Agree’ with a means score ranging from 4.1 to 5.0. A standard deviation of >1 shows that there was a significant difference in the responses given by the respondents. The results are as presented in the Table 4.10.

Table 4.10 Perceived Risks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perceived Risks</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I will lose my money</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>.068</td>
<td>.942</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My friends will laugh at me</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>1.52</td>
<td>.053</td>
<td>.725</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It may not work well</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>1.93</td>
<td>.083</td>
<td>1.143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It may harm me</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>.078</td>
<td>1.072</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I may not like them</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>1.65</td>
<td>.081</td>
<td>1.110</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The findings on Table 4.10 shows that the respondents disagreed with the statements that: that their friends will laugh at them (mean score 1.52), that they did not like the products from Kenya (mean score 1.65), that the products from Kenya may harm them (mean score 1.83) and that the products from Kenya may not work well (mean score 1.93). It was also found that the respondents neutrally agreed with the statement that they will lose money by buying products from Kenya (mean score 2.67). From the findings of the study, it can be said that there was no perceived risk associated with the use of the products from Kenya. According to Greatorex and Mitchell (1993), it is theorized that when perceived risk falls below an individual’s acceptance value, it has little effect on intended behaviour and is essentially ignored. On the other hand, an extremely high level of perceived risk can cause a consumer to postpone or avoid a purchase entirely. Dowling and Staelin (1994) found that the extent of the exposure depends on the importance or magnitude of the goal, the seriousness of the penalty for not attaining the goal, and the amount of means committed to achieving the goal. Thus the perceived risk is usually measured as a multidimensional construct: physical loss, financial loss, psychological loss, time loss, performance risk and social risk. From these findings it can be concluded that the purchase of the Kenyan manufactured fast moving consumer products was influenced by the risks associated with the products.
CHAPTER FIVE:
SUMMARY OF THE STUDY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 Introduction
This chapter presents a summary of the study, a summary of research findings, conclusions, recommendations and recommendations for further study.

5.2 Summary of the Study
The purpose of this study was to determine the factors affecting consumer perception of Kenyan manufactured fast moving goods in East African Community, a case of laundry detergents products. Descriptive survey design was used in the study. The study targeted the consumers of laundry detergents manufactured in Kenya, from the capital Cities of Kenya, Uganda, Tanzania, Rwanda and Burundi. Questionnaires were used as instruments for data collection.

On the perception of Kenyan manufactured fast moving consumer goods, a case of laundry detergents, the study found that different detergents such as Omo, Sunlight, Ariel, Persil and Toss were consumed in the five Nations. These products enjoyed positive perception in EAC market, based on tangible and intangible product attributes. An example is OMO which was the most consumed product. The major reasons for the consumption of such products were that: the detergents were well packed, cleans off dirt and stains, gentle on fabric, economical to use, has fresh smell and that they remove stains.

Regarding the factors influencing the perception of these laundry detergents products, the study found that the products were fairly expensive. This is an indication that the consumers perceived the prices charged on the products to be reasonable. On the quality of these products, the study found that the products were perceived to be of good quality. This is an indication that the consumers perceived laundry detergents manufactured in Kenya to be of good quality.
Concerning the country of origin, the study found that respondents agreed that they rather buy laundry products made in Kenya because they could always trust in quality, availability and other attributes. The study also found that the respondents disagreed with the statements that they would rather buy laundry products made in their own country whether they are of good or bad quality, expensive or fair price and that they would rather buy laundry products made in Europe because they can always trust in quality and their availability. This is an indication that the county of origin of the laundry detergent products did not affect the consumer perception of the Kenyan manufactured fast moving products.

On the risks associated with the products, the study found the respondents disagreed with the statements that: that their friends will laugh at them, that they did not like the products from Kenya, that the products from Kenya may harm them and that the products from Kenya may not work well. From the findings of the study, it can be said that there was no perceived risk associated with the use of laundry detergents manufactured in Kenya.

5.3 Conclusion

From the findings of the study, it can be concluded that the East African Community market perceived Kenyan manufactured fast moving goods, the case of laundry detergent products, to be of good quality and value as evidenced by the fact that they use the products and that they have good reasons for consuming them.

On the factors influencing the perception of these products, it can be concluded that the consumers perceived the prices charged on the products to be reasonable. It can also be concluded that consumers in the East African Community perceived these laundry detergent products to be of good quality. It can further be concluded that the country of origin of the products did not affect the consumer perception of the laundry detergents products. It can finally be concluded that there was no perceived risk associated with the use of these products.
5.4 Recommendations of the Study

The study recommends that Kenyan traders selling laundry detergents products in the East African Community market to put in place marketing strategies aimed at increasing their sales. This is due to the fact that some of their products like Omo are consumed by larger proportion of the population while other products are consumed in small quantities as represented by the percentage consumption of respective products.

The study also recommends that Kenyan manufacturers dealing in fast moving consumer goods such as laundry detergent products should ensure that their prices are reasonable, the quality of the products are improved and that there be less risks associated with the consumption of their products. This will have an impact on the market share of the Kenyan manufactured fast moving products.

5.5 Recommendations for further Research

This study was aimed at determining the factors affecting consumer perception of Kenyan manufactured fast moving goods, case of laundry detergents, in East African Community. The researcher therefore recommends that another study be done on the challenges facing the trading of the Kenyan manufactured consumer goods in East African community market which was not the concern of this study.
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APPENDICES

APPENDIX I: QUESTIONNAIRE (ENGLISH VERSION)

PART 1: BACKGROUND INFORMATION

Age
- Between: 0 – 30 [ ]
- Between: 30 – 50 [ ]
- Between: 50 and above [ ]

Gender
- Male [ ]
- Female [ ]

City
- Nairobi [ ]
- Kampala [ ]
- Dar es Salaam [ ]
- Kigali [ ]
- Bujumbura [ ]

Highest academic qualification
- Primary education [ ]
- Secondary education [ ]
- University education [ ]
PART 2: PERCEPTION OF LAUNDRY PRODUCTS MANUFACTURED IN KENYA

Which of the below laundry detergents made in Kenya do you use?

OMO [ ]
Ariel [ ]
Sunlight [ ]
Persil [ ]
Other (please specify) [ ]

The main reasons I buy my favorite detergent (in Q1 above is/are)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>It is well packed</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is quality and the price is just right</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It cleans off all dirt and stains</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is gentle on fabric</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is economical to use</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It has fresh smell</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is gentle on hands</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It retains color</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It removes stains</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It makes washing easy</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PART 3: FACTORS AFFECTING PERCEPTION OF LAUNDRY PRODUCTS MANUFACTURED IN KENYA

PERCEIVED PRICE
Laundry detergents made in Kenya are;

- Too expensive [ ]
- Expensive [ ]
- Fairly expensive [ ]
- Good bargain [ ]

PERCEIVED QUALITY
Laundry detergents made in Kenya are;

- Excellent quality [ ]
- Good quality [ ]
- Fair quality [ ]
- Poor quality [ ]
## COUNTRY OF ORIGIN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I’d rather buy laundry products made in Kenya because I can always trust in quality, availability and other attributes</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I’d rather buy laundry products made in my own country whether they are of good or bad quality, expensive or fair price</td>
<td>[ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I’d rather buy laundry products made in Europe because I can always trust in quality, availability etc</td>
<td>[ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## PERCEIVED RISK

If I buy a laundry product made in Kenya

| I will lose my money | [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] |
| My friends will laugh at me | [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] |
| It may not work well | [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] |
| It may harm me | [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] |
| I may not like them | [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] |
APPENDIX II: SAMPLE QUESTIONNAIRE (FRENCH VERSION)

1ère partie: Information personnelle

**Age**
- De 0 à 30 [  ]
- De 30 à 50 [  ]
- Plus de 50 [  ]

**Sexe**
- Homme [  ]
- Femme [  ]

**Ville**
- Nairobi [  ]
- Kampala [  ]
- Dar es Salaam [  ]
- Kigali [  ]
- Bujumbura [  ]

**Niveau de formation**
- Ecole primaire [  ]
- Lycée [  ]
- Licence universitaire [  ]

Lequel de ces produits utilisez-vous?

- OMO [  ]
- Ariel [  ]
- Sunlight [  ]
- Persil [  ]
- Autre (à specifier) [  ]
2ème Partie: Enquête sur la perception des produits de lessive fabriqués au Kenya

La raison principale de mon choix.
- Bien emballé
- Bon rapport qualité-prix
- Il nettoie toutes les saletés et taches
- Doux sur tissu
- C’est économique
- Il a un parfum frais
- Doux au toucher
- Il retient les couleurs
- Il enlève les taches
- Il rend le lavage plus facile

3ème Partie : Les facteurs déterminant la perception des produits de lessive fabriqués au Kenya

Prix perçu

Les produits de lessive fabriqués au Kenya sont
- Trop cher
- Cher
- Assez cher
- Bon marché

Qualité perçue

Les produits de lessive fabriqués au Kenya sont
- Excellente qualité
- Bonne qualité
- Assez bonne qualité
- Mauvaise qualité
### Pays d'origine

Je préfère acheter des produits de lessive fabriqués au Kenya car je fais confiance à la qualité, à la disponibilité et à d'autres attributs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Entièrement d'accord</th>
<th>D'accord</th>
<th>Neutre</th>
<th>Pas d'accord</th>
<th>Entièrement pas d'accord</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Je préfère acheter des produits de lessive fabriqués dans mon pays d'origine quel que soit la qualité, la chérète.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Entièrement d'accord</th>
<th>D'accord</th>
<th>Neutre</th>
<th>Pas d'accord</th>
<th>Entièrement pas d'accord</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Je préfère acheter des de lessive fabriqués en Europe car je fais confiance à la qualité, la disponibilité etc.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Entièrement d'accord</th>
<th>D'accord</th>
<th>Neutre</th>
<th>Pas d'accord</th>
<th>Entièrement pas d'accord</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Risques perçus

Si j'achète des produits de lessive fabriqués au Kenya

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Entièrement d'accord</th>
<th>D'accord</th>
<th>Neutre</th>
<th>Pas d'accord</th>
<th>Entièrement pas d'accord</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

je perdrai de l'argent

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Entièrement d'accord</th>
<th>D'accord</th>
<th>Neutre</th>
<th>Pas d'accord</th>
<th>Entièrement pas d'accord</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

mes amis se moqueront de moi

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Entièrement d'accord</th>
<th>D'accord</th>
<th>Neutre</th>
<th>Pas d'accord</th>
<th>Entièrement pas d'accord</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ça ne fonctionnerait pas bien

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Entièrement d'accord</th>
<th>D'accord</th>
<th>Neutre</th>
<th>Pas d'accord</th>
<th>Entièrement pas d'accord</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ça me ferait mal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Entièrement d'accord</th>
<th>D'accord</th>
<th>Neutre</th>
<th>Pas d'accord</th>
<th>Entièrement pas d'accord</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

je n'aimerais pas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Entièrement d'accord</th>
<th>D'accord</th>
<th>Neutre</th>
<th>Pas d'accord</th>
<th>Entièrement pas d'accord</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX III – KENYAN EXPORT TO EAC

Kenya Exports to the rest of EAC (Millions of Ksh)
(Source: Economic Survey 2010)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Uganda</td>
<td>42679</td>
<td>27812</td>
<td>33571</td>
<td>42285</td>
<td>46240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanzania</td>
<td>19953</td>
<td>18288</td>
<td>22326</td>
<td>29224</td>
<td>30087</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rwanda</td>
<td>7283</td>
<td>4765</td>
<td>5801</td>
<td>8953</td>
<td>9536</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burundi</td>
<td>3715</td>
<td>2184</td>
<td>2424</td>
<td>3480</td>
<td>4597</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>73630</td>
<td>53049</td>
<td>64122</td>
<td>83942</td>
<td>90460</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>