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ABSTRACT

Research on brand equity and brand image management suggests that marketers should develop brand image strategies before focusing on tactical marketing mix issues. In general, when the name of a brand is mentioned, the first idea that comes to the consumer’s mind is the corporate image associated with it. Despite all this literature none of the studies have been able to address the link between brand image and the business customer purchase decision making process of detergents brands. This study sought to assess the corporate brand image as perceived by Ecolab’s customers and determine the influence of brand image on the business customer decision making process by Ecolab.

This study adopted a survey design. The target population for this study was all customers in both the food and beverage division and the institution divisions of Ecolab East Africa Ltd in Nairobi. The study targeted 65 companies who are Ecolab’s consistent customers. Primary data was collected through the use of both structured and unstructured questions were used in the questionnaire. The questionnaires were administered through a drop and pick method. The collected data was first coded and entered. Descriptive statistics such as measures of central tendency, measures of variability and measures of frequency were employed to analyze the data. The Statistics Package for Social Scientists (SPSS) program aided in analyzing the data which was presented in form of frequency tables, pie charts, bar graphs for easier interpretation.

The study found out that most customers researched on at least three different varieties of brands before they purchase. Ecolab’s brand image was clearly recognized. Quality, price and suppliers reputation were what most customers value the most when making the purchase decision The study concludes that customer experienced functional, physical and financial barriers in making decisions on the detergents brand to buy. The study recommends that, for Ecolab to remain competitive in marketing of its products, the company should ensure that their products meet the best quality, affordable price and ensure continued innovations.
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CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background of the Study
The rapidly expanding and highly competitive global marketplace is stimulating awareness of the significance of corporate and product brands as strategic factors in building a company’s value. In fact, a company’s brand often impacts on stock performance by as much as 5 per cent on average - a significant number that can make a major impression on market valuation. The brand is one of the company’s most significant assets (Gregory 2002).

1.1.1 Concept of Corporate and Global Branding
Research studies done by Corporate Branding show, among other things, that brand image contributes to positive corporate financial performance affecting both share prices and revenue. Thus, the brand serves as an attractive beacon for investors and customers. Perhaps the most prevalent reason given for global branding is that of economy, particularly the economies achieved by an extended scope of sales driving down the average unit cost. Production side savings are not the only economies realized. Marketing and advertising costs as well can be cut by concentrating spending against a single global brand instead of a number of brands.

According to Gregory (2002), the need for effectively managing the brand assets in an increasingly global marketplace has become apparent. There is a strong interest in global branding because of key market trends such as rising economies of scale, exploitation of experience curves and knowledge transfers, capitalizing on geographic image spillover, seeking new growth opportunities and consolidation and globalization of the retail trade.

As global markets turn more competitive, it becomes more expensive for a company to achieve a meaningful advantage. Rising costs of research and development for product differentiation, along with production cost advantages that necessitate plant capacities that exceed local demand, call for companies to globalize their brands in order to amortize these and other costs across local markets.

Gregory (2002) continues to add that there used to be only two ways of approaching global branding process. First, the traditional headquarter approach which is efficient but not particularly sensitive to local needs and the multifocal strategy which focuses on the special
requirements of each and every market area which is highly inefficient and not suitable for global branding. In the current business context, the technique that appears to work best is the transnational or glocal. Such organizations strive for global coverage and efficiency but also respect local traditions and sensitivities and recognize a need for market-by-market flexibility to the consumers in those markets.

Understanding the buying behavior of the target market is the essential task of marketing managers under the marketing concept. The consumer market consists of all the individuals and households that buy or acquire goods and services for consumption (Kotler, 1988).

Traditionally, marketers could understand consumers through the daily experience of selling and interacting with them. But the growth in the size of firms and markets has removed many marketing decision makers from direct contact with customers. Managers have had to turn to consumer researchers to answer the most important questions about any market. Of central interest that managers are most interested in, is how consumers respond to various market controlled stimuli. The company that understands how consumers will respond to different product features, pricing and advertising appeals among other attributes, will have an enormous advantage over its competitors (Kotler, 1988).

The global brand forum Africa was an exciting measure and aimed to be the foremost brand strategy event in building the marketing community in Kenya. Through their planned activities, MSK and GMN and brandscape sought to strengthen their commitment in enabling African organizations to access the very latest branding practices being developed by the world leading Global faculty. (Sokoni, 2011)

1.1.2 Determinants of Consumer Purchase Process

Consumers’ purchase decisions are highly influenced by the buyer’s unique set of cultural, sociological, psychological factors, economic factors and business marketing activities. These are external to the company and they cannot be controlled. Marketers would therefore like to understand the impact of these factors on their organizations.

Cultural factors are a combination of beliefs, values and customs of consumers in a particular context such as a nation or region. Sociological factors include culture, subculture, social class and reference groups. Human beings are social beings. They live and interact with others and therefore others opinions influence the purchase decision.
Psychological factors include attitudes, perceptions and motivation learning process among others. These are internal to the consumer buyer. Economic factors are income, wealth, credit facilities, and prices of substitute products and complement goods.

Business marketing activities are internal to the organization and involve the decision areas of Product, pricing, packaging and promotional activities.

Marketers have to go beyond the various influences on buyers and develop an understanding of how consumers actually make their buying decisions. Marketers must identify who makes the buying decision, the type of buying decision that is involved and the steps to the buying process.

For many products, it is fairly easy to identify the buyer but in a case where the product involves a decision making unit, marketers have to distinguish the several roles of people in the buying decision; the initiator, Influencer, Decider, Buyer, and user. Knowing the main participants and the roles they play helps the marketer to fine tune the marketing program. (Kotler, 1988)

1.1.3 Types of Business Buying Decision Behavior

Consumer decision making varies with the type of buying decision. The more complex and expensive decisions are more likely to involve more buyer deliberation and more buying participants. Asael distinguished four types of consumer buying behavior based on the degree of buyer involvement in the purchase and the degree of difference between brands.

Complex buying behavior customers are customers who are highly involved in the purchase behavior. Differences between brands are very high. Dissonance reducing buying behavior is exhibited by the customer when the product purchase requires high involvement but only limited difference between brands. Where there are significant differences between the brands but customers are less involved while purchasing, marketers identify this behavior as variety seeking behavior. Habitual buying behavior is exhibited with customers who have low involvement with the purchase decision and there is little difference between brands.

Consumers therefore pass through the five stages of the buying process which emphasize that the buying process starts long before the actual purchase and have consequences long after the purchase. It encourages the marketer to focus on the buying process rather than the purchase decision.
1.1.4 Detergents Industry in Kenya

The detergent industry in Kenya is divided into two sectors; the consumer sector which produces detergents for use in the households and the commercial sector which produces industrial detergents for use in factories, hotels, hospitals and other institutions. The detergent manufacturing industry includes about 700 companies worldwide, with total revenue of USD 17 Billion. Principal players in the consumer sector include Proctor and Gamble, Unilever and Dial. The major companies in the commercial sector include divisions of Ecolab and the US chemical. The industry is highly concentrated, with the top 50 companies commanding 90% of the market share (First Research Industry Profile, 2008).

In Kenya, the commercial sector is mainly dominated by a few players namely Ecolab, Diversy and Odex chemicals. These players command 70% of the total market with many other local companies sharing the 30% market share. Major customers for the commercial industry include hotels, food and beverage companies, and healthcare providers, industrial and commercial laundries. They may also use distributors to penetrate into the market and bridge the gaps. These companies use in house sales force with trade shows as an important vehicle. Superior service is important for these companies to maintain long term relationships with large customers.

Prices of many petroleum based raw materials used in soap and detergent manufacture are on the rise which will push the detergents prices upwards. Cleaning and sanitization manufacturer Ecolab Inc reported a seventeen per cent growth for its first quarter in 2008. This has been due to the rise in sales to Asia and Latin America. Ecolab has over twenty two thousand, five hundred and twenty five employees globally with a net sale of eleven billion U.S dollars. This was brought about by the resent merger with Nalco. Diversy on the other hand, was recently bought out by Sealed Air, to bring the total number of employees to twenty six thousand, three hindred globally, with sales of eight billon U.S dollars.

Major products include laundry detergents, dishwashing detergent, food processing plants detergents and sanitizers. Laundry detergent accounts for 40% of the industry revenue. Companies in the commercial sector sell a wide range from multipurpose detergents, specialized
detergents, sanitizers and personal care products. They may also sell dispensing equipment and offer additional training. In Kenya, majority of these companies manufacture these detergents themselves. However, due to the rising costs of operations and energy, some have moved towards third party contract manufacturing companies.

The two multinational detergent manufacturing companies are Ecolab East Africa and Diversy East Africa. Their headquarters are in the United States. Their operations in African run in many countries. However, Kenya acts as the regional centre for the East African countries, with the majority of the operations such as manufacturing and distribution. Advanced technology in cleaning and sanitization has lead to new ways of cleaning, dispensing and sanitization. These new ways have lead to the technological advancement of commercial detergents manufacture. Majority of the technological advancement have been driven by the move towards eco friendly products, the customers who push for reductions in operations. These companies have invented detergents which have multiple uses and functions and others which do not require to be rinsed out, thus saving on water. Other companies like Orbit chemicals are involved in Toll manufacturing for major multinational companies like Colgate-Palmolive, Reckitt & Benckiser and Ecolab among others.

1.2 Research Problem
Branding means much more than just giving a brand name and signaling to the outside world that such a product or service has been stamped with the mark and imprint of the organization. Branding consists of transforming the product category, and thus, brands are a direct consequence of the strategy of market segmentation and product differentiation. A brand can only be strong if it has a strong supply of loyal Customers (Kapferer, 1999). This gives the brand stability of future sales.

Brand management in the industrial detergents market involves the design and implementation of marketing activities to build and manage brand equity. Industrial detergent manufacturers start with an understanding as to what the brand is to represent and how it should be positioned with respect to competing brands. When positioning these detergents, the goal is to locate the brand in the minds of the consumer such that the potential benefit to the firm is maximized (Keller and
Georgson, 2008). The power of the brand lies in what resides in the minds of the consumers. The challenge for marketers in the detergent industry in building strong brand is ensuring that the customers have the right type of experiences with the products and services and their accompanying marketing campaigns so that the desired thoughts and feelings become linked to the brands that they market.

The Kenyan detergent manufacturing industry plays an important role in that it provides cleaning and sanitization products and services to Food and beverage companies that require these products. With the liberalization of the economy, the industry’s barriers have been loosened and more companies have been established, leading to a decrease in the market share of existing suppliers. This therefore, means that Ecolab East Africa (K) Ltd needs to analyze its corporate brand management if it expects to secure and grow its market share and sustain its and product brand image in the long term.

Many scholars in the recent past have studied elements in brand management, such as Brand loyalty, Brand personality and Consumer perception. Mwangi, (2003) carried out a research on factors affecting brand loyalty among toothpaste users in the westlands area and found out that customers were more sensitive to cavities and bad breath. Wasonga (2011) studied in factors affecting consumer perception of Kenyan manufactured fast moving consumer goods, a case on laundry detergents. None of these studies have been able to address the link between brand image and the business customer purchase decision making process of detergents. The research question that was most appropriate was, how does brand image affect the business customer purchase decision making process of detergents in Ecolab East Africa (K) Ltd?

1.3 Research Objectives

This study has two objectives;

(i) To assess the corporate brand image as perceived by Ecolab’s customers.

(ii) To determine the influence of brand image on the business customer decision making process by Ecolab.
1.4 Value of the Research

This research will be beneficial to the industry in that it will act as a brand management reference for the Industrial detergent companies in their marketing strategies. The study will reveal how the various detergent companies can be perceived favorably by their customers. The study will also add to new ways of brand management of the various detergents that are in the market.

The Ministry of Planning and National Development can use this study in policy making and Economic survey studies in determining the industry’s output and productivity.

Academicians, business researchers and scholars will be able to borrow from the findings of this research to support literary references as well as develop themes for further research.
CHAPTER TWO: LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Introduction

This chapter reviews the literature related to brand image and brand identity. The chapter will highlight how brand identity and brand image are inter related, the consumer purchase decision making process and the factors in the brand identity that affect the consumer purchase decision.

2.2 Brand Identity and Brand Image

Brand identity stems from an organization. That is, an organization is responsible for creating a distinguished product with unique characteristics. Brand identity is the total proposal or promise that an organization makes to the consumer. The brand can be perceived as a product or personality, a set of values and a position it occupies in the mind of the consumer. Brand identity is all that an organization wants the brand to be considered as. It is a feature linked with a specific company, product, service or individual. Brand identity is the noticeable elements of a brand; That is, the trademark, Logo, name and symbol that identify and differentiates a brand in target audience mind.

Figure 2.1 Brand Identity Model

In B2B setting, branding is a multidimensional construct that includes product characteristics, brand image, support and distribution services, company reputation and company policy (Cretu and Brodie 2007; McQuiston 2004). Therefore, B2B brand perceptions are influenced to some extent by associations related to an ongoing relationship, corporate reputation and service reputation.

2.3 Young & Rubicam’s Brand Asset Valuator

The premier advertising agency Young & Rubicam (Y&R) has developed a multiple criteria method to assess brand equity growth. The company used its Brand Asset Valuator to assess the brand equity of 450 global brands and more than 8,000 local brands in 24 countries. Each brand was examined using a 32-item survey that included, in addition to a set of brand personality scales, four distinct measures:

Differentiation: Measures how distinctive the brand is in the marketplace.

Relevancy: Measures whether a brand has personal relevance for the potential customer.

Esteem: Measures whether a brand is held in high regard and considered best in its class. Closely related to perceived quality and the extent to which the brand is growing in popularity.

Familiarity: Measures the degree to which potential customers understand what a brand stands for.

According to this approach to brand equity, brand differentiation is the core of a successful brand proposition with a distinctive position in the marketplace that will promote long-term growth. Y&R defines it as the power of a brand to express its uniqueness and reach top-of-mind status with target consumers.

Once consumers are aware of the brand, it needs to be relevant to their needs, satisfying and exceeding their expectations. The way that the brand manager is able to express that relevancy in a language consumers appreciate will determine its success. Once consumers understand what the brand can do for them, they need to aspire to own it, or have esteem for it. Finally, when the
brand has communicated its unique, relevant and aspiration message, it will be able to achieve familiarity through repurchase and re-use.

These four measures form the basis of two equations:

Differentiation x Relevance = Brand Strength (or vitality)

Esteem x Familiarity = Brand Stature

The equations represent an attempt to overcome issues with other methods that assess brands solely in terms of present earning power. They suggest that scores relating to brand differentiation and relevance indicate the potential for growth, while those relating to brand esteem and familiarity indicate its present stature.

2.4 Product Branding and Brand Extensions

When it comes to introducing and naming products and brand extensions, two tools are usually considered. Keller (2008) states that Brand-product matrix is used to show the products and brands marketed by a company and Brand hierarchy is used to portray relationships between elements are considered. To provide some historical perspective, for years, firms used to follow the market leaders in avoiding to introduce any new brands, using an existing brand name. Over time, firms were forced to re-think their one brand-one product policy by recognizing the value of their brands and introducing a host of other products under the host strong brand names. That is, brand extensions.

2.5 Consumer Purchase Decision in Business Marketing

Business markets are markets for products and services bought by businesses, government bodies and institutions such as hospitals for incorporation, consumption use or for resale. The detergent industry in Kenya falls into this category of business marketing as it sells its detergents, sanitizers and equipment for use by food and beverage plants and other institutions.

Organizational buying behavior is a process, not an isolated act or event. Tracing the history of a procurement decision uncovers critical decision points, involving information requirements.
Internally, the purchase decision begins when someone recognizes a problem that can be solved. However, the purchase decision can be prompted externally by a sales person who can precipitate the need for a product by demonstrating opportunities for improvement. During this process, minor decisions are made that ultimately translate into the final choice of supplier (Hutt and Speh, 2010).

Once the supplier is selected and agrees to the purchasing guidelines such as the required quantities and expected time of delivery, a performance review is the final stage in the purchase process.

2.6 Branding in the Organizational Purchase Decision Making Process

With regard to industrial buyers, research has found brands to convey a number of largely intangible benefits. As a brand is essentially a summary of associated values, it can increase the buyer’s confidence in their choice (Michelle et al 2001, Low et al 2002). It increases the level of satisfaction the buyer feels with regard to the purchase (Low et al 2002) and provides comfort and the “feel good” factor (Mudambi, 2002). Brands are useful for reducing the level of perceived risk and uncertainty in buying situations (Mudambi, 2002, Bengtson et al 2005 and Ohemus 2009). The buying company’s product may gain legitimacy through the incorporation of a branded product being associated with a prestigious company.

Branding is essentially used to convey a set of values to potential buyers which may be considered at various stages of the organizational decision making process including the determination of the characteristics of the product or service, the search for potential suppliers and the evaluation of proposals (Sweeney 2002). In addition to understanding the process of the decision, Lynch et al (2004) states that it is also necessary to understand the structure of the decision making unit and the evaluative criteria used to make purchase decisions. It is also necessary to understand the characteristics of the purchase situation and the nature of the organizational buyers. An understanding of these aspects of organizational buying will enable marketers to determine how branding can be successfully implemented.

The criteria used by industrial buyers to evaluate their suppliers have been investigated. Bendixen et al (2004) found that branding only had a relevance importance of 16% when buyers
were deciding to make a purchase decision. Other attributes were found to be more important including delivery period (27% relative importance) the most desired attribute, followed by price (24%), technology (19%) and finally availability of parts (14%). Bendixen et al (2004) continued by investigating how buyers rated nine attributes of their preferred brand. They found quality was the most desirable attribute, followed by reliability, performance, after-sales service, ease of operation, ease of maintenance, price, supplier’s reputation and relationship with supplier’s personnel. Furthermore, Beverland et al (2007) examined global B2B brands and concluded that what leading brands shared in common was that they built an identity around adaptability to customer needs and the provision of a total solution.
CHAPTER THREE: RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.1 Introduction

This chapter sets out various stages and phases that were followed in completing the study. It was a blueprint for the collection, measurement and analysis of data. This section was an overall scheme to aid the researcher in answering the raised research question. Most decisions about how research was executed and how respondents were approached, as well as when, where and how the research was completed were addressed. Therefore, in this section the research identified the procedures and techniques that were used in the collection, processing and analysis of data.

3.2 Research design

This study adopted a survey design. The survey collected data and information aimed at identifying how Ecolab East Africa’s brand management methods affected the organizational purchase decision making process of their customers. The survey gathered information on what brand imagery methods should be used by Ecolab East Africa Ltd.

3.3 Population

The target population for this study was all customers in both the food and beverage division and the institution divisions of Ecolab East Africa Ltd in Nairobi. There was an existing customer data base of 65 companies who are Ecolab’s consistent customers. From this population, the heads of procurement, the quality managers and the factory managers of these organizations, who are the key decision makers in determining which commercial detergent manufacturer to supply, were interviewed.

3.4 Data collection

Both structured and unstructured questions were used in the questionnaire to collect primary data. The questionnaire contained questions relating to the brands that are purchased by the companies. The questionnaire focused on how these brands and the corporate brand image affect the purchase decision process of Ecolab’s customers. The questionnaire contained three main
sections. Section A, gathered information on the demographic data of the respondents and Section B gathered information on the brand.purchase process while Section C gathered information on the brand and purchase decision making process.

Data was collected using questionnaires, using the call and drop method. The respondents were called then the questionnaires were dropped to the available respondents or their substitute. The questionnaires were then collected at an agreed time.

3.5 Data analysis

Once the data was collected, it was analyzed using descriptive statistics such as measures of central tendency, measures of variability and measures of frequency among others. The Statistics Package for Social Scientists (SPSS) program was used to analyze the data and output presented in form of frequency tables, mean scores, percentages, pie charts, bar graphs among others for easier interpretation and deduction.
CHAPTER FOUR: DATA PRESENTATION, ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION

4.1 Introduction
This chapter focuses on data analysis, interpretation and presentation of the data collected in the study. The purpose of the study was to examine the relationship between corporate brand image and business customer purchase decision making of detergents in Ecolab East Africa limited. The study targeted a sample of 65 companies who are Ecolab’s customers of which 36 responses were obtained. To show the relationship between variables, data was presented in form of tables and charts.

4.2 Background information
In this section, the research sought to find out the demographics of companies which took part in the study; this includes information such as ownership, sales turnover and sub sector of the Company. The results are presents as below.

4.2.1 Ownership of the Organization
Figure 4.1 depicts the ownership of the organization

Figure 4.1 Ownership of the Organization

Source: Primary Data

The study shows that 72.2 % of the respondents that took part in the study were locally owned while 27.8% were multinationals. This shows that the study was diversified and responses from
both local and multinational companies improve the reliability of the results since comparisons can also be made.

4.2.2 Sales Turnover Per Annum (Kenya Shillings)

Table 4.1 summarizes the sales turnover per annum of the companies interviewd.

Table 4.1 Sales Turnover Per Annum (Kenya Shillings)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sales Turnover (in Kshs.)</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 100 M</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101M to 500 M</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>501M to 1 Billion</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above 1 Billion</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>36.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>36</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Primary Data

The study shows 25% of the companies which took part in the study had a sales turnover of Kenya shillings 1 billion and above while 16.7% had a sales turnover of between Kenya shillings 500 million to 1 billion. On the other hand, 11.1% of the respondents revealed that they had a sales turnover of less than 100 million and between 100 million to 500 million respectively. However, 36.1% of the respondents did not respond to this.

4.2.3 Sub- Sector the Company Belongs

Table 4.2 shows which sub sector the companies belongs in.

Table 4.2 Sub- Sector the Company Belongs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub- sector</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Meat/Poultry/Fisheries</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dairy and dairy processing</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooking oils and Edible fats</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baking</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alcoholic/Non-alcoholic Beverages</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>19.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fruits and vegetable Processing</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotel (Three, four and five star)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>22.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospitals</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quick Service restaurant</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The study was conducted on various sub sectors as shown in the table 4.1 whereby 22.2% of the companies were in the hotel sector while 19.4% were in the alcoholic/non-alcoholic beverages sub-sector. On the other hand, 8.3% of the companies were in the meat/poultry/fisheries; dairy and dairy processing and; fruits and vegetable processing sub sector respectively. 5.6% were in the hospital and quick Service restaurant sub-sector respectively while 2.8% were in the cooking oils and edible fats; baking; and the education (Schools) sub sectors respectively. Other two companies however stated that they were in the Lodges and Pharmaceuticals sub sectors respectively.

4.3 Brand Purchase Process

4.3.1 Whether the Company Buys Branded Detergents

In figure 4.2, the chart shows what percentage of the companies buy branded detergents and which ones do not.

Figure 4.2 Whether the Company Buys Branded Detergents

Source: Primary Data

Figure 4.2 above shows that majority of the respondents (94.4%) revealed that they buy branded detergents while only 5.6% indicated that they don’t buy branded detergents.
4.3.2 How the Respondents Would Describe the Involvement in the Brand Purchase Process

In this section, the study sought to establish the nature of involvement by the respondents in the brand purchase process. That is, whether they are decision makers or influencers; new, current or previous; and the type of user. The table 4.3 depicts the nature of involvement that is involved when making the purchase decision.

Table 4.3 Nature of Involvement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Involvement</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Decision maker</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Influencer</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>36</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Primary Data

Table 4.3 shows that half of the respondents (50%) revealed that they were decision makers while the other half revealed that they were the influencers.

4.3.3 New, Current or Previous User

The table 4.3 presents the type of user of Ecolab’s detergents.

Figure 4.3 New, Current or Previous Users

Source: Primary Data
The study shows that majority of the respondents (75%) revealed that they were current users while 13.9% indicated that they were the previous users. On the other hand, 11.1% indicated that they were new users.

### 4.3.4 Type of User

The table 4.4 also shows the type of user of Ecolab’s detergents in terms of frequency of use.

**Table 4.4 Type of User**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of User</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Occasional</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>27.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Light</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heavy</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>36</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Primary Data*

Majority of the respondents (50%) indicated that they were heavy users while 27.8% revealed that they were occasional users. Further, 16.7% of the respondents revealed that they were light user; however, 5.6% did not respond.

### 4.3.5 Whether currently a user of Competitor Brands

In figure 4.4, the chart contains a representation of the users of competitor brands.

**Figure 4.4 Whether Currently a user of Competitor Brands**

![Pie chart showing 36.1% Yes and 63.9% No]

*Source: Primary data*
Majority of the respondents (63.9%) indicated that they were currently users of competitor brands while 36.1% revealed that they were not currently users of competitor brands.

4.3.6 Source of Information Used to Make Purchase Decisions (in order of priority)

Table 4.5 summarizes the source of information, in order of priority, that is used to make the purchase decision of detergents.

**Table 4.5 Source of Information Used to Make Purchase Decisions (in order of priority)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of information</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clients, capability, suppliers, campaign</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customer database</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience in using the detergents, supplier visits and demonstration, knowledge of the brand</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>from other departments, from suppliers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global companies</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Influencers, previous experience</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother company</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multinationals, tenders</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previous users, references, advert, search</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prior use, other departments</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>proven quality, cost of use, historical data, other users</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference, company from parent</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>suppliers capability, delivery representatives</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>suppliers prequalification, contacts with salesmen</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tender processes, previous experiences</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Users experience, sales force influence</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Word of mouth from references by the audited and extended influencers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>38.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>36</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Primary Data*

4.3.6 Most Important Attribute Considered Before Purchasing Industrial Detergents

This was to determine the considered most important before purchasing industrial detergents. A scale of 1-5 was used. The scores “Not important at all” and “Less important” were represented by mean score, equivalent to 1 to 2.5 on the continuous Likert scale (1 ≤ Less important ≤ 2.5). The scores of ‘Moderately important’ were equivalent to 2.6 to 3.5 on the Likert scale (2.6 ≤ moderately important ≤ 3.5). The score of “Important” and “Highly important” represented
major contribution to the project implementation rate. This was equivalent to 3.6 to 5.0 on the Likert Scale (3.6 ≤ Important ≤ 5.0).

Table 4.6 summarizes the most important attributes that the decision makers consider before purchasing the detergents.

**Table 4.6 Most Important Attributes before Purchasing Industrial Detergents**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Not Important at All</th>
<th>Less Important</th>
<th>Moderately Important</th>
<th>Important</th>
<th>Highly Important</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quality of the product</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>77.8</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>4.78</td>
<td>.422</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both price and quality</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>69.4</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>4.63</td>
<td>.598</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplier's reputation</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>47.2</td>
<td>47.2</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>4.42</td>
<td>.604</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Price of the product</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>63.9</td>
<td>27.8</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>4.19</td>
<td>.577</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>41.7</td>
<td>36.1</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>1.324</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Product design/ packaging</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>52.8</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>.926</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brand name of the product</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>38.9</td>
<td>27.8</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>1.198</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source: Primary Data**

The respondents revealed that they considered: quality of the product; both price and quality; supplier's reputation; price of the product; technology and product design/packaging as the most important attributes before purchasing industrial detergents, in that order. This is shown by means scores of 4.78, 4.63, 4.42, 4.19, 3.80 and 3.67 respectively on the continuous likert scale. However, the respondents considered brand name of the product as moderately important as shown by a means core of 3.22 on the likert scale. Moreover the respondents stated that they considered attributes such as brand availability, innovation, Packaging size and performance as well.
4.3.7 Conducting information Search on Which Brands to Purchase, Before the Purchase Process

Table 4.7 depicts the extent of information search that is done by the decision makers before the decision is made to procure detergents.

Table 4.7 Information Search on Brands to Purchase

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Information Search</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>I don’t Know</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Extensive information search</td>
<td>75.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compared only few brands</td>
<td>27.8</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>61.1</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited information search</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>77.8</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No information search</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>88.9</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Primary Data

The study shows that majority of the respondents (75%) revealed that they conducted an extensive information search on which brands to purchase, before the purchase process while 27.8% indicated that the compared only few brands. On the other hand, 5.6% of the respondents indicated that they conducted limited information search while 2.8% revealed that they did not conduct any information search on which brands to purchase, before the purchase process.

4.3.8 Types of Brands Considered Before Buying a Detergent

The table 4.5 presents the number of different detergents that were considered before purchase.

Figure 4.5 Types of Brands Considered Before Buying a Detergent

Source: Primary Data
Majority of the respondents (50%) revealed that they considered three brands before buying a detergent while 22.2% revealed that they considered four brands. Further, 16.7% of the respondents indicated that they considered more than four brands while only 11.1% of the respondents indicated that they considered two brands.

**4.3.9 Whether Branded Detergents Were Considered To Be Of Better Quality than Non-Branded Detergents**

In the table 4.8, the information gathered summarizes whether branded detergents were considered to be of better quality than non branded ones.

**Table 4.8 Whether Branded Detergents Were Considered To Be Of Better Quality than Non-Branded Detergents**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes I agree</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No I don't agree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not necessarily</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I agree but not always true</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>22.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>36</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Primary Data*

Table 4.8 shows that 50% of the respondents agreed that they considered branded detergents to be of better quality than non-branded detergents while 25% indicated that it was not necessarily so. On the other hand, 22.2% of the respondents indicated agreed but revealed that it was not always true 2.8% did not agree.

**4.4 Whether Well Known Brands Act as A Status Symbol among the Customers**

Table 4.9 shows whether the respondents regarded well known brands as a status symbol.

**Table 4.9 Whether Well Known Brands Act As A Status Symbol among the Customers**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes I agree</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>66.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No I don't agree</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not necessarily</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I agree but not always true</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.9 shows that majority of the respondents (66.7) agreed that well known brands act as a status symbol among the customers. On the other hand, 11.1% of the respondents respectively indicated that they didn’t agree, not necessarily and agree but not always.

### 4.4.1 Whether the Organization Prefer Branded Detergents to Non-Branded Detergents

In figure 4.6, the bar graph summarizes the organizational preference on branded and non branded detergents.

**Figure 4.6 Organization Preferences on Branded Detergents and Non-Branded Detergents**

![Bar graph showing preferences](image)

**Source: Primary Data**

Figure 4.6 shows that 63.9% of the respondents revealed that they always preferred branded detergents to non-branded detergents while 19.4% revealed that they frequently preferred while 16.7% indicated that they sometimes preferred branded detergents to non-branded detergents.

### 4.4.2 The Person Who Plays the Major Role in the Purchase Decision Of Detergents

Figure 4.7 shows the person who plays a major role in the purchase decision making process.
Figure 4.7 Playing Major Role in the Purchase Decision Of Detergents

![](chart.png)

Source: Primary Data

According to 52.58% of the respondents, the inter-departmental decision played a major role in the purchase decision of detergents while 41.7% of the respondents revealed that the departmental decision played a major role.

4.4.3 Barriers to Purchasing of Branded Detergents from Ecolab

In this section, the study sought to rank the barriers to purchasing of branded detergents from Ecolab. A scale of 1-5 was used. The scores “Not important at all” and “Less important” were represented by mean score, equivalent to 1 to 2.5 on the continuous Likert scale (1 ≤ Less important ≤ 2.5). The scores of ‘Moderately important’ were equivalent to 2.6 to 3.5 on the Likert scale (2.6 ≤ moderately important ≤ 3.5). The score of “Important” and “Highly important” represented major contribution to the project implementation rate. This was equivalent to 3.6 to 5.0 on the Likert Scale (3.6 ≤ Important ≤ 5.0).

Table 4.10 summarizes the barriers faced by the respondents when purchasing detergents from Ecolab.
Table 4.10 Barriers to Purchasing of Branded Detergents from Ecolab

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Barriers</th>
<th>Not Important at All</th>
<th>Less Important</th>
<th>Moderately Important</th>
<th>Important</th>
<th>Highly Important</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Functional (Will the product function as I expect)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>72.2</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>.941</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical (Will the product harm my staff or processed</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>30.6</td>
<td>55.6</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>4.28</td>
<td>1.059</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial (can I afford the purchase?)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>4.06</td>
<td>.873</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (How much time and efforts will I expend to</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>1.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social (what will my peers/coworkers think?)</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>41.7</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>1.170</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Primary Data

The respondents revealed that they considered the following barriers important in purchasing of branded detergents from Ecolab: Functional (Will the product function as I expect); Physical (Will the product harm my staff or processed food/Beverage?); Financial (can I afford the purchase?); Time (How much time and efforts will I expend to make this purchase?); and how much do you care about your choice of detergent brands?, in that order. This is shown by means scores of 4.50, 4.28, 4.06 and 3.86 respectively on the continuous likert scale. However, the respondents revealed that they considered social barrier (what will my peers/coworkers think?) as moderately important. This is shown by a mean score of 3.06 on the likert scale.

4.4.4 Care about the Choice of Detergent Brands

In the chart 4.8, the respondents showed their extent of caring on the choice of detergents they purchased.
An overwhelming 88.9% of the respondents revealed that they care about the Choice of detergent brands to purchase. Only 2.8% of the respondents revealed that they don’t care while 8.3% revealed that they somewhat care.

4.4.5 Five Companies that Come into Mind when Customers Think Of Industrial Detergents

Table 4.11 revealed the corporate brand recognition in the respondents mind.

Table 4.11 Five Companies that Come into Mind

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Company</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ecolab</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>66.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversey</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>61.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Odex</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>47.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soilex</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>38.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue Ring</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Primary Data

According to 66.7% of the respondents, the first company that comes into their minds when they think of industrial detergents is Ecolab while 61.1% indicated Diversey. Others are Odex (47.2%), Soilex (38.9%), and Blue Ring (33.3%) in that order.
4.4.6 Identification of Brands from Logos

To establish the brand recognition of the various companies, table 4.5 summarized the data as to whether the respondents could identify the various companies from the logos shown.

Table 4.12 Identification of Brands from Logos

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Logos</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ecolab</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>66.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Diversy</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>64.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Odex</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>55.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Primary Data

The study shows that 66.7% of the respondents indentified the first logo as Ecolab while 64% indentified the second logo as Diversey; on the other hand, 55.6% indentified the third logo as Odex brand.

4.4.7 Company's Brands That the Respondents would like to be most Associated With

Here, the study sought to rank the brands that the respondents would like to be most associated with. A scale of 1-5 was used. The scores “Not associated at all” and “Less associated” were represented by mean score, equivalent to 1 to 2.5 on the continuous Likert scale (1 ≤ Less associated ≤ 2.5). The scores of ‘Moderately Associated’ were equivalent to 2.6 to 3.5 on the Likert scale (2.6 ≤ Associated ≤ 3.5). The score of “Associated” and “Highly Associated” represented major contribution to the project implementation rate. This was equivalent to 3.6 to 5.0 on the Likert Scale (3.6 ≤ Associated ≤ 5.0). Table 4.13 represents the brands that the respondents would like to be associated with the most.
Table 4.13 Brands that the Respondents would like to be most Associated With

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Brand</th>
<th>Not associated at all</th>
<th>Less associated</th>
<th>Moderately Associated</th>
<th>Associated</th>
<th>Highly Associated</th>
<th>No Response</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ecolab</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>86.1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>4.83</td>
<td>.447</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversey</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>38.9</td>
<td>55.6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>.609</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Odex</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>27.8</td>
<td>27.8</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>27.8</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>3.73</td>
<td>.827</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soilex</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>44.4</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>1.268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rubicon</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>47.2</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>2.26</td>
<td>1.284</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue Ring</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>41.7</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>2.48</td>
<td>1.401</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Primary data

On the brands that the respondents would like to be associated with, majority of the respondents indicated that they would like to be associated with Ecolab, Diversey and Odex, in that order. This is shown by a mean score of 4.83, 4.50 and 3.73 respectively. The respondents further revealed that they were moderately associated with Soilex (2.65) while they further revealed that they were less associated with Rubicon and Blue Ring; this is shown by means scores of 2.26 and 2.48 respectively on the continuous likert scale. The respondents further stated that they would like to be associated with orbit chemicals, trade house and wurth.

4.4.8 Detergent Company Trusted Most

Figure 4.9 summarized which company is trusted the most by the respondents.
According to 55.6% of the respondents, Ecolab is the detergent company most trusted while 27.8% of the respondents revealed that they trusted most Diversy company. On the other hand, 16.7% of the respondents revealed that they trusted Odex most.

4.4.9 Whether there is Another Company That Is Similar in Offerings

Table 4.14 contains a summary of whether the respondents consider the detergent companies listed to have another one with similar offerings.

Table 4.14 Whether there is Another Company That Is Similar in Offerings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>No Response</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ecolab</td>
<td>75.0</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversey</td>
<td>77.8</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Odex</td>
<td>52.8</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>44.4</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rubicon</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>86.1</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soilex</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>77.8</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue Ring</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>80.6</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Primary Data

On this section, the study sought to find out whether for each of the above detergent companies, there is another company that is similar in offerings. On Ecolab, 75% of the respondents agreed that there is another company that is similar in offerings while on Diversy, 77.8% of the
respondents agreed. Further, 52.8% agreed that there is a similar company that is similar in offerings while on Soilex 19.4% of the respondents agreed.

4.4.10 Detergent Company the Respondents Would Buy From and Reasons Behind It

Table 4.15 summarizes the company that the respondents would buy form and the reasons supporting the decision.

Table 4.15 Detergent Company the Respondents Would Buy From and Reasons Behind It

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Ecolab</th>
<th>Diversy</th>
<th>Odex</th>
<th>Rubicon</th>
<th>Soilex</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quality</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>38.9</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ease of use</td>
<td>47.2</td>
<td>41.7</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innovation</td>
<td>58.3</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trustworthiness</td>
<td>52.8</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship with supplier’s staff</td>
<td>41.7</td>
<td>38.9</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suppliers corporate image</td>
<td>58.3</td>
<td>36.1</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Quality</td>
<td>58.3</td>
<td>30.6</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Primary Data

On the Ecolab Company, 66.7% of the respondents revealed that they would from the company due to the quality; 47.2% because of ease of use; 58.3% because of innovation; 52.8% because of trustworthiness; 41.7% because of relationship with supplier’s staff; and 58.3% because of suppliers’ corporate image and service quality respectively. On the other hand, 38.9% revealed that they would buy from Diversy because of quality and relationship with supplier’s staff; 41.7% because of ease of use while 33.3% because of innovation and trustworthiness respectively.

4.4.11 The Detergent Company/ Brand That Deliver Their Promise the Most

Table 4.16 depicts the company that is perceived to deliver on its promises the most.
### Table 4.16 The Detergent Company/Brand That Deliver Their Promise the Most

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Delivers the Most</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7 - Delivers the least</th>
<th>No response</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ecolab</td>
<td>52.8</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversey</td>
<td>27.8</td>
<td>44.4</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Odex</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>30.6</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>38.9</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rubicon</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>77.8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soilex</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>75.0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue Ring</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>75.0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Primary Data

The study shows that 52.8% of the respondents revealed that Ecolab delivered the most while 27.8% revealed that Diversey delivered the most. The two companies were ranked high in delivering. Further the respondents ranked the other companies as shown Odex (5.6%); Rubicon (2.8%); Soilex (5.6%); Blue Ring (2.8%).

### 4.4.12 Order of Preference- Company's Brands the Respondents Would Like To Stock

Table 4.17 contains data on the preference of the company’s detergents that the respondents would like to stock the most.

### Table 4.17 Order of Preference

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1 - Most preferred</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7 - Least preferred</th>
<th>No response</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ecolab</td>
<td>61.1</td>
<td>27.8</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversey</td>
<td>36.1</td>
<td>44.4</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Odex</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>27.8</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rubicon</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td></td>
<td>80.6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soilex</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td></td>
<td>72.2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue Ring</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>75.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Primary Data

The study shows that 61.1% of the respondents most preferred Ecolab while 36.1% most preferred Diversey; 8.3% most preferred Odex while 5.6% most preferred Rubicon and Soilex
respectively. On the other hand, 2.8% of the respondents revealed that they least preferred Soilex and Blue Ring respectively.

4.4.13 Recommendations of the study to Ecolab East Africa Ltd
The respondents gave various recommendations to Ecolab East Africa Ltd on how they can enhance brand management. The respondents revealed that Ecolab need to do aggressive marketing and make follow-ups on their customers, be flexible on pricing, better customer care, faster delivery, faster response rate, to harmonize the customer requirements in all departments; improve product documentation and make available to the end user through interest; more customer visits; recognizing branding to ease product identification in the market; regular training, follow-up on missing items, offering samples of new products, and appreciating the brand users. However, some respondents revealed that they were satisfied and happy with Ecolab.
CHAPTER FIVE: SUMMARY OF FINDINGS, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1. Introduction

This chapter covers the summary of findings, conclusion and findings of the study. The chapter is split into sections such as summary of findings, conclusions and recommendations.

5.2. Summary of Findings.

The following are the key findings of the study. The objectives of this study were to determine the corporate brand image of Ecolab East Africa Limited as perceived by its customers and to determine how the perception of the corporate image influences the business customer decision making process.

On the brand purchase process, majority of the respondents revealed that they bought branded detergents. The study established that majority of the customers were current users while on the other hand majority of the respondents indicated that they were heavy users. Majority of the respondents also indicated that they were currently users of competitor brands. On the attributes considered before purchasing the detergents, majority of the respondents revealed that they considered: quality of the product; both price and quality; supplier's reputation; price of the product; technology and product design/ packaging as the most important attributes before purchasing industrial detergents, in that order. However, the brand name of the product was just considered as moderately. The respondents further stated that they considered attributes such as brand availability, innovation, Packaging size and performance as well.

On the source of information used to make purchase decisions, majority of the respondents revealed that they conducted an extensive information search on which brands to purchase, before the purchase process while others indicated that they compared a few brands. Findings from the study indicate that most customers will research on at least three different varieties of brands before they purchase. Ecolab’s brand image is also clearly recognized by every respondent who was surveyed. From the Logos shown in the questionnaire, a high percent of the respondents had knowledge of Ecolab’s logo. Findings also show that the respondents hold the
use of Ecolab’s brands in high esteem because they would like to be associated with Ecolab and trust the detergent company the highest amongst its competitors.

The study further established that majority of the respondents considered branded detergents to be of better quality than non-branded detergents. They further agreed that well known brands act as a status symbol among the customers. Findings also established that the inter-departmental decision played a major role in the purchase decision of detergents; only a few of the respondents revealed that the departmental decision played a major role. Further the study established that the customers experienced the following barriers in purchasing of branded detergents from Ecolab: Functional (Will the product function as I expect); Physical (Will the product harm my staff or processed food/Beverage?); Financial (can I afford the purchase?); Time (How much time and efforts will I expend to make this purchase?); and how much do you care about your choice of detergent brands?, in that order.

An overwhelming number of the respondents revealed that they cared about the choice of detergent brands to purchase. On the brands that the respondents would like to be associated with, majority of the respondents indicated that they would like to be associated with Ecolab, Diversey and Odex, in that order. The respondents further stated that they also would like to be associated with orbit chemicals. According to majority of the respondents, Ecolab is the detergent company most trusted followed by Diversy Company and Odex in that order.

On the brand that the company would buy and the reasons behind it, majority of the respondents indicated that they would buy from Ecolab Company due to the quality, ease of use, innovation, trustworthiness, relationship with supplier’s staff and because of suppliers’ corporate image and service quality respectively. On the other hand, a few revealed that they would buy from Diversey as their second choice.

Findings from the study also show that Ecolab’s brand image is clearly differentiated in the customers mind as compared to the nearest competitor. Ecolab also is the company that most respondent would buy from as it ranks very high on the issues that its customers hold as the main reasons for purchasing. Detergents offered by Ecolab would be most favorable to be bought by the customers.
Lastly, the customers gave recommendations to Ecolab East Africa Ltd in order to enhance brand management. According to the customers, Ecolab should do aggressive marketing and make follow-ups on their customers, be flexible on pricing, give better customer care and ensure faster delivery and faster response rate. The customers further stated that Ecolab need to make more customer visits; make the brand more recognizable to ease product identification in the market and offering samples of new products, and appreciating the brand users.

5.3 Conclusions

The following conclusions were made based on the summary of the findings:

The study concluded that most customers will generally liaise with other departments in the purchase decision process and will ask for at least three quotations before making their purchase request. The fact that the brand name was ranked the least showed that most customers will not necessarily care on what the detergent’s brand name is, but rather the corporate brand image determines which detergent will be bought from. Ecolab’s corporate image is very strong as the image has high relevance and clear differentiation to its customers.

Quality, price and suppliers reputation are what most customers value the most when making the purchase decision. Managers therefore need to focus on ensuring that the detergents produced deliver on performance in terms of cleanliness and hygiene and the company’s promises to the customers are fulfilled to ensure that the company has a good reputation.

The study concludes that customer experience barriers in making decisions on the detergents brand to buy. The most common brands are functional, that is will the product function as i expect; second barrier is physical; that is, will the product harm my staff or processed food/Beverage? And lastly the financial barrier (can I afford the purchase?).
5.4 Recommendations of the Study

The following recommendations were made based on the summary and conclusions of the study:

The study recommends that for Ecolab to remain competitive in marketing of its products, the company should ensure that their products meet the best quality, affordable price and ensure continued innovations. Moreover, the company should give customers trust on their brand so that the customers can make sound decisions and overcome barriers such as the functional, and the physical barriers.

5.5 Limitation of the study

All research studies have several limitations and this study is no exception. Given such an ambitious endeavor, the research findings have inherent limitations. This study suffered from low number of responses. Not all companies responded to the questionnaire sent out. It also focused on companies in Nairobi only while Ecolab has presence in East and central Africa. Further studies would benefit from conducting a study in these countries as well.
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APPENDICES

APPENDIX A: STUDY QUESTIONNAIRE

CORPORATE BRAND IMAGE AND THE BUSINESS CUSTOMER DECISION MAKING PROCESS OF DETERGENTS IN ECOLAB EAST AFRICA (K) LTD

Thank you for taking the time to complete this questionnaire. Please ensure that you complete all questions by ticking all that apply. Completion of this questionnaire is voluntary and all responses will remain confidential.

A. DEMOGRAPHICS

1. Name of organization/ company:

2. How can you describe the ownership of the organization?

   Multinational ( )

   Local ( )

   Other

3. What is the sales turnover per Annum (Kenya Shillings, Millions)

   Less than 100 M ( )

   100M to 500 M ( )

   500M to 1B ( )

   1B and above ( )

4. In which sub-sector does your company belong to?

   Meat/Poultry/Fisheries ( )

   Dairy and dairy processing
Cooking oils and Edible fats

Baking

Sugar and confectionery

Alcoholic/Non-alcoholic Beverages

Fruits and vegetable Processing

Five star hotel

Four star hotel

Three star hotel

Hospitals

Schools

Quick Service restaurant

Others

B. BRAND PURCHASE PROCESS

5. Does your company buy branded detergents?
   Yes ( )
   No ( )

6. In the following sections, how would you describe your involvement in the brand purchase process?
Decision maker or influencer
( ) Decision Maker
( ) Influencer

New, current or previous user
( ) New
( ) current
( ) Previous

Type of user
( ) Occasional
( ) Light
( ) Heavy

Currently a user of Competitor brands
( ) Yes
( ) No

Source of information used to make purchase decisions (in order of priority)
1.
2.
3.
4.

6. What is the most important attribute that you consider before purchasing industrial detergents? (Please use the following scale: (1) Not important at all, (2) Less important, (3) Moderately important, (4) Important, (5) Highly important)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attribute</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Price of the product</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of the product</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both price and quality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brand name of the product</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Product design/ packaging</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplier’s reputation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others (Please specify)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7. To which extent do you conduct information search on which brands to purchase, before the purchase process?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Information Search</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>I don’t know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Extensive information search</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compared only few brands</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited information search</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No information search</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. How many types of brands do you consider before buying a detergent?

   One  ( )
   Two  ( )
   Three ( )
   Four ( )
   More than four ( )

9. In your opinion, do you consider branded detergents to be of better quality than non-branded detergents?

   Yes I agree  ( )
   No I don’t agree  ( )
   Not necessarily  ( )
   I agree but not always true  ( )

10. Do well known brands act as a status symbol to you among your customers?

    Yes, I agree  ( )
No, I don’t agree ( )
Not necessarily ( )
I agree but not always true ( )

11. Does your organization prefer branded detergents to non-branded detergents?

Always ( )
Frequently ( )
Sometimes ( )
Never ( )

C. BRANDS AND ORGANIZATIONAL PURCHASE DECISION PROCESS

12. Who plays the major role in the purchase decision of detergents?

Own Decision ( )
Departmental Decision ( )
Inter-departmental Decision ( )
Others (Specify)

13. How would you rank the following barriers to purchasing of branded detergents from Ecolab? (1) Not important at all, (2) Less important, (3) Moderately important, (4) Important, (5) Highly important)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Functional (Will the product perform as I expect?)</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Physical (Will the product harm my staff or processed food/Beverage?)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

45
Social (what will my peers/colleagues think?)

Financial (can I afford the purchase?)

Time (How much time and efforts will I expend to make this purchase?)

Functional (Will the product perform as I expect?)

Physical (Will the product harm my staff or processed food/Beverage?)

14. How much do you care about your choice of detergent brands?
   (a) Care ( )
   (b) Somewhat care ( )
   (c) Don’t care ( )

15. Name five companies that come into mind when you think of industrial detergents.
   (a)
   (b)
   (c)
   (d)

16. Identify the brands form the logos shown below.

![Logo 1]

![Logo 2]

![Logo 3]

17. Which Company’s brands would you like to be most associated with? (1) Not associated at all, (2) Less associated, (3) Moderately Associated, (4) Associated (5) Highly Associated

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Ecolab</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Diversey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Odex</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Soilex</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Rubicon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Blue Ring</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Others (Please specify)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

18. From your experience, which of the following detergent companies do you trust most?

(a) Ecolab
(b) Diversey
(c) Odex
(d) Soilex
(e) Blue Ring
(f) Others (Please Specify)

19. For each of the following detergent companies, do you feel that there is another company that is similar in offerings?

(a) Ecolab (Yes) (No)
(b) Diversey (Yes) (No)
(c) Odex (Yes) (No)
(d) Rubicon (Yes) (No)
(e) Soilex (Yes) (No)
(f) Blue Ring (Yes) (No)
(g) Others (Specify)
20. For the following reasons, which detergent company would you buy from?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Situations</th>
<th>Ecolab</th>
<th>Diversey</th>
<th>Odex</th>
<th>Rubicon</th>
<th>Soilex</th>
<th>Blue ring</th>
<th>Others</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Quality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Ease of use</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Innovation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Trustworthiness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Relationship with supplier’s staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Supplier’s corporate image</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Service Quality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

21. Which detergent company/ Brand would you rank as to deliver their promise the most? (1 delivers the most and 7 delivers the least)

(a) Ecolab

(b) Diversey

(c) Odex

(d) Rubicon

(e) Soilex
(f) Blue Ring
(g) Others (specify)

22. In order of preference, which company’s brands would you like to stock? (1 Most preferred the most and 7 least preferred)

(a) Ecolab
(b) Diversey
(c) Odex
(d) Rubicon
(e) Soilex
(f) Blue Ring
(g) Others (specify)

17. What do you think needs to be done by Ecolab East Africa Ltd, to enhance the brand management so as to ease the purchase decision making process?

Filed By: ________________________________________________________________

Designation: __________________________________________________________

Your cooperation is highly appreciated.
APPENDIX B: LIST OF ECOLAB’S FOOD AND BEVERAGE CUSTOMERS IN NAIROBI

1. Kenya Breweries Limited
2. Farmers’ Choice Limited
3. Kenchic Limited
4. Frigoken Kenya Limited
5. Kenya Wines Agencies Limited
6. Coca Cola Juices (K) Limited
7. Glaxo Smithkline (K) Limited
8. Nestle (K) Limited
9. SC Johnson (K) Limited
10. Glacier Products
11. Kevian (K) Limited
12. Crown Beverages (K) Limited
13. Wrigley’s Company (E.A) Limited
14. Wilham (K) Ltd
15. Nampak (K) Limited
16. Brookeside Dairy Limited
17. Highland canners
18. Mini Bakeries Limited
19. Chemserve Limited
20. Kenya Nut Company Limited
21. Del Monte (K) Limited
22. Lasap (K) Limited
23. Ennsvalley Bakery
24. Vegpro (K) Ltd
25. Prime water company Ltd
26. Pristine Water Ltd
27. Sarova Stanley Hotel
28. Ecka Hotel
29. Karen Hospital
30. Nairobi Hospital
31. Boma Hotel
32. Oozebeco
33. Nas servair
34. Southern sun Hotel
35. Fairmont Hotel
36. Brackenhurst Hotel and Lodge
37. Nairobi Bottlers
38. Kuku foods Lomited
39. Panari Hotel
40. Crowne Plaza
41. Intercontinental Hotel
42. Hilton Hotel
43. Getrudes Hospital
44. Fairview Hotel
45. Sanbkara Hotel
46. Safari Park Hotel
47. Utalii Hotel
48. Sandton Palace Hotel
49. Ole Sereni Hotel
50. Laice Regency Hotel
51. 680 Hotel
52. Clarion Hotel
53. Hotel La Mada
54. Tech Pack Industries
55. Oryx Hotel
56. Oakwood Hotel
57. Steers
58. Peppers Restaurant
59. Aga Khan Hospital
60. Braeburn Schools
61. Strathmore University
62. Catholic University
63. Daystar University
64. International School Of Kenya
65. Kenya Airways

Source: Ecolab East Africa (K) Ltd customer database