International Journal of Trade and Commerce-IIARTC
January-June 2014, Volume 3, No. 1
ISSN-2277-5811 (Print), 2278-9065 (Online)

Herbal (Organic) Cosmetics the way ahead in Modern India

Sameer A. Virani

Associate Prof, METIOM.
Email id: sameerv_iom@met.edu., viranisameer@yahoo.com .9892016968

Abstract

Purpose/Research aim of this research is to identify various factors and their perception amongst the consumers on consumers belonging to various income groups , this paper investigates how the need for this research comes from growing consciousness of ill effects of chemical based cosmetics almost Indian customers. In the light of these developments, it seems important for a retail chain of perfumes and ***cosmetics*** *stores, to use its competitive advantage and effectively apply right communications and Segmentations strategies towards* ***organic cosmetics range****. For Design/methodology/approach the research approach used both, exploratory qualitative tool such ad FGD and quantitative research tool such as Factor analysis and ANOVA. For obtaining qualitative data, eight beauty experts were invited for F.G.D. This qualitative data became the basis of the quantitative study consisting of a survey with 100 respondents. Findings The using of a various communications strategies in their campaign and proper segmentation , which may prevent the wrong positioning of brand images or help the* ***organic*** *brand reflecting a different positioning as compared to non organic counter parts.*

Key Words: *Organic cosmetics, Segmentation, Communication channels*

PAPER/ARTICLE INFO
RECEIVED ON: 15/09/2013
ACCEPTED ON: 12/06/2014

Reference to this paper should be made as follows: Sameer A. Virani (2014) "Herbal (Organic) Cosmetics the way ahead in Modern India" *Int. J. of Trade and Commerce-IIARTC*, Vol. 3, No. 1, pp. 182-194

**Corresponding Author*

1. INTRODUCTION

Indians have become more image conscious, growing income levels, corporatization, Life style and increasing consumer awareness has led to rapid expansion of Cosmetic Industry today in India. The Indian Cosmetics Industry is defined as skin care, hair care, color cosmetics, fragrances and oral care segments, which stood at an estimated $2.5 billion in 2008 and is too expected to grow at 17%, Andrew (2010) Increasing spending power has made cosmetic industry one of the most rapidly growing industries in India, providing significant Marketing opportunities in India. In India Cosmetics largely consists of -Lips, Nails, Eyes, Face, Brushes & Accessories, home Fragrances deodorants, shaving and grooming, soaps, Hand and Nail Care, Body Lotion, Moisturizer, Lips Care. Face Treatment, face wash, Scrubs**.** HUL, P& G, Vicco, Dabur, Fair and Lovely , Ponds are few of major Cosmetic Brands in India. Indian cosmetic sector can be largely divided into two parts i.e., Chemical based Cosmetics which are largely sold by Brands such as Ponds, Lakme, HUL etc. and Herbal or Organic based Cosmetics , VICCO and DABUR and EMAMI are prominent Brands in this Segment. Brand like HUL are majorly into chemical based cosmetics with AVIANCE and AYUSH . AVIANCE has both chemical as well as Herbal range. Aviance's Organic range includes brands like nature coconut shampoo , Aloe Vera etc , Ayush has totally scientific based organic therapies for beauty. On the other hand brands like Dabur , Vicco, Himalaya , Emamai etc are almost entirely Organic in nature.

Shilpa(2010) The herbal cosmetics industry is "driving growth in the beauty business" in India and is expected to grow at a rate of seven percent as more people shun chemical products in favour of organic ones. The emphasis of the herbal cosmetic has been on the growth. The Herbal and Ayurvedic beauty products business was introduced in India by beauty expert Shahnaz Husain who was the first to introduce the concept of Ayurvedic cosmetics to the world when she launched her products way back in 1970. Today, the Indian cosmetics industry has a plethora of herbal cosmetic brands like Forest Essentials, Biotique, Himalaya, Blossom Kochhar, VLCC, Dabur and Lotus and many more. Despite concept and heritage of Ayurveda being in India for thousands of years and Indian attachment to nature is more than any other Civilization , Market share of Organic cosmetics as compared Total cosmetic Industry is very low. This Paper investigates how—Corporate can increase the market share of Herbal Range in India. Traditionally, Organic Cosmetics have never been Marketed or Promoted by Brands. Consumer perception is now changing; Marketing of Herbal or Organic Cosmetics has now become new Concept of Marketing and Brand Building. In this paper Researcher has tried to understand and do a Comparative analysis for both Organic and Chemical based Cosmetics with regards to the Perception of Consumers about Various Factors that are important during the Decision making process for the purchase of cosmetic products. Finally the Researcher has also Designed recommendations for Organic Brands which he believes will help them to increase their market share in a highly dominated in organic Cosmetic Industry.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

Main focus in this literature Review is to highlight various prominent researches that have been conducted for Branding and Promotion of Organic Cosmetics .This will help us in understanding what can be various ways in which Organic Brands can increase their visibility and likeability vis-

a-vis chemical based cosmetics, and to understand what Marketing and Branding strategies have been suggested by various researchers for the same. Traditional selling and Advertising practices for Cosmetics include 1. Departmental Stores 2. Flagship Stores 3. Spas/Salons 4. Medical Clinics 5.Drugstores 6.Supermarkets 7.Mass Category Speciality Stores 8. Direct Selling 9. TV Advertising, Radio Advertising , Celebrities promotion , Sponsorships, Corporate Branding etc. for Organic Brands needs to create a Marketing Mix so as to create an opportunity to increase their market share in highly dominated inorganic Brands of Cosmetics.

Chein et al. (2010) maintains that by utilizing creative and intelligent, and unique strategies and tools new brands can be among the global competitors. Internet sales at manageable costs for small companies are suggested. They also discuss the propensity for women to purchase online beauty products. They further mention that answering customer's queries and providing knowledge about the products is vital. Corporate Branding is another way in which Organic Brands can leverage their products. **Steinberg et al. (2011) i**n the article examines the marketing of a product line of cosmetics by CBS Corp.'s Consumer Products Division and Sony Pictures Television, broadcasters and producers of the television soap opera "The Young & the Restless," with the brand name Jabot, based on Jabot Cosmetics, a fictional company which is prominent in the plot of the program. The companies have a marketing agreement with actual cosmetics industry firm Fusion Brands, which will produce the product. **Makarychev (2011)** in his research he shows Influence of Corporate Branding on Launching of Organic Cosmetic Brand Chain in Cyprus. In this paper the researcher, discusses consumer and employee research, the paper investigates how the corporate branding strategy influences on a successful product line extension towards organic cosmetics in a retail chain of perfumes and cosmetics stores in Cyprus. Celebrities can be handy to create visibility for Organic Brands, In country like India where Celebrities are being Idolized, they can be useful in many ways. In India we have two types of celebrities Cricketing and Film industry; these celebs have tremendous impact on. **Antioto (2012)** discusses how in the last several years, marketers have started to use "nonidealized" models in advertisements (i.e., "Dove's Campaign for Real Beauty"). However product demand little is known about the effects of "non-idealized" advertising on consumers and whether this type of advertising-when compared to idealized advertising-is truly beneficial for the branded products promoted in these ads. **Trumpe et al. (2011)** compared the consumption with non consumption situations; they proposed and tested the self-activation effect of advertisements, which holds that attractiveness-relevant products in advertisements can increase consumer self-activation and lower consumer self-evaluation. **Digital Marketing** is another good way for Organic Brands to create visibility and likeability among consumers. **Viveiros (2007)** in article discusses the key role played by Marisa Thalberg, vice president of global digital marketing of cosmetics giant Estée Lauder, in building the sales and brand of the company. **Promotion of events** is another way in which cosmetic brands have been able to create positive image in the minds of consumers. **Jesitus et al. (2012)** in the article discusses the right ways of organizing, hosting and scheduling of promotional events on cosmetics for male patients. To sum up the above it can be said that there are various promotion tools that can be used by Organic Brands to create positive image in the minds of the consumers.

3. RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY: OBTAINING PRIMARY DATA AND INSTRUMENT DEVELOPMENT

The Research approach embraced both exploratory qualitative and Survey based on quantitative approach. For obtaining qualitative based, Primary Data that is to identify the variables which are important for consumers in buying decisions of cosmetics. A Focus Group Discussion (F.G.D) was conducted with Eight Beauty Experts in the city of Mumbai. Once these important Variable were identified using FGD, these variables became a part of first Questionnaire (Construct). 150 Respondents were identified across the city. The respondents were asked to fill a Self Administered Questionnaire, which consisted of the variables identified I FGD , all of these variables had to be Rated on the Scale of 1 to 7 indicating their agreeability towards importance of each variable in the decision making process for the purchase of Cosmetic Products. These Questionnaires would then be analyzed using Factor Analysis to reduce the number of variables from many too few. Prior to carrying out Factor analysis, reliability analysis for Scale was carried out to understand the reliability of scale. Then a total of 100 questionnaires was administered by using self administered technique , These Variables were Rated on A scale of 1 to 7 to understand the Agreeability and the importance of each of these variables in the decision making process for buying of cosmetics. Using Factor Analysis these variables were converted into factors. These newly found Factor were now manageable to carry further treatment, by using One way ANOVA for to test various Hypothesis .

Item-Total Statistics

	Scale Mean if Item Deleted	Scale Variance if Item Deleted	Corrected Item-Total Correlation	Squared Multiple Correlation	Cronbach's Alpha if Item Deleted
Variety	84.4000	440.779	-.151	.	.869
Packaging	83.7500	413.882	.367	.	.861
Gragrance	84.0000	402.737	.509	.	.857
Trend	82.8500	395.082	.546	.	.855
Staff	83.4000	420.042	.234	.	.864
Safety	84.7000	416.747	.446	.	.860
Safe Environment	83.7000	397.063	.530	.	.856
Quality	84.9000	433.253	.154	.	.865
Social response	82.6000	389.621	.585	.	.854
Price	83.8500	425.503	.111	.	.868
Sales promo.	82.8500	388.871	.556	.	.855
Sampling	82.6000	395.200	.496	.	.857
Discounts	82.5000	414.263	.250	.	.864
Bonus	82.5500	426.787	.089	.	.869
Edu-program	81.0500	385.313	.610	.	.853
Sponsorships	81.3500	390.345	.558	.	.855

Celebs	81.2000	393.432	.496	.	.857
Press adv	81.7500	387.145	.648	.	.852
Tv adv	82.4500	392.366	.567	.	.855
Radio adv	81.0500	401.734	.451	.	.858
Direct mail	81.0500	394.576	.475	.	.858
website	82.3500	407.608	.333	.	.862
Outlet type	83.9500	424.050	.226	.	.864
Word of mouth	84.2000	415.642	.406	.	.860
Merchandising	83.5000	414.579	.328	.	.862
Prent brand fit	83.6000	421.305	.309	.	.862
Testers	84.3000	411.800	.458	.	.859
Leaflets	82.9000	401.989	.357	.	.862

Scale Statistics Reliability statistics						
Mean	**Variance**	**Std. Deviation**	**N of Items**	**Cronbach's Alpha**	**Cronbach's Alpha Based on Standardized Items**	**N of Items**
86.0500	435.734	20.87425	28	.864	.858	28

Nargundkar (2007) found that if the Alpha Value for Scale is 0.7 or more, it is usually considered to be a good scale. If the item to total Correlation for an item is low you can consider to drop an item from scale. In our Output for Reliability Analysis we are examining the Scale which has 28 items . What we find is that scale reliability is 0.858. If we see item to total correlation we see that there are many variables which have a low value for item to total correlations, we can drop these items from the scale. But the researcher feels it is not important to drop these items from the scale, finally it is to the researchers discretion.

Rotated Component Matrix[a]								
	Component							
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
Variety	-.090	.373	-.035	-.282	.214	.348	.593	.013
Packaging	-.040	.467	.137	.189	.646	.027	.125	-.058
Fragrance	.290	.249	.124	-.266	.683	.043	-.167	.079
Trend	.358	-.063	.022	.063	.748	.166	.123	-.052
Staff	-.269	.192	.088	.065	.579	-.057	.459	.201
Safety	.195	.750	.155	-.205	.044	.378	.013	.057

Safe Environment	-.089	.512	.370	-.038	.203	.596	-.147	.068
Quality	.126	.714	.053	-.415	.012	.318	.202	-.009
Social resp	.127	.018	.065	.049	.076	.895	.117	-.112
Price	.054	.182	.508	-.373	-.087	.168	.302	.458
Sales promo	.228	.050	.809	-.056	.120	.093	-.024	.237
Sampling	.108	.195	.829	-.041	.132	.043	-.018	-.139
Discounts	.275	-.035	.721	.139	-.010	.066	.260	-.312
Bonus	.375	-.095	.182	.249	.061	-.007	.736	-.015
Edu program	.438	-.280	.298	.337	-.013	.408	.130	.219
Sponsorships	.202	.131	-.021	.875	-.063	.069	.064	-.025
Celebs	.560	.053	-.033	.667	.252	-.048	.078	.110
Press adv	.836	.073	.127	.308	.053	-.007	-.075	.079
Tv adv	.895	.104	.012	.079	.164	.153	-.080	-.011
Radio adv	.715	-.235	.337	-.081	.013	.088	.127	.100
Direct mail	.716	-.007	.276	.156	-.085	-.074	.144	.025
Website	.505	.348	-.028	.303	.216	-.316	.196	.317
Outlet type	-.003	.821	-.084	.194	-.046	-.145	.053	.021
Word of mouth	.111	.792	.038	.065	.256	-.103	.008	-.012
Merchandising	.556	.289	.029	-.148	.261	.131	.123	.110
Prent brand fit	.028	.324	-.125	.279	-.184	.205	-.037	.477
Testers	-.175	.707	.271	.203	.278	.056	-.054	.019
Leaflets	.197	-.114	-.021	-.031	.125	-.171	.012	.790
Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.								

The first step in analyzing this output is to look at factors extracted, their Eigen values and cumulative percentage of variance. We can see from COM PCT VAR column that Eight factors extracted together accounted for 75.248 % of the total variance. When we look at the total number of variables we can see that this is very good because we are able to economize 28 variables into 8 factors. While we are losing only 25% of content only 75 % of content is retained in 8 factors extracted. Now, the second task which follows to interprete what these eight factors extracted represent. This can be accomplished by looking at rotated and non-rotated factor matrix following tables. When we see Rotated Factor Matrix, we notice that variables number 18, 19, 20, 21 have loadings of 0.836, 0.895, 0.715, 0.716 respectively on factor 1. This suggests that factor 1 is the combination of these four original variables. There is no problem in interpreting factor 1 as combination of Press Advertisement, TV Advertisement, Radio Advertisement and Direct Mail

we have named factor one as **Communication tools** (strategies). Now when we look into interpretation for Factor two we can see from output that Factor 2 suggests that factor 2 is combination of Variables 6 and 8 , 24 and 27 respectively which has loadings of .750 and .714 .792 and .707 respectively. Therefore, there is no problem in interpreting factor 2 as combination of Safety, Quality, Word of Mouth and Testers. We can name this factor as **standardization**, further Factor 3 suggests that factor 3 is combination of three of the original variables i.e., variable 11, 12 and 13 with loadings of .809,.829, and .721 respectively . Therefore, there is no problem in interpreting factor 3 as combination of Sales Promotion, Discounts and Bonus. Researcher has renamed this Factor as **ADD ON.** Factor 4 is combination of the following original variables i.e., 16 and 17. Therefore, there is no problem in interpreting factor 4 as combination of Sponsorship and Celebrities factor as Branding, Brand power. Now when we look into interpretation for factor five we can see from the output that Factor 5 is combination of 2, 3, 4, and 5 of the original variables with loadings of .646,.683,.748,.579 respectively . Therefore, there is no problem in interpreting factor 5 as combination Packaging, Fragrance, Trend, and Staff. The Researcher has renamed this as **Aesthetics**. Now when we look into interpretation for factor six, we can see from output that Factor 6 is combination of the following two of the original variables, Variable 7 and Variable 9 with loadings of .596 and .895 respectively Therefore, there is no problem in interpreting factor 6 as combination of Environment Safety and Social Responsibility. I have renamed this factor as **Social responsibility.** Now, when we look into interpretation for factor seven we can see from output that Factor 7 suggests combination of these two original variables, Variable 1 and Variable 15 with their loadings of 0.593 and 0.736 respectively. Therefore there is no problem in interpreting factor 7 as combination of variety and Education Program, therefore, we name this factor as Education. Now when we look into interpretation for factor eight we can see from output that Factor 8 consists of only one variable of the original variables that is 28th with loading of .79. Therefore, there is no problem in interpreting factor 8 consisting of only 1 variable i.e., Leaflets.

Finally, one way ANOVA on few of these important factors. Here the researcher is trying to understand if there is any significant difference in the mean ratings of girls between age group of 15 to 30 belonging to three income groups about the perception of few important factors identified from factor analysis namely Standardization, Communication tools and ADD Ons.

Hypothesis 1: H_0: There is no significant difference in Mean Rating across three income groups about the Perception of Standardization for Organic Brands of Cosmetics.

Ha : At least one population mean is different from the others.

ANOVA

addon_org

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	6.273	3	2.091	.928	.432
Within Groups	159.913	71	2.252		
Total	166.187	74			

From the output of ANOVA table we can see that (F) statistic equals to 0.928 with a corresponding p- value 0.432. Hence, **we fail to reject Null Hypothesis** and conclude that these data provide substantial evidence of at least no significant difference in the mean ratings among three income groups of girls.

Hypothesis 2 : Ho : There is no significant difference in Mean Rating across three income groups about the Perception of Standardization for Herbal Brands of Cosmetics .

Ha : At least one population mean is different from the others.

ANOVA					
stand_org					
	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	36.027	2	18.013	7.426	.001
Within Groups	174.640	72	2.426		
Total	210.667	74			

From the output of ANOVA table we can see that (F) statistic equals to 7.426 with a corresponding p- value 0.001**. Reject**. Null Hypothesis (H_0) and conclude that these data provide substantial evidence that there insignificant difference in the mean ratings among three income groups of girls.

Hypothesis 3 : Ho : There is no significant difference in Mean Rating across three income groups about the Perception of effectiveness of **Communications tools** used for Organic Brands of Cosmetics .

Ha: At least one population mean is different from the others.

ANOVA					
communc_org					
	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	23.707	2	11.853	4.154	.020
Within Groups	205.440	72	2.853		
Total	229.147	74			

From the output of ANOVA table we can see that (F) statistic equals to 4.154 with a corresponding p- value 0.020. Hence we **Reject** Null Hypothesis and conclude that these data provide substantial evidence of at least one significant difference in the mean ratings among three income groups of girls.

Now, we know that means are not all same hence we now need to find out where the difference lies. To answer this question we conducted a Post- Hoc test, researcher used Tukey's Honestly significant Difference Test. When we look at the Descriptives of Group Means we see the following table:

Descriptive								
communc_org								
	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
less than 50,000	25	3.4000	1.89297	.37859	2.6186	4.1814	1.00	6.00
income 50,000-100,000	25	3.6000	1.75594	.35119	2.8752	4.3248	1.00	7.00
income more than 1 llakh	25	4.6800	1.37598	.27520	4.1120	5.2480	2.00	6.00
Total	75	3.8933	1.75971	.20319	3.4885	4.2982	1.00	7.00

Multiple Comparisons						
communc_org Tukey HSD						
(I) income	(J) income	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound
less than 50,000	income 50,000-100,000	-.20000	.47777	.908	-1.3434	.9434
	income more than 1 llakh	-1.28000*	.47777	.025	-2.4234	-.1366
income 50,000-100,000	less than 50,000	.20000	.47777	.908	-.9434	1.3434
	income more than 1 llakh	-1.08000	.47777	.068	-2.2234	.0634
income more than 1 llakh	less than 50,000	1.28000*	.47777	.025	.1366	2.4234
	income 50,000-100,000	1.08000	.47777	.068	-.0634	2.2234
*. The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.						

The first line of the table indicates pair-wise comparison of the mean ratings between income category of 50, 000 and 50,000 to 1 lakh. The mean difference listed is -.2000 lack of asterisk suggests that the difference is insignificant , further we see that comparison of mean ratings between income category of less than 50, 000 and category of more than 1 lakh we see the mean difference is -1.2800 and an asterisk (*) is displayed next to it. Indicating that, this represents significant difference. Looking back at group means in the descriptive section , we can conclude

that Girls in the income group of below 50, 000 have better ratings for communications of organic Brands of cometics as compared to Women between income group of more than 1 lakh. The rest of the differences are insignificant. Hence, we can conclude that as far as belief that Organic cosmetics have a good communications tools income category of below 50, 000 have a lower mean (indicating they agree that organic brands have good strategy) of 3.4 as compared to above 1 lakh with mean 4.6 indicating that companies manufacturing organic cosmetics need to address this issue to target audience of **girls above income category of 1 lakh who believe that Organic Cosmetics do not have good communications strategy.**

Hypothesis 4 : **Ho :** There is no significant difference in Mean Rating across three income groups about the Perception of effectiveness of Communications tools used for Chemical Brands of Cosmetics.

Ha : Atleast one population mean is different from the others.

ANOVA					
communc_chem					
	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	5.307	2	2.653	.958	.388
Within Groups	199.360	72	2.769		
Total	204.667	74			

From the output of ANOVA table we can see that (F) statistic equals to 0.958 with a corresponding p- value 0.388 which is higher than our α (0.05) . **Hence we fail to Rejct Null Hypothesis** (H_0) and conclude that these data provide substantial evidence that there is no significant difference in the mean ratings for likings towards communication strategies among three income groups of girls between age group .

Hypothesis 5 : **Ho :** There is no significant difference in Mean Rating across three income groups about the Perception of ADD ONNS offered by Herbal Brands of Cosmetics .

Ha : At least one population mean is different from the others.

ANOVA					
addon_org					
	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	27.642	3	9.214	3.354	.024
Within Groups	195.025	71	2.747		
Total	222.667	74			

From the output of ANOVA table we can see that (F) statistic equals to 3.354 with a corresponding p- value 0.005. hence we **Reject** Null Hypothesis and conclude that these data provide substantial evidence of at least one significant difference in the mean ratings among three income groups of girls.

Now we know that the means are not all same hence we now need to find out where the difference lies. To answer this question we conducted a Post- Hoc test, researcher used Tukey's Honestly significant Difference Test.

Multiple Comparisons						
addon_org Tukey HSD						
(I) income	(J) income	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound
less than 50,000	income 50,000-100,000	-1.20000*	.46552	.032	-2.3141	-.0859
	income more than 1 llakh	-1.36000*	.46552	.013	-2.4741	-.2459
income 50,000-100,000	less than 50,000	1.20000*	.46552	.032	.0859	2.3141
	income more than 1 llakh	-.16000	.46552	.937	-1.2741	.9541
income more than 1 llakh	less than 50,000	1.36000*	.46552	.013	.2459	2.4741
	income 50,000-100,000	.16000	.46552	.937	-.9541	1.2741
*. The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.						

When we look at the Descriptive of Group Means we see that
The first line of the table indicates pair-wise comparison of the mean ratings for income group less than 50, 000 and rest of the two income groups -. The mean difference listed is -1.2 and -13. Respectively, an asterisk (*) is displayed next to it. Indicating that both these represents significant difference.

Descriptive								
addon_org								
	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
less than 50,000	25	2.6800	1.57374	.31475	2.0304	3.3296	1.00	6.00
income 50,000-100,000	25	3.8800	1.92180	.38436	3.0867	4.6733	1.00	7.00
income more than 1 lakh	25	4.0400	1.39881	.27976	3.4626	4.6174	2.00	7.00

Descriptive								
addon_org								
	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
less than 50,000	25	2.6800	1.57374	.31475	2.0304	3.3296	1.00	6.00
income 50,000-100,000	25	3.8800	1.92180	.38436	3.0867	4.6733	1.00	7.00
income more than 1 lakh	25	4.0400	1.39881	.27976	3.4626	4.6174	2.00	7.00
Total	75	3.5333	1.73465	.20030	3.1342	3.9324	1.00	7.00

Looking back at group means in the descriptive section , we can conclude that Girls of different age groups have means 2.68, 3.88 and 4.04 the girls between income group of 1 lakh and above are least satisfied by ADD ONNS offered by Herbal brand of cosmetics followed by income group of 50 ,000 to 1 lakh nand then the last. Companies manufacturing Herbal brand of cosmetics need to address this issue by offering better ADD ONNS which will appeal to income groups of 1 lakh and above.

Hypothesis 6: There is no significant difference in Mean Rating across three income groups about the Perception of ADD ONNS offered by Chemical Brands of Cosmetics .

Ha : Atleast one population mean is different from the others.

ANOVA					
addon_chem					
	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	6.273	3	2.091	.928	.432
Within Groups	159.913	71	2.252		
Total	166.187	74			

From the output of ANOVA table we can see that (F) statistic equals to 0.928 with a corresponding p- value 0.432. **Hence, we accept Null Hypothesis** and conclude that these data provide substantial evidence that there is no significant difference between mean ratings among three income groups of girls.

4. KEY FINDINGS AND MANAGERIAL IMPLICATIONS

From the outputs and Testing of hypothesis it can be seen that as far as Perception of standardization of chemical and Herbal cosmetics is concerned there is no significant difference in the mean ratings of all the three income groups of women from age group of 15 to 35 years. As far as likings towards communications is concerned for Herbal brands of cosmetics, women in the income category of below 50, 000 have a lower mean (indicating they agree that organic brands

have good strategy) of 3.4 as compared to above 1 lakh with mean 4.6 indicating that companies manufacturing organic cosmetics need to address this issue to target audience of girls above income category of 1 lakh who believe that Organic Cosmetics do not have good communications strategy. Perception of communication tools for chemical brands of cosmetics. We see that there is no significant difference in the perception of all the three income categories As far as Perception of ADD ONNS offered by Companies manufacturing Herbal brand of cosmetics need to address this issue by offering better ADD ONNS which will appeal to income groups of 1 lakh and above as their perception is not very good about the add ones offered by these companies. As far as Perception of ADD ONNs offered by chemical brands of cosmetics we see that there is no significant difference in the mean ratings of all the three income groups.

REFERENCES

[1]. Advertising Age; 6/20/2011, Vol. 82 Issue 25, p1-30, 2p.
[2]. Data Analysis, with SPSS, version 16, CENGAGE LEARNING, Carver. Nash.
[3]. Global Cosmetic Industry; Jan2012, Vol. 180 Issue 1, p44-48, 4p, 1 Illustration
[4]. headlinesindia.mapsofindia.com/.../herbal-products-driving-indian-c.
[5]. Jesitus, John. *Cosmetic* Surgery Times, Feb2012, Vol. 15 Issue 2, p8-8, 2/3p
[6]. Journal of International Marketing & Marketing Research; Feb2007, Vol. 32 Issue 1, p3-15, 13p, 4 Chart
[7]. Journal of Consumer Research; Apr2011, Vol. 37 Issue 6, p1030-1045, 16p, 1 Black and White Photograph, 4 Graphs.
[8]. .Journal of Advertising Research; Mar2012, Vol. 52 Issue 1, p15-30, 16p
[9]. MAKARYCHEV, OLEKSIY; KAUFMANN, HANS RUEDIGER; TSANGARI, HARITINI; TEMPERLEY, JOHN. International Journal of Management Cases, Sep2011, Vol. 13 Issue 3, p190-199,
[10]. Marketing Research , Rajendra Nargundkar, 2nd edition,Mc Graw Hill publication.
[11]. www.stat.cmu.edu/~cshalizi/350/lectures/13/lecture-13.pdf
[12]. Viveiros, Beth Negus. Chief Marketer, Aug/Sep2011, Vol. 3 Issue 4, p12-15, 4p