

Examining Retailer Satisfaction and Preference Dynamics in Laundry Care Products: Insights from Coimbatore District

Manoj Kumar Thamotharan¹, Praveen Paul Jeyapaul²

¹Assistant Professor (Sr. Grade), Mepco School of Management Studies, Sivakasi, TN, India

Email: manothamu@mepcoeng.ac.in

² Professor, Mepco School of Management Studies, Sivakasi, TN, India

E-mail: praveen@mepcoeng.ac.in

ABSTRACT

This study investigates the factors impacting retailer satisfaction with laundry care products among 321 retailers in the Coimbatore district. Using a descriptive research design, the research assesses the relationship between satisfaction and marketing mix elements such as product, price, place, and promotion. Analytical methods, including Chi-square tests, regression analysis, and ANCOVA, reveal significant insights into retailer preferences and satisfaction drivers across store types, locations, and years of experience. Results indicate that grocery stores dominate the market, preferring larger SKUs, while petty shops favor smaller, more affordable sizes. Payment preferences vary by store location, with rural stores primarily using cash and urban stores adopting online options. Key factors such as product quality, pricing, and promotions account for 60.2% of the variation in satisfaction. Retailers are advised to tailor product and payment offerings based on store type and location to enhance satisfaction and sales

Keywords: Retailer satisfaction, laundry care products, SKU movement, Coimbatore, store type, location, marketing mix, payment methods, detergents

INTRODUCTION:

Laundry care, whilst often perceived as a routine domestic chore, assumes a crucial role in the preservation of hygiene and public health. The efficacy of laundering serves to eliminate dirt, bodily fluids, and pathogens, thereby substantially mitigating the risk of infection, particularly when employed in conjunction with adequately elevated temperatures (e.g., exceeding 40 to 60 °C), detergents, and additives such as bleach or enzymes (Abney et al., 2021; Reynolds et al., 2022). Furthermore, laundering practices significantly contribute to environmental ramifications, encompassing water and energy utilization as well as the challenges associated with wastewater treatment, which accentuates the necessity for the advancement of sustainable product innovations. In India, consumer predilections are influenced by cultural values such as fragrance, whiteness, and affordability coupled with hygiene concerns. Retailers in locales such as Coimbatore are tasked with navigating this complex landscape, striving to balance the demand for reliable, effective products with the escalating interest in environmentally sustainable alternatives. Presently, innovations such as biodegradable detergents, microfiber capturing technologies, and materials designed to diminish micro plastic release are experiencing increased acceptance among both consumers and retailers (Periyasamy, 2023; Shah et al., 2024; S. Zhao et al., 2024). Thus, the examination of retailer satisfaction and preference dynamics provides invaluable insights into how factors such as product efficacy, sustainability, pricing, and manufacturer support impact stocking decisions within a competitive and rapidly evolving marketplace

The laundry care industry in India has evolved into a competitive sector, with diverse products catering to the specific preferences and needs of customers across urban, semi urban, and rural areas. As consumer expectations grow (Tran et al., 2021), along with spending power (Jeyapaul & Manimaran, 2019) in India the role of retailers becomes critical in bridging the gap between brands and end users. Retailers not only influence the visibility of fabric wash products on shelves but also directly impact customer purchase behavior through product recommendations, stock availability, and price positioning. These dynamic positions retailers as essential stakeholders in shaping the success of laundry care products in different markets. In Coimbatore, a city marked by diverse retail formats including grocery stores, departmental stores, and petty shops, understanding retailer satisfaction can offer insights for manufacturers seeking to enhance product distribution and customer satisfaction (Jeyapaul & Christa, 2020). This study examines factors influencing retailer satisfaction with laundry care products, focusing on how variables such as store type, store location, and the retailer's experience in handling these products affect overall satisfaction. Additionally, this research explores SKU movement patterns and payment preferences, contributing to a more comprehensive understanding of retailer operations and product demand in this market.

By employing analytical tools such as Chi-square tests, regression analysis, and ANCOVA, this study seeks to evaluate how factors related to the marketing mix (product, price, place, and promotion) affect retailer satisfaction. The findings aim to support laundry care product manufacturers and retailers in aligning inventory and payment options to cater to customer preferences across diverse retail settings. This alignment is expected

to optimize product availability, enhance sales, and improve the shopping experience for customers in Coimbatore and similar markets.

2. Literature Review

The global laundry care market is projected to expand at a CAGR of 4.85% from 2025 to 2030 (Intelligence, 2025). In India, laundry care products hold significant importance within the FMCG sector, with an estimated market value of Rs. 12,000 crore and a robust growth forecast at a CAGR exceeding 9% (Singh, 2019). The Asia Pacific region, led by China and India, is poised to dominate market consumption, driven by technological advancements and a rising demand for convenient, user friendly detergent products (Intelligence, 2025). In India, the laundry care market comprises synthetic detergents including bars, powders, and liquids and oil based soaps, with a particularly competitive household care segment that enjoys a high level of market penetration (Research and Markets, 2022). Urbanization, the introduction of smaller, cost effective pack sizes, and sachets have fuelled demand, yet small regional and unorganized players still hold a significant share of the market volume. Hindustan Unilever Limited (HUL) leads the washing powder sector with a 38% market share, followed by other major players like Nirma, Henkel, and Procter & Gamble. Growing consumer awareness about liquid detergents, paired with industrial advancements, continues to shape the detergent market landscape. Increased government initiatives promoting healthy lifestyles in rural India are also supporting rising detergent sales (IBEF, 2025). For instance, Indo Count Industries Ltd. (ICIL) announced an investment of Rs. 200 crore in May 2021 to enhance its bedding solutions production capacity, reflecting the industry's growth potential.

The detergent sector's extensive advertising influence enhances its growth, with companies like Rohit Surfactants broadening Ghari detergent's reach to new states and expanding their distribution network to over 3,500 dealers. With affordable pricing and accessible distribution, detergent brands in India are well positioned for continued growth. Pricing and quality remain critical competitive factors in laundry care, particularly for online fashion retailers seeking to enhance their brand image and consumer engagement (Alireza Aghighi, 2015; Shokouhyar et al., 2018; Siddiqui et al., 2003). Tan et al., emphasizes the manner in which proficient packaging can significantly elevate the sales of environmentally friendly products by attracting a broader consumer demographic and augmenting purchase intentions (Tan et al., 2024). Although sales promotions can momentarily boost sales, they often lack the impact necessary to build lasting brand loyalty, especially in low involvement categories such as detergents (Alam, M. Syeed, 2009). The gradual shift in consumer preference from powdered to liquid detergents highlights a growing preference for products that simplify laundry routines, particularly for washing machines (Bajpai & Tyagi, 2007).

Brand trust, shaped by economic optimism and brand perception, significantly impacts purchasing decisions, especially when satisfaction relies on product availability, quality, and brand preference (Lymperopoulos et al.,

2010). Research further indicates that authenticity, perceived value, and trust in retailers play a crucial role in fostering long term loyalty, with strong brand-retailer relationships significantly enhancing commitment (Lacoeuilhe et al., 2017). The Retailer Satisfaction Index identifies specific domains where managerial attention should be focused. Through the implementation of focused initiatives such as sales promotions, gift incentives, and exchange offers managers may enhance performance and ensure favourable opportunities for the future (Ali & Dubey, 2014). Additionally, well framed customer care practices that align with a retailer's image can strengthen patronage intentions, while effective product assortment and merchandising practices directly contribute to an improved store image and loyalty (Vannucci et al., 2023). Regional brands recognized for their quality could further improve market presence by refining promotional efforts (Melibaeva, 2024). Sales promotions have long been a central driver of retailer interest. Evidence suggests that comparative advertising and promotional pricing strategies (Gong & Zhang, 2025) enhance brand visibility (Ibrahim et al., 2025) and perceived value (Park & Ahn, 2025), ultimately driving sales. In this context, in-store promotional activities, trade promotions (He & Zhou, 2019), and skilled sales forces are particularly effective in influencing retailer decision making (Fam & Merrilees, 1996). For price sensitive retailers (Zhang et al., 2025), cost efficient promotions (Tang et al., 2024) such as enhanced in store visibility are often preferred over costly paid media campaigns, while personalised pricing strategies (Li et al., 2025) for retailers like discounts and reference pricing significantly shape perceived value and purchase intentions (Fam & Merrilees, 2015). Although such activities may temporarily increase sales (Alam, M. Syeed, 2009) their role in creating enduring loyalty remains limited. Cultural orientation also plays a role in shaping loyalty and perceptions of ethical practices, thereby influencing buying intentions within online retail (Lu et al., 2013). Beyond product variety, Profit margin (Hasiloglu-Ciftciler & Kaya, 2025), shopping motivations are influenced by ambiance and service quality, which shape perceptions of retail quality (Morschett et al., 2005). Salesperson expertise and the quality of interaction have also been identified as critical for building long term relationships and fostering profitable portfolio management (Arditto et al., 2020). Unique challenges define rural retailing, making it essential for brands to understand and address the distinct needs of rural consumers (Mullis & Kim, 2011; Zuhdi et al., 2024). Rural and semi urban retailers, in particular, prioritize supply quality, delivery efficiency (W. Zhao et al., 2025), brand reputation, and margin considerations when making purchase decisions (Sarkar et al., 2016). Efficient delivery systems reduce costs and encourage retailers (Son et al., 2019; Y. Wang et al., 2025) to stock more products, while distributor networks further enhance accessibility across regional markets (Sarkar & Kundu, 2017). Credit facilities offered by wholesalers also support retailers in managing deteriorating inventory effectively. Evaluating customer satisfaction is crucial for understanding a product's ability to meet consumer expectations (Gunasekara & Robb, 2025). In response to shifting consumer preferences, the

detergent industry is gradually adopting eco-friendly formulations, as more consumers seek products made from green ingredients (Siwayanan et al., 2015). Retailer satisfaction with detergent products (van Ewijk et al., 2022; W. (Britney) Wang et al., 2025) is driven by several key factors that influence their willingness to stock and promote these brands. A thorough understanding of these factors is essential for manufacturers seeking to enhance retailer relationships and expand market presence. Retailers are generally more satisfied with brands that demonstrate strong performance and meet consumer expectations, which affects their promotional efforts and willingness to support these brands (Ebru Tumer Kabadayi, 2012). Retailer perceptions on the availability of local brands of detergent products directly influence purchasing decisions (Vroegindewey et al., 2021) and inventory management (Chen et al., 2026) strategies, underlining the importance of these perceptions for effective marketing. Retailers prioritize high quality detergents with competitive pricing, which fosters increased stock willingness. Additionally, impactful sales promotions can further boost retailer interest, resulting in higher order volumes (Zuhdi et al., 2024). According to (Vakratsas, 2008), low prices, effective promotions, and strong brand endorsements positively impact retailer store brand equity and consumer purchase intentions, strategies that could similarly enhance retailers' perceptions of detergent products.

3. Research Methodology

The current investigation is descriptive in essence and centers on the exploration of retailer satisfaction and preference dynamics concerning laundry care products within the Coimbatore district. The research aspires to attain three interrelated objectives: firstly, to discern the factors that drive retailer satisfaction within the laundry care market; secondly, to scrutinize the variations in preferences for product formats, brands, and payment methods across different retail formats and geographical areas; and thirdly, to assess how store characteristics such as type, location, and tenure influence levels of satisfaction. Collectively, these objectives furnish a comprehensive understanding of the dynamics that shape retailer satisfaction and preferences.

A convenience sampling methodology was employed for the purpose of data collection. To ensure the integrity of the data, a pilot study was conducted among 25 retailers, and based on their feedback, the questionnaire was meticulously refined before its final administration. The ultimate sample comprised 321 retailers, encompassing supermarkets, small shops, convenience stores, departmental outlets, and other minor formats, distributed across urban, semi urban, and rural areas of the Coimbatore district. Both primary and secondary data sources were utilized: primary data was gathered through structured questionnaires, whilst secondary data was sourced from academic journals, corporate reports, and trade publications.

For geographical delineation, Coimbatore was categorized into four principal zones. North Coimbatore includes Mettupalayam, Annur, Periyanaickenpalayam, and regions adjacent to the Nilgiri Biosphere Reserve,

representing a blend of rural and gateway markets. Central Coimbatore, which encompasses Gandhipuram, Ram Nagar, and Tatabad, serves as the commercial and administrative nucleus of the city. South Coimbatore, comprising Pollachi, Kinathukadavu, and Madukkarai, reflects semi urban and agrarian retail environments characterized by emerging organized formats. East Coimbatore, represented by Sular and surrounding localities, constitutes the industrial and textile cluster of the district. The distribution of the sample across these zones is delineated below in the Table 1, enhancing the effectiveness of subsequent analyses.

Table 1: Geographical Distribution of Sample

Zone	Key Locations	No. Of Samples
North Coimbatore	Mettupalayam, Annur, Periyanaickenpalayam, Nilgiri Biosphere border areas	80
Central Coimbatore	Gandhipuram, Ram Nagar, Tatabad	90
South Coimbatore	Pollachi, Avinasi, Kinathukadavu, Madukkarai	76
East Coimbatore	Sular and surrounding industrial areas	75
Total		32

4. Data Description and Analysis

4.1 Demographic Profile of Retailers

The following profile from Table 2 describes the different retail formats, locations, and experience levels within our sample. These details give context for the patterns of preference and satisfaction, as well as help explain SKU movement and payment choices in relation to the store environment.

Table 2: Demographic Profile of Respondents

Demographic Variables	Categories	No. of Respondents	Percentage (%)
Stores Types of	Grocery Store	142	45.80 %
	Departmental Store	93	29.30 %
	Petty Shop	79	24.90 %

Location of Stores	Urban	169	52.60 %
	Semi-rban	130	40.50 %
	Rural	22	6.90%
Duration of Retailers Dealing with Product	0 to 5 years	133	44.10 %
	6 to 10 years	177	55.10 %
	11to15 years	11	3.40%

Inference

The analysis provides a breakdown of the types of stores, store locations, and the duration retailers have dealt with the fabric wash products. This helps to understand the market structure, showing that the types of stores: Grocery stores dominate the market (45.80%), followed by departmental stores (29.30%) and petty shops (24.90%). Locations: Most stores are located in urban areas (52.60%), with fewer in semi urban (40.50%) and rural (6.90%) areas. Experience with products: Most retailers have been dealing with fabric wash products for 6 to 10 years (55.10%).

4.2 Sales Frequency and Brand Preference in Laundry Care Products

This classification delineates the product formats (powder/bar/liquid) that exhibit the most rapid turnover at the sales counter. It establishes a foundational demand

metric for correlating SKU strategy and promotional efficacy in subsequent evaluations.

Table 3: Sales Frequency of Laundry Care products

Type of Detergent Product	Mean Value	Rank
Powder	2.89	1
Bar	2.11	2
Liquid	1.31	3

Inference

From the above Table 3, it was observed that powder was the fastest moving laundry care product category with a mean value of 2.89. This is because retailers are informed that powder is easy to use and it is available in smaller packets. Detergent soap or bar is the next fast moving laundry care product category with a mean value of 2.11. It was identified that customers prefer soap bars because of their durability. The liquid category is comparatively slow-moving because it is relatively priced higher and less durable.

Brand preference reflects perceived quality, value for money, and on shelf promotional support. The chart below shows the Garrett scores and reveals which regional Brands are exceeding expectations

4.3 Retailers' Preferred Brand of Fabric Wash

The Garrett Ranking Technique constitutes a systematic approach employed to ascertain the comparative significance of various factors or attributes. In the below Table 4 X represents Garrett table value and F is frequency of each rank provided by retailers (where F represents the number of retailers assigning a particular rank)

Table 4: Retailers' Preferred Brand of Fabric Wash

S.No	Brand Name	Rank Scale Value	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Total Score	Garrett Mean Score	Mean Rank
		X	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8			
1	Surf Excel	F	69	48	46	44	35	32	23	24	321	56	1
		Fx	5520	3264	2760	2332	1505	1280	736	504	17901		
2	Rin	F	39	60	55	51	41	27	43	1	321	55	1
		Fx	3120	4080	3300	2703	1763	1080	1440	21	17457		
3	Ariel	F	50	51	40	41	37	37	32	33	321	53	3
		Fx	4000	3468	2400	2173	1591	1440	1024	651	16721		
4	Tide	F	54	32	36	43	53	45	31	27	321	52	4
		Fx	4320	2176	2160	2279	2279	1800	928	546	16483		
5	Wheel	F	41	41	34	33	49	69	2	52	321	50	5
		Fx	3280	2788	2040	1749	2107	2720	64	1092	15715		
6	Others	F	39	35	31	34	29	45	66	42	318	48	6

		Fx	3120	2380	1860	1802	1247	1800	2080	840	15029		
7	Nirma	F	37	27	29	32	29	45	74	46	321	46	7
		Fx	2960	1836	1740	1696	1247	1800	2400	924	14592		
8	Henko	F	0	47	45	31	24	33	42	99	321	42	8
		Fx	0	3196	2700	1643	1032	1320	1280	2058	13212		

Inference

The Garrett Mean Score analysis from Table 4 reveals that in Coimbatore’s laundry care market, multinational brands like Surf Excel, Rin, and Ariel lead due to their brand reputation, advertising strength, and perceived quality among retailers. Surf Excel and Rin hold the top rank, driven by their strong quality perception and consumer trust. Ariel and Tide follow closely, valued for their advanced cleaning capabilities, particularly suitable for urban markets. Wheel, with its affordability and accessibility, appeals significantly to budget conscious consumers, maintaining a strong position. However, regional brands, represented as "Others" in the table, including Arasan, Ponvandu, and other regional brands that have their presence only in the Coimbatore district, continue to hold substantial influence in Coimbatore.

Regional brands dominate MNCs in specific segments by capitalizing on affordability, strong local distribution networks, and long standing cultural loyalty. Their pricing advantage and targeted product formulations meet the daily needs of Coimbatore’s consumers, making them essential in areas where cost effectiveness takes precedence over premium branding. This market approach allows regional players like Arasan and Ponvandu to effectively compete with multinational giants in Coimbatore’s detergent market.

4.4 Analysis of Factors Affecting Retailer Satisfaction in Laundry Care Products

Here, the framework measures how each marketing mix element (Product, Price, Place, Promotion) drives overall retailer satisfaction, pinpointing which levers deserve the greatest focus for maximum impact.

Table 5: Model Summary of Factors Influencing Retailer Satisfaction

Model	R	R ²	Adjusted R ²	Std error of the Estimate	Sig. f changes
Factors Influencing Retailers Satisfaction	0.756	0.602	0.598	0.24800	0.000

Inference

This ranking delineates the product forms (powder/bar/liquid) that exhibit the most rapid turnover at

the point of sale. It establishes a foundational demand metric for correlating SKU strategies and evaluating the efficacy of promotions in subsequent analyses.

Table 5.1: ANOVA Test of Overall Model Significance

Model		Sum squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig
Factors Influencing Retailers Satisfaction	Regression	27.169	3.573	7060	155.677	0.000
	Residual	14.877	272	0.052		
	Total	30.769	281			

Inference

It is observed from the above Table 5.1 that the ANOVA p-value is below .05, showing that the marketing mix variables, taken together, genuinely drive retailer

satisfaction. In other words, satisfaction isn’t just random—it’s systematically tied to those predictors.

Table 5.2: Relationship between marketing mix factors and overall satisfaction

Factors	Constant	Co efficient		P Value
Product	0.981	0.653	5.465	0.000
Price		0.617	6.272	0.000
Place		0.452	8.752	0.021
Promotion		0.563	6.818	0.0413

Inference

The regression model from above Table 5.2 provides insights into the factors that significantly impact the overall satisfaction of retailers with fabric wash products. Key predictors are: Product ($\beta = 0.653, p < 0.001$), Price ($\beta = 0.617, p < 0.001$), Place ($\beta = 0.452, p < 0.05$) and Promotion ($\beta = 0.563, p < 0.05$). The R^2 value of 0.602 indicates that 60.2% of the variation in retailer satisfaction is explained by these factors. This regression analysis highlights the critical role of product quality, pricing, distribution (place), and promotions in driving retailer satisfaction. Retailers can use these insights to optimize their inventory by stocking products that offer the best price to quality ratio and ensuring effective promotions and availability in strategic location. The equation $Y = 0.981 + 0.653X1 + 0.617X2 + 0.452X3 + 0.563X4$ represents a linear regression equation that delineates the correlation between retailer satisfaction (Y) and four independent variables: Product (X1), Price (X2), Place (X3), and Promotion (X4).

4.5 Analysis of the Association between demographic factors and preference of retailers regarding laundry care products

This section explores whether retailer preferences such as the choice of fast moving SKUs and preferred payment methods differ significantly across store type, geographical location, and years of business operation. Examining these variations provides insights into how demographic and structural factors shape retailer behavior. For example, grocery shops may

prioritize compact SKUs due to space constraints, while departmental stores might emphasize premium packs with higher margins. Similarly, payment preferences may shift with location, where urban outlets lean toward digital transactions and rural counterparts rely more on credit or cash. Identifying these systematic differences enables manufacturers and marketers to design targeted, format specific strategies that align better with the unique

Table 6: Association between demographic factors and preference of retailers

Type of the shop	Fast moving Fabric wash product				Pearson Square	Chi-
	fabric wash soap	Fabric wash liquid	Fabric wash powder	Total		
Petty shop	39	4	37	80	0.119	
grocery shop	83	18	46	147		
departmental store	55	8	31	94		
Total	177	30	114	321		
Type of the shop	Fast-moving SKU in fabric wash soap				Pearson Square	Chi-
	130g	150g	300g	Total		
Petty shop	16	24	40	80	0.026	
grocery shop	15	72	60	147		
departmental store	8	43	43	94		
Total	39	139	143	321		

Type of the shop	Fast moving SKU - fabric wash Powder				Pearson Square	Chi-Square
	200g	500g	1kg	Total		
Petty shop	13	65	2	80	0.00	
grocery shop	8	130	9	147		
departmental store	2	79	13	94		
Total	23	274	24	321		
Type of the shop	Fast moving SKU - fabric wash liquid				Pearson Square	Chi-Square
	40ml	500ml	1l	Total		
Petty shop	0	49	31	80	0.065	
grocery shop	1	90	56	147		
departmental store	0	42	52	94		
Total	1	181	139	321		
Convenient method of payment						
Location of the Store	Cash	Credit	Online payment	Total	Pearson Square	Chi-Square
Rural	10	1	11	22	0.00	
Semi urban	99	26	5	130		
Urban	94	0	75	169		
Total	203	27	91	321		
Period of time dealing with the product	Fast moving Fabric wash product				Pearson Square	Chi-Square
	Fabric wash soap	Fabric wash liquid	Fabric wash powder	Total		
0-5 years	59	12	62	133	0.001	
6-10 years	107	18	52	177		
11-15 years	11	0	0	11		
Total	177	30	114	321		

Inference

The Type of Shop vs. Fast Moving Fabric Wash Products analysis shows no significant difference ($p = 0.119$) in the product type (soap, liquid, powder) sold across different store types. Petty shops, grocery stores, and departmental stores stock similar products, suggesting that all retailers should offer a balanced variety of fabric wash products to meet customer preferences. In the Type of Shop vs. Fast Moving SKU in Fabric Wash Soap analysis, there is a

significant difference ($p = 0.026$). Grocery stores tend to stock larger SKUs (150g, 300g), while petty shops prefer smaller ones (130g). This means grocery stores should cater to bulk buyers, while petty shops focus on more affordable, smaller SKUs. For Type of Shop vs. Fast Moving SKU in Fabric Wash Powder, a highly significant difference ($p = 0.000$) was observed. Petty shops stock smaller packages (200g, 500g), while larger stores sell bigger sizes (500g, 1kg). Retailers should align SKU sizes

with their store type, optimizing for customer preferences in their area. In the case of Type of Shop vs. Fast Moving SKU in Fabric Wash Liquid, there is no significant difference ($p = 0.065$) in the sizes sold across store types. All stores can confidently stock medium and large sizes (500ml, 1L), as these suit a broad customer base. The Location of Shop vs. Preferred Payment Method analysis shows a highly significant difference ($p = 0.000$). Rural stores prefer cash, semi urban stores use both cash and credit, and urban stores favor cash and online payments. Retailers should tailor payment methods based on their location, with urban stores offering online payments and rural stores focusing on cash transactions. The Period of Dealing vs. Fast Moving Fabric Wash Products analysis reveals a significant difference ($p = 0.001$). Retailers with 0 to 5 years of experience sell a mix of products, while those with 6 to 10 years focus more on soap. Newer retailers should offer a balanced stock, while experienced retailers can concentrate on popular items like soap. Retailers should stock a mix of fabric wash products (soap, liquid, and powder), adapting SKU sizes based on store type. Petty shops should focus on smaller, affordable

SKUs, while larger stores should stock bulk sizes. Payment methods must be tailored to store location, with online payments prioritized in urban areas and cash in rural areas. Retailer experience also influences product mix, with newer retailers advised to diversify, while experienced retailers focus on high demand items like soap. These insights will help retailers optimize inventory, meet customer needs, and enhance sales across different store types and locations.

4.5 Comparative Satisfaction across Retail Formats and Locations

Below mentioned Table 7 displays covariate-adjusted mean satisfaction scores, enabling a direct comparison of retailer experiences across varied store formats, geographic regions, and lengths of operation. These adjusted estimates underscore how structural factors shape satisfaction levels independently of basic demographic characteristics.

Table 7: Effect of Store and Demographic Variables on Retailer Satisfaction

Factor	F	Sig.	Partial Eta Squared
Type of Shop	2.775	0.064	0.018
Location of Shop	3.040	0.049	0.020
Period of Dealing	1.533	0.218	0.010
Type of Shop vs Location of Shop	0.779	0.506	0.008
Type of Shop vs Period of Dealing	1.008	0.389	0.010
Location of Shop vs Period of Dealing	0.706	0.495	0.005
Type of Shop vs Location of Shop vs Period of Dealing	0.097	0.908	0.001

Inference:

The above table shows that the demographic factors, i.e., the type of shop, location of the shop, and the period of dealing with the fabric wash product, have an impact on the overall satisfaction of the retailers, which has been tested using the analysis of covariance, and the null hypothesis has been rejected. The detailed relationship of the retailers' satisfaction in the particular shop, its location, and the period is mentioned in the table below.

By breaking down satisfaction scores for each store type, region, and years in business, we can clearly see which groups are happiest and which lag. This detailed view points us straight to the retailer segments that deserve our targeted marketing efforts.

Table 8: Adjusted Mean Satisfaction Scores by Shop Type, Location, and Tenure

Type of Shop	Location of the shop	Period dealing	of Mean	Std. Deviation	Average
Departmental store	Rural	0 to 5 years	5.00		5.00%
		6 to 10 years	5.00		
		Total	5.00	0.000	
	Semi urban	0 to 5 years	5.00	0.000	5.00%
		Total	5.00	0.000	
	urban	0 to 5 years	4.55	0.671	4.56%
		11 to 15 years	4.60	0.548	
		6 to 10 years	4.55	0.502	
		Total	4.55	0.544	
	Total	0 to 5 years	4.62	0.637	4.59%
		11 to 15 years	4.60	0.548	
		6 to 10 years	4.56	0.501	
Total		4.57	0.539		
Grocery shop	Rural	0 to 5 years	4.29	0.488	4.36%
		6 to 10 years	4.43	0.535	
		Total	4.36	0.497	
	Semi urban	0 to 5 years	4.83	0.379	4.79%
		6 to 10 years	4.74	0.449	
		Total	4.79	0.409	
	urban	0 to 5 years	4.53	0.629	4.58%
		11 to 15 years	4.67	0.577	
		6 to 10 years	4.53	0.620	
		Total	4.54	0.615	
	Total	0 to 5 years	4.64	0.542	4.63%
		11 to 15 years	4.67	0.577	
		6 to 10 years	4.58	0.570	
		Total	4.61	0.555	
	Rural	0 to 5 years	3.75	0.500	4.13%
		6 to 10 years	4.50	0.707	
		Total	4.00	0.632	

Petty shop	Semi urban	0to5 years	4.42	0.554	4.71%
		11to15 years	5.00	0.000	
		6to10 years	4.71	0.519	
		Total	4.58	0.549	
	Total	0to5 years	4.35	0.580	4.68%
		11to15 years	5.00	0.000	
		6to10 years	4.70	0.520	
		Total	4.54	0.572	

Inference

The above table shows the significant relationship for the type of shop, location of the shop and the period of dealing with the product has an impact on the overall satisfaction of the retailers which is been proved that the departmental stores in Rural area who are dealing with the product for up to 5 years are highly satisfied where the grocery stores in rural area who are dealing with the same period are satisfied and the petty shop in rural area with the same years of existence are having moderate opinion towards the fabric wash products. While seeing the same departmental store in a rural area, retailers who have dealt with the product for up to 10 years are highly satisfied. In contrast, both grocery stores and small shops in rural areas are happy with the product. The next part of the study reveals that departmental stores located in semi urban and urban areas, which have dealt with the product for up to 5 years, are delighted. Similarly, both grocery shops and petty shops in semi urban and urban areas are satisfied with the fabric wash products. The grocery stores and the small shops in semi urban areas that have been dealing with the fabric wash products for a period of 10 years are satisfied with them. Additionally, the small shops in semi urban areas that have been in operation for more than 10 years, i.e., up to 15 years, are delighted with the fabric wash product. While seeing the department store and the grocery store in an urban area that has been in business for 5 years, I am satisfied with the products. The same is true for both the departmental store and the grocery stores, which have been dealing with the fabric wash products for 10 to 15 years, and are also satisfied with them. Therefore, the stores in each location and the period of time they dealt with clearly stated how well they were satisfied with the fabric wash products.

5. Findings and Suggestions

Retailers dealing with laundry care products show varying preferences based on store type, location, and years of experience. Grocery stores dominate the market, accounting for 45.80% of stores, followed by departmental stores (29.30%) and petty shops (24.90%). Most stores are located in urban areas (52.60%), with fewer in semi urban (40.50%) and rural areas (6.90%). In terms of experience, the majority of retailers (55.10%)

have been dealing with fabric wash products for 6 to 10 years. In terms of product preference, there is no significant difference in the type of fabric wash product (soap, liquid, powder) sold by different store types. However, grocery stores tend to stock larger SKUs of soap (150g and 300g), while petty shops focus on smaller sizes (130g). When it comes to fabric wash powder, larger stores prefer bulk sizes (500g, 1kg), while petty shops opt for smaller packages (200g, 500g). Payment methods also vary by location. Rural stores primarily use cash, while semi urban stores utilize a mix of money and credit, and urban stores favor cash and online payments. Retailer experience plays a role in the product mix, with newer retailers (0 to 5 years) offering a wide variety of products, and those with 6 to 10 years of experience focus more on soap. The main factors influencing retailer satisfaction are product quality, price, availability (distribution), and promotions. These factors account for 60.2% of the variation in satisfaction. Additionally, the store type, location, and the period of dealing with the product significantly affect overall satisfaction. For example, departmental stores in rural areas dealing with the product for up to 5 years show higher satisfaction compared to petty shops, which express moderate satisfaction. Retailers should stock products based on their store type and customer preferences. Petty shops can focus on smaller, affordable SKUs, while grocery and departmental stores should cater to bulk buyers by offering larger sizes. Payment options should be tailored to the store's location, with rural stores considering online payments and urban stores continuing to offer both cash and online methods. Promotions should focus on price and product quality to improve satisfaction. Newer retailers (0 to 5 years) should offer a broad range of products, while more experienced retailers (6 to 10 years) can prioritize popular products like soap. By aligning product offerings, payment methods, and promotions with customer preferences and regional needs, retailers can optimize inventory, improve satisfaction, and increase sales.

6. Conclusion

This study highlights key factors influencing the overall satisfaction of retailers with laundry care products. By analyzing store types, locations, retailer experience, and payment preferences, it becomes clear that different retail environments require tailored strategies to maximize customer satisfaction and sales. Store type, location, and

experience significantly impact the products stocked, the sizes of products offered, and the payment methods used. Grocery stores, departmental stores, and petty shops have distinct product and SKU preferences, and these differences must be accounted for when developing inventory strategies. Grocery and departmental stores are better suited for bulk sized products due to their customer base, while petty shops thrive on smaller, more affordable SKUs. Payment methods also vary based on the store's location. Rural retailers rely heavily on cash but should consider adding online payment options to adapt to evolving customer preferences. Urban and semi urban stores are already incorporating online and credit payment systems, and continuing to offer flexible payment options will help retain and attract more customers. The study also found that product quality, price, availability, and promotions are the primary drivers of retailer satisfaction. Retailers who offer high quality products at competitive prices, ensure good availability, and utilize effective promotions are likely to experience higher customer

satisfaction. The regression analysis showed that these four factors account for a substantial portion (60.2%) of the overall retailer satisfaction. Moreover, experience matters: Newer retailers (0 to 5 years) should focus on offering a wide range of products to appeal to various customers, while more experienced retailers (6 to 10 years) can hone in on best selling items like soap, leveraging their deeper understanding of customer preferences. In conclusion, this study offers valuable insights for both retailers and product suppliers, enabling them to understand how various factors influence customer satisfaction. By tailoring their product offerings, SKU sizes, payment methods, and promotions to specific store types, locations, and customer experiences, retailers can significantly enhance customer satisfaction and drive growth. These strategies ensure that they meet the diverse needs of retailers selling laundry care products across different regions and store formats, ultimately optimizing sales and strengthening market position

REFERENCES

1. Abney, S. E., Ijaz, M. K., McKinney, J., & Gerba, C. P. (2021). Laundry Hygiene and Odor Control: State of the Science. *Applied and Environmental Microbiology*, 87(14). <https://doi.org/10.1128/AEM.03002-20>
2. Alam, M. Syeed, F. F. (2009). Effect of Sales Promotion on Consumer Brand Preference: A Case Study Of Laundry Detergent in Dhaka City Consumers. <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:16511732>
3. Ali, S. S., & Dubey, R. (2014). Redefining Retailer's Satisfaction Index: A Case of FMCG Market in India. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 133, 279–290. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2014.04.194>
4. Alireza Aghighi, M. F. (2015). Analyzing the Influence of Sales Promotion on Customer Purchasing Behavior. *International Journal of Economics and Management Sciences*, 04(04). <https://doi.org/10.4172/2162-6359.1000243>
5. Arditto, L., Cambra-Fierro, J. J., Fuentes-Blasco, M., Jaraba, A. O., & Vázquez-Carrasco, R. (2020). "How does customer perception of salespeople influence the relationship? A study in an emerging economy." *Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services*, 54, 101952. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jretconser.2019.101952>
6. Bajpai, D., & Tyagi, V. K. (2007). Laundry Detergents: An Overview. *Journal of Oleo Science*, 56(7), 327–340. <https://doi.org/10.5650/jos.56.327>
7. Chen, G., Wahab, M. I. M., & Fang, L. (2026). Optimal periodic review order-up-to policy in a single-vendor multi-retailer cold chain with continuous multi-stage quality degradation. *Applied Mathematical Modelling*, 149, 116323. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apm.2025.116323>
8. Ebru Tumer Kabadayi. (2012). The effects of manufacturer brand performance, brand strength and role performance on retailer satisfaction. *AFRICAN JOURNAL OF BUSINESS MANAGEMENT*, 6(2). <https://doi.org/10.5897/AJBM10.1682>
9. Fam, K. S., & Merrilees, B. (1996). Determinants of shoe retailers' perceptions of promotion tools. *Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services*, 3(3), 155–162. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0969-6989\(95\)00094-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/0969-6989(95)00094-1)
10. Fam, K. S., & Merrilees, B. (2015). Strategic Promotion Management Approach -Is it relevant for the small independent retailers? (pp. 560–568). https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-17320-7_148
11. Gong, H., & Zhang, K. (2025). Patience and promotion: Intertemporal preference for premium-based (vs. discount-based) promotions. *International Journal of Research in Marketing*. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijresmar.2025.04.002>
12. Gunasekara, L., & Robb, D. J. (2025). Optimisation of retailer take-back of low and medium-value products for a circular economy. *Computers & Industrial Engineering*, 201, 110739. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cie.2024.110739>
13. Hasioglu-Ciftciler, M., & Kaya, O. (2025). Dynamic inventory sharing, ordering, and pricing strategies for perishable foods to maximize profit and minimize waste. *Computers & Industrial Engineering*, 205, 111158. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cie.2025.111158>
14. He, C., & Zhou, H. (2019). A retailer promotion policy model in a manufacturer Stackelberg dual-channel green supply chain. *Procedia CIRP*, 83, 722–727. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.procir.2019.04.104>
15. IBEF. (2025). Initiatives by the government to improve access, availability, and quality of healthcare services.
16. Ibrahim, B., Hazzam, J., Qalati, S. A., & Attia, A. M. (2025). From perceived creativity and visual appeal to positive emotions: Instagram's impact on fast-food brand evangelism. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 128, 104140. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhm.2025.104140>
17. Intelligence, M. (2025). Laundry Detergents Market Size & Share Analysis - Growth Trends and Forecast (2025 - 2030).
18. Jeyapaul, P. P., & Christa, J. (2020). RANKING OF DECISION MAKING CRITERIA FOR PURCHASE OF AIR CONDITIONERS USING ANALYTICAL

HIERARCHY PROCESS – RETAILERS PERSPECTIVE. *Journal of Critical Reviews*, 7(13). <https://doi.org/10.31838/jcr.07.13.32>

19. Jeyapaul, P. P., & Manimaran, S. (2019). Consumer Purchase Motives Towards Flavoured Milk Products - Gender and Locational Influence Perspective. *ICTACT Journal on Management Studies*, 5(2), 996–1005. <https://doi.org/10.21917/ijms.2019.0136>
20. Lacœuille, J., Louis, D., & Lombart, C. (2017). Impacts of product, store and retailer perceptions on consumers' relationship to terroir store brand. *Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services*, 39, 43–53. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jretconser.2017.07.002>
21. Li, S., Wu, J., Li, J., & Zhou, F. (2025). The adoption of personalized pricing in a supply chain with a common retailer. *Transportation Research Part E: Logistics and Transportation Review*, 193, 103865. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tre.2024.103865>
22. Lu, L., Chang, H., & Yu, S. (2013). Online shoppers' perceptions of e-retailers' ethics, cultural orientation, and loyalty. *Internet Research*, 23(1), 47–68. <https://doi.org/10.1108/10662241311295773>
23. Lymperopoulos, C., Chaniotakis, I. E., & Rigopoulou, I. D. (2010). Acceptance of detergent-retail brands: the role of consumer confidence and trust. *International Journal of Retail & Distribution Management*, 38(9), 719–736. <https://doi.org/10.1108/09590551011062457>
24. Melibaeva, G. N. (2024). THE IMPACT OF MARKETING INNOVATIONS ON COMPETITIVENESS. *QO'QON UNIVERSITETI XABARNOMASI*, 12, 39–43. <https://doi.org/10.54613/ku.v12i.985>
25. Morschett, D., Swoboda, B., & Foscht, T. (2005). Perception of store attributes and overall attitude towards grocery retailers: The role of shopping motives. *The International Review of Retail, Distribution and Consumer Research*, 15(4), 423–447. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09593960500197552>
26. Mullis, K., & Kim, M. (2011). Factors determining inshopping in rural US communities. *International Journal of Retail & Distribution Management*, 39(5), 326–345. <https://doi.org/10.1108/09590551111130757>
27. Park, J., & Ahn, S. (2025). Unpacking masstige brand perception: A multimethod study on value dimensions and brand extension. *Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services*, 87, 104376. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jretconser.2025.104376>
28. Periyasamy, A. P. (2023). Environmentally Friendly Approach to the Reduction of Microplastics during Domestic Washing: Prospects for Machine Vision in Microplastics Reduction. *Toxics*, 11(7), 575. <https://doi.org/10.3390/toxics11070575>
29. Research and Markets. (2022). *India Detergent Market Outlook, 2027-28*.
30. Reynolds, K. A., Verhougstraete, M. P., Mena, K. D., Sattar, S. A., Scott, E. A., & Gerba, C. P. (2022). Quantifying pathogen infection risks from household laundry practices. *Journal of Applied Microbiology*, 132(2), 1435–1448. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jam.15273>
31. Sarkar, D. N., & Kundu, K. (2017). The effect of embeddedness on purchase behaviour of rural

- unorganised retailers: implications for transnational corporations in developing economies. *Transnational Corporations Review*, 9(3), 169–189. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19186444.2017.1362859>
32. Sarkar, D. N., Kundu, K., & Roy Chaudhuri, H. (2016). Constructing a conceptual model of purchase behaviour of village shopkeepers – a study of small rural retailers in Eastern India. *Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services*, 28, 1–16. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jretconser.2015.08.007>
33. Shah, N., Saiyad, M., Joshipura, M., Pillai, S., & Dwivedi, A. (2024). Advanced Technologies to Reduce Marine Microfiber Pollution. In *Microfiber Pollution* (pp. 251–270). CRC Press. <https://doi.org/10.1201/9781003529903-13>
34. Shokouhyar, S., Safari, S., & Mohsenian, F. (2018). Improving candy industry competitiveness: Retailers' perception regarding customer satisfaction. *Journal of Food Products Marketing*, 24(6), 761–783. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10454446.2017.1389666>
35. Siddiqui, N., O'Malley, A., McColl, J. C., & Birtwistle, G. (2003). Retailer and consumer perceptions of online fashion retailers: Web site design issues. *Journal of Fashion Marketing and Management: An International Journal*, 7(4), 345–355. <https://doi.org/10.1108/13612020310496949>
36. Singh, B. (2019). A comparison of fmcg industry in India and the usa: The case of laundry detergent market. *International Journal of Development Research*, 9(4), 27407–27413. <https://www.journalijdr.com/comparison-fmcg-industry-india-and-usa-case-laundry-detergent-market>
37. Siwayanan, P., Bakar, N. A., Aziz, R., & Chelliapan, S. (2015). Exploring Malaysian Household Consumers Acceptance towards Eco-friendly Laundry Detergent Powders. *Asian Social Science*, 11(9). <https://doi.org/10.5539/ass.v11n9p125>
38. Son, J., Kang, J. H., & Jang, S. (2019). The effects of out-of-stock, return, and cancellation amounts on the order amounts of an online retailer. *Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services*, 51, 421–427. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jretconser.2019.02.008>
39. Tan, F., Li, X., Agarwal, R., Joshi, Y., & Yaqub, M. Z. (2024). Does multilingual packaging influence purchasing in retail segment? Evidence from multiple experiments. *Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services*, 79, 103878. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jretconser.2024.103878>
40. Tang, T., Xu, H., Chen, K., & Zhang, Z. (2024). Optimal financing and sales channel strategies for a capital-constrained supply chain with different risk preferences. *Computers & Industrial Engineering*, 187, 109813. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cie.2023.109813>
41. Tran, A. D., Pallant, J. I., & Johnson, L. W. (2021). Exploring the impact of chatbots on consumer sentiment and expectations in retail. *Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services*, 63, 102718. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jretconser.2021.102718>
42. Vakratsas, D. (2008). The effects of advertising, prices and distribution on market share volatility. *European Journal of Operational Research*, 187(1), 283–293. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ejor.2007.02.034>
43. van Ewijk, B. J., Gijsbrechts, E., & Steenkamp,

- J.-B. E. M. (2022). The dark side of innovation: How new SKUs affect brand choice in the presence of consumer uncertainty and learning. *International Journal of Research in Marketing*, 39(4), 967–987. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijresmar.2022.01.002>
44. Vannucci, V., Dasmi, C., Nechaeva, O., Pizzi, G., & Aiello, G. (2023). WHY do YOU care about me? The impact of retailers' customer care activities on customer orientation perceptions and store patronage intentions. *Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services*, 73, 103305. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jretconser.2023.103305>
45. Vroegindewey, R., Richardson, R. B., Ortega, D. L., & Theriault, V. (2021). Consumer and retailer preferences for local ingredients in processed foods: Evidence from a stacked choice experiment in an African urban dairy market. *Food Policy*, 103, 102106. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foodpol.2021.102106>
46. Wang, W. (Britney), Deleersnyder, B., & Yildirim, G. (2025). The impact of new product entry on brand sales volatility at the retailer: A Detailed Look into volatility drivers. *Journal of Business Research*, 191, 115267. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2025.115267>
47. Wang, Y., Li, J., Zhu, S., Wang, S., & Cheng, T. C. E. (2025). Should a retailer opt for an advance selling strategy? Perspectives from a capital-constrained supply chain. *Omega*, 138, 103380. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.omega.2025.103380>
48. Zhang, K., Dai, Y., & Cai, G. (George). (2025). Unifying or discriminating: Competitive pricing strategies for multi-channel retailers. *Journal of Retailing*. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jretai.2025.05.002>
49. Zhao, S., Rillig, M. C., Bing, H., Cui, Q., Qiu, T., Cui, Y., Penuelas, J., Liu, B., Bian, S., Monikh, F. A., Chen, J., & Fang, L. (2024). Microplastic pollution promotes soil respiration: A global-scale meta-analysis. *Global Change Biology*, 30(7). <https://doi.org/10.1111/gcb.17415>
50. Zhao, W., Yan, X., & Yu, Y. (2025). Product price and delivery-time commitment decisions with reference effects. *Transportation Research Part E: Logistics and Transportation Review*, 197, 104093. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tre.2025.104093>
51. Zuhdi, S., Primandini, D., & Sujana, S. (2024). The Influence Of Product Quality, Price Perceptions, And Sales Promotions On Purchasing Decisions. *Jurnal Ilmiah Manajemen Kesatuan*, 12(3), 617–628. <https://doi.org/10.37641/jimkes.v12i3.2541>