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Purpose – The purpose of this paper is to investigate the positive and the negative relationship of the personal characteristics such as price consciousness, value consciousness, social risk and quality consciousness with the attitude and intention towards the private label snacks and grocery products.

Scope – The scope of the study is limited to a Vellore city and two retail outlets. The scope is to check the personal characteristics such as price consciousness, quality consciousness, value consciousness and social risk as any relationship towards attitude and intention towards PLBs in this area of study.

Design/Methodology/Approach – The data was collected through a structured questionnaire from 108 respondents. The study was conducted in Vellore city (South India).

Findings – The major findings of the study has revealed that the attitude toward private label food brand and the purchase intention is positively and significantly associated. The most interesting finding of the study was, the Social risk has a weak positive relationship with the attitude towards PLBs which is contrary to the previous studies.

Research Limitations – Firstly, the sample chooses for the study was representative and which can’t be generalized for the overall opinion of country. The study is limited to the product categories like snack and grocery items, therefore for further research is required to better understand whether the demographic variables or the product category are causing this difference.

Originality/Value – The study attempt to provide the useful insights and better understanding about the factors that influence the consumer buying behaviour towards private label brands. Which guides the retailers while designing the private label branding strategies.
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1. Introduction

The entry of the private label brands have created a great milestone in the phase of retailing history. The retail industry’s swift growth and dynamic consumer buying behaviour has immensely increased the private label brands presence in almost all the product categories by increasing its market share. In early 19th century there was an exceptional raise in numbers of the departmental and super market retail store chains in US and Europe which in turn lead to the introduction of the new concept called private labels and it was defined as “Private-label brands are those products which are fully owned, controlled and sold exclusively by the retailers” (Steenkamp & Dekimpe, 1997). At present private labels have captured the attention of the customers and have gained a competitive advantage over national brands in price, promotion, quality and value. In short, they have literally changed their image of low price and low quality to superior price and quality items.

The Indian food and grocery sector is emerged as a world’s sixth largest and it contributes around 70 percent of the food industry therefore India has tremendously increased its contribution towards the world food trade and it has emerged as a high growth and profit sector within the food processing sector. “The food industry, which is currently valued at US$ 39.71 billion! Is expected to grow at a Compounded Annual Growth Rate (CAGR) of 11 per cent to US$65.4 billion by 2018. Food and grocery account for around 31 per cent of India’s consumption basket.” Private Label brands (PLB) are gaining acceptance and are present in almost every product category and it was estimated that the market share of private label products in India will increase from current 4.5% to 10% by 2020. (IBEf.org)

The scope of the study is vast because the Indian consumers are often considered to be conscious and prefer purchasing private label brands by finding some benefits. The private label market found to be more attractive in Indian market, where the “demanding and aspirational middle class of 300 million people (or 75 million households) and a large young population of 500 million under the age of 25 years are just two of the demographic-oriented statistics that suggest a large market for private labels in India”.

A survey indicated an interesting finding that “42% of Millennials (ages 18-36) agree that store brand food products are more innovative than name-brand products. In fact, Millennials are more likely to buy store brand foods in general (97% versus 94% of all U.S. shoppers)” (Mediapost, 2016). The share of the “private label’s in India retail market is about 7%, but it is as high as 40% in European countries, and as low as less than 1% in China”.
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Mintel reported that 94% of the shoppers are “private label lovers” and usually purchases private label food and grocery products because of their lower prices offered at better quality (India retailing, 2016). Therefore “enhancing the quality, variety and innovation levels of private label foods is key for engaging with private-label lovers”. Private labels are playing a significant role in acquiring potential customers, building loyalty and in turn increases the retailer’s profitability. Consumers today are delighted and are more willing to buy private labels in their available stores. A study concluded that customers experiences with the retailers includes perceived store image, quality, store layout and store environment influences the purchase decision (Paswan, 2006). The entrance of private label brands strengthened the retailer’s bargaining power and have a significant effect on the relationship between the manufacturer and retailer. In order to stay competitive in the market, both retailers and manufacturers of PLB need to understand the key factors driving consumers’ decision in purchasing PLB and the post purchase behaviour of the customers. Therefore, this study attempts to enhance understanding about the factors Price consciousness (PC), Quality consciousness (QC), Value consciousness (VC), Social risk (SR) which may be thought to influence Consumers Attitude, Intention to purchase and Trial purchase of Private label brands.

The Based on the growing importance of the private label brands, retailers need to understand the factors that influence the buyers of PLB, especially those retailers who have a loyal set of customers. There are many factors that influence consumers’ decisions while choosing PLB over branded products, but there is no affirmation of what persuades customers to go for trail purchase, and remain loyal, and also to engage in positive word of mouth referrals (WOM) of PLB. However, there is a call for more research by integrating robust theories of consumer behaviour regarding private label food products. More specifically, the studies conducted on the post purchase factors are sparse in the case of grocery and snacks. Therefore, the findings of this study on these key factors will benefit the retailers with better knowledge of how to acquire new customers, to retain the existing customers and to increase their margin through PLB.

2. Theoretical Framework and Hypotheses Development

Private label brand(PLB) is described as a products produced by the or on the behalf of the retailers and sold them under their own name or trade mark in the retail channels.(Batlas,
1997). The private labels are owned, controlled and sold exclusively by a retailer (Raju, Sethuraman, & Dhar, 1995). But many of the PLB’s are not made by the retailers but by the manufacturers who produce for them in order to increase their economies of scale, increase in sales by reducing marketing costs and there by selling PLB’s at less prices. Generally, PLB’s are also called as store brands, house brands, own brands, phantom brands (Raju, Sethuraman & Dhar, 1995). Strategically PLBs were classified under 3 categories (Batlas, 1997) the First one as Classic PLB which is at most similar to the branded and priced on an average between 10 to 30 percent. Second are, Generic PLB’s which are developed by the retailers for a primary purpose with poor quality, packaging and with few advertising activates and position the product under low price category(Yelkur, 2000) and the third type of brand which is positioned similarly as branded product is Premium private label brand (Hoch and Banerji, 1996). PLB’s has emerged over 25 years and earlier the products of PLB’s were perceived as a product with low quality and price by the consumers (Burt, 2000). The entry of the PLB into the consumer market has substantially increased and gained acceptance and are present in almost every product category and it was estimated that the market share of private label products in India will increase from current 4.5% to 10% by 2020. Earlier studies had found that the purchase of the private label food products brands are influenced by the demographic factors like income, gender, age, family size etc., and the products which are mostly purchased by the low income households (Belizzi et al., 1981; Baltas et al., 2007) and later Burton et al. 1998and by Jin and Suh., 2005) have emphasised Psychographic factors such as price-quality –value consciousness, risk perceptions. But a recent study on private label brands found that psychographic factors plays an important role in influencing the purchase decision of PLB’s than the demographic and social factors (Martinez and Montaner, 2008).

Therefore while considering private labels food products, specifically in snacks and grocery items category both the retailers and consumers exhibit some psychological factors that plays a major role in the consumer buying process are the interest, great level of involvement, perception, attitude (Kwon et al., 2008). Some of the researches explained these factors as the Consumer perception plays a major role in reaching a decision on quality of private label food products. (Yee et al., 2005; Knight et al., 2007). Some of the factors influencing attitude towards private label brands (consumer factors: Price consciousness, Value consciousness,), intention to purchase private label brands (influenced by Quality consciousness and social risk).
2.1 Determinants of attitude & purchase intention towards private label food brands

2.1.1 Price Consciousness

Price plays a vital role in purchasing the merchandise of Private label food products. Price conscious customers are those who prefer to purchase products with low price and purchase of these PLBs are highly influenced by the income level of the customers (Lichtenstein et al., 1993). It was anticipated that the customers who wants more utility of product at an affordable prices are more price conscious and prefer to purchase PL food products (Veloutsou et al., 2004) and also the price conscious customers are likely to get attracted by the promotional offerings of the retailers and have less knowledge in differentiating the products, less loyal towards the brands and always tend to save money. A study explained that the price conscious customers in relation to low prices and stated that high price consciousness customers pays more attention and easily get attracted towards low priced private labels than the low price conscious customers. (Sinha and Batra, 1999; Ailawadi et al., 2001). Some studies concluded low price as an important factor and a predictor in purchasing private label food brands and have a positive influence on the attitude of private label food customers (Burger and Schott, 1972; Moore and Carpenter, 2006; Burton et al., 1998; Boyle and Lathrop, 2013). According to (Roth, 1995) concluded that income plays the most important role in purchase decisions and the customers who are price sensitive purchase the products and services in order to meet their basic needs rather hedonic needs in terms of private label food brands, so it is important for the private label retailers in understanding the factors influencing the private label purchase for making effective strategies in order to gain the competitive advantage over the branded items. Some of the important pricing strategies that retailers offer PLBs to attract and retain their customers base is through special price discounts on few set of merchandise (Ellickson and Misra, 2008), everyday low pricing (EDLP) for the customers who don’t put much effort and time in comparing prices in various outlets, promotional pricing (HiLo) is for the customers who deliberately search for the better offers (Ailawadi and Keller, 2004; Hoch et al., 1994). Some other strategies that retailers follow are (Burt, 2000; Steiner, 2004) concluded in a study, that in order to maintain competitive advantage retailers are classifying the PLBs offering as Economy (low price with low quality), Standard (mid-price with mid quality) and premium (high price with high quality). The recent technological up gradations, increased online purchases and economic fluctuations like recession, inflation has increased the price search and comparisons between the private label food brands and national brands in the consumer buying process and pay more attention.
and prioritize price than other factors. Therefore (Burton et al. 1998 and Ailawadi et al. 2001) concluded in their studies that the consumers who prefer to opt for the low prices and conscious towards the price had a favourable attitude towards purchasing private label food and snacks.

Therefore, this study hypothesizes

**H1. Price consciousness will have a positive relationship with attitude towards PLBs.**  
**H2. Price consciousness will have a positive relationship with purchase intention towards PLBs.**

### 2.1.2 Value Consciousness
Perceived value is defined by various researchers as the comparison between the expected and the actual benefits that a consumer acquired from a purchasing a product. Most of the studies concluded the success of PLBs is where value conscious customers not only consider the price implies but also the quality. The value consciousness customers consider both the low price with better quality as the value they get for the price they paid for a merchandise. Zeithaml (1988). In the marketing literature, the intention to purchase PLBs is strongly influenced by the perceived price and the quality (Jin and Suh, 2005). Various studies found that the value consciousness is positively related with the attitude which in turn leads to the purchase intention of the private labels of both food products and non-food product (Burton et al., 1998; Jin and Suh, 2005). From the past few decades the private labels have improved the quality of the food and snack items and offered the products at lower prices compared with the national brands by creating better value. Few studies have concluded that the perceived value is a multidimensional and it is crucial for marketers to understand these dimensions to gain competitive advantage (Zeithaml, 1988). The perceived value of a product not only describes the perception of the organisation that the customers carry in their minds but also the promotional activities and the channels through which they communicate the message also influence the decision process towards private label food products. (Sweeney and Soutar, 2001). According to (Huber et al., 2007, Petrick, 2002 and Lapierre, 1997) stressed out that the value equation consists of various variables which plays an important role are price, time spent in searching for the alternatives, effort in purchasing and service quality. Therefore the perceived value towards the private label food brands has been explained as one of the most important determinant in positively influence the attitude and
the of the purchase intention towards private labels. (Chang and Wang, 2011; Ulaga and Chacour, 2001).

Therefore, this study hypothesizes:

**H3.** *Value consciousness will have a positive relationship with attitude towards PLBs.*

**H4.** *Value consciousness will have a positive relationship with purchase intention towards PLBs.*

### 2.1.3 Quality Consciousness

Quality consciousness of the customer’s plays a significant role in purchasing decision of the private label brands. (Baltas and Argouslidis, 2007). On the other hand perceived quality influences the consumers in choosing PLBs. But (Sproles and Kendell, 1986) defined quality conscious customers are those who prefer high quality food products at best prices. Hence these kind of customers will not choose private label food brands because of its negative brand perception of low quality (Dick et al., 1995). As PLBs earlier perceived to be as low quality but now a days the retailers continuously improving the quality, though the quality gap remained same in the minds of the customers. (Stiener, 2004). Earlier, few studies concluded that the quality conscious customers perceive private label food brands are low in quality compared with the national brands. (Dick et al. 1995; Batra and Sinha, 2000). Hence these perceived quality difference or variation act as an important aspect which influence customers to choose national brands over PLBs. (Batra and Sinha, 2000; Sethuraman and Cole, 1997). Many studies stressed out that perception plays an important role in in choosing the PLB merchandise (Beneke et al., 2013). The risk perception in terms of quality is higher for the private labels food brands compared with the national brands. (Zielke and Dobbelstein, 2007). The consumption level of private labels is higher for the low differentiation products (Sprott and Shimp, 2004; Olson, 2012). Therefore this perceived quality risk specifically in food and groceries have a negative impact on the purchase intention of the private labels. (González-Benito and Martos-Partal, 2012).

The other related factors which influence the purchase decision of PLBs along with quality conscious are consumer characteristics (such as Demographic factors, perception, personality etc.,) (Hyman et al., 2010), store image, price-value consciousness. Quality consciousness PLBs are defined as the inferior quality products compared with the national brands. (Richardson et al., 1994). Later a study revealed that the choice of PLBs is influenced by the attitude of the customer i.e., when a customer is more conscious to quality than to
price purchase PLBs instead of national brands, only when they perceive the quality of private label is similar to the national brands (Erdem et al., 2004). Few studies (Ailawadi et al., 2001; González-Benito, 2009) stated that quality acts as an important motivator in choosing the private label brands. The quality propositions of private label merchandise have drastically shifted from previous years and some retailers are providing PLBs with better quality compared to national brands (Geyskens et al., 2010; Nielsen, 2011; Parker, 2006). Though the retailers are improving the quality of PLBs but there is suspicion and customer uncertainty remained still. Therefore many studies found that the quality consciousness negatively influence the purchase intention of the private labels food brands. (Erdem et al., 2004; Banerji, 1993). The quality determines the market share of that particular PLB. (Hoch and Banerji, 1993). The Studies of (Huber et al., 2007) concluded that price and value relationship is mediated by the quality variable. It was founded that perceived quality variation (Batra and Sinha, 2000) indirectly and negatively affects the perception of the private labels purchase. They studied the quality variation in private labels by comparing the products required much purchase experience and the products required search characteristics with little experience. Where they found that the consumers are prone to choose higher quality variation for the products with the much purchasing experience than the products with little experience. Hence in contrast the findings and conclusions of various studies increases the curiosity in studying the quality consciousness and its negative relationship with attitude.

Therefore, this study hypothesizes

**H5:** Quality consciousness will have a negative relationship with attitude towards PLBs.

**H6:** Quality consciousness will have a negative relationship with purchase intention towards PLBs.

### 2.1.4 Social Risk

Social risk is also called as a psychological risk which is associated with the consumer’s faith and status in consumption of a product or a service belong to the private label food brand. Social risk is all about the society’s influence on the decision making of PLBs. Perceived risk was defined by the (Dowling, 1986) “as the uncertainty of a desired performance that all customers experience when making purchasing decisions.” Therefore another study stressed out that social risk ( as the private labels are perceived as not good enough by friends) as one of the dimension of the “multidimensional phenomenon” perceived risk (Mitchell, 1998). In contrast to this that the perceived risk was studied as a single construct that explains the
consumer preferences. (Dunn et al., 1986). Anyhow concept of perceived risk was explained in various studies in various forms like Psychological risk, functional risk, social risk and financial risk. (Jacoby and Kaplan, 1972; Laforet, 2007; Murphy and Enis, 1986; Peter and Tarpey, 1975; Schiffman and Kanuk, 2009; Shimp and Bearden, 1982). Earlier a study explained social risk as choice of buying is based on the ability of the brand in meeting the customer prestige, status and personal image. (Solomon, 1983). Later studies proved that perceived risk of consumers plays a prominent role in choosing the PLB food brands over national brands. (Sethuraman and Cole, 1999). Customers will not purchase product and services when they feel that there is a potential loss of prestige. (Zielke and Dobbelstein, 2007). Various studies explained that higher the risk, the choice of buying private labels was lower, generally studies called these kind of customers as risk averse, who normally refrain from buying private label brands. (Richardson et al., 1996). A study by (Gutierrez, 2006) found that the social risk have no significant impact on the purchase intention of the private label foods. (Bellizzi, Hamilton, Krueckeberg and Martin, 1981) found that purchasing a wrong product or by mistake is considered as the risk factor. The main risk that the consumer perceives in purchasing private labels was inferior quality. According to (Williams, 2002) social risk is explained as the influence of the negative perception of the friends and family on the purchasing choice of PLBs as a poor or inferior choice. According to (Zielke & Dobbelstein, 2007) consumers feel more conscious of risk when the private label food products are offered for others or consumed publically therefore conducted a research and concluded that consumers are perceived to face more social pressure and have a negative relationship while purchasing products for parties, events.

Hence the study hypothesized that

H7: Social Risk will have a negative relationship with attitude towards PLBs.

H8: Social Risk will have a negative relationship with purchase intention towards PLBs.

2.1.5 Attitude

Attitude (ATT) is defined “as a set of beliefs, experiences, and feelings forming a predisposition to act in a given direction” (Diallo et al., 2013). (Burton et al., 1998) explained the attitude towards PLB’s “as a predisposition to react in either a favourable or unfavourable way due to product, purchase or oneself evaluations”. Attitude have a significant impact on the intention and throughout the consumer buying behaviour (Fishbein and Ajzen, 1975). According to (Burton et al., 1998). Demography and psychographic
variables positively influence the attitude of the consumers in buying the private label brands. (Martinez and Montaner, 2008). Earlier image of the private label food brands are perceived as a low quality and exclusively developed for the low income households, hence these factors play a significant role on developing a negative attitude towards private labels specifically when the retailers promote private label offers. But these days the attitude towards store brands were changed as the retailers are modifying their products and providing higher quality value added products. For example the Tesco in UK provide their customers with premium branded and higher quality private labels than manufacturer brands (Kumar and Steenkamp, 2007). The customers who prefer higher quality private labels will develop a more positive attitude towards them compared with the private labels (Huang and Huddleston, 2009). The attitude towards the PLBs was classified into three factors influencing the customers such as personality, perceptual and socio economic. Of these factors perceptual factor like perceived price, quality, fairness, social risk and value have a significant influence on the purchase intention of the private labels. (Burton et al., 1998; Garretson et al., 2002; Batra and Sinha, 2000; Richardson et al., 1996). A study found that the attitude will have a significant impact on the purchase intention of the private label brands (Collins-Dodd and Lindley, 2003). According to (Burton et al., 1998) positive attitude acts as an antecedent of purchase intention of private label brands and found that the attitude is being affected by the perceived quality, price and value. Hence it is important for the retailers, marketing managers and strategists to understand the factors influencing attitude towards private labels. Therefore the study focuses on understanding the factors like price consciousness, quality consciousness, social risk and value consciousness and its impact on positive attitude of private label brands. Earlier, customers used to negatively evaluate and assume private label foods as the alternatives for manufacturer brands manufactured for the low income households and are poor in quality. Therefore (Huang and Huddleston, 2009) study found that the negative attitude towards private labels are changing as the retailers improving the quality and creating value for their offerings which in turn leads in developing favourable attitude towards private label brands. Therefore a study concluded that attitude plays a significant role in driving the intention to purchase the private label food brands where social risk is minimal (Zielke and Dobbelstein, 2007).

2.1.6 Purchase Intention
The purchase intention (PI) plays a major role in making strategic decisions and various
marketing programmes by the marketing managers, strategists and the manufacturers of PLBs. Purchase intention is defined as consumer tendency to purchase a specific brand in future (Wu et al., 2011). Intentions was also defined as “motivational components of a behaviour, that is, the degree of conscious effort that a person will exert in order to perform a behaviour” (Ajzen, 1991, p. 201). (Wu, Yeh, & Hsiao, 2011) explained intention as the likelihood where a customer decide to purchase products and services for a short-term. According to the “cognitive and affective model”, there are many perceptual factors that influence the purchase intention of private label brands. Generally, when a customer perceive that the product was offered at the right price, quality and customers intend and likely to buy a specific private label brand. Many studies have explained that purchase intention consequence of the positive attitude towards private labels and also a predictor of final purchase. A study concluded that purchase intention would directly lead to actual purchase of the private label brands. The construct purchase intention means projection of the future purchase, but it is often get confused with final purchase of the private label brands (Jin and Suh, 2005). The construct purchase intention is widely indicated as a consequence of the consumer buying behaviour after various evaluations before purchase. (Grewal, Krishnan, Baker, & Borin, 1998). As the previous studies explained the construct purchase intention as a consequence of private label attitude or private label proneness or private label preference. (I.e. Richardson et al., 1996). The proposed model explains the factors such as price consciousness, quality consciousness and value consciousness and its relationship with the private label attitude and the purchase intention. Hence the study hypothesized that:

**H9: Attitude will have a positive relationship with purchase intention towards PLBs.**

![Figure 1: The conceptual model](image-url)
3. Methodology

3.1 Sampling and data collection
To meet the objectives and to test the conceptual model a descriptive study on consumer behaviour with regard to PLB. Convenience sampling was adopted to collect the data from the respondents. The data was collected through a structured questionnaire from 108 respondents. The study was conducted in Vellore city (South India). In order to make respondents understand about private label brands, images of private label brands in the food and snacks category were shown to them prior to data collection. Data was collected from customers belonging to two retail outlets in Vellore.

3.2 Measurements
The chosen six variables of the study were measured on a five-point Likert scale ranges from “Strongly disagree” to “Strongly agree.” The measurements items of the study were developed and adopted from previous validated studies.

3.2.1 Price Consciousness. The scales were assessed the consumers’ consciousness towards the price of the private labels. Three items were adopted from (Ailawadi et al., 2001) to measure the price consciousness construct.

3.2.2 Quality consciousness: The price and value relationship is mediated by the quality variable (Huber et al., 2007). Three items were adopted from (Ailawadi et al., 2001) to measure the quality consciousness construct. This construct explains the subjective views of the consumers towards private labels in terms of quality.

3.2.3 Value Consciousness: value consciousness is assumed by the customers as the amount paid in relation with the quality received or judgement of the consumers about the quality received for the price that they paid for. (Lichtenstein et al., 1993) . Therefore the construct is measured by five items scale, where one item was adapted from (Burton et al., 1998) and remaining four items were adapted from (Diallo et al., 2013).

3.2.4 Social Risk: The social risk is a psychological risk where the consumer’s faith and status in consumption of private labels. The 3 item scale from (Gonzalez et al., 2006) were adopted to represent and measure the social risk construct.
3.2.5 **Attitude:** The attitude is a predisposition which determines and establishes a relationship with the purchase intention of private labels and it was measured by the four item scale which were adapted from (Diallo et al., 2013).

3.2.6 **Purchase Intention:** The customers conscious efforts in purchasing private labels Therefore the construct is measured by five items scale, where three items were adapted from (Grewal et al., 1998) and remaining two items were adapted from (Jin and Suh, 2005).

4. **Data Analysis and Results**

The primary research data which were collected through the survey. Further to test the hypothesis, the collected responses were exported to SPSS statistical tool for analysis in order to decide whether the hypothesis drawn for the study may be either confirmed or rejected.

It is necessary to check for any errors or missing values before the analysis. However, the next step is to confirm the validity of measures, where the validity of a construct was analysed by the results of Pearson correlation between each variable (explained in Table 1). In order to find out the strength and the direction between two variables. Therefore, hypotheses are analysed and tested using Pearson’s correlation test was adapted for identifying the positive and the negative relationship between the constructs.

1.1 **Age**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 25</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>48.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 to 40</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-60</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>23.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>above 60</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.2 **Gender**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>37.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>62.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1.3 Monthly Household Income

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Monthly Household Income</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 25,000</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25,000-40,000</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>21.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40,001-60,000</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>15.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60,000 and above</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>52.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It can be seen from the Table 1 that most of the questionnaires were answered more by the female respondents than by the male respondents. Female consists 62% (68 responses) while male has 37% (40 responses). This is expected because the most times household shopping are made by women as they pay more attention in comparing various products and select the right product category by considering aspects, such as price, quality and value for money etc. Age wise, most of the respondents are below 25-40 years. The table explains that majority of the respondents comes under the income category of 60,000 and above.

Table 2: Correlation, Mean and Standard Deviation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>PC</th>
<th>VC</th>
<th>QC</th>
<th>SR</th>
<th>ATT</th>
<th>PI</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PC</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.637**</td>
<td>.449**</td>
<td>-.006</td>
<td>.149</td>
<td>3.5706</td>
<td>.85926</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VC</td>
<td>.637**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.499**</td>
<td>-.096</td>
<td>.036</td>
<td>3.6250</td>
<td>.74844</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QC</td>
<td>.449**</td>
<td>.499**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.097</td>
<td>.145</td>
<td>.233*</td>
<td>3.7531</td>
<td>.85058</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR</td>
<td>-.006</td>
<td>-.096</td>
<td>-.097</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.143</td>
<td>-.227*</td>
<td>2.5397</td>
<td>.84863</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATT</td>
<td>.023</td>
<td>.036</td>
<td>.145</td>
<td>.143</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.563**</td>
<td>3.1366</td>
<td>.70162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PI</td>
<td>.149</td>
<td>.044</td>
<td>.233*</td>
<td>.227*</td>
<td>.563**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.1537</td>
<td>.66169</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p<0.01;  p<0.05

It can be seen from Table 2 that, there is a moderate positive relation between price consciousness and value consciousness. The studies reveal that there is a moderate positive relation between price consciousness and quality consciousness. There is moderate positive relationship between quality consciousness and value consciousness. There is a low positive relationship between quality consciousness and the purchase intention. There is a negative relationship between the social risk and purchase intention. It has been found that there is a moderate positive relation between the attitude and purchase intention towards private label food and snacks brands.
It can be seen from Table 3 that, there is a significant positive relation between the price consciousness and purchase intention towards private label food brands ($p<0.05$) The study found that there is a significant positive relation between quality consciousness and purchase intention towards private label food brands, which contradicts the current hypothesis and the previous research studies (Ailawadi et al. 2001 and Abramaviciene, R., & Pikturniene, I., 2015). The study reveal that there is a significant positive relation between value consciousness and purchase intention towards private label food brands ($p<0.005$). The study found that there is significant positive relationship between social risk and purchase intention towards private label food brands, in contrary to the hypothesis and the previous research studies (Ailawadi et al. 2001 and Abramaviciene, R., & Pikturniene, I., 2015). The results proved that there is a significant positive relation between the attitude and the purchase intention towards the private label food brands ($p<0.00$). The study found (that there is no significant relation between the consumer personal characteristics (I.e., Price consciousness, quality consciousness, value consciousness and social risk) with the attitude towards private label food brands.

### Table 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ATT</th>
<th>PI</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>PC</strong></td>
<td>.044</td>
<td>.160</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>QC</strong></td>
<td>.664</td>
<td>.012</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>VC</strong></td>
<td>.154</td>
<td>.247*</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SR</strong></td>
<td>.125</td>
<td>.013</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ATT</strong></td>
<td>.028</td>
<td>.048</td>
<td>In Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correlation</td>
<td>.778</td>
<td>.632</td>
<td>In Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.132</td>
<td>.216*</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correlation</td>
<td>.189</td>
<td>.031</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td></td>
<td>.568*</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correlation</td>
<td></td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 4 Summary of the Hypothesis Testing Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypotheses</th>
<th>Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$H_1$ Price consciousness will have a positive relationship with attitude towards PLBs.</td>
<td>Not supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$H_2$ Price consciousness will have a positive relationship with purchase intention towards PLBs.</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$H_3$ Value consciousness will have a positive relationship with the attitude towards PLBs.</td>
<td>Not Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$H_4$ Value consciousness will have a positive relationship with the purchase intention towards PLBs.</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$H_5$ Quality consciousness will have a negative relationship with the attitude towards PLBs.</td>
<td>Not confirmed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$H_6$ Quality consciousness will have a negative relationship with the purchase intention towards PLBs.</td>
<td>Not confirmed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$H_7$ Social Risk will have a negative relationship with the attitude towards PLBs.</td>
<td>Not confirmed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$H_8$ Social Risk will have a negative relationship with the purchase intention towards PLBs.</td>
<td>Not confirmed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$H_9$ Attitude will have a positive relationship with the purchase intention towards PLBs.</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5. Discussion and Implications

The main purpose of the study is to understand the relationship between the consumer personal factors (price consciousness, value consciousness, quality consciousness and social risk) with the attitude and the purchase intention in the context of private label food products. The results of the study confirmed few hypotheses while others left unsupported. Various individual factors and its relationship with the private label purchase decision was acknowledged in many previous studies in various categories. But this research study attempts in understanding the relationship of these variables on the attitude and purchase intention of private label snack and grocery items through a theoretical framework. Although low positive relationship has been found out in Table 2 there exists a weak positive relationship between the variables under the study namely price consciousness, value consciousness, quality consciousness, social risk, attitude and the purchase intention towards private label food brands. Based on the prior study found that there is a random, nonlinear relationship between the price consciousness, value consciousness, quality consciousness and attitude & purchase intention towards private label food brands which doesn’t support the hypothesis (H1, H2, H3, H4, H5 and H6) of the study and in contrary to the previous studies (Burton et al. 1998; Ailawadi et al. 2001 and Abramaviciene, R., & Pikturmine, I., 2015). Further research is required to done to better understand whether the demographic variables or the product category are causing this difference.

6. Limitations and Future Research

The study has many limitations which provides an opportunity for future research and further improvements. The generalizability of the findings of the study is limited by confining the research to a specific retail store and a specific product categories like snack and grocery items with a, therefore a cross-cultural study might improve the generalizability of the study. Primarily, the future research may focus on the other significant factors like the store image and various psychological factors like perception that influence the purchase intention of the private label customers. Secondly, future research can be conducted on the post purchase factors such as customer satisfaction, customer loyalty and word of mouth, where the research studies conducted on these factors are sparse in the context of private label food brands. Finally, as the consumers purchasing involvement varies for various product categories so the further research can be done on the situational factors like impulse purchase,
Hence the further research on these recommended subjects will provide a better understanding and a deep insight into consumers’ buying behaviour towards private label brands.
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