

Effect of Product Cues on the Purchase of Private Labels of Food Products from Organised Retailers in Chandigarh

Rajneesh Mehra¹

Associate Professor, Gian Jyoti Institute of Management and Technology,
Sector 54, Mohali, Punjab, India

Abstract

Organised retail industry is at a nascent stage in India. Industry of private label branded products, though evolving, is rapidly growing. Majority of the organised retail firms are still offering products under national and local brands. However, many of them are enabling the availability of some products under private label brands. It is to be noted that most Indian customers in urban areas are habituated towards buying products under national or local brands, irrespective of whether purchase is being made from an organised outlet or a stand-alone store. This could be because of various reasons such as customer's familiarity with national brands, lack of faith in private label brands, product availability, promotion of national brands, etc. Nevertheless, many existing stand-alone retail outlets have been selling many product categories under private label brands. Cue theory has been extensively cited to explain the proneness to buy products and brands. The present study examines the effect of product cues on the proneness to buy private label brands of food products from the organised retail stores amongst customers in Chandigarh. It is an exploratory study based on data gathered using questionnaire. It has been concluded that the effect of the product cues is not favourable on the proneness to buy private label brands of instant noodles and milk and milk products sold by the organised retail outlets.

Keywords: Organised retail, private label brands, product cues.

Cite this article: Mehra, R. (2015). Effect of Product Cues on the Purchase of Private Labels of Food Products from Organised Retailers in Chandigarh. *International Journal of Management, Accounting and Economics*, 2(10), 1161-1190.

¹Corresponding author's email: rajneeshme@gmail.com

Introduction

Organised retail industry is still at a nascent stage in India. According to a recent Nielsen study, the share of modern trade or organised retail in the overall retail industry in India is 5% (The Nielsen Company, 2014). Organised retailing in India means any retail outlet chain (and not a one shop outlet) which is professionally managed (even if it is family run), has accounting transparency (with proper usage of MIS and accounting standards) and organised supply chain management with centralized quality control and sourcing (certain part of the sourcing can be locally made) (Mukherjee & Patel, 2005)(Madaan, 2009). It has been pointed out that a retail business, whether organised or un-organised / stand-alone store, has four primary costs – people, taxes, utility and real estate. These costs put together pose challenges to the growth forecasts for the organised retailers thus impacting their potential to increase their share in the overall retail market (Lal, 2015). Most organised retail firms have not been able to breakeven even after 7-10 years of being operational. CRISIL Ratings reports that top 10 food retailers in the country suffered losses worth Rs. 13,000 crore in 2013-14. The two large retailers seen as profitable by CRISIL Ratings are Future Value Retail (Big Bazaar, Food Bazaar) and Avenue Supermarts (D-Mart)(Misra, 2014). In order to overcome the challenges to sustenance and growth, organised retail firms have been taking various steps like reducing the size of the stores, changing the merchandise assortment, focusing on improving the supply chain, consolidation, sell-off, and shutting down stores(Kamath (a), 2014).

In recent times, many retail firms like Aditya Birla Retail, Spencer's, Reliance Retail and Bharti Retail's Easyday have been reported to reduce the size of their hypermarket stores from 50,000 – 70,000 sq. ft. to less than 10,000 sq. ft., thereby converting their outlets to 'compact hypermarkets'. This reduction in the size of the stores has been predominantly done for the food and grocery category of product assortments that these retail firms sell. It enables reduction in the real estate costs which are as much as 5-6% of the revenue earned by the organised retail firms (Mukherjee & Kalbag, 2011).

In addition to reducing the size of their stores, food retailers have been reported to put their expansion plans on hold. Most of these retailing organisations increased the number of their stores between 2006 and 2010. However, for the last 4 years these organisations have shut down stores that have not been profitable (Kamath (a), 2014).

Supply chain issues like lack of access to cheaper sources of fresh food products have contributed to the losses that these organisations have been incurring. Food and grocery category is highly local in nature in terms of procurement of fresh food products. These firms have been forced to build scale at the local level and not just at the national level.

Merchandise assortments have also undergone significant changes as many unprofitable product categories have been removed and private label brands, especially under low-margin food and grocery category have been introduced. CRISIL Ratings reports that this has been done to help the loss-making firms breakeven faster (Sethi, Hari B S, & Nori, 2014).

Private label products or services are brands owned not by a manufacturer or producer but by a retailer or supplier who gets its goods made by a contract manufacturer under its

own label (businessdictionary.com). Private label goods and services are available in a wide range of industries from food to cosmetics to web hosting. There has been a significant increase in private label brands in the recent years worldwide. In Europe, private label goods now account for about 45% of products sold in supermarkets, compared to 25% in the USA. Wal-Mart, for instance, has a 40% private label representation in their stores. Pacific Rim countries, such as Australia, Singapore, and Japan, also have significant presence of private labels on store shelves. Historically, private labels were seen as low-priced, low-quality products. In recent years, however, companies have started using private labels to market higher quality items, and many believe high-quality private labels will increase their presence (thefreedictionary.com). The Nielsen study mentioned earlier reports that despite the slow growth in share of organised retail, India is the most successful market in Southeast Asia for private label brands as their share grew by 27% from 2012 to September 2014 (The Nielsen Company, 2014).

Organised retail firms have to balance their merchandise assortment with national brands and their own private label brands under various product categories that they offer. National brands can help retailers in building their image, increase the number of customers visiting and buying from their stores and reduce their selling and promotional expenses. The customers tend to become loyal to national brands over time and thus patronize retailers that sell these brands. However the margins earned by retailers by selling national brands are lower as compared to selling their own private label brands. Further, retailers are not able to make their customers loyal to their stores by selling national brands as these are available across different retail stores. In order to attract customers, retailers have to offer discounts on the national brands thus negatively impacting their gross margins even more (Levy, Weitz, & Pandit, 2008).

Private label brands can help to enhance the image of the retailer and draw customers to the store. Though private label brands may be sold at prices lower than the national brands by the retailers, they can still provide opportunity to the retailer to earn higher gross margins. However, the retailers have to make significant investments in designing the merchandise, managing the vendor firms who would manufacture the products sold under private label brands, creating customer awareness and developing a favourable image for the private label brands. Hence the necessity to create a right blend of national and private label brands in product assortments and categories (Levy, Weitz, & Pandit, 2008).

According to (McKinsey & Company, Inc., 2008) report, major product categories available in the Indian retail market are food and beverages; household appliances; paper and stationery; beauty, personal and health care products; home décor and furnishing; footwear; clothing and textile; and communication.

This paper assesses the effect of product cues on the proneness of customers in Chandigarh to buy private label brands of food and beverage products.

Literature review and hypotheses

Examining the consumer-level factors that affect the success of private label brands in any product category is necessitated by the fact that consumers seem to be susceptible to purchasing the private label brands. As has been mentioned earlier, consumers purchase national and private label brands of different product categories for a variety of reasons. Levy, Weitz, & Pandit, (2008) mention that customers become loyal to national brands over time because they know what to expect from the products, like them and trust them. It can be implied that customers tend to lower the risk of purchasing a product by buying it from a known sponsor of the brand. Retailers as well as customers face risks when products are sold and bought respectively under private label. Risks for retailers can be store related and product category related. If the private label brands are corporate brands, i.e., the name of the retailer being used to brand the offerings also, the risk is that of acceptance or lack of it by the consumers based on the image of the store in their minds. On the other hand if the identity being extended to the product is distinct from that of the retailer, then the risk is loss of investment if the brand is not accepted by the consumers either due to the image of the store or the product category not being suitable for the private label. The latter also increases the chances of spill-over effect on other product categories being sold under the same private label brand (Semeijn, van Riel, & Ambrosini, 2004).

Semeijn et al (2004) also state that when consumers buy and consume a food and beverages product, they expose themselves to functional, psychosocial and financial risks. Functional risk or risk of performance or physical risk captures the potential loss due to the physical composition of the product. Social risk or psychological risk relates to the symbolic aspect of the product in terms faith in it and the status associated with its consumption. Financial risk is the price to pay for the product (Rzem & Debabi, 2012).

Baltas & Argouslidis (2007) studied ratings of quality, price level, packaging, store image, advertising of store brands in comparison with manufacturer brands, socio-demographics and shopping behaviour (shopping frequency store loyalty, spending per shopping trip, monthly grocery expenditure, brand and price sensitivity) among consumers in Greece for grocery category. The study concluded that quality has a significant role in store brand preferences; advertising and packaging were found to be significant in determining the consumption rate of store brands; large families are not more inclined towards the purchase of store brands; and, more frequent shoppers tend to prefer store brands. Price sensitivity was found to have a positive relationship with store brand proneness. Store loyalty had a significant influence on determining the private label purchase. It was found that consumers who tend to prefer brands are found least likely to switch into private labels.

Abhishek & Koshy, (2008) looked into how retailers can influence the quality perceptions for private label brands in grocery by providing additional information cues to the customers. Conclusion drawn from the study is that consumer perceptions can be improved by introducing quality labels recognized by consumers which can ensure adequate quality levels for private labels. However, the study did not take into account the attributes like price, packaging and risk which can determine the private label purchase and focused on quality perceptions.

The Indian consumers have been exhibiting varied attitudes towards organised retail stores and the store brands sold therein. India has been mentioned as one of the fastest growing market in south-east Asia for private label brands by The Nielsen Company (2014). Business media have been extensively analyzing the organised retail industry, especially with regard to the practices for private label brands (Lal, 2015), (Sethi, Hari B S, & Nori, 2014), (Kamath (a), 2014), (Misra, 2014), (Mukherjee & Kalbag, 2011), (McKinsey & Company, Inc., 2008). Therefore, the retailers need to develop a better understanding of the conditions leading to success of a private label brand for food and beverages product category. This can be achieved by examining all the factors that can impact the consumption of private label brands in Indian markets.

It has to be appreciated that food and beverages product category is very vast and deep. Based on the findings of this study, retailers will be able to focus on product lines, types and items that are most compatible with their respective store images. Jayakrishnan, Chaudhuri, & Chikhalkar (2012) reviewed around 54 studies that were published between 1958 and 2011 in order to identify the factors that moderate the purchase of private label brands. There were 4 studies that were conducted in India and were focused on food, grocery, apparels, personal care and consumer durable products. Brief summary of these studies is presented in Table 1.

Nair (2011) examined the changing perceptions about private labels in food and grocery segment among consumers and retailers in Pune region. The study considered various factors including perceived quality, trust in the brand, pricing, freshness, healthy nature, accessibility, packaging, availability of alternatives and retail communications related with private labels. There has been hardly any study that has been conducted in context of north India, especially Chandigarh. As has been mentioned earlier, the category of food and beverages is vast and deep, necessitating a product type-based analysis of consumer preferences for private label brands. Therefore, the product types that have been considered for this study are instant noodles, and milk and milk products. The choice of these product types is based on availability and familiarity of the consumers. It has also been observed that private label brands of instant noodles have been introduced by organised retailers like Reliance Fresh, More and Big Bazaar. Similarly Reliance Fresh, More and Big Bazaar have their own private labels for milk and milk products.

The problem statement of this study is what are the product cue factors that influence purchase of the food and beverages product category under the private label brands?

(Laibson, 2001) has propounded a model that seeks to explain the impact of environmental cues on the preferences of customers as cue-triggered responses tend to increase the marginal utility of consumption¹. The retailer and product cues examined in

¹Based on the Stimulus-Response model of consumer behaviour, a cue can be explained as pattern of the data present in the stimulus that can be extrapolated to generate a specific response. Sensory cues are a fundamental part of perception theories that have been applied in marketing to explain the behaviour of customers towards marketing stimuli comprised in the marketing mix elements of product, price, place, promotion, people, physical evidence and processes. Sensory cues can be visual cues (based on sight), auditory cues (based on hearing), olfactory cues (based on smell), haptic cues (based on touch), environmental cues (combination of sensory and marketing cues), etc. (Wikipedia contributors, 2014)

this study have been taken from Jayakrishnan's (2012) research. These are perceived quality, price related factors, positioning, and category factors (range).

The following sub-question was formulated:

How do perceived quality, discount and range offered, and location or positioning inside the store affect consumer evaluations of the private label brands of instant noodles and milk and milk products?

Thus following hypotheses are specified for the study:

H1: Organised retail outlets are preferred for buying food products in Chandigarh.

H2a: Private label brands of instant noodles sold by organised retailers are preferred over national brands sold by organised retailers.

H2b: Private label brands of milk and milk products sold by organised retailers are preferred over national brands sold by organised retailers.

H2c: Proneness to purchase private label brands of instant noodles and milk and milk products varies by the retailer.

Research design

The research is of exploratory in nature. Primary and secondary data have been collected. Consumer survey method has been used for primary data collection. A questionnaire was administered that contained structured questions with 5 point Likert scale. About 750 forms were distributed in Punjab and Chandigarh, out of which 125 forms were distributed in Chandigarh. A total of 366 responses have been used for analysis after discarding, cleaning and coding the data. Of these 66 responses were from Chandigarh. The responses' description is as follows: 65% females and 35% males; 45.5% in service and 18.2% each as self-employed, students and unemployed; 27.3% married and 72.7% unmarried; 80% are post-graduates or less with 45% being post-graduates, and the remaining being professionally qualified viz. CA, PhD, etc.

Sampling

For the purpose of the study the population included all the residents of Chandigarh who are responsible for making purchase decisions for their households and actually visit an organised retail outlet for the purpose. The sampling unit was an individual customer who visited an organised retail outlet with an intention to make a purchase. Convenience sampling has been used.

Analysis and results

H1: Organised retail outlets are preferred for buying food products in Chandigarh.

Outlets of organised retailers namely Amartex, Big Bazaar, More and Reliance Fresh have been observed selling food products in Chandigarh. Preference for their outlets is highlighted in the tables 2 to 5.

Reliance Fresh and Big Bazaar outlets are preferred by more than 60% of the respondents in Chandigarh whereas More and Amartex are not preferred for buying food products. Food retailing is found attractive as it has a share of 69% of the total retail market of Rs. 23.5 lakh crore (CRISIL Insight, 2014). The category provides opportunities to the retailers, especially the organised retailers, for improving their margins by offering their private label brands. However, not all food products may be amenable to be sold as private label brands. This is evident from the analysis of preference for private label brands of instant noodles and milk and milk products sold by organised retailers.

Analysis of instant noodles

H2a: Private label brands of instant noodles sold by organised retailers are preferred over national brands sold by organised retailers.

Cue theory has been extensively cited to explain the purchase intentions of the customers. As has been mentioned earlier, this paper uses perceived quality, discounts offered by retailers, ease of locating the private label brand inside the store and the range offered by the retailer as cues to measure the proneness of customers to purchase private label brands of instant noodles and milk and milk product. Popularity of 'Maggi' brand of instant noodles in India, sold by Nestle has prompted the organised retail outlets to experiment with offering them under their private label brands. It has been observed that Reliance Fresh and More sell private label brands of instant noodles from their outlets. However, the customers have not shown their proneness towards them, as is indicated in the tables 6 to 17.

H2a(i): Customers prefer private label brand of instant noodles sold by Reliance Fresh as they find its QUALITY better than that of the national brands.

Means have been compared for those who find the QUALITY of Reliance Fresh labeled instant noodles better than those of anywhere else, even national brands, with those who do not (Table 6). As assessed by Levene's test, since variances are not assumed to be equal and $p < 0.001$ is less than the chosen significance level $\alpha = 0.05$, the null hypothesis cannot be accepted.

H2a (ii): Customers prefer private label brand of instant noodles sold by Reliance Fresh due to better DISCOUNT.

Means have been compared for those who prefer private label brands of instant noodles sold by Reliance Fresh with those who do not (Table 7). Since equal variances are not assumed, as assessed by Levene's test, and $p < 0.001$ is less than the chosen significance level $\alpha = 0.05$, the null hypothesis cannot be accepted.

H2a (iii): Customers prefer private label brand of instant noodles sold by Reliance Fresh as they can easily LOCATE them.

Comparison of means shows that though respondents can locate the Reliance Fresh-labeled instant noodles, but they are still unwilling to buy them (equal variances not assumed, $p < 0.001$ is less than the chosen significance level $\alpha = 0.05$, Table 8). Thus the null hypothesis cannot be accepted.

H2a (iv): Customers prefer private label brand of instant noodles sold by Reliance Fresh as they can get a wider RANGE.

Comparison of means shows that though respondents get the range of the Reliance Fresh-labeled instant noodles, but they are still unwilling to buy them (equal variances not assumed, $p < 0.001$ is less than the chosen significance level $\alpha = 0.05$, Table 9). Thus the null hypothesis cannot be accepted.

H2a(v): Customers prefer private label brand of instant noodles sold by Big Bazaar as they find its QUALITY better than that of the national brands.

Means have been compared for those who find the QUALITY of Big Bazaar labeled instant noodles better than those of anywhere else, even national brands, with those who do not (Table 10). Since variance are not assumed to be equal and $p < 0.004$ is less than the chosen significance level $\alpha = 0.05$, the null hypothesis cannot be accepted.

H2a (vi): Customers prefer private label brand of instant noodles sold by Big Bazaar due to better DISCOUNT.

Means have been compared for those who prefer private label brands of instant noodles sold by Big Bazaar with those who do not (Table 11). Since equal variances are not assumed and $p < 0.001$ is less than the chosen significance level $\alpha = 0.05$, the null hypothesis cannot be accepted.

H2a (vii): Customers prefer private label brand of instant noodles sold by Big Bazaar as they can easily LOCATE them.

Comparison of means shows that though respondents can locate the Big Bazaar-labeled instant noodles, but they are still unwilling to buy them (equal variances not assumed, $p < 0.003$ is less than the chosen significance level $\alpha = 0.05$, Table 12). Thus the null hypothesis cannot be accepted.

H2a (viii): Customers prefer private label brand of instant noodles sold by Big Bazaar as they can get a wider RANGE.

Comparison of means shows that though respondents get the range of the Big Bazaar-labeled instant noodles, but they are still unwilling to buy them (equal variances not assumed, $p < 0.001$ is less than the chosen significance level $\alpha = 0.05$, Table 13). Thus the null hypothesis cannot be accepted.

H2a (ix): Customers prefer private label brand of instant noodles sold by More as they find its QUALITY better than that of the national brands.

Means have been compared for those who find the QUALITY of More labeled instant noodles better than those of anywhere else, even national brands, with those who do not (Table 14). It is evident that about 58% respondents were unsure about the quality of More-labeled instant noodles since they had not bought instant noodles from any More outlet. Out of 42% respondents who have shopped, 86% do not prefer private label brands of instant noodles sold by More. Hence, although $p < 0.089$ is more than the chosen significance level $\alpha = 0.05$ for un-pooled variances, the null hypothesis cannot be accepted.

H2a(x): Customers prefer private label brand of instant noodles sold by More due to better DISCOUNT.

Means have been compared for those who prefer private label brands of instant noodles sold by More with those who do not (Table 15). Since equal variances are not assumed and $p < 0.004$ is less than the chosen significance level $\alpha = 0.05$, the null hypothesis cannot be accepted.

H2a (xi): Customers prefer private label brand of instant noodles sold by More as they can easily LOCATE them.

Comparison of means shows that though respondents can locate the More-labeled instant noodles, but they are still unwilling to buy them (equal variances not assumed, $p < 0.001$ is less than the chosen significance level $\alpha = 0.05$, Table 16). Thus the null hypothesis cannot be accepted.

H2a (xii): Customers prefer private label brand of instant noodles sold by More as they can get a wider RANGE.

Comparison of means shows that though respondents get the range of the More-labeled instant noodles, but they are still unwilling to buy them (equal variances not assumed, $p < 0.001$ is less than the chosen significance level $\alpha = 0.05$, Table 17). Thus the null hypothesis cannot be accepted.

Analysis of milk and milk products

H2b: Private label brands of milk and milk products sold by organised retailers are preferred over national brands sold by organised retailers.

Milk and milk products take the maximum share of the monthly per capita expenditure ($MPCE_{MMRP}$)¹ on food in urban households in Chandigarh. According to the latest NSS Round 68 (National Sample Survey Office (NSSO), 2013), approximately 7% of the total $MPCE_{MMRP}$ is spent on the consumption of milk and milk products in India. The proportion of milk and milk products in the total food consumption of urban households in Chandigarh is higher at 8.99%. The break-up of the value of per capita consumption is presented in Table 18 below.

¹Modified Mix Reference Period (MMRP) method has been considered for reporting the monthly per capita expenditure.

Distribution of milk and milk products in Chandigarh is fragmented with many forms of distributors co-existing. Mainly, these range from milk cooperatives like Markfed in Punjab and Chandigarh to vendors on bi-cycles and bikes delivering milk and milk products to the doorstep of customers. Organised retailers like Reliance Fresh have vertically integrated into production and sale of private label brand of milk and milk products from its outlets. Others like More and Big Bazaar have only a few milk products like ghee being produced and sold as private label brands from their outlets. Amartex does not have its own private label for milk and milk products and sells only national brands from its outlets. The market potential notwithstanding, the customers have not shown their proneness towards the private label brands of milk and milk products as is indicated in the tables 19 to 30. Proneness has been measured by using the cues as mentioned earlier.

H2b(i): Customers prefer private label brand of milk and milk products sold by Reliance Fresh as they find its QUALITY better than that of the national brands.

Means have been compared for those who find the QUALITY of Reliance Fresh labeled milk and milk products better than those of anywhere else, even national brands, with those who do not (Table 19). Since variance are not assumed to be equal and $p < 0.001$ is less than the chosen significance level $\alpha = 0.05$, the null hypothesis cannot be accepted.

H2b(ii): Customers prefer private label brand of milk and milk products sold by Reliance Fresh due to better DISCOUNT.

Means have been compared for those who prefer private label brands of milk and milk products sold by Reliance Fresh with those who do not (Table 20). Since equal variances are not assumed and $p < 0.001$ is less than the chosen significance level $\alpha = 0.05$, the null hypothesis cannot be accepted.

H2b(iii): Customers prefer private label brand of milk and milk products sold by Reliance Fresh as they can easily LOCATE them.

Comparison of means shows that though respondents can locate the Reliance Fresh-labeled milk and milk products, but they are still unwilling to buy them (equal variances not assumed, $p < 0.001$ is less than the chosen significance level $\alpha = 0.05$, Table 21). Thus the null hypothesis cannot be accepted.

H2b(iv): Customers prefer private label brand of milk and milk products sold by Reliance Fresh as they can get a wider RANGE.

Comparison of means shows that though respondents get the range of the Reliance Fresh-labeled milk and milk products, but they are still unwilling to buy them (equal variances not assumed, $p < 0.001$ is less than the chosen significance level $\alpha = 0.05$, Table 22). Thus the null hypothesis cannot be accepted.

H2b(v): Customers prefer private label brand of milk and milk products sold by Big Bazaar as they find its QUALITY better than that of the national brands.

Means have been compared for those who find the QUALITY of Big Bazaar labeled milk and milk products better than those of anywhere else, even national brands, with those who do not (Table 23). Since variance are not assumed to be equal and $p < 0.001$ is less than the chosen significance level $\alpha = 0.05$, the null hypothesis cannot be accepted.

H2b (vi): Customers prefer private label brand of milk and milk products sold by Big Bazaar due to better DISCOUNT.

Means have been compared for those who find that Big Bazaar better DISCOUNT on its private labeled milk and milk products than those of anywhere else, even national brands, with those who do not (Table 24). It is evident that about 27% respondents were unsure about the quality of Big Bazaar-labeled milk products since they had not bought these from any Big Bazaar outlet. Out of 73% respondents who have shopped, 54% do not prefer private label brands of milk and milk products sold by Big Bazaar. Hence, although $p < 0.658$ is more than the chosen significance level $\alpha = 0.05$ for un-pooled variances, the null hypothesis cannot be accepted.

H2b (vii): Customers prefer private label brand of milk and milk products sold by Big Bazaar as they can easily LOCATE them.

Comparison of means shows that though respondents can locate the Big Bazaar-labeled milk and milk products, but they are still unwilling to buy them (equal variances not assumed, $p < 0.001$ is less than the chosen significance level $\alpha = 0.05$, Table 25). Thus the null hypothesis cannot be accepted.

H2b (viii): Customers prefer private label brand of milk and milk products sold by Big Bazaar as they can get a wider RANGE.

Comparison of means shows that though respondents get the range of the Big Bazaar-labeled milk and milk products, but they are still unwilling to buy them (equal variances not assumed, $p < 0.001$ is less than the chosen significance level $\alpha = 0.05$, Table 26). Thus the null hypothesis cannot be accepted.

H2b (ix): Customers prefer private label brand of milk and milk products sold by More as they find its QUALITY better than that of the national brands.

Means have been compared for those who find the QUALITY of More labeled instant noodles better than those of anywhere else, even national brands, with those who do not (Table 27). It is evident that about 55% respondents were unsure about the quality of More-labeled milk products since they had not bought these from any More outlet. Out of 45% respondents who have shopped, 80% do not prefer private label brands of milk and milk products sold by More. Hence, although $p < 1.000$ is more than the chosen significance level $\alpha = 0.05$ for un-pooled variances, the null hypothesis cannot be accepted.

H2b (x): Customers prefer private label brand of milk and milk products sold by More due to better DISCOUNT.

Means have been compared for those who prefer private label brands of milk and milk products sold by More with those who do not (Table 28). It is evident that about 55% respondents were unsure about the quality of More-labeled milk products since they had not bought these from any More outlet. Out of 45% respondents who have shopped, none prefer private label brands of milk and milk products sold by More. Hence the null hypothesis cannot be accepted.

H2b (xi): Customers prefer private label brand of milk and milk products sold by More as they can easily LOCATE them.

Comparison of means shows that respondents are unable to locate the More-labeled milk products. It can be inferred that they are unwilling to buy them though $p < 0.137$ (equal variances not assumed, Table 29) is more than the chosen significance level $\alpha = 0.05$. Hence, the null hypothesis cannot be accepted.

H2b (xii): Customers prefer private label brand of milk and milk products sold by More as they can get a wider RANGE.

Means have been compared for those who prefer private label brands of milk and milk products sold by More with those who do not (Table 30). It is evident that about 55% respondents were unsure about the quality of More-labeled milk products since they had not bought these from any More outlet. Out of 45% respondents who have shopped, 87% do not prefer private label brands of milk and milk products sold by More. Hence the null hypothesis cannot be accepted.

Inferences

It can be inferred from the analyses above that customers are aware that the organised retail stores sell food products under their respective private label brands. The reason for introducing private label brands under the food products category by the organised retailers is mainly to improve their margins. Food and groceries are high volume but low margin product category. There have been instances when the organised retail stores have sought better margins from national brand owning food products' vendors but they not been successful in negotiating the same (Kamath (b), 2010).

Further, instant noodles as a food product is not preferred by consumers under private label brands despite consumers finding the private label brands being better than the national brands in terms of quality, discount, range and ease of locating them inside the store. Organised retail store owners, specifically Reliance Fresh and Big Bazaar, are trusted more as compared to More in terms of the aforementioned attributes. However, the store image for neither of the organised retailers is strong enough to take the customers away from national brands of instant noodles. Indeed, market reports (Euromonitor International, 2015), (Technopak Advisors Pvt. Ltd.) suggest that Nestlé India leads the overall instant noodles market in India with a market share of more than 70% for its 'Maggi' brand, with other brands like Top Ramen from Nissin Foods, Knorr Soupy Noodles from Hindustan Unilever, Horlicks Foodles from GSK Consumer, Smith & Jones from Capital Foods, and Sunfeast Yippee from ITC capturing the remaining 25%.

Private label brands of Big Bazaar, More and Reliance Fresh have a combined market share of just 5% as of 2014.

The production of milk and milk products is highly fragmented. The unorganized milk producers have a market share of about 70%. The informal or unorganized market is dominated by small dairy farmers in the rural areas who consume approximately 45% of their own produce. The remaining 55% surplus is in turn sold to either the dairy cooperatives or to other larger private dairies and dairy product making organisations depending upon the prevailing prices in the international markets. Reduction in demand in the international markets makes private dairy organisations to procure less from the farmers thus turning the farmers towards the dairy cooperatives. Most state level dairy cooperatives are defunct and not as successful as the ones in Punjab, Gujarat, and Karnataka (Malik, Sivakumar, & Sinha, 2015). Punjab and Chandigarh are amongst the highest per capita consumers of milk and milk products, as has been mentioned earlier. This has prompted most organised retailers to introduce private label brands of milk and milk products. Amongst the organised retailers only Reliance Fresh sells a large range of milk and milk products under Dairy Pure private label brand. Big Bazaar and More sell only ghee under their respective private label brands of Fresh n Pure and Kitchen's Promise. However, these private label brands are not being preferred despite the efforts of organised retailers to position their offerings at par with and in some cases better than the national brands in terms of quality, prices, range and ease of location inside the stores.

Conclusions

The conclusions drawn above for instant noodles and milk and milk products suggest that consumers are not yet ready to buy private label brands of these products. It has to be appreciated by the organised retailers that private label brands typically are accepted in such product categories that do not have strong brands, which is not so in case of instant noodles and milk and milk products. Organised retailers may have to improve their own brand image in the minds of their customers before introducing the private label brands in various product categories that they sell.

Acknowledgements

The author acknowledges the contribution of Dr. Arunesh Garg, Asst. Professor, Thapar University, Patiala, and Mr. A. K. Mittal, Professor, Gian Jyoti Institute of Management and Technology, for interpretation of results. Any error, if found, is completely that of the author.

Bibliography

- Abhishek, & Koshy, A. (2008, February). Improving Quality Perceptions of Private Label Brands. Retrieved July 2011, from IIM Ahmedabad Working Paper: <http://www.iimahd.ernet.in/publications/data/2008-02-04Abhishek.pdf>
- Baltas, G. (2003). A combined segmentation and demand model for store brands. *European Journal of Marketing*, 37(10), 1499-1514.

Baltas, G., & Argouslidis, P. C. (2007). Consumer characteristics and demand for store brands. *International Journal of Retail and Distribution Management*, 35(5), 328-341.

businessdictionary.com. (n.d.). Private Label. Retrieved March 13, 2011, from Business Dictionary: <http://www.businessdictionary.com/definition/private-label.html>

CRISIL Insight. (2014). Top 10 food retailers rack up Rs. 13,000 crore losses. CRISIL.

Dhar, S. K., & Hoch, S. J. (1997). Why Store Brand Penetration Varies by Retailer? *Marketing Science*, 16(3), 208-227.

Euromonitor International. (2015, March). Noodles in India. Retrieved August 2015, from Euromonitor International: <http://www.euromonitor.com/noodles-in-india/report>

Jayakrishnan, S., Chaudhuri, R., & Chikhalkar, R. D. (2012, June 26). Factors moderating private label purchase. Retrieved January 30, 2014, from Global Conference on Flexible Systems Management, Vienna: SSRN: <http://ssrn.com/abstract=2347901>

Kamath (a), R. (2014, June 24). Seven years on, retailers still see red. (T. N. Ninan, Ed.) Retrieved June 23, 2015, from Business Standard: http://www.business-standard.com/article/companies/seven-years-on-retailers-still-see-red-114062200229_1.html

Kamath (b), R. (2010, March 26). Retailers take on FMCG firms with private label push. (T. N. Ninan, Ed.) Retrieved August 15, 2015, from Business Standard: http://www.business-standard.com/article/companies/retailers-take-on-fmcg-firms-with-private-label-push-110032600089_1.html

Laibson, D. (2001, February). A Cue-Theory of Consumption. Retrieved September 2015, from The Quarterly Journal of Economics: <http://faculty.apec.umn.edu/jkinsey/Behavioral-econ-Laibson-2001-Q-theory-of-consumption-1.pdf>

Lal, R. (2015, March 30). Most organised retail cannot handle competition: Rajiv Lal. (D. Joshi, Interviewer) Business Standard.

Levy, M., Weitz, B. A., & Pandit, A. (2008). *Retailing Management (Special Indian Edition)* (6th ed.). New Delhi: Tata McGraw-Hill.

Madaan, K. V. (2009). Changing Face of Retail - Main Features of Modern Retail. In K. V. Madaan, *Fundamentals of Retailing* (pp. 6-7). McGraw-Hill.

Malik, D., Sivakumar, J. B., & Sinha, S. K. (2015, March). Outlook FY16: Dairy. Retrieved August 2015, from India Ratings & Research: <https://www.indiaratings.co.in/upload/research/specialReports/2015/3/19/indra19Dairy.pdf>

McKinsey & Company, Inc. (2008). *The Great Indian Bazaar - Organised Retail Comes of Age in India*. Retrieved November 17, 2012, from McKinsey Quarterly:

http://csi.mckinsey.com/~media/Extranets/Consumer%20Shopper%20Insights/Reports/THE_GREAT_INDIAN_BAZAAR_SECURE.ashx

Misra, B. (2014, May 28). Food retailers including Reliance, Aditya Birla Retail, Wal-Mart, Bharti accumulate Rs 13,000 cr loss in FY14: CRISIL. Retrieved June 23, 2015, from Economic Times: http://articles.economictimes.indiatimes.com/2014-05-28/news/50149340_1_food-bazaar-retailers-reliance-fresh

Mukherjee, A., & Patel, N. (2005). FDI in Retail Sector: India. Food and Public Distribution, Govt. of India, Department of Consumer Affairs, Ministry of Consumer Affairs. Academic Foundation, Indian Council for Research in International Economic Relations (ICRIER).

Mukherjee, D., & Kalbag, H. (2011). The Case for "Compact Hypermarkets" in India. Retrieved June 23, 2015, from A. T. Kearney: http://www.atkearney.in/documents/10192/481624/The_Case_for_Compact_Hypermarkets_in_India.pdf/ff2d3e3d-7d70-4149-82ba-acb2408cb097

Nair, L. (2011, January). Private Labels Brands in Food & Grocery: The Changing Perceptions of Consumers & Retailers in India - A Study in the Pune Region. Retrieved July 22, 2011, from Journal of Arts, Science & Commerce: www.researchersworld.com/vol2/PAPER_15.pdf

National Sample Survey Office (NSSO). (2013, June). Key Indicators of Household Consumer Expenditure in India - NSS 68th Round. Retrieved August 2015, from Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation, Government of India: http://mospi.nic.in/Mospi_New/Admin/publication.aspx

Rzem, H., & Debabi, M. (2012). Store Image as a Moderator of Store Brand Attitude. *Journal of Business Studies Quarterly*, 4(1), 130-148.

Semeijn, J., van Riel, A. C., & Ambrosini, A. B. (2004). Consumer evaluations of store brands: effects of store image and product attributes. *Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services*, 11(4), 247-258.

Sethi, A., Hari B S, S., & Nori, A. K. (2014, May 28). Top 10 Food Retailers rack up Rs. 13,000 crore losses. Retrieved June 23, 2015, from CNBC TV18 Web site: http://www.moneycontrol.com/news_html_files/news_attachment/2014/Food-Retail_CRISIL_280514.pdf

Technopak Advisors Pvt. Ltd. (n.d.). Instant Noodles Market in India. Retrieved August 2015, from Technopak Advisors Pvt. Ltd.: <http://www.technopak.com/Files/instant-noodles-market-in-india.pdf>

The Nielsen Company. (2014, November 18). State of Private Label around the World. Retrieved April 29, 2015, from The Nielsen Company Web site: <http://www.nielsen.com/in/en/insights/reports/2014/the-state-of-private-label-around-the-world.html>

thefreedictionary.com. (n.d.). Private Label. Retrieved March 13, 2011, from The Free Dictionary: <http://encyclopedia.thefreedictionary.com/Private+label>

Wikipedia contributors. (2014, December 26). Sensory cue. Retrieved September 13, 2015, from Wikipedia, The Free Encyclopedia: https://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Sensory_cue&oldid=639636926

Appendix: Tables 1 to 30

Table 1: Summary of literature review by Jayakrishnan, Chaudhuri and Chikhalkar (2012)

Author / Year	Category	Type of paper / Context in India	Method / Instrument	Method of data analysis
Abhishek, Koshy (2008)	Grocery	Qualitative, NA	NA	Review
Abhishek (2011)	Apparels	Quantitative, NA	Secondary data	Logit modeling
Pandya, Joshi (2011)	Personal care, consumer durables	Quantitative, Gujarat	Questionnaire	T-test
Nair (2011)	Food and grocery segment	Quantitative, Pune	Questionnaire	Percentage analysis

Table 2: Outlet Preference for Food products from Amartex

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes	22	33.3	33.3	33.3
	No	44	66.7	66.7	100.0
	Total	66	100.0	100.0	

Table 3: Outlet Preference for Food products from Big Bazaar

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes	44	66.7	66.7	66.7
	No	22	33.3	33.3	100.0
	Total	66	100.0	100.0	

Table 4: Outlet Preference for Food products from More

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes	10	15.2	15.2	15.2
	No	56	84.8	84.8	100.0
	Total	66	100.0	100.0	

Table 5: Outlet Preference for Food products from Reliance Fresh

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes	40	60.6	60.6	60.6
	No	26	39.4	39.4	100.0
	Total	66	100.0	100.0	

Table 6: Group Statistics

		I find Reliance Fresh labeled instant noodles to be of better QUALITY than available anywhere else, maybe even national brands.		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean			
Preference for Reliance Fresh labeled instant noodles	Yes			32	1.38	0.492	0.087			
	No			18	3.56	0.984	0.232			
Independent Samples Test										
		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
									Lower	Upper
Preference for Reliance Fresh labeled instant noodles	Equal variances assumed	17.981	0.000	-10.479	48	0.000	-2.181	0.208	-2.599	-1.762
	Equal variances not assumed			-8.807	21.882	0.000	-2.181	0.248	-2.694	-1.667

Table 7: Group Statistics

	I can get a DISCOUNT for Reliance Fresh labeled milk and milk products at their store.	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean					
Preference for Reliance Fresh labeled instant noodles	Yes	22	1.09	0.294	0.063					
	No	16	3.75	0.856	0.214					
Independent Samples Test										
		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
									Lower	Upper
Preference for Reliance Fresh labeled instant noodles	Equal variances assumed	35.438	0.000	-13.56	36	0.000	-2.659	0.196	-3.057	-2.261
	Equal variances not assumed			-11.92	17.594	0.000	-2.659	0.223	-3.129	-2.19

Table 8: Group Statistics

	I can LOCATE Reliance Fresh labeled instant noodles easily inside their store.	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean					
Preference for Reliance Fresh labeled instant noodles	Yes	32	1.44	0.504	0.089					
	No	18	3.44	1.199	0.283					
Independent Samples Test										
		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
									Lower	Upper
Preference for Reliance Fresh labeled instant noodles	Equal variances assumed	12.617	0.001	-8.301	48	0.000	-2.007	0.242	-2.493	-1.521
	Equal variances not assumed			-6.772	20.436	0.000	-2.007	0.296	-2.624	-1.39

Table 9: Group Statistics

	I can get the RANGE of Reliance Fresh labeled instant noodles that I need to buy.	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean					
Preference for Reliance Fresh labeled instant noodles	Yes	32	1.5	0.622	0.11					
	No	18	3.33	1.283	0.302					
Independent Samples Test										
		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
									Lower	Upper
Preference for Reliance Fresh labeled instant noodles	Equal variances assumed	11.84	0.001	-6.816	48	0.000	-1.833	0.269	-2.374	-1.293
	Equal variances not assumed			-5.696	21.585	0.000	-1.833	0.322	-2.502	-1.165

Table 10: Group Statistics

	I find Big Bazaar labeled instant noodles to be of better QUALITY than available anywhere else, maybe even national brands.	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean					
Preference for Big Bazaar labeled instant noodles	Yes	34	1.88	0.478	0.082					
	No	22	3	1.574	0.335					
Independent Samples Test										
		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
									Lower	Upper
Preference for Big Bazaar labeled instant noodles	Equal variances assumed	32.364	0.000	-3.89	54	0.000	-1.118	0.287	-1.694	-0.542
	Equal variances not assumed			-3.236	23.526	0.004	-1.118	0.345	-1.831	-0.404

Table 11: Group Statistics

	I can get a DISCOUNT for Big Bazaar labeled instant noodles at their store.	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean					
Preference for Big Bazaar labeled instant noodles	Yes	38	1.84	0.594	0.096					
	No	18	3.33	1.455	0.343					
Independent Samples Test										
		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
									Lower	Upper
Preference for Big Bazaar labeled instant noodles	Equal variances assumed	33.67	0.000	-5.468	54	0.000	-1.491	0.273	-2.038	-0.944
	Equal variances not assumed			-4.186	19.732	0.000	-1.491	0.356	-2.235	-0.747

Table 12: Group Statistics

	I can LOCATE Big Bazaar labeled instant noodles easily inside their store.	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean					
Preference for Big Bazaar labeled instant noodles	Yes	32	1.88	0.609	0.108					
	No	24	2.92	1.472	0.3					
Independent Samples Test										
		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
									Lower	Upper
Preference for Big Bazaar labeled instant noodles	Equal variances assumed	27.608	0.000	-3.62	54	0.001	-1.042	0.288	-1.619	-0.465
	Equal variances not assumed			-3.264	28.932	0.003	-1.042	0.319	-1.695	-0.389

Table 13: Group Statistics

		I can get the RANGE of Big Bazaar labeled instant noodles that I need to buy.	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean				
Preference for Big Bazaar labeled instant noodles	Yes		40	1.85	0.58	0.092				
	No		16	3.5	1.461	0.365				
Independent Samples Test										
		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
									Lower	Upper
Preference for Big Bazaar labeled instant noodles	Equal variances assumed	32.625	0.000	-6.104	54	0.000	-1.650	0.270	-2.192	-1.108
	Equal variances not assumed			-4.383	16.923	0.000	-1.650	0.376	-2.445	-0.855

Table 14: Group Statistics

		I find More labeled instant noodles to be of better QUALITY than available anywhere else, maybe even national brands.	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean				
Preference for More labeled instant noodles	Yes		4	2.5	0.577	0.289				
	No		24	3.25	1.327	0.271				
Independent Samples Test										
		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
									Lower	Upper
Preference for More labeled instant noodles	Equal variances assumed	1.351	0.256	-1.099	26	0.282	-0.750	0.682	-2.153	0.653
	Equal variances not assumed			-1.895	9.634	0.089	-0.750	0.396	-1.637	0.137

Table 15: Group Statistics

		I can get a DISCOUNT for More labeled instant noodles at their store.	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean				
Preference for More labeled instant noodles	Yes		6	1.670	1.033	0.422				
	No		22	3.550	1.011	0.215				
Independent Samples Test										
		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
									Lower	Upper
Preference for More labeled instant noodles	Equal variances assumed	0.004	0.951	-4.019	26	0.000	-1.879	0.467	-2.840	-0.918
	Equal variances not assumed			-3.968	7.826	0.004	-1.879	0.474	-2.975	-0.783

Table 16: Group Statistics

		I can LOCATE More labeled instant noodles easily inside their store.	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean				
Preference for More labeled instant noodles	Yes		8	2	1.069	0.378				
	No		20	3.6	1.046	0.234				
Independent Samples Test										
		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
									Lower	Upper
Preference for More labeled instant noodles	Equal variances assumed	0.246	0.624	-3.634	26	0.001	-1.600	0.440	-2.505	-0.695
	Equal variances not assumed			-3.599	12.705	0.003	-1.600	0.445	-2.563	-0.637

Table 17: Group Statistics

	I can get the RANGE of More labeled instant noodles that I need to buy.	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean					
Preference for More labeled instant noodles	Yes	8	1.75	0.886	0.313					
	No	20	3.7	0.923	0.206					
Independent Samples Test										
		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
									Lower	Upper
Preference for More labeled instant noodles	Equal variances assumed	0.390	0.538	-5.102	26	0.000	-1.950	0.382	-2.736	-1.164
	Equal variances not assumed			-5.196	13.461	0.000	-1.950	0.375	-2.758	-1.142

Table 18: Breakup of Monthly per Capita Expenditure

(Modified Mixed Reference Period)

Value (Rs.) and Percentage (%) of total per capita consumption in 30 days

Item	Punjab (Urban)		Chandigarh (Urban)		All India (Urban)	
	Value (Rs.)	Percentage (%)	Value (Rs.)	Percentage (%)	Value (Rs.)	Percentage (%)
1. Food	1145.00	40.98	1263.24	37.63	1120.88	42.62
i. Milk & Milk Products	347.33	12.43	302.05	8.99	184.30	7.01
ii. Pulses & Pulse Products	48.17	1.72	73.62	2.19	50.76	1.93
iii. Cereal	139.85	5.00	150.66	4.49	173.82	6.61
iv. Gram	7.79	0.28	8.12	0.24	2.90	0.11
v. Spices	57.42	2.06	66.10	1.97	63.73	2.42
vi. Beverages, refreshments, etc.	193.43	6.93	299.30	8.92	236.18	8.98
2. Clothing	159.36	5.70	137.79	4.10	141.09	5.37
Total	2794.02*	100.00*	3357.05*	100.00*	2629.65*	100.00*

*Values and Percentages do not add-up to the total as only a few items have been considered.

Source: NSS 68th Round

Table 19: Group Statistics

		I find Reliance Fresh labeled milk and milk products to be of better QUALITY than available anywhere else, maybe even national brands.	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean				
Preference for Reliance Fresh labeled milk and milk products.	Yes		28	1.14	0.356	0.067				
	No		10	3.2	1.229	0.389				
Independent Samples Test										
		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances	t-test for Equality of Means							
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
									Lower	Upper
Preference for Reliance Fresh labeled milk and milk products.	Equal variances assumed	22.117	0.000	-8.119	36	0.000	-2.057	0.253	-2.571	-1.543
	Equal variances not assumed			-5.214	9.545	0.000	-2.057	0.395	-2.942	-1.172

Table 20: Group Statistics

		I can get a DISCOUNT for Reliance Fresh labeled milk and milk products at their store.	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean				
Preference for Reliance Fresh labeled milk and milk products.	Yes		22	1.09	0.294	0.063				
	No		16	2.5	1.366	0.342				
Independent Samples Test										
		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances	t-test for Equality of Means							
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
									Lower	Upper
Preference for Reliance Fresh labeled milk and milk products.	Equal variances assumed	93.041	0.000	-4.712	36	0.000	-1.409	0.299	-2.016	-0.803
	Equal variances not assumed			-4.058	16.016	0.001	-1.409	0.347	-2.145	-0.673

Table 21: Group Statistics

		I can LOCATE Reliance Fresh labeled milk and milk products easily inside their store.	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean				
Preference for Reliance Fresh labeled milk and milk products.	Yes		20	1.1	0.308	0.069				
	No		18	2.33	1.372	0.323				
Independent Samples Test										
		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
									Lower	Upper
Preference for Reliance Fresh labeled milk and milk products.	Equal variances assumed	86.196	0.000	-3.918	36	0.000	-1.233	0.315	-1.872	-0.595
	Equal variances not assumed			-3.730	18.541	0.001	-1.233	0.331	-1.926	-0.540

Table 22: Group Statistics

		I can get the RANGE of Reliance Fresh labeled milk and milk products that I need to buy.	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean				
Preference for Reliance Fresh labeled milk and milk products.	Yes		22	1.09	0.294	0.063				
	No		16	2.5	1.366	0.342				
Independent Samples Test										
		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
									Lower	Upper
Preference for Reliance Fresh labeled milk and milk products.	Equal variances assumed	93.041	0.000	-4.712	36	0.000	-1.409	0.299	-2.016	-0.803
	Equal variances not assumed			-4.058	16.016	0.001	-1.409	0.347	-2.145	-0.673

Table 23: Group Statistics

	I find Big Bazaar labeled milk and milk products to be of better QUALITY than available anywhere else, maybe even national brands.	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean					
Preference for Big Bazaar labeled milk and milk products.	Yes	20	1.400	0.503	0.112					
	No	28	3.210	0.957	0.181					
Independent Samples Test										
		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
									Lower	Upper
Preference for Big Bazaar labeled milk and milk products.	Equal variances assumed	6.582	0.014	-7.736	46	0.000	-1.814	0.235	-2.286	-1.342
	Equal variances not assumed			-8.522	42.813	0.000	-1.814	0.213	-2.244	-1.385

Table 24: Group Statistics

	I can get a DISCOUNT for Big Bazaar labeled milk and milk products at their store.	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean					
Preference for Big Bazaar labeled milk and milk products.	Yes	22	2.55	1.405	0.3					
	No	26	2.38	1.023	0.201					
Independent Samples Test										
		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
									Lower	Upper
Preference for Big Bazaar labeled milk and milk products.	Equal variances assumed	11.881	0.001	0.458	46	0.649	0.161	0.351	-0.546	0.868
	Equal variances not assumed			0.446	37.690	0.658	0.161	0.361	-0.569	0.891

Table 25: Group Statistics

		I can LOCATE Big Bazaar labeled milk and milk products easily inside their store.	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean				
Preference for Big Bazaar labeled milk and milk products.	Yes		18	1.78	0.943	0.222				
	No		30	2.87	1.167	0.213				
Independent Samples Test										
		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances	t-test for Equality of Means							
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
									Lower	Upper
Preference for Big Bazaar labeled milk and milk products.	Equal variances assumed	2.455	0.124	-3.353	46	0.002	-1.089	0.325	-1.743	-0.435
	Equal variances not assumed			-3.538	41.868	0.001	-1.089	0.308	-1.710	-0.468

Table 26: Group Statistics

		I can get the RANGE of Big Bazaar labeled milk and milk products that I need to buy.	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean				
Preference for Big Bazaar labeled milk and milk products.	Yes		18	1.78	0.943	0.222				
	No		29	2.86	1.187	0.22				
Independent Samples Test										
		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances	t-test for Equality of Means							
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
									Lower	Upper
Preference for Big Bazaar labeled milk and milk products.	Equal variances assumed	3.049	0.088	-3.282	45	0.002	-1.084	0.330	-1.750	-0.419
	Equal variances not assumed			-3.464	42.140	0.001	-1.084	0.313	-1.716	-0.453

Table 27: Group Statistics

		I find More labeled milk and milk products to be of better QUALITY than available anywhere else, maybe even national brands.	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean				
Preference for More labeled milk and milk products.	Yes		6	3	0.894	0.365				
	No		24	3	0.59	0.12				
Independent Samples Test										
		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances	t-test for Equality of Means							
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
									Lower	Upper
Preference for More labeled milk and milk products.	Equal variances assumed	2.240	0.146	0.000	28	1.000	0.000	0.299	-0.612	0.612
	Equal variances not assumed			0.000	6.130	1.000	0.000	0.384	-0.936	0.936

Table 28: Group Statistics

		I can get a DISCOUNT for More labeled milk and milk products at their store.	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Preference for More labeled milk and milk products.	Yes		0*	.	.	.
	No		30	3	0.643	0.117
* t cannot be computed because at least one of the groups is empty.						

Table 29: Group Statistics

		I can LOCATE More labeled milk and milk products easily inside their store.	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean				
Preference for More labeled milk and milk products.	Yes		4	3.5	0.577	0.289				
	No		26	2.92	0.628	0.123				
Independent Samples Test										
		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
									Lower	Upper
Preference for More labeled milk and milk products.	Equal variances assumed	0.104	0.750	1.726	28	0.095	0.577	0.334	-0.108	1.262
	Equal variances not assumed			1.838	4.173	0.137	0.577	0.314	-0.280	1.434

Table 30: Group Statistics

		I can get the RANGE of More labeled milk and milk products that I need to buy.	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean				
Preference for More labeled milk and milk products.	Yes		8	2.75	0.886	0.313				
	No		21	3.1	0.539	0.118				
Independent Samples Test										
		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
									Lower	Upper
Preference for More labeled milk and milk products.	Equal variances assumed	5.956	0.022	-1.284	27	0.210	-0.345	0.269	-0.897	0.206
	Equal variances not assumed			-1.031	9.048	0.329	-0.345	0.335	-1.102	0.411