European Economic Letters
ISSN 2323-5233
Vol 15, Issue 2 (2025)
http://eelet.org.uk

Cartography of Consumption: A Regional Study of Private Label Brands from Local Tastes to Global Trends

[1]**Dr. Parampal Singh**
Associate Professor
MBA Department
Chandigarh Business School of Administration
CGC
Landran.
[2]**Dr. Manjeet**
Assistant Professor
University School of Financial Studies
Guru Nanak Dev University
Amritsar

ABSTRACT:
There is a paradigm shift towards the purchase of private label brands as compared to the national brands. Successful differentiation of the private label brands has been achieved worldwide and further their impact in the seen the developed markets (Justin Beneke, 2010). The emergence of private label brands is quite evident from the fact that higher margins provided by the private label brands to the retailers as compared to national brands have resulted in higher sales push to the retailers and has augured enough for the growth of private label brands. The present study focused upon to identify the demographic profile influencing customer buying behavior towards private label brands over national brands. Various tools and techniques have been used to achieve these objectives of the study. To analyze and interpret the data cross sectional analysis and descriptive statistics has been utilized. Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS 16) has been used to analyze the data for the present study. The demographic profile of the respondents has been analyzed based upon their region of living. This parameter has been cross tabulated with the awareness level of respondents about the private label brands considered for the study. The awareness level has been studied on five point likert scale (NTAW= Not at all aware, SUAW= Somewhat Unaware, CS= Can't say, SAW= Somewhat aware and CAW= Completely Aware). As per the inferences derived after the data analysis, it was quite evident that private label brands are gaining importance with respect to customers as well as retailer. The majority of the respondents of Punjab and Chandigarh were aware about the private label brands whereas respondents belonging to Haryana were not at all aware about the private label brand. Private label brands can be lethal weapon which would serve as a point of distinction in the battles fought with other brands. Retailers will have a unique selling proposition by the means of private label brands.

KEYWORDS: Private Label Brand, Gender, Demographic and Consumer Buying Behaviour

INTRODUCTION

From time to time the trends have been changing in the shopping patterns of the customer which is due to the change in their perception of seeing products and services. As per the Cambridge dictionary perception can be described as 'a belief or opinion often held by many people and based on how things seem'. It is a systematic approach by which an individual select, organize and interpret stimuli in an evocative representation of the world. Perception is defined as a extensive thoughts that people construct in their mindset and infer that thoughts as a bigger significant picture (Raji et.al, 2016). This concept has deepens its root in the land of marketing and plays a vital role in the explanation of customer perception. Marketing activities can get knotty and obscure at certain times in the business. It is because of the complexity of the human brain and the manner it functions. Customers are dynamic in their thought process but tend to amalgamate while portraying definite emotions and behaviours. A lot of these complex thoughts and behavioural patterns that the customers reveal can be pooled into a concept called as customer perception. A customer creates an image in his/her mindset as soon as he/she encounters the product or service. Customer perception can be defined in a formal manner as a marketing concept that deals with the customer impression, awareness and/or consciousness about a company/brand and its offered product or services. It can be positive feelings, negative feelings, predispositions, expectations or experiences. In simple words, customer perception is what the present customers and potential customers think about the organization. This thought process straightforwardly impacts the pull of new customers and the ability to uphold superior relationships with present customers. It plays a crucial role in an organization ability to create a center of attention for new customers and to hang on to the pre-existing customers. The good news is that organizations have the capacity to manage many of these factors that build a customer's perception towards the company/brand. Customer perception has been formulated at the very first notion about the product. Customers form an opinion about the value of a product immediately before purchasing the product. In addition to it, the customer perception is opinionated by the experience already captured from the similar product (Amini et. al, 2014). The main factors that changed the customer consumption pattern across the globe and eventually helped the emergence of private labels are as follows:-

- Ascend in urbanization, which amplified the number of modern retail formats such as supermarkets, hypermarkets, convenience and discount stores.
- Increase in the population of the youth, as well as rise in the number of working women.
- Increase in the disposable income of the middle class drove consumers toward packaged products for hygiene and better quality.
- Ability of private label brands to offer affordable products compared with the FMCG brands.
- Sales push by the retailers, as private labels offer higher margins.

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Cuneo et al (2019) investigated about the strategic decisions to be taken by the retail managers to boost the choice of private label brand among consumers. This paper has also provided strategic decisions to be taken by the national brand managers to fight against the rise of private label brands. Socio demographics were analyzed by considering age, gender, social class and number of inhabitants in the region. This study was conducted in Spain, which contains the data of 1505 respondents by using stratified random sampling. Authors have considered only two product categories of shampoos and deodorants. The techniques employed to analysis the data were latent class analysis which comprises up certain steps i.e. conducting exploratory factor analysis by the means of Kaiser Meyer Olkin test and conducting confirmatory factor analysis for structural equation model. Results revealed that there were four segments identified after LCA i.e. Price driven, Image reflectors, Brand category discerners and smart shoppers. Firstly, price driven were those who reflect polarized consumption pattern that they purchase lowest price products and they mostly purchase private label brands. Authors also suggested for retail managers that private label brands can be sold by aggressive selling/promotion activities, trading up by developing premium quality private label brand and moving from functional aspects to emotional aspects of the product. The future scope of the research were that product categories with lower rate of purchase and higher rate of risk and involvement can be considered and future research can be considered in other developing countries to analyze the penetration of private label brands. **K. Vidhya and D. Ganesam (2019)** focused upon the customer perception about private label brands. This study was conducted in the city of Tamil Nadu named Salem. The objectives of the study were to find out the customer preference and perception about the private label brands, to identify the level of preference towards private label products, to examine various factors which influenced the buying behaviour of the private label brands, to analyze the private label product benefits as well as the difference between private label brand and manufacture brand, to study the impact of price of product on buying behaviour of the customers and to analyze the performance of private label brands with manufacturers brand. Convenience sampling technique was used to conduct the research. Data was collected from 100 respondents with the help of questionnaire in aid to personal interviews. Data was analyzed with the various statistical techniques such as percentage method, weighted average score analysis and correlation analysis. Results indicated that majority of the people were males (58%), of 36-45 years of age group (43%), private employees (33%) and have a family income above Rs 40000 (38%). It is also observed that 74% respondents purchase private label brands for their personal use, 45% respondents purchase private label brands from super markets and 68% respondents make the purchase of private label brand whenever needed. Consumers prefer to shop for private label brands in the food and beverage segment followed by grocery, apparels, footwear and consumer durables. It is also found that majority of the respondents feel packaging of private label brand were somewhat attractive, TV commercials and newspaper magazines were major source of information about private label brands. Majority of the respondents consider private label brand as good choice for value of money as well as their performance is also good. **Kanukolanu Venkata Sajjan and M. Jyothsna (2019)** articulated about the consumer perceptions of private label brands in the grocery segment. This study was based upon the city named Bengaluru. The objectives of the study were to understand the socio-demographic profile and store preferences of the customers making private label brands purchases at various selected retail outlets and to identify the relationship between different socio-demographics variables and perception variables of private label brands and intentions to buy the private label brands. 780 responses were collected with the help of questionnaire prepared on 5 point likert scale, out off which 715 were considered for analysis of the data. Chi square test and average score techniques were used to analysis the data. The results of the study indicated that gender has no significant impact regarding store service, price and quality of private label brands i.e. feelings about the parameters were same in males and females. Results revealed that age has a significant impact on price and quality of private label brands i.e. feeling about the parameters vary across different age groups. **Hassan et al (2020)** examined the impact of visual merchandising and customer value purchase intentions of private label brands. This study

European Economic Letters
ISSN 2323-5233
Vol 15, Issue 2 (2025)
http://eelet.org.uk

was conducted in Indonesia. The objective of the study was to develop propositions about visual merchandising, customer value and purchase intention of private label brands. Authors had suggested that several factors affecting purchase intentions of private label brands were sore image, perceived risk, perceived quality, perceived value, trust and service quality. Authors had specified visual merchandising relationship with display of products, store interiors and store brand name. Authors had discussed five types of customer values namely functional value, social value, emotional value, epistemic value and conditional value which were used in the retail stores during the buying of products. Authors had formulated a model which depicts that visual merchandising has an impact on customer value, visual merchandising has an impact on purchase intentions and customer value has an impact on purchase intention. **V. Anitha and A.R. Krishnan (2020)** investigated the consumer purchase intention of private label edible products with special focus on price and quality. This study was conducted in the capital city of Tamil Nadu, Chennai. The objectives of the study were to identify the factor influencing consumer purchase intention in modern trade retail outlets in Chennai, to know the impact of perceived quality and perceived value on consumer purchase intention and to analyze the association between perceived quality and perceived value towards purchase intention. Simple random sampling technique was used to collect the data from 200 respondent which were buyers at 5 retail stores (Nilgris, More, Spencer, Reliance Fresh and Big Bazaar). Data was collected with the help of structured questionnaire developed upon 21 items by using mall intercept method. Data was analyzed by using quantitative techniques like correlation, regression and factor analysis. Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (0.786) and Bartlett's test was conducted for doing factor analysis. Factor analysis results indicated that 17 items were extracted into 2 factors namely perceived quality and perceived price. Regression analysis results based upon the R square value indicated that perceived quality is determined to the extent of 42% and perceived price is determined to the extent of 35% on consumer purchase intention towards private label brands. The major finding of the study indicated that major factors influencing consumer perceptions related to private labels were proximity, private label brand loyalty, risk aversion, serviceability and corporate image along with price and quality dimensions. Private label brand consumers can be grouped into four categories namely quality conscious shoppers, high expectation seekers, apathetic shoppers and impression oriented shoppers. The major factors influencing price dimensions related to private label brands were value maximization, sale proneness, price consciousness, price mavens, and prestige sensitivity. Consumers give more importance to intrinsic cues as compared to extrinsic cues of quality dimensions of private label brands.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The present study focused upon to identify the demographic profile influencing customer buying behavior towards private label brands over national brands. The demographic profile of the respondents has been analyzed based upon their region of living. The awareness level of people of Punjab about the private label brands was based upon the information gathered from 192 respondents of Punjab out off the total 496 respondents. The awareness level of people of Haryana about the private label brands was based upon the statistics collected from 200 respondents of Haryana out off the total 496 respondents. The awareness level of people of Chandigarh about the private label brands was based upon the information gathered from 104 respondents out off the total 496 respondents. To analyze and interpret the data the cross sectional analysis and descriptive statistics was employed. Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS 16) has been used to analyze the data for the present study. This parameter has been cross tabulated with the awareness level of respondents about the private label brands considered for the study. The awareness level has been studied on five point likert scale (NTAW= Not at all aware, SUAW= Somewhat Unaware, CS= Can't say, SAW= Somewhat aware and CAW= Completely Aware).

DATA ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION

REGION WISE ANALYSIS

This segment of the current research design delineates the analysis of the respondent performed on the basis of their region specifically Punjab, Haryana and Chandigarh.

Punjab Awareness Level about Private Label Brands

Private Label Brand		NTAW	SUAW	CS	SAW	CAW
Swiss Tempelle	Count	37	25	27	76	27
	% within Region	19.30%	13.00%	14.10%	39.60%	14.10%
	% of Total	7.50%	5.00%	5.40%	15.30%	5.40%
Golden Harvest	Count	10	47	43	51	41

European Economic Letters
ISSN 2323-5233
Vol 15, Issue 2 (2025)
http://eelet.org.uk

Private Label Brand		NTAW	SUAW	CS	SAW	CAW
	% within Region	5.20%	24.50%	22.40%	26.60%	21.40%
	% of Total	2.00%	9.50%	8.70%	10.30%	8.30%
Tasty Treat	Count	9	10	42	89	42
	% within Region	4.70%	5.20%	21.90%	46.40%	21.90%
	% of Total	1.80%	2.00%	8.50%	17.90%	8.50%
Karmiq	Count	12	18	23	81	58
	% within Region	6.20%	9.40%	12.00%	42.20%	30.20%
	% of Total	2.40%	3.60%	4.60%	16.30%	11.70%
Sunkist	Count	19	13	34	91	35
	% within Region	9.90%	6.80%	17.70%	47.40%	18.20%
	% of Total	3.80%	2.60%	6.90%	18.30%	7.10%
Kosh	Count	10	24	30	79	49
	% within Region	5.20%	12.50%	15.60%	41.10%	25.50%
	% of Total	2.00%	4.80%	6.00%	15.90%	9.90%
Fresh & Pure	Count	11	15	34	102	30
	% within Region	5.70%	7.80%	17.70%	53.10%	15.60%
	% of Total	2.20%	3.00%	6.90%	20.60%	6.00%
Sangi’s Kitchen	Count	11	12	47	83	39
	% within Region	5.70%	6.20%	24.50%	43.20%	20.30%
	% of Total	2.20%	2.40%	9.50%	16.70%	7.90%
Clean Mate	Count	10	8	21	96	57
	% within Region	5.20%	4.20%	10.90%	50.00%	29.70%
	% of Total	2.00%	1.60%	4.20%	19.40%	11.50%
Desi Atta Company	Count	9	12	44	74	53
	% within Region	4.70%	6.20%	22.90%	38.50%	27.60%
	% of Total	1.80%	2.40%	8.90%	14.90%	10.70%
Feasters	Count	28	15	44	69	36
	% within Region	14.60%	7.80%	22.90%	35.90%	18.80%
	% of Total	5.60%	3.00%	8.90%	13.90%	7.30%
Kitchen’s Promise	Count	13	9	50	98	22
	% within Region	6.80%	4.70%	26.00%	51.00%	11.50%
	% of Total	2.60%	1.80%	10.10%	19.80%	4.40%

Private Label Brand		NTAW	SUAW	CS	SAW	CAW
Selecta	Count	14	17	17	93	51
	% within Region	7.30%	8.90%	8.90%	48.40%	26.60%
	% of Total	2.80%	3.40%	3.40%	18.80%	10.30%
More Choice	Count	14	8	40	71	59
	% within Region	7.30%	4.20%	20.80%	37.00%	30.70%
	% of Total	2.80%	1.60%	8.10%	14.30%	11.90%
More Life	Count	9	26	42	77	38
	% within Region	4.70%	13.50%	21.90%	40.10%	19.80%
	% of Total	1.80%	5.20%	8.50%	15.50%	7.70%
Snac tac	Count	20	14	66	76	16
	% within Region	10.40%	7.30%	34.40%	39.60%	8.30%
	% of Total	4.00%	2.80%	13.30%	15.30%	3.20%
Best Farms	Count	9	15	46	99	23
	% within Region	4.70%	7.80%	24.00%	51.60%	12.00%
	% of Total	1.80%	3.00%	9.30%	20.00%	4.60%
Healthy Life	Count	16	5	52	84	35
	% within Region	8.30%	2.60%	27.10%	43.80%	18.20%
	% of Total	3.20%	1.00%	10.50%	16.90%	7.10%
Enzo	Count	7	22	45	63	55
	% within Region	3.60%	11.50%	23.40%	32.80%	28.60%
	% of Total	1.40%	4.40%	9.10%	12.70%	11.10%
Good Life	Count	15	15	40	93	29
	% within Region	7.80%	7.80%	20.80%	48.40%	15.10%
	% of Total	3.00%	3.00%	8.10%	18.80%	5.80%
	RESPONDENTS OF PUNJAB				192	
	TOTAL RESPONDENTS				496	

Source: Compiled from primary data.

The table unveils the awareness level of people of Punjab about the private label brands based upon the information gathered from 192 respondents of Punjab out off the total 496 respondents. It exhibits that for the private label brand named Swiss Tempelle, 39.6% (76) of the Punjab respondents were somewhat aware and 13% (25) of the Punjab respondents were somewhat unaware. 26.6% (51) of the Punjab respondents were somewhat aware whereas at the lower side 5.2% (10) of the Punjab respondents were not at all aware about the Golden Harvest private label brand. 46.4% (89) of the Punjab respondents were somewhat aware whereas at the lower side 4.7% (9) of the Punjab respondents were not at all aware about the Tasty Treat private label brand. In the case of the Karmiq private label brand, 42.2% (81) of the Punjab respondents were somewhat aware and 6.2% (12) of the Punjab respondents were not at all aware. For the Sunkist private label brand,

European Economic Letters
ISSN 2323-5233
Vol 15, Issue 2 (2025)
http://eelet.org.uk

47.4% (91) of the Punjab respondents were somewhat aware and 6.8% (13) of the Punjab respondents were somewhat unaware. 41.1% (79) of the Punjab respondents were somewhat aware and 5.2% (10) of the Punjab respondents were not at all aware about the Kosh private label brand. 53.1% (102) of the Punjab respondents were somewhat aware and 5.7% (11) of the Punjab respondents were not at all aware about the Fresh & Pure private label brand. For the Sangi's Kitchen private label brand, 43.2% (83) of the Punjab respondents were somewhat aware and 5.7% (11) of the Punjab respondents were not at all aware. 50% (96) of the Punjab respondents were somewhat aware and 4.2% (8) of the Punjab respondents were not at all aware about the Clean Mate private label brand. 38.5% (74) of the Punjab respondents were somewhat aware whereas at the lower side 4.7% (9) of the Punjab respondents were not at all aware about the Desi Atta Company private label brand. For the Feasters private label brand, 35.9% (69) of the Punjab respondents were somewhat aware and 7.8% (15) of the Punjab respondents were somewhat unaware. The Kitchen's Promise private label brand had shown its presence as 51% (98) of the Punjab respondents were somewhat aware and 4.7% (9) of the Punjab respondents were somewhat unaware about it. 48.4% (93) of the Punjab respondents were somewhat aware and 7.3% (14) of the Punjab respondents were not at all aware about the Selecta private label brand. 37% (71) of the Punjab respondents were somewhat aware whereas at the lower side 4.2% (8) of the Punjab respondents were somewhat unaware about the More Choice private label brand. For the More Life private label brand, 40.1% (77) of the Punjab respondents were somewhat aware and 4.7% (9) of the Punjab respondents were not at all aware. 39.6% (76) of the Punjab respondents were somewhat aware and 7.3% (14) of the Punjab respondents were somewhat unaware about the Snac tac private label brand. For the Best Farms private label brand, 51.6% (99) of the Punjab respondents were somewhat aware and 4.7% (9) of the Punjab respondents were not at all aware. 43.8% (84) of the Punjab respondents were somewhat aware and 2.6% (5) of the Punjab respondents were somewhat unaware about the Healthy Life private label brand. The Enzo private label brand had shown its presence as 32.8% (63) of the Punjab respondents were somewhat aware and 3.6% (7) of the Punjab respondents were not at all aware about it. 48.4% (93) of the Punjab respondents were somewhat aware whereas at the lower side 7.8% (15) of the Punjab respondents were somewhat unaware as well as not at all aware about the Good life private label brand. In the state of Punjab, it was found that 30.7% (59) respondents were completely aware about the More Choice private label brand which is the maximum value in this column category and 19.3% (37) respondents were not at all aware about the Swiss tempelle private label brand which is the maximum value in the specified column category.

Haryana Awareness Level about Private Label Brands

Private Label Brand		NTAW	SUAW	CS	SAW	CAW
Swiss Tempelle	Count	38	29	30	71	32
	% within Region	19.00%	14.50%	15.00%	35.50%	16.00%
	% of Total	7.70%	5.80%	6.00%	14.30%	6.50%
Golden Harvest	Count	11	46	53	58	32
	% within Region	5.50%	23.00%	26.50%	29.00%	16.00%
	% of Total	2.20%	9.30%	10.70%	11.70%	6.50%
Tasty Treat	Count	19	18	38	86	39
	% within Region	9.50%	9.00%	19.00%	43.00%	19.50%
	% of Total	3.80%	3.60%	7.70%	17.30%	7.90%
Karmiq	Count	19	22	14	88	57
	% within Region	9.50%	11.00%	7.00%	44.00%	28.50%
	% of Total	3.80%	4.40%	2.80%	17.70%	11.50%
Sunkist	Count	28	19	25	74	54
	% within Region	14.00%	9.50%	12.50%	37.00%	27.00%
	% of Total	5.60%	3.80%	5.00%	14.90%	10.90%

Private Label Brand		NTAW	SUAW	CS	SAW	CAW
Kosh	Count	15	22	34	83	46
	% within Region	7.50%	11.00%	17.00%	41.50%	23.00%
	% of Total	3.00%	4.40%	6.90%	16.70%	9.30%
Fresh & Pure	Count	15	23	32	96	34
	% within Region	7.50%	11.50%	16.00%	48.00%	17.00%
	% of Total	3.00%	4.60%	6.50%	19.40%	6.90%
Sangi's Kitchen	Count	14	12	35	99	40
	% within Region	7.00%	6.00%	17.50%	49.50%	20.00%
	% of Total	2.80%	2.40%	7.10%	20.00%	8.10%
Clean Mate	Count	10	15	12	87	76
	% within Region	5.00%	7.50%	6.00%	43.50%	38.00%
	% of Total	2.00%	3.00%	2.40%	17.50%	15.30%
Desi Atta Company	Count	15	16	37	88	44
	% within Region	7.50%	8.00%	18.50%	44.00%	22.00%
	% of Total	3.00%	3.20%	7.50%	17.70%	8.90%
Feasters	Count	25	23	55	70	27
	% within Region	12.50%	11.50%	27.50%	35.00%	13.50%
	% of Total	5.00%	4.60%	11.10%	14.10%	5.40%
Kitchen's Promise	Count	13	21	36	109	21
	% within Region	6.50%	10.50%	18.00%	54.50%	10.50%
	% of Total	2.60%	4.20%	7.30%	22.00%	4.20%
Selecta	Count	19	18	17	99	47
	% within Region	9.50%	9.00%	8.50%	49.50%	23.50%
	% of Total	3.80%	3.60%	3.40%	20.00%	9.50%
More Choice	Count	22	15	28	77	58
	% within Region	11.00%	7.50%	14.00%	38.50%	29.00%
	% of Total	4.40%	3.00%	5.60%	15.50%	11.70%
More Life	Count	7	31	56	80	26
	% within Region	3.50%	15.50%	28.00%	40.00%	13.00%
	% of Total	1.40%	6.20%	11.30%	16.10%	5.20%
Snac tac	Count	16	13	69	82	20
	% within Region	8.00%	6.50%	34.50%	41.00%	10.00%

European Economic Letters
ISSN 2323-5233
Vol 15, Issue 2 (2025)
http://eelet.org.uk

Private Label Brand		NTAW	SUAW	CS	SAW	CAW
	% of Total	3.20%	2.60%	13.90%	16.50%	4.00%
Best Farms	Count	10	20	63	85	22
	% within Region	5.00%	10.00%	31.50%	42.50%	11.00%
	% of Total	2.00%	4.00%	12.70%	17.10%	4.40%
Healthy Life	Count	15	12	54	81	38
	% within Region	7.50%	6.00%	27.00%	40.50%	19.00%
	% of Total	3.00%	2.40%	10.90%	16.30%	7.70%
Enzo	Count	13	18	40	75	54
	% within Region	6.50%	9.00%	20.00%	37.50%	27.00%
	% of Total	2.60%	3.60%	8.10%	15.10%	10.90%
Good Life	Count	9	25	36	99	31
	% within Region	4.50%	12.50%	18.00%	49.50%	15.50%
	% of Total	1.80%	5.00%	7.30%	20.00%	6.20%
	RESPONDENTS OF HARYANA				200	
	TOTAL RESPONDENTS				496	

Source: Compiled from primary data

The table indicates the awareness level of people of Haryana about the private label brands based upon the statistics collected from 200 respondents of Haryana out off the total 496 respondents. It reveals that for the private label brand named Swiss Tempelle, 35.50% (71) of the Haryana respondents were somewhat aware and 14.50% (29) of the Haryana respondents were somewhat unaware. 29.00% (58) of the Haryana respondents were somewhat aware whereas at lower side 5.50% (11) of the Haryana respondents were not at all aware about the Golden Harvest private label brand. 43.00% (86) of the Haryana respondents were somewhat aware whereas at the lower side 9.00% (18) of the Haryana respondents were somewhat aware about the Tasty Treat label brand. In the case of the Karmiq private label brand, 44.00% (88) of the Haryana respondents were somewhat aware and at the lower side 7.00% (14) of the Haryana respondents have neutral viewpoint. For the Sunkist private label brand, 37.00% (74) of the Haryana respondents were somewhat aware and about 9.50% (19) were somewhat unaware. 41.50% (83) of the Haryana respondents were somewhat aware and 7.50% (15) of the Haryana respondents were not at all aware about the Kosh label brand. 48.00% (96) of the Haryana respondents were somewhat aware and 7.50% (15) of the Haryana respondents were not at all aware about the Fresh & Pure private label brand. For the Sangi's Kitchen private label brand, 49.50% (99) of the Haryana respondents were somewhat aware and 6.00% (12) of the Haryana respondents were somewhat unaware. 43.50% (87) of the Haryana respondents were somewhat aware and 5.00% (10) of the Haryana respondents were not at all aware about the Clean Mate private label brand. For the Desi Atta Company private label brand, 44.00% (88) of the Haryana respondents were somewhat aware and 7.50% (15) of the Haryana respondents were not at all aware. 35.00% (70) of the Haryana respondents were somewhat aware and 11.50% (23) of the Haryana respondents were somewhat unaware about the Feasters private label brand. For Kitchen's Promise private label brand, 54.50% (109) of the Haryana respondents were somewhat aware and 6.50% (13) of the Haryana respondents were not at all aware. 49.50% (99) of the Haryana respondents were somewhat aware and at the lower side 8.50% (17) of the Haryana respondents have neutral viewpoint about the Selecta private label brand. For More Choice private label brand 38.50% (77) of the Haryana respondents were somewhat aware and 7.50% (15) of Haryana respondents were somewhat unaware. 40.00% (80) of the Haryana respondents were somewhat aware and 3.50% (7) of the Haryana respondents were not at all aware about the More Life private label brand. For Snac Tac private label brand 41.00% (82) of the Haryana respondents were somewhat aware and 6.50% (13) of the Haryana respondents were somewhat unaware. 42.50% (85) of the Haryana respondents were somewhat aware and 5.00% (10) of the Haryana respondents were not at all aware about the Best Farms private label brand. For Healthy life private

European Economic Letters
ISSN 2323-5233
Vol 15, Issue 2 (2025)
http://eelet.org.uk

label brand 40.50% (81) of the Haryana respondents were somewhat aware and 6.00% (12) of the Haryana respondents were somewhat unaware. 37.50% (75) of the Haryana respondents were somewhat unaware and 6.50% (13) of the Haryana respondents were not at all aware about the Enzo private label brand. For Good Life private label brand 49.50% (99) of the Haryana respondents were somewhat aware and 4.50% (9) of the Haryana respondents were not at all aware. In the state of Haryana, it was found that 38.00% (76) of the Haryana respondents were completely aware about the Clean Mate private label brand which is the maximum value in this column category and 19.00% (38) of the Haryana respondents were not at all aware about the Swiss Tempelle private label brand which is the maximum value in the specified column category.

Chandigarh Awareness Level about Private Label Brands

Private Label Brand		NTAW	SUAW	CS	SAW	CAW
Swiss Tempelle	Count	14	16	14	42	18
	% within Region	13.50%	15.40%	13.50%	40.40%	17.30%
	% of Total	2.80%	3.20%	2.80%	8.50%	3.60%
Golden Harvest	Count	5	20	20	32	27
	% within Region	4.80%	19.20%	19.20%	30.80%	26.00%
	% of Total	1.00%	4.00%	4.00%	6.50%	5.40%
Tasty Treat	Count	5	7	37	32	23
	% within Region	4.80%	6.70%	35.60%	30.80%	22.10%
	% of Total	1.00%	1.40%	7.50%	6.50%	4.60%
Karmiq	Count	8	18	7	42	29
	% within Region	7.70%	17.30%	6.70%	40.40%	27.90%
	% of Total	1.60%	3.60%	1.40%	8.50%	5.80%
Sunkist	Count	25	11	14	29	25
	% within Region	24.00%	10.60%	13.50%	27.90%	24.00%
	% of Total	5.00%	2.20%	2.80%	5.80%	5.00%
Kosh	Count	9	10	13	39	33
	% within Region	8.70%	9.60%	12.50%	37.50%	31.70%
	% of Total	1.80%	2.00%	2.60%	7.90%	6.70%
Fresh & Pure	Count	5	15	21	46	17
	% within Region	4.80%	14.40%	20.20%	44.20%	16.30%
	% of Total	1.00%	3.00%	4.20%	9.30%	3.40%
Sangi's Kitchen	Count	8	10	26	43	17
	% within Region	7.70%	9.60%	25.00%	41.30%	16.30%
	% of Total	1.60%	2.00%	5.20%	8.70%	3.40%
Clean Mate	Count	2	15	14	45	28
	% within Region	1.90%	14.40%	13.50%	43.30%	26.90%

Private Label Brand		NTAW	SUAW	CS	SAW	CAW
	% of Total	0.40%	3.00%	2.80%	9.10%	5.60%
Desi Atta Company	Count	8	7	17	38	34
	% within Region	7.70%	6.70%	16.30%	36.50%	32.70%
	% of Total	1.60%	1.40%	3.40%	7.70%	6.90%
Feasters	Count	10	8	24	46	16
	% within Region	9.60%	7.70%	23.10%	44.20%	15.40%
	% of Total	2.00%	1.60%	4.80%	9.30%	3.20%
Kitchen's Promise	Count	5	8	28	49	14
	% within Region	4.80%	7.70%	26.90%	47.10%	13.50%
	% of Total	1.00%	1.60%	5.60%	9.90%	2.80%
Selecta	Count	8	16	7	47	26
	% within Region	7.70%	15.40%	6.70%	45.20%	25.00%
	% of Total	1.60%	3.20%	1.40%	9.50%	5.20%
More Choice	Count	7	12	18	38	29
	% within Region	6.70%	11.50%	17.30%	36.50%	27.90%
	% of Total	1.40%	2.40%	3.60%	7.70%	5.80%
More Life	Count	5	18	24	38	19
	% within Region	4.80%	17.30%	23.10%	36.50%	18.30%
	% of Total	1.00%	3.60%	4.80%	7.70%	3.80%
Snac tac	Count	9	8	36	41	10
	% within Region	8.70%	7.70%	34.60%	39.40%	9.60%
	% of Total	1.80%	1.60%	7.30%	8.30%	2.00%
Best Farms	Count	4	8	27	45	20
	% within Region	3.80%	7.70%	26.00%	43.30%	19.20%
	% of Total	0.80%	1.60%	5.40%	9.10%	4.00%
Healthy Life	Count	6	8	21	41	28
	% within Region	5.80%	7.70%	20.20%	39.40%	26.90%
	% of Total	1.20%	1.60%	4.20%	8.30%	5.60%
Enzo	Count	6	9	21	32	36
	% within Region	5.80%	8.70%	20.20%	30.80%	34.60%
	% of Total	1.20%	1.80%	4.20%	6.50%	7.30%
Good Life	Count	7	6	18	53	20

Private Label Brand		NTAW	SUAW	CS	SAW	CAW
	% within Region	6.70%	5.80%	17.30%	51.00%	19.20%
	% of Total	1.40%	1.20%	3.60%	10.70%	4.00%
	RESPONDENTS OF CHANDIGARH				104	
	TOTAL RESPONDENTS				496	

Source: Compiled from primary data

The table illustrates the awareness level of people of Chandigarh about the private label brands based upon the information gathered from 104 respondents out off the total 496 respondents. It demonstrates that for the private label brand named Swiss Tempelle, 40.40% (42) of the Chandigarh respondents were somewhat aware and 13.50% (14) of the Chandigarh respondents were not at all aware as well as neutral viewpoint. For Golden Harvest private label brand, 30.80% (32) of the Chandigarh respondents were somewhat aware and 4.80% (5) were not at all aware. 35.60% (37) of the Chandigarh respondents have neutral viewpoint whereas at the lower side 4.80% (5) were not at all aware about the Tasty Treat private label brand. For Karmiq private label brand, 40.40% (42) of the Chandigarh respondents were somewhat aware and 6.70% (7) of the Chandigarh respondents have neutral viewpoint. 27.90% (29) of the Chandigarh respondents were somewhat aware and 10.60% (11) of the Chandigarh respondents were somewhat unaware about the Sunkist private label brand. For Kosh private label brand, 37.50% (39) of the Chandigarh respondents were somewhat aware and 8.70% (9) of the Chandigarh respondents were not at all aware. 44.20% (46) of the Chandigarh respondents were somewhat aware and 4.80% (5) were not at all aware about the Fresh & Pure private label brand. For Sangi’s Kitchen private label brand, 41.30% (43) of the Chandigarh respondents were somewhat aware and 7.70% (8) were not at all aware. 43.30% (45) of the Chandigarh respondents were somewhat aware and 1.90% (2) of the Chandigarh respondents were not at all aware about the Clean Mate private label brand. For Desi Atta Company private label brand, 36.50% (38) were somewhat aware and 6.70% (7) of the Chandigarh respondents were somewhat unaware. 44.20% (46) of the Chandigarh respondents were somewhat aware and 7.70% (8) of the Chandigarh respondents were somewhat unaware about the Feasters private label brand. For Kitchen’s Promise private label brand, 47.10% (49) were somewhat aware whereas at the lower side 4.80% (5) of the Chandigarh respondents were not at all aware. 45.20% (47) of the Chandigarh respondents were somewhat aware and 6.70% (7) of the Chandigarh respondents have neutral viewpoint about the Selecta private label brand. For More Choice private label brand, 36.50% (38) of the Chandigarh respondents were somewhat aware and 6.70% (7) of the Chandigarh respondents were not at all aware. 36.50% (38) of the Chandigarh respondents were somewhat aware and 4.80% (5) were not at all aware about the More Life private label brand. For Snac tac private label brand, 39.40% (41) of the Chandigarh respondents were somewhat aware and 7.70% (8) of the Chandigarh respondents were somewhat unaware. 43.30% (45) of the Chandigarh respondents were somewhat aware whereas at the lower side 3.80% (4) of the Chandigarh respondents were not at all aware about the Best Farms private label brand. For Healthy Life private label brand, 39.40% (41) of the Chandigarh respondents were somewhat aware and 5.80% (6) were not at all aware. 34.60% (36) of the Chandigarh respondents were completely aware and 5.80% (6) of the Chandigarh respondents were not at all aware about the Enzo private label brand. For Good Life private label brand, 51.00% (53) of the Chandigarh respondents were somewhat aware and 5.80% (6) of the Chandigarh respondents were somewhat unaware. In the union territory named Chandigarh, it was found that 34.60% (36) of the Chandigarh respondents were completely aware about the Enzo private label brand which is the maximum value in this column category and 24.00% (25) of the Chandigarh respondents were not at all aware about the Sunkist private label brand which is the maximum value in the specified column category.

CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTION

- The awareness level of people of Punjab about the private label brands was based upon the information gathered from 192 respondents of Punjab out off the total 496 respondents. In the state of Punjab, it was found that 30.7% (59) respondents were completely aware about the More Choice private label brand and 19.3% (37) respondents were not at all aware about the Swiss Tempelle private label brand. The majority of the respondents of Punjab were aware about the private label brands.
- The awareness level of people of Haryana about the private label brands was based upon the statistics collected from 200 respondents of Haryana out off the total 496 respondents. In the state of Haryana, it was found that 38.00% (76) of the Haryana respondents were completely aware about the Clean Mate private label brand and 19.00% (38) of the

Haryana respondents were not at all aware about the Swiss Tempelle private label brand. The majority of the respondents of Haryana were aware about the private label brands.

- The awareness level of people of Chandigarh about the private label brands was based upon the information gathered from 104 respondents out off the total 496 respondents. In the union territory named Chandigarh, it was found that 34.60% (36) of the Chandigarh respondents were completely aware about the Enzo private label brand and 24.00% (25) of the Chandigarh respondents were not at all aware about the Sunkist private label brand. The majority of the respondents of Chandigarh were aware about the private label brands.
- As per the inferences derived after the data analysis, it was quite evident that private label brands are gaining importance with respect to customers as well as retailer. Private label brands can be lethal weapon which would serve as a point of distinction in the battles fought with other brands. Retailers will have a unique selling proposition by the means of private label brands.
- As there is dramatic shift in the buying behavior and consumption patterns of the consumer, there shopping habits are moving towards the organized retail industry which in turn would be profitable for the retail chains and gaining profits from their own private label brands would be one of their prime motives to do the business.

REFERENCES

1. Amini, P., Falk, B., & Schmitt, R. (2014). Quantitative analysis of the consumer perceived value deviation. *Procedia CIRP*, *21*, 391-396.
2. Anitha, V., & Krishnan, A. R. (2020). Consumer Purchase Intention of Private Label Edible Products with an Emphasis on Price and Quality. *Studies in Indian Place Names*, *40*(59), 397-402.
3. Burns, A. C., & Bush, R. F. (2007). *Basic marketing research using Microsoft Excel data analysis*. Prentice Hall Press, Upper Saddle River, New Jersey, United States of America.
4. Beneke, J. (2010). Consumer Perceptions of Private Label Brands within the Retail Grocery Sector of South Africa. *African Journal of Business Management*, *4*(2), 203-220.
5. Comrey, A. L., & Lee, H. B. (2013). *A first course in factor analysis*. Psychology press, Hove, East Sussex, United Kingdom.
6. Cuneo, A., Milberg, S. J., del Carmen Alarcon-del-Amo, M., & Lopez-Belbeze, P. (2019). Private label and manufacturer brand choice in a new competitive reality: Strategic directions and the future of brands. *European Management Journal*, *37*(1), 117-128.
7. Dancey, C. P., & Reidy, J. (2007). *Statistics without maths for psychology*. Pearson education, London, United Kingdom.
8. Hair, J. F., Anderson, R. E., Babin, B. J., & Black, W. C. (2010). *Multivariate data analysis: A global perspective* (Vol. 7). Pearson, Upper Saddle River, New Jersey, United States of America.
9. Harman, H. H. (1976). *Modern factor analysis*. University of Chicago press, Chicago, Illinois, United States of America.
10. Kaiser, H. F. (1960). The application of electronic computers to factor analysis. *Educational and psychological measurement*, *20*(1), 141-151.
11. Kaiser, H. F., & Rice, J. (1974). Little jiffy, mark IV. *Educational and psychological measurement*, *34*(1), 111-117.
12. Kline, P. (2014). *An easy guide to factor analysis*. Routledge Publication, Abingdon.
13. MacCallum, R. C., Widaman, K. F., Zhang, S., & Hong, S. (1999). Sample size in factor analysis. *Psychological methods*, *4*(1), 84.
14. Maharani, N., Helmi, A., Mulyana, A., & Hasan, M. (2020, March). Purchase Intention of Private Label Products as the Impact of Visual Merchandising and Customer Value. In *2nd Social and Humaniora Research Symposium (SoRes 2019)* (pp. 461-464). Atlantis Press.
15. Mulaik, S. A. (2009). *Foundations of factor analysis*. CRC press, Boca Raton, Florida, United States of America.
16. Murtagh, F., & Heck, A. (2012). *Multivariate data analysis* (Vol. 131). Springer Science & Business Media, Berlin, Germany.
17. Nunnally, J. C., & Bernstein, I. H. (1978). *Psychometric testing*. McGraw- Hill, New York, United States of America.
18. Nunnally, J. C., & Bernstein, I. H. (1994). *Psychological theory*. McGraw- Hill, New York, United States of America.
19. Rummel, R. J. (1988). *Applied factor analysis*. Northwestern University Press, Evanston, Illinois, United States of America.
20. Raji, M.N. and Zainal, A. (2016). *The effect of customer perceived value on customer satisfaction: A case study of Malay upscale restaurants*. Malaysian Journal of Society and Space, 12(3).
21. Sajjan, K. V., & Jyothsna, M. (2019). A study on consumer perceptions of private label brand groceries in Bangalore (Bengaluru). *International Journal of Advance and Innovative Research*, 6(1), 177-186.

22. Singh, P., & Singla, B. B. (2018). Private label brand: Low cost alternative or high quality alternative. *Pacific Business Review International*, *11*(2).
23. Thompson, B. (2004). *Exploratory and confirmatory factor analysis*. American Psychological Association, Washington DC, United States of America.
24. Vidhya, K., & Ganesan, D. (2019). Customer Perception about Private Label Brands in Salem. *International Journal of Recent Technology and Engineering*, *8*(4), 963-967.
25. Yates, A. (1988). *Multivariate exploratory data analysis: A perspective on exploratory factor analysis*. Suny Press, New York, United States of America.
26. Yong, A. G., & Pearce, S. (2013). A beginner's guide to factor analysis: Focusing on exploratory factor analysis. *Tutorials in quantitative methods for psychology*, *9*(2), 79-94.