Journal of General Management Research Vol. 9, Issue 2, December 2022, pp. 55-72

JOURNAL OF
GENERAL MANAGEMENT RESEARCH

EVALUATION OF FACTORS DRIVING PRIVATE LABEL BRANDS SUCCESS IN HYPERMARKETS- A CONSUMER PERSPECTIVE STUDY

Shilpa Sarvani Ravi
Shikha Bhagat

School of Business and Management, Christ (Deemed to be University)

Abstract

In traditional retail, the consumers purchase used to happen only from the nearby retail stores of unorganized segments. With the globalization and retail revolution undercurrent, the majority of the consumers are observed to purchase in Hyper Markets, Supermarkets and malls in organized sectors. This research actively evaluated factors driving consumers preferences towards Private Label Brands in hypermarkets. Research also examined the most influential factor that the consumer considers in the purchase of Private label brands. The study is conducted across all the hypermarket chains in Bengaluru city. The sample size considered for the consumer survey is 600 which has been divided in quota sampling among the hyper store chains in Bengaluru city. Deliver fresh from the factory was identified as the most impacting factor of the dependent variable of consumer satisfaction followed by Reasonable price and good quality.

Keywords: *Private label brands, Hypermarkets, supermarkets, organized sectors, Consumer preferences.*

INTRODUCTION

The retail industry in India is the fastest growing industry in the world. The anticipated consumption expenditure of India is likely to reach US$ 1,407 billion by 2026 which was US$ 779 billion in the year 2019. 66.39 lakh crores which is US$950 billion at CAGR of 13 percent is the reach of the retail industry in India. This is estimated to reach Rs. 76.87 lakh crore or US$1.1 trillion by 2023(IBEF, 2022). India as a country stands first in the per capita retail store availability. India stands at the third position in the race of Global Retail Ranking among the emerging nations after China and Brazil. India as a country stands at fifth place in the Global Retail platform. India has a huge market potential with a high consumer base. The economic risk of the country is low and the political risk is high. Indian retail industry is booming in the last two decades. About 10 percent of the Indian GDP is the retails sale of the country. India's net retail sale is growing on a significant scale. Over 8 percent of the aggregate employment of the country accounts for the retail segment of the country (IBEF, 2022). As per the DIPP report (2019), Inflows of Foreign Direct Investment of US$ 1.09 billion is received by India within a span of 17 years which is between the years 2000 and 2017. Hundred percent FDI is allowed by the Government of India in retail goods and services online sales through automatic route. This move is encouraging the e-commerce companies to operate in Indian Business.

The introduction of web-based services to the consumers at low cost and high speed has exposed the Indian consumer base to online retailing. Online retailing is increased from USD 14.5 billion in 2016 to USD 17.8 billion in 2017 and is expected to reach USD 73 billion by 2022 at a CAGR of 29.2 percent. This online retailing is the pillar of the retail sector growth in India. The other technology impacts include the payment methods using Plastic debit/ Credit cards or UPI transactions or net banking facilities to ease the retail business. Technology is also helping to computerize the retail operation in the store, shipments operations, warehouse operations and billing counters. These are providing value to the consumers and improving retail sector standards in the country. Researches like Laroche *et al.* (2003); Pechtl (2004); Richardson *et al.* (1996), have investigated the disposition of the private label brand 's purchasing patterns with consumer attitudes. Cotterill *et al.*, (2000), have identified the demand equation for the private label share and the national brands share. But psychographic variables were not involved in this research. Psychographic and demographic attributes drive the purchase intentions of private label and national brands (Aidawadi *et al.*, 2001; Garretson *et al.*, 2002).

THEORETICAL BACKGROUND

Private label brands are growing at an intense pace. They are becoming the influencing factor in the rapid growth of the food market and are acting as a threat to all the national brands across the globe (Ravi and Prasad, 2020). They are the most profitable brands for retailers (Baltas, 1997; Guerrero *et al.*, 2000). In the research conducted by Collins and Lindley (2003) established that private label brands are low-cost consumer goods with relatively good quality. Mathuravalli (2013) established that the private label brands are high in quality and pricing as per the study on consumer perception towards the store brands. Collins & Lindley (2003) also argued that the consumer perception of individual store brands was impacted by the quality of the products and services provided by the retail store. Wells *et al.* (2007) conducted a detailed study on the packaging design importance of the private label brands. They stressed the packaging design components of private label brands as the major contributor in the consumer decision-making process. Their key finding elaborated that about 73 percent of the consumers depend upon the packaging in the purchase decision- making process. Connolly (2013) studied the packaging techniques of private label brands. They focused on the change in the packaging ideas; creativity attracts the point of purchase consumers. He illustrated private label brand 's examples with organic styles, colors, and quotes to gain the attention of the consumer in the purchase process. Baltas (2003) claimed statistically that the demographic factors like age, working time, promotions, and family factors do not improve the purchase patterns of private label brands. Kauppinen (2014) also in his study mentioned the color usage strategy in the packaging which revealed that colors powerfully help to capture consumer attention and highly influence the point of purchase behavior. The variables like

perceived risk, price consciousness was proved to be influencing the consumer purchase intentions of private-label brands in various researches conducted (Baltas, 2003). Narasimhan and Wilcox (1998); Hoch and Banerji (1993) have identified that consumers treat Private labels and national brands in the same way. They opt for the national brands if the prices are the same, but if the Private label brands prices are lower when compared to the national brand 's consumers show interest in the purchase of the private label brands. Consumers have highly favorable factors towards the purchase of the private label brands majorly based on the product features (Burton, *et al.* 1998). Monroe and Krishnan (1985) have disclosed that price consciousness attributes vary from product to product. Sinha and Batra (1999) also identified price conscious as the major factor determining the consumer purchase intentions in the purchase of Private Label brands. Baltas (1997) disclosed that the consumers always look for the low-price products because the lower the prices the higher the performance of the product is the consideration by the consumer. Vahie & Paswan (2006) concluded that the consumer perception of the private label brands in the apparel industry is directly based on the store image. They compared the store image with private label brands and the national brand 's presence and consumer perceptions. Ravi and Bhagat (2020) suggested that the retail store manages should harmonize their private label brands present in the store to establish a concrete store image for the retail outlet. Manzur *et al.* (2011) conducted a novel study to identify the consumer attitude towards advertisements of national brands and store brands. Their results strongly emphasize that the consumer attitude is similar to both national brands and store brands in the pricing issues. The strength of national brand advertisements differs in aspects like loyalty and relationships. Advertisements also yield good results to the national brands but the authors suggested that the retailers should design their advertisements in such manner not to conflict with the national brands. Janakiraman *et al.* (2016) in their study on the effects of the return policy on consumer buying patterns declared the effect of policy on consumer purchases. They identified that the lenient retail return policy will increase sales but may not improve the returns of the firm. Factors like Store locations in the neighborhood and long working hours will add-on to the convenience aspect of the retailer and attain the per square feet sales to the retailers. The location of the store and the proximity to the residential areas will encourage the household to visit the retail outlets. The convenience at the billing counters and the checkout points available per square feet also influence the consumer buying behavior in a particular retail outlet (Kumar and Karande, 2000). Miquel et al (2014) have investigated the private label brand 's purchase patterns and disclosed relationship management is the key to the purchase of PLBs. Consumer propensity increase towards private label brands while generating trust and commitment which is possible through the strategic relationships maintained by the retailer. This is also the source for long term profitability to the retailer. In the study of key factors affecting the customer satisfaction with Iranian retailers: evidence from the Hypermarkets and Supermarkets, it is clearly articulated that more the customer-oriented service more is the business success in the intense market competition (Fazlzadeh *et al.*, 2012). Research conducted on the Effect of Store Atmosphere on Consumer Purchase Intention, the researcher targeted to identify the consumer purchase intentions concerning the atmosphere in a retail chain outlet in Karachi, Pakistan. The findings revealed that atmospheric factors like cleanliness, lighting, scent, layout of the store are very significant to improve the purchase intentions of the consumer (Hussain and Ali 2015). Das & Kumar (2009) discussed that consumers will enjoy freedom in the purchase. With intense competition in the retail industry with the national and international players, the shopper is given numerous options to decide on the purchase. De Wulf *et al.* (2005b) the authors compared the national brand's products with the private label brands. Private label brands are gaining importance in recent times. Awareness in consumer minds is also improving. Customers no longer purchase PLBs due to their low prices but they also look for value which highlights the evolvement of consumer behavior in PLB's (Ndlovu & Heeralal,2022).

RESEARCH GAP

It is turning out to be a challenge to the retail markets and companies to identify the purchase preferences towards the Private label brands. The author believes that the study will give solutions to marketers to identify the strategic and

innovative market approaches. With intense competition and evolving market conditions of the organized retail industry in the country, the retailers need to target and snap the market share by distinguishing the underlying factors influencing the consumer purchase preferences of private label brands in hypermarket.

SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY

The growth of the retail industry is been fueled by Private Label Brands across the globe. However, in India organized sector accounts for only ten percent of the total retail sales which evidently establishes growth capacities. Of organized retail sales major market share is contributed by hypermarkets. They are the biggest attraction of this format stores in India. Private label brands are the retail store owned brands. With vertical integration, retailers offering Private label brands are improving their profits and exerting an edge in the market. This study investigated the penetration of Private Label Brands in the basket of consumer consumption. This study analyzed the consumer purchase patterns; satisfaction levels and evaluated the factors that influence the consumer 's preferences towards the private label brands in hypermarkets.

Table 1- Consumer preference determinants identified from literature

S.no	Determinants	Factors
1	Price	Offers & Discounts Bundle packs
2	Store Image	Reliability Credibility Previous Experiences
3	Advertisements	TVC Internet & Social media Flyers Hoardings & Boardings Sponsorship Events
4	Service provided	Assortment Availability Staff courteousness Staff knowledge on products Customer problem-solving skills Staff personal attention
5	Convenience	Location Proximity Parking facility
6	Perceived Quality	Value for the product Durability Worth price Ingredients mention Calories information
7	Packaging	Stylish Innovativeness Appealing Expiry and Manufacturing dates
8	Point-of-Purchase Visibility	Point of purchase elements Innovative displays Arch branding Category dressings

9	Policy	Safe Transaction Major Payment Methods Return policies

Source: Authors' Compilation

OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

1. To understand the Socio-Demographic factors of the consumers in the area of study at Bengaluru.
2. To identify the Private Label Brand 's Reach and the major means of promotion to the consumer base.
3. To evaluate the factors driving consumers preferences towards Private Label Brands in hypermarkets.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The research design used in the study was Descriptive and quantitative research. The sample size was considered by taking into consideration the total corporate chain hypermarkets in Bengaluru City which operate nationally. The sample size considered for the consumer survey is 600 which has been divided in quota sampling among the hyper stores as per the Table 2(shown below) among the six hyper store chains in Bengaluru city. The questionnaire was constructed with a five-point likert scale with 30 variables identified by literature review and structured interviews. This pilot questionnaire also included demographic factors and experiences with PLB based questions. A pre-testing of the questionnaire was conducted after collecting the questionnaire from 61 consumers at thirteen organized retail hyper stores like More Mega Store, Big Bazaar, Reliance, D-mart, Vishal Mega Mart, Star Bazaar and Spar in Bengaluru city. The techniques and tools used for data analysis were Reliability Testing, Descriptive Statistics, Multiple Regression and Stepwise Regression.

Table 2: Store-wise sample size

Hyper- chains	no. of stores	Sample size (%)	Quota per store
ABRL	11	19	114
FVRL	19	32	192
D-mart	11	19	114
Max Hyper	6	10	60
Tesco	3	5	30
Vishal	6	10	60
Reliance	3	5	30
Total	**59**		**600**

Source: Authors Calculations

Reliability Test

The most accepted method to test the reliability of the scales used in the study is Cronbach 's coefficient alpha test (Peterson, 1994). The value of the coefficient varies from 0 to 1. Positive reliability should acquire the Cronbach alpha value of at least 0.07. In this research, the data was collected from 600 respondents. Cronbach 's alpha testing was done for the entire sample collected to test the reliability of the sample size. The coefficient value varies from o to 1 and the value exceeding 0.7 can be considered as reliable sampling data for further testing. The Cronbach 's alpha for this sample of 600 respondents was recorded as 0.90 and proved content for further testing which is shown in table 3.

Table 3: Case Processing Summary

		N	%	Cronbach's Alpha
Cases	Valid	600	95.6	0.907
	Excluded[a]	28	4.4	
	Total	628	100	

Source: Authors Calculations

Listwise deletion based on all the variables in the procedure. This survey was conducted by collecting responses from 600 consumers from seven different retail corporate chains in Bengaluru city. The response rate of the consumers was recorded in the table below 4.

Table 4: Response Rate Store wise

S.no	Store Name	No. of respondents	No. of respondents Rejected	Percentage
1	More Mega Mart	114	05	19
2	Big Bazaar	192	08	32
3	D-mart	114	05	19
4	SPAR	60	04	10
5	STAR Bazaar	30	04	5
6	Vishal Mega Mart	60	02	10
7	Reliance SMART	30	04	5
Total		600	32	100

Source: Authors Calculations

Profile of the Respondents

This section depicts the attributes of the respondents based on their demographic factors. In the survey conducted, eight personal attributes of the respondents were recorded excluding the name which was framed as an optional question. These attributes include Gender, Age, Education Qualification, Income, Members in the family, Occupation, Frequency and Monthly purchase. The responses of the consumers were in detail illustrated in table 5 below as the Demographic profile of consumers.

Table 5: Demographic Profile of Consumers

Variables	Frequency	Percentage
	No	%
GENDER		
Male	246	41
Female	354	59
Total	600	100
AGE		
20-29	90	15
30-39	256	44
40-49	138	25
50-59	94	13
60 and above	22	3
Total	600	100
EDUCATONAL QUALIFICATION		
>10th Class	75	14
12th Class	161	26
Graduation	279	47
Post-Graduation & more	84	13
Total	600	100
FAMILY INCOME LEVEL (PER MONTH)		
Below Rs 25000	119	20
Rs25000 to Rs 45000	234	38

Above Rs 45000	247	42
Total	600	100
MEMBERS IN THE FAMILY		
2<	125	22
2 to 4	341	56
4 to 6	81	14
6 & above	53	8
Total	600	100
OCCUPATION		
Professional	189	31
Employee	226	38
Business	123	21
Others	62	10
Total	600	100
FREQUENCY OF VISIT		
Weekly	19	4
Fortnightly	83	16
Monthly	459	72
Half- Yearly	39	8
Total	600	100
AVERAGE MONTHLY PURCHASE IN RUPEES		
<200	53	8
200-1000	112	17
1000-3000	316	54
3000<	119	21
Total	600	100

Source: Authors Calculations

The detailed analysis of demographics per retail hyper store was evaluated in table 6.

Table 6: Demographic Profile of Consumers Store Wise

Variables	**More Mega Mart**		**Big Bazaar**		**D-mart**		**SPAR**		**STAR**		**Vishal**		**Reliance**	
	No.	**%**	**No.**	**%**	**No.**	**%**	**No.**	**%**	**No.**	**%**	**No.**	**%**	**No.**	**%**
GENDER														
Male	42	37	75	39	57	50	23	38	12	41	25	42	12	40
Female	72	63	117	61	57	50	37	62	18	59	35	58	18	60
Total	114	100	192	100	114	100	60	100	30	100	60	100	30	100
AGE														
20- 29	18	16	29	15	15	13	11	18	4	12	8	14	5	17
30- 39	52	46	81	42	47	41	23	38	16	53	23	39	14	48
40- 49	32	28	36	19	19	17	19	32	11	35	13	22	8	25
50-59	7	6	38	20	29	25	3	5	0	0	14	24	3	10
60 and above	5	4	8	4	5	4	4	7	0	0	1	1	0	0
Total	114	100	192	100	114	100	60	100	30	100	60	100	30	100
EDUCATION QUALIFICATION														
>10th Class	19	17	17	9	8	7	8	14	6	19	13	21	4	13

12th Class	27	24	52	27	36	32	19	31	9	30	13	22	5	16
Graduation	46	40	92	48	55	48	28	46	14	45	29	49	16	54
Post-Graduation	22	19	31	16	15	13	5	9	2	6	5	8	5	17
Total	114	100	192	100	114	100	60	100	30	100	60	100	30	100
INCOME LEVEL (PER MONTH)														
Below Rs 25000	36	32	23	12	25	22	15	25	6	20	8	14	5	17
Rs25000 to Rs 45000	39	34	86	45	44	39	19	31	14	47	23	38	9	29
Above Rs 45000	39	34	83	43	44	39	26	44	10	33	29	48	16	54
Total	114	100	192	100	114	100	60	100	30	100	60	100	30	100
MEMBERS IN THE FAMILY														
2<	23	20	42	22	16	14	13	21	5	18	17	28	9	30
2 to 4	67	59	115	60	63	55	36	60	18	61	27	45	15	50
4 to 6	16	14	23	12	13	11	4	7	6	19	16	27	3	9
6 & above	8	7	12	6	23	20	7	12	1	2	0	0	3	11
Total	114	100	192	100	114	100	60	100	30	100	60	100	30	100
OCCUPATION														
Professional	39	34	69	36	29	25	16	26	9	31	16	27	11	38
Employee	46	40	63	33	48	42	29	48	12	39	19	32	10	33
Business	18	16	36	19	29	25	11	18	4	14	16	27	8	28
Others	11	10	23	12	9	8	5	8	5	16	8	14	0	1
Total	114	100	192	100	114	100	60	100	30	100	60	100	30	100
FREQUENCY OF VISIT														
Weekly	2	2	6	3	1	1	2	3	2	6	2	4	3	11
Fortnightly	16	14	19	10	10	9	13	22	5	17	14	24	5	16
Monthly	84	74	161	84	98	86	39	65	22	72	36	60	19	64

Half-Yearly	11	10	6	3	5	4	6	10	2	5	7	12	3	9
Total	114	100	192	100	114	100	60	100	30	100	60	100	30	100
AVERAGE MONTHLY PURCHASE IN RUPEES														
<200	15	13	19	10	6	5	4	7	2	6	5	8	2	7
200-1000	21	18	42	22	23	20	8	13	5	16	10	16	5	15
1000-3000	60	53	98	51	57	50	33	55	17	58	35	59	15	51
3000<	18	16	33	17	29	25	15	25	6	20	10	17	8	27
Total	114	100	192	100	114	100	60	100	30	100	60	100	30	100

Source: Author's Calculations

PRIVATE LABEL BRANDS REACH

The reach of private label brands to the consumers was tested by a nominal scale question in the questionnaire. The reach of Private Label Brands for consumers was proved high where the mean was noted as 2.01 and a median of 2.00 and a standard deviation of 0.769. A table representation of the same was captured in below Table 7.

Table 7: Consumer Reach Analysis

	No. of consumers	**Percentage**
No	174	29
Partially	246	41
Yes	180	30
Total	600	

Source: Author's Calculations

Table 8: Descriptive statistics of the PLB Reach

Valid	600
Missing	0
Mean	2.01
Median	2
Std. Deviation	0.769
Range	2
Minimum	1
Maximum	3

Source: Author's Calculations

The Null Hypothesis (H1o) of the study specifies that there is no significant influence of identified marketing techniques over the consumer reach of PLBs in retail hypermarkets. The consumer reach to PLB was majorly classified into six marketing techniques and a question was constructed to identify the maximum effectiveness of the marketing technique that reached the consumer. The four marketing techniques were identified as (1) Advertisements (2) Messages & Mails (Direct marketing) (3) In-store displays (4) Flyers at the entrance (5) Friends & Family (word of mouth) (6) Through the staff. The regression method in SPSS was used to identify the effective way of communication of PLB to the end consumer.

When applied multiple regression model where,

$Y = a + b1x1 + b2x2 + b3x3 + b4x4 + b5x5 + b6x\ 6 + e$

$Y = 0.168 + 0.013\ (Ads) + 0.261\ (M\&M) + 0.133(In\text{-}store\ displays) + 0.422\ (Flyers) + 0.042(F\&F) + 0.096(Staff)$

Whereas;

Y = Consumer reach of PLB

x1 = Through Staff

x2 = Through Mails & messages; x3 = Through Flyers;

x4 = From Friends and Family; x5 =In-store displays;

x6 = Through Advertisements

b1, b2, . . .b6 = Regression co-efficient of independent variables a = Intercept.

This regression tool was used shown in table 9 to analyze the six various marketing techniques and identify the most influenced technique which improved the consumer reach. Multiple regression analysis was utilized to read the variance in the outcomes, which was R-square. The psychometric evidence for incremental validity was tested.

Table 9: Model Summary

Mode 1	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.843[a]	0.711	0.708	0.44

Source: Author's Compilation

Note- a. Predictors: (constant), Through staff, Advertisements, Flyers at the entrance, Friends and Family, Messages & Mails, In-store Display

Table 10: ANOVA

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	281.877	6	46.979	242.751	.000
	Residual	114.763	593	0.194		
	Total	396.64	599			

Source: Author's Compilation

Note- Dependent Variable: Reach; Predictors: (Constant), Through staff, Advertisements, Flyers at the entrance, Friends and Family, Messages & Mails, In-store Displays

Table 11: Coefficients

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
	B	Std. Error	Beta		
(Constant)	.168	.114		1.475	.141
Advertisements	.013	.017	.017	.731	.465
Messages & Mails	.261	.022	.301	12.085	.000
In-store Displays	.133	.022	.156	5.973	.000
Flyers at the entrance	.422	.020	.531	21.365	.000
Friends and Family	.042	.021	.046	1.951	.052
Through staff	.096	.018	.128	5.357	.000

Source: Author's Compilation

Note- Dependent Variable: Reach

The principal goal was to test the impact of various marketing tools on the consumer reach and also to identify the most impacting variable on the consumer reach in concern with the Private Label Products. The Adjusted R-square value was identified as 0.711 in Table 9. The R-square value was considered as significant as the value exceeds 0.70. The F-value of 242.751 stands significant at a value of 0.000 in the table 10 shown above. The study was identified

as fit model with the marketing techniques having a strong positional impact on consumer reach. It was observed that from Table 11 the most impacting marketing technique was factor 4, which stands as the flyers at the entrance of the store. This factor possessed the highest t-value of 21.365 and a significance value of 0.000. The next most influencing marketing technique that impacts consumer reach was identified as messages and mails sent to consumers (direct marketing) with the t-value of 12.085 at the significance value of 0.000. The third most impacting factor was termed as the in-store visibility or displays at the store with the t-value of 5.973 at the significance level of 0.000. The fourth influencing marketing technique was marked as the staff promoting the PLB with the t-value of 5.357 at the significance value of 0.000. The following marketing technique was identified as the word of mouth from friends and family with the t-value of 1.951 at a significance of 0.052 and the least impacting marketing technique with the TVC and Social media advertisements of PLB to improve the consumer reach with the t- value of 0.731. Thus, this study rejects the null hypothesis and accepts the alternate hypothesis (H1) that there is a significant influence of identified marketing techniques over consumer reach of PLBs in retail hypermarkets.

Consumer Satisfaction Levels on Private Label Brands

The study involved a question to the end consumer where the consumer declared their satisfaction levels on Private label brands. This analysis tests the (H2o) that there is no significant relationship among variables identified and consumer satisfaction levels of PLBs in retail hypermarkets. Twenty-three attributes were identified broadly for the consumer to give his/her rating of their preference in the questionnaire on a five-point Likert scale. The attributes include (1) satisfied with incredible customer service (2) satisfied with availability of PLB in store (3) satisfied with high variety of PLB (4) satisfied with the staff assistance for PLB sale (5) satisfied with purity & hygiene (6) Satisfied with the packaging (7) Satisfied with quality of PLB (8) satisfied with PLB freebies & samples at the store (9) satisfied with all ingredients mention on the package of PLB (10) Satisfied with the innovation of PLB (11) satisfied with membership benefits (12) Satisfied with shape and feel of PLBs (13) Desired quantity available for less price (14) Satisfied with the Payback cards (15) Satisfied with PLBs gift coupons & passes (16) Satisfied with easy access to PLBs in the shelves (Shelf Proximity- eye level display) (17) Satisfied with the PLB‘s design (18) Satisfied with reasonable pricing of PLB (19) Satisfied with the offers and combos of PLBs (20) Satisfied with free delivery options of Stores selling PLBs (21) Satisfied with the in-store visibilities & displays of PLBs (22) Believe that PLBs are the fresh stock direct from the factories.

The consumers were requested to give a rating of their satisfaction levels of PLB in the Likert scale of options (1) highly Dissatisfied (2) Dissatisfied (3) Neutral (4) Satisfied (5) Highly satisfied. The descriptive statistics of mean and standard deviation were identified for all the independent variables and dependent variables were explained in the below table 12 of Descriptive statistics.

Table 12: Descriptive Statistics

	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
Consumer Satisfaction	2.01	.769	600
Satisfied with incredible customer service	3.61	1.089	600
Availability of goods	3.57	.926	600
More Variety	3.92	.849	600
Staff assists in purchase of PLB	3.66	.847	600
Pure & Hygiene	3.50	1.101	600
satisfied with packaging	3.57	1.077	600

Good Quality	3.74	.938	600
Freebies & samples	3.46	1.022	600
Ingredients mentioning	3.57	1.101	600
Product innovation	3.39	1.112	600
Membership benefits	3.49	1.062	600
good shape & feel	3.52	1.035	600
affordable price at desired quantity	3.62	.798	600
Payback cards	3.62	1.068	600
Coupons & Passes	3.84	1.031	600
Eye level	3.75	.949	600
Product design	3.71	1.089	600
Reasonable Price	3.92	1.024	600
Offers & combos	3.54	.983	600
Free home delivery	3.67	.811	600
Instore visibility & displays	3.57	.895	600
Deliver fresh products from the factory	3.84	.721	600

Source: Author's Compilation

Stepwise Regression Analysis

Regression analysis was applied to the 22 various factors that influence consumer satisfaction. Stepwise regression analysis was used to identify the best predictor variables among the twenty- two variables which account for the most variance (R-square). The primary goal of this regression analysis is when there are more independent variables and to identify the most impacting variable that influences the dependent variable. The results of the stepwise regression analysis were published in the tables below 13, 14, 15 and 16.

The below table 13 distinctively established that the most influencing factors of consumer satisfaction were (1) Deliver fresh products from the factory, (2) Satisfied with incredible customer service, (3) Reasonable Price, (4) Good Quality, (5) Staff assists in the purchase of PLB, (6) Affordable price at desired quantity, (7) Offers & combos, (8) Payback cards, (9) Satisfied with easy access to PLBs in the shelves (Shelf Proximity- eye-level display), (10) Availability of goods and (11) Satisfied with shape and feel of PLBs. This specifies that the other eleven factors were less influencing and were eliminated from the regression stepwise analysis. The eliminated factors include (1) satisfied with a high variety of PLB (2) satisfied with purity & hygiene (3) Satisfied with the packaging (4) satisfied with all ingredients mentioned on the package of PLB (5) Satisfied with the innovation of PLB (6) satisfied with membership benefits (7) Satisfied with the PLB's design (8) Satisfied with PLBs gift coupons & passes (9) Satisfied with the in-store visibilities & displays of PLBs (10)Satisfied with free delivery options of Stores selling PLBs.

Table 13: Variables Entered/Removed[a]

Model	Variables Entered	Variables Removed	Method
1	Deliver fresh products from the factory	.	Stepwise (Criteria: Probability-of-F-to-enter <= .050, Probability-of-F-to-remove >= .100).
2	Satisfied with incredible customer service	.	Stepwise (Criteria: Probability-of-F-to-enter <= .050, Probability-of-F-to-remove >= .100).
3	Reasonable Price	.	Stepwise (Criteria: Probability-of-F-to-enter <= .050, Probability-of-F-to-remove >= .100).
4	Good Quality	.	Stepwise (Criteria: Probability-of-F-to-enter <= .050, Probability-of-F-to-remove >= .100).
5	Staff assists in purchase of PLB	.	Stepwise (Criteria: Probability-of-F-to-enter <= .050, Probability-of-F-to-remove >= .100).
6	affordable price at desired quantity	.	Stepwise (Criteria: Probability-of-F-to-enter <= .050, Probability-of-F-to-remove >= .100).
7	Offers & combos	.	Stepwise (Criteria: Probability-of-F-to-enter <= .050, Probability-of-F-to-remove >= .100).
8	Payback cards	.	Stepwise (Criteria: Probability-of-F-to-enter <= .050, Probability-of-F-to-remove >= .100).
9	Eye level	.	Stepwise (Criteria: Probability-of-F-to-enter <= .050, Probability-of-F-to-remove >= .100).
10	Availability of goods	.	Stepwise (Criteria: Probability-of-F-to-enter <= .050, Probability-of-F-to-remove >= .100).
11	good shape & feel	.	Stepwise (Criteria: Probability-of-F-to-enter <= .050, Probability-of-F-to-remove >= .100).

Source: Authors Compilation

Note- Dependent Variable: a. Consumer Satisfaction

In the stepwise regression, the R square represents the account of variance which ranges from 0 to and hold significant when it is above 0.7 in Table 14 (Model Summary) the R-square value for the last combination of eleven variables group 76.6 percent and the adjusted R square was noted as 0.761 which specified that the model was significant and fits the required criteria. The Durbin-Watson value was also calculated and identified as 1.737 which holds significant with the combination of eleven values.

Table 14: Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Durbin-Watson
1	.787[a]	.619	.619	.475	
2	.797[b]	.636	.634	.465	
3	.809[c]	.655	.653	.453	
4	.824[d]	.680	.677	.437	
5	.842[e]	.709	.707	.416	
6	.858[f]	.735	.733	.397	
7	.865[g]	.748	.745	.388	
8	.871[h]	.759	.756	.380	
9	.873[i]	.762	.758	.378	
10	.874[j]	.764	.760	.377	
11	.875[k]	.766	.761	.375	1.737

Source: Authors Calculations

Note- a. Predictors: (Constant), Deliver fresh products from the factory; b. Predictors: (Constant), Deliver fresh products from the factory, Satisfied with incredible customer service; c. Predictors: (Constant), Deliver fresh products from the factory, Satisfied with incredible customer service, Reasonable Price; d. Predictors: (Constant), Deliver fresh products from the factory, Satisfied with incredible customer service, Reasonable Price, Good Quality; e. Predictors: (Constant), Deliver fresh products from the factory, satisfied with incredible customer service, Reasonable Price, Good Quality, Staff assists in purchase of PLB;Predictors: (Constant), Deliver fresh products from the factory, satisfied with incredible customer service, Reasonable Price, Good Quality, Staff assists in purchase of PLB, affordable price at desired quantity; f. Predictors: (Constant), Deliver fresh products from the factory, satisfied with incredible customer service, Reasonable Price, Good Quality, Staff assists in purchase of PLB, affordable price at desired quantity, Offers & combos; g. Predictors: (Constant), Deliver fresh products from the factory, Satisfied with incredible; h. customer service, Reasonable Price, Good Quality, Staff assists in purchase of PLB, affordable price at desired quantity, Offers & combos, Payback cards; i. Predictors: (Constant), Deliver fresh products from the factory, satisfied with incredible customer service, Reasonable Price, Good Quality, Staff assists in purchase of PLB, affordable price at desired quantity, Offers & combos, Payback cards, Eye level; j. Predictors: (Constant), Deliver fresh products from the factory, satisfied with incredible customer service, Reasonable Price, Good Quality, Staff assists in purchase of PLB, affordable price at desired quantity, Offers & combos, Payback cards, Eye level, Availability of goods; k. Predictors: (Constant), Deliver fresh products from the factory, satisfied with incredible customer service, Reasonable Price, Good Quality, Staff assists in purchase of PLB, affordable price at desired quantity, Offers & combos, Payback cards, Eye level, Availability of goods, good shape & feel.

The next step of stepwise regression output indicates the ANOVA table with sum of squares, degrees of freedom, mean square, F value and significance as major outcomes. In the below table 15, The value of _l 'with Predictors of Deliver fresh products from the factory, satisfied with incredible customer service, Reasonable Price, Good Quality, Staff assists in the purchase of PLB, the affordable price at the desired quantity, Offers & combos, Payback cards, Eye-level,

Availability of goods, good shape & feel and dependent variable as consumer satisfaction the F-value F identified as 174.775 at a significant value of 0.000.

Table 15: ANOVA[a]

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
	Regression	219.21	1	219.21	972.964	.000b
1	Residual	134.73	598	0.225		
	Total	353.94	599			
	Regression	224.941	2	112.47	520.504	.000c
2	Residual	128.999	597	0.216		
	Total	353.94	599			
	Regression	231.821	3	77.274	377.133	.000d
3	Residual	122.119	596	0.205		
	Total	353.94	599			
	Regression	240.521	4	60.13	315.446	.000e
4	Residual	113.419	595	0.191		
	Total	353.94	599			
	Regression	251.089	5	50.218	290.025	.000f
5	Residual	102.851	594	0.173		
	Total	353.94	599			
	Regression	260.29	6	43.382	274.696	.000g
6	Residual	93.65	593	0.158		
	Total	353.94	599			
	Regression	264.847	7	37.835	251.405	.000h
7	Residual	89.093	592	0.15		
	Total	353.94	599			
	Regression	268.608	8	33.576	232.545	.000i
8	Residual	85.332	591	0.144		
	Total	353.94	599			
	Regression	269.529	9	29.948	209.322	.000j
9	Residual	84.411	590	0.143		
	Total	353.94	599			
	Regression	270.441	10	27.044	190.767	.000k
10	Residual	83.499	589	0.142		
	Total	353.94	599			
	Regression	271.042	11	24.64	174.775	.000l
11	Residual	82.898	588	0.141		

	Total	353.94	599			

Source: Authors' Calculations

Table 16 was the coefficients table which displayed the stepwise regression equation coefficients for the model variables. The coefficient of each variable was represented as B and the intercept equivalent in the equation was represented by the _constant 'value. The t values and the p values play a significant role to identify the most impacting variable and less impacting variables. This rejects the null hypothesis and accepts the alternative hypothesis (H2) that there is no significant relationship among variables identified and consumer satisfaction levels of PLBs in retail hypermarkets. According to the below table, 30.046 was identified as the highest t value at a significance level of 0.00 which was less than 0.05, Deliver fresh from the factory was identified as the most impacting factor of the dependent variable of consumer satisfaction. The following variable was recognized as a Reasonable Price of t value 14.856 at a significance level of 0.00. The next influencing variable was calculated as Good Quality with t value of 11.668 at a significance level of 0.00. The factor followed was recognized as 10.976 Staff assistance in the purchase of PLB at a significance level of 0.00. The fourth major influencing factor in the list was tracked as desired affordable price with desired quantity with a t value of 9.171 at a significance level of 0.00. The fifth influencing factor in the list was noted as the satisfaction with incredible customer service with a t value of 8.569 at a significance level of 0.00. the next factor was identified as satisfied with Payback cards with a _t-value 5.365 at a significance level of 0.00. the next satisfying factor was identified as the offer and combos for the PLB with 3.705 of t value at a significance level of 0.00. Consumer's satisfaction with availability of the PLB and PLB was in good feel and shape with t values of 2.570 and 2.066.

Table 16: Coefficients

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
	B	Std. Error	Beta		
(Constant)	.132	.117		1.126	0.261
Deliver fresh products from the factory	2.006	.067	1.881	30.046	.000
Satisfied with incredible customer service	.140	.016	.199	8.569	.000
Reasonable Price	.417	.028	.555	14.856	.000
Good Quality	.276	.024	.337	11.668	.000
Staff assists in purchase of PLB	.314	.029	.346	10.976	.000
affordable price at desired quantity	.214	.023	.222	9.171	.000
Offers & combos	.075	.020	.096	3.705	.000
Payback cards	.089	.016	.123	5.365	.000
Eye level	.054	.020	.067	2.695	.000
Availability of goods	.055	.021	.067	2.57	.010
good shape & feel	.032	.015	.043	2.066	.039

Source: Authors' Calculations

FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The marketing tools analysed in the study (independent variables) include Advertisements, Messages &mails, Instore displays, Flyers at the entrance, Friends & Family and through staff with a Dependent variable as consumer reach. mails, Instore displays, Flyers at the entrance, Friends & Family and through staff with a Dependent variable as consumer reach. It

was analysed those Flyers and entrance is the most effective marketing tool followed by Friends and family The least influencing tool was identified as advertisements for PLBs. Deliver fresh from the factory was identified as the most impacting factor of the dependent variable of consumer satisfaction followed by Reasonable price and good quality. Most preferred private label brands across hypermarkets were identified from More Mega Mart stores and less preferred PLBs were identified from the Vishal Mega Mart hypermarkets.

Managerial Implications

This study assists the R&D teams of retail PLB marketers to identify the appropriate market segment and position their products appropriately. The retail leadership teams can also adopt promotional strategies based on the outcome of the study by focusing on the freshness of PLBs (most satisfying factor) and Services offered (most influencing factor for purchase). The result of the study also portrayed 'packaging' as the least influencing factor in consumer preferences which can be given less priority in formulating the marketing strategies by the Hypermarkets. Thus, this study serves essential not only for PLB marketers and organized retails but also for the National brands companies in strategy formulations for not losing their market shares to the PLB brands.

REFERENCES

1. Ailawadi, K. L., Neslin, S. A., & Gedenk, K. (2001). Pursuing the value-conscious consumer: store brands versus national brand promotions. *Journal of marketing*, *65*(1), 71-89.
2. Baltas, G. (1997). Determinants of store brand choice: a behavioral analysis. *Journal of product & brand management*, *6*(5), 315-324.
3. Baltas, G. (2003). A combined segmentation and demand model for store brands. *European Journal of Marketing*, *37*(10), 1499-1513.
4. Burton, S., Lichtenstein, D. R., Netemeyer, R. G., & Garretson, J. A. (1998). A scale for measuring attitude toward private label products and an examination of its psychological and behavioral correlates. *Journal of the academy of marketing science*, *26*(4), 293.
5. Collins-Dodd, C., & Lindley, T. (2003). Store brands and retail differentiation: the influence of store image and store brand attitude on store own brand perceptions. *Journal of Retailing and consumer services*, *10*(6), 345-352.
6. Connolly, K. B. (2013). Private Label Packaging Playing an Essential Role in Retailer Brand Strategies.
7. Cotterill, R. W., Putsis, Jr, W. P., & Dhar, R. (2000). Assessing the competitive interaction between private labels and national brands. *The Journal of Business*, *73*(1), 109-137.
8. De Wulf, K., Odekerken-Schröder, G., Goedertier, F., & Van Ossel, G. (2005). Consumer perceptions of store brands versus national brands. *Journal of Consumer Marketing*, *22*(4), 223-232.
9. DIPP (2019) *Indian Retail Industry Report Retrieved from* https://digitalindia.gov.in/content/department-industrial-policy-promotion-dipp
10. Fazlzadeh, A., Sahebalzamani, S., & Sarabi, B. (2012). Key Factors Affecting Customer Satisfaction with Iranian Retailer Stores: Evidence from Hypermarkets and Supermarkets. *IUP Journal of Marketing Management*, *11*(4).
11. Garretson, J. A., Fisher, D., & Burton, S. (2002). Antecedents of private label attitude and national brand promotion attitude: similarities and differences. *Journal of Retailing*, *78*(2), 91-99.
12. Guerrero, L., Colomer, Y., Guàrdia, M. D., Xicola, J., & Clotet, R. (2000). Consumer attitude towards store brands. *Food Quality and Preference*, *11*(5), 387-395.
13. Hoch, S. J., & Banerji, S. (1993). When do private labels succeed?. *MIT Sloan Management Review*, *34*(4), 57.
14. Hussain, R., & Ali, M. (2015). Effect of store atmosphere on consumer purchase intention. *International Journal of Marketing Studies*, *7*(2).
15. IBEF (2019, October) *Indian Retail Industry Report.* Retrieved from https://www.ibef.org/industry/retail-india.aspx
16. IBEF (2022, October) *Indian Retail Industry Report.* Retrieved from https://www.ibef.org/industry/retail-india.aspx
17. Janakiraman, N., Syrdal, H. A., & Freling, R. (2016). The

effect of return policy leniency on consumer purchase and return decisions: A meta-analytic review. *Journal of Retailing*, *92*(2), 226-235.

18. Kumar, V., & Karande, K. (2000). The effect of retail store environment on retailer performance. *Journal of business research*, *49*(2), 167-181.
19. Kauppinen- Räisänen, H. (2014). Strategic use of colour in brand packaging. *Packaging Technology and Science*, *27*(8), 663-676.
20. Laroche, M., Pons, F., Zgolli, N., Cervellon, M. C., & Kim, C. (2003). A model of consumer response to two retail sales promotion techniques. *Journal of Business research*, *56*(7), 513-522.
21. Mathuravalli, C. R. (2013). An Investigation of Consumer Preferences towards Store Brands Purchase in Madurai District.
22. Monroe, K. B., & Krishnan, R. (1985). The effect of price on subjective product evaluations. *Perceived quality*, *1*(1), 209-232.
23. Mathuravalli, C. R. (2013). An Investigation of Consumer Preferences towards Store Brands Purchase in Madurai District.
24. Manzur, E., Olavarrieta, S., Hidalgo, P., Farías, P., & Uribe, R. (2011). Store brand and national brand promotion attitudes antecedents. *Journal of Business Research*, *64*(3), 286-291.
25. Miquel-Romero, M. J., Caplliure-Giner, E. M., & Adame-Sánchez, C. (2014). Relationship marketing management: Its importance in private label extension. *Journal of Business Research*, *67*(5), 667-672.
26. Ndlovu, S. G., & Heeralal, S. (2022). An investigation into marketing activities role on the purchase of private label brands: A systematic review of trends in literature. *International Journal of Research in Business and Social Science (2147-4478)*, *11*(1), 33-41.
27. Narasimhan, C., & Wilcox, R. T. (1998). Private labels and the channel relationship: a cross- category analysis. *The journal of business*, *71*(4), 573-600.
28. Pechtl, H. (2004). Profiling intrinsic deal proneness for HILO and EDLP price promotion strategies. *Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services*, *11*(4), 223-233.
29. Peterson, R. A. (1994). A meta-analysis of Cronbach's coefficient alpha. *Journal of consumer research*, *21*(2), 381-391.
30. Richardson, P., Jain, A. K., & Dick, A. (1996). The influence of store aesthetics on evaluation of private label brands. *Journal of Product & Brand Management*, *5*(1), 19-28.
31. Ravi, S. S., & Prasad, M. R. (2020). I Know Why I Choose Private Label Brands-Brand Equity Analysis in Organized Retailing. Indian Journal of Marketing, 50(3), 33-46.
32. Ravi, S. S., & Bhagat, S. (2020). Will Mobile Application Technology Help Retail Merchandising? Breakthrough Innovation by FMCG Companies. Indian Journal of Marketing, 50(12), 24-39.
33. Sinha, I., & Batra, R. (1999). The effect of consumer price consciousness on private label purchase. *International journal of research in marketing*, *16*(3), 237-251.
34. Vahie, A., & Paswan, A. (2006). Private label brand image: its relationship with store image and national brand. *International Journal of Retail & Distribution Management*, *34*(1), 67-84.
35. Wells, L. E., Farley, H., & Armstrong, G. A. (2007). The importance of packaging design for own-label food brands. *International Journal of Retail & Distribution Management*, *35*(9), 677-690.