A Study on Factors influencing the adaptation of private labels in organized retail branding among Malaysians

Anniselam Francis[1], Alex Hou Hong Ng[1*]

[1]Faculty of Business, Communication, and Law, INTI International University, Nilai, Negeri Sembilan, Malaysia

Corresponding Author: houhong.ng@newinti.edu.my

Abstract

With the growing realization that brand images are one of a firm's most valuable intangible assets, branding has emerged as a top management priority in the last decade. Given its highly competitive nature, branding can be especially important in the retailing industry to influence customer perceptions and drive store choice and loyalty. Five major objectives to determine about the Factors influencing the adaptation of private labels in organized retail branding among Malaysians which are product quality, price, brand & packaging on influencing the purchasing pattern of retail brand. The price, quality, brand and packaging dimension of the private label products were tested on Malaysian consumers on comparing between two product dimension that is on retailers branding products and manufactures branding product. Meanwhile, the researcher was also determining on the relationship between all the independent variables. The research been conducted in qualitative method where 300 questionnaires were distributed via online Google form. Then, the data collected was further analysed with the analysis method of frequency table, independent t-test, and descriptive analysis. Meanwhile secondary data were also used for support with journals, reference books, articles and online data information as to achieve the valid of research.

Keywords

Product quality, Price, Brand Image, Packaging, Adaptation of private labels, Retail branding

Introduction

Retailers are growing in a faster pace in many countries. Retailers prospect in Malaysia on the other hand at the nascent stage and have tremendous potential with respect to all types of ways in marketing their FMCG (Fast Moving Consumer Goods) at their stores as competition between retailers grow day by day. To keep up with the competition, retailers' source out various way to capture the market to strive in today's cut throat competition. To enhance the effectiveness of retailers in the market, retailer's own store brand is emerging as new concept and is slowly capturing the market. When the retail stores come out with the ideas to provide their product (known as retail brand), it is becomes alternatives choice for the consumer in purchasing the household. This idea being accepted by the worldwide consumer (including Malaysian) since those retail brands offer lower price of product. It is somehow attract consumer to buy this retail

brand, according (Laura Heller, 2011). The purpose of this study is to understand the 'Factors influencing the adaptation of private labels in organized retail brand among Malaysians' whereby are the retailers able to capture the market by performing these own brand strategies.

Retail brand were traditionally defined as replacement of product offerings to compete with their manufacture brand counterparts to fulfil the price value purpose. Generally, they imitate these more expensive brands and competing on price. These definitions of retail brand are evolving significantly over time. In recent years, retailers such as Tesco, Giant, and AEON etc. have been liberating themselves from the traditional definition of retail label and improvise their marketing approaches. Retailers realize that they cannot simply rely on manufacture brand products to attract consumers into their stores. They need to offer more items to the consumer (Keller, 2003).

Modernization and urbanization has changed the Malaysian retail industry in recent years. The small and traditional mode of retailing in highly urbanized areas is moving towards shopping complexes and hypermarket. The loose restrictions by Malaysian government on foreign retailers had increased the opportunities for foreign retailers. Thus, encourage more space for retail industry to expand. In these recent years, the secondary town also have hypermarket in the area. This is a proof that retail industries are given more space to reaching out the customer beyond the main town (Hazliza Hassan, 2013).

Methodology

The study is using descriptive research design, this is due to the researcher wants to understand the factors affecting consumers buying decision towards private label brands. Moreover, the study will justify how price, quality, packaging and brand image influence consumers towards purchasing private label brand. Therefore, casual study will also be applied in the research. 300 respondents are chosen as the sample size for this study. The researcher decided on the number according to the number of respondents in prior studies as shown in Table below. 250 respondents are chosen as the threshold as the researcher allows some unusable responses and missing date. Based on the sample size of prior studies, 250 respondents as a sample size for this research is justifiable. Frequency table is actually used for most of the variable of the questionnaire. The analysis is based on the respondent profile. The analyses are made based on the questions that have been asked in the question that have been asked in the questionnaire. In the research there are six questions to be analyses. They are gender, marital status, age, annual income, and highest academic qualification. For this research, we also use this method to analyse the question of categories of retail brand, the reason of buying retail brand product, have our respondent ever heard about the retail brand? And also the history of private labels in organized retail branding. Descriptive analysis will be use to analyse the mean/average answer of 5 point Likert-scale in our questionnaire. Therefore, we can monitor whether our respondent have positive or negative perception towards price, quality, brand, and packaging perspective of private labels in organized retail branding. T-test is the most commonly used method to evaluate the difference in mean between two groups. All four major parts (Price, Quality, Brand Image, and Packaging) in questionnaire go through t-test analysis. For this analysis, we choose to compare the variables of gender and their perception.

Results and Discussion

The demographic based on 300 respondent shows that both male and female percentages are almost equal with male represent 52% of total respondent, whereas female respondent represent 48%. Gender information is an important element. This information will help researchers to analyse the differences in male and female perception towards private labels in organized retail branding. In the next method of data analysis, researcher will compare their knowledge and opinion regarding retail branding. 24% of respondents are married, followed by 76% of respondents are single. This research conclude that majority of respondents is single. Majority of our respondent are among those who still further their study. Therefore, probability to meet those who are married is low. From this information, researcher will identify the differences in awareness level about private labels in organized retail branding between single respondents and married respondent. In the next methods of analysis, we will discuss further this differences. 4% of the respondent's that age are between 41-50 years old. It is followed by 6% that age 50 years and above. 17.7% of the respondents are below 20 years old. 20.3% of the respondents are between 31-40 years old while 52% respondents are between 21-30 years old. So, research concludes that majority of respondent age is 21-30 years old. Respondents with annual income more than RM60,000 are 9.3% while respondents with annual income less than RM20,000 are 54.0%. This data are useful to analyse how this people react towards price of private labels in organized retail branding. Are this people willing to purchase retail brand? I the next data analysis, we will discuss further about this. The highest percentage are monopolized by undergraduate with 56.3% followed by secondary school with 21.0%. Post Graduate with 12.7% and Professional Studies with 7.3%.This data can be used to differentiate the knowledge level among our respondent.

Descriptive analysis for PRICE of private labels in organized retail branding among Malaysians in below table:

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Satisfied	300	1	5	3.60	.869
Value for money	300	1	5	3.66	.860
Comparative	300	1	5	3.33	1.154
Lowest price	300	1	5	3.32	1.024
Future Purchases	300	1	5	4.02	.894
Average mean				**3.586**	

The average mean for the perception towards price is 3.586 which nearly 4 (agree). Generally, the respondents has the positive perception towards retailer's private label brand in price perspective.

Descriptive analysis for QUALITY of private labels in organized retail branding among Malaysians

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Similar	300	1	5	2.88	.988
Rely	300	1	5	3.26	.888
Consider to Purchase	300	1	5	3.47	.905
Safety	300	1	5	3.50	.795
Low Price & Quality	300	2	5	3.98	.776
Overall satisfaction	300	1	5	3.44	.869
Improvise	300	2	5	4.23	.775
Average mean				**3.537**	

The average mean for the perception towards price is 3.537 which nearly 4 (agree). Generally, the respondents has the positive perception towards retailer's private label brand in quality perspective.

Independent T-test analysis for PRICE perspective:

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means					95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
		F	Sig.	t	Df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	Lower	Upper
Satisfied	Equal variances assumed	2.258	.134	-.680	298	.497	-.068	.101	-.266	.129
	Equal variances not assumed			-.684	297.135	.495	-.068	.100	-.265	.128
Value for money	Equal variances assumed	3.382	.067	-.871	298	.385	-.087	.099	-.282	.109
	Equal variances not assumed			-.877	294.797	.381	-.087	.099	-.281	.108
Compare the price	Equal variances assumed	1.374	.242	-1.554	298	.121	-.207	.133	-.469	.055
	Equal variances not assumed			-1.554	296.130	.121	-.207	.133	-.469	.055
Lowest price	Equal variances assumed	1.525	.218	-1.348	298	.179	-.159	.118	-.392	.073
	Equal variances not assumed			-1.354	297.485	.177	-.159	.118	-.391	.072
Future hope	Equal variances assumed	3.806	.052	-2.165	298	.031	-.222	.103	-.424	-.020
	Equal variances not assumed			-2.184	292.143	.030	-.222	.102	-.422	-.022

H0: There is a significant perceptional difference between male and female towards retail brand price
H1: There is no significant perceptional difference between male and female towards retail brand price

For the 'satisfied with retail brand price' question, the probability of error is .497 > 0.5, therefore, we accept the null hypothesis. For the 'value of money' question, the probability of error is .385 > 0.5, therefore, we accept the null hypothesis. For the 'comparing the price' question, the probability of error is .121> 0.5, therefore, we accept the null hypothesis. For the 'choosing the lowest price item' question, the probability of error is .179> 0.5, therefore, we accept the null hypothesis. However, for the 'future price expectation' question, the probability of error is .031< .05. Hence, we have to reject the null hypothesis. With 95% confident, there is no significant perceptional difference between male and female towards private labels in organized retail branding

Independent T-test analysis for QUALITY perspective:

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means					95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	Lower	Upper
Similar	Equal variances assumed	.000	.988	.084	298	.933	.010	.114	-.215	.235
	Equal variances not assumed			.084	295.468	.933	.010	.114	-.215	.235
Rely	Equal variances assumed	2.058	.152	.317	298	.751	.033	.103	-.170	.235
	Equal variances not assumed			.318	297.775	.750	.033	.102	-.169	.234
Consider to purchase	Equal variances assumed	2.694	.102	-.168	298	.866	-.018	.105	-.224	.188
	Equal variances not assumed			-.169	297.714	.866	-.018	.104	-.223	.188
Safety	Equal variances assumed	.479	.490	.942	298	.347	.087	.092	-.094	.267
	Equal variances not assumed			.944	297.976	.346	.087	.092	-.094	.267
Low prices concern	Equal variances assumed	.296	.587	-1.325	298	.186	-.119	.090	-.295	.058
	Equal variances not assumed			-1.322	293.470	.187	-.119	.090	-.295	.058
Overall satisfaction	Equal variances assumed	1.368	.243	-.350	298	.726	-.035	.101	-.233	.163
	Equal variances not assumed			-.352	297.937	.725	-.035	.100	-.232	.162
Improvise	Equal variances assumed	1.532	.217	-.506	298	.613	-.045	.090	-.222	.131
	Equal variances not assumed			-.508	297.915	.612	-.045	.089	-.221	.130

Gender has been chosen as our variable and come out with the hypothesis as follows:

H0: There is significant perceptional difference between male and female towards retailer's private label brand product quality
H1: The is no significant perceptional difference between male and female towards retailer's private label brand product quality
Referring to above table, we can see that the probability of error for all seven (7) questions exceed the value of .05, therefore we have to accept the null hypothesis. With 95% of confident, there is no significant perceptional difference between male and female towards retailer's private label brand product quality.

Independent T-test analysis for BRAND IMAGE perspective:

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
									95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	Lower	Upper
Unable to compete	Equal variances assumed	8.639	.004	2.755	298	.006	.293	.106	.084	.503
	Equal variances not assumed			2.766	297.938	.006	.293	.106	.085	.502
Preference	Equal variances assumed	1.946	.164	1.974	298	.049	.225	.114	.001	.449
	Equal variances not assumed			1.966	288.305	.050	.225	.114	.000	.450
Loyalty	Equal variances assumed	1.400	.238	-1.017	298	.310	-.124	.122	-.365	.116
	Equal variances not assumed			-1.020	297.991	.308	-.124	.122	-.364	.116
Future purchase	Equal variances assumed	.048	.827	1.379	298	.169	.135	.098	-.058	.328
	Equal variances not assumed			1.377	294.685	.169	.135	.098	-.058	.328

Unable to compete

As we can see above, 'unable to compete' question score probability error of .006 which is <.05. Thus, we must reject the null hypothesis and conclude that there is a significant perceptional difference between male and female about the ability of the retail brand to compete with other establish manufacture brand. In order to further analyse this situation, we compare the mean of answer of female and male respondent. The table is as follows:

Gender	Mean	N	Std. Deviation
Male	3.40	156	.962
Female	3.10	144	.875
Total	**3.26**	**300**	**.931**

Based on above table, we can see that male respondent tend to be pessimist about the ability of retail brand to compete, while female believe retail brand has an ability to compete with other manufacture brand. This perception difference among male and female is simply because female doing more shopping compared to male. They have better judgement compared to men (Van Slyke, 2002).

Preference

'Preference' question in above analysis score probability error of .049 which is <.05. Thus, we must reject the null hypothesis and conclude that there is a significant perceptional difference between male and female about their preference of brand. In order to further analyse this situation, we compare the mean of answer of female and male respondent. The table is as follow:

Gender	Mean	N	Std. Deviation
Male	3.72	156	.935
Female	3.49	144	1.038
Total	**3.61**	**300**	**.991**

Indeed, male respondent seems prefer to buy manufacture product compared to retail brand product since they score higher mean score than female respondent. Male respondent believe established manufacture brand is better than retail brand (Catherine C. ,1999)

Independent T-test analysis for PACKAGING perspective:

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means					95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
		F	Sig.	t	Df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	Lower	Upper
Packaging Presentation	Equal variances assumed	3.252	.072	2.395	298	.017	.222	.093	.040	.404
	Equal variances not assumed			2.386	289.862	.018	.222	.093	.039	.405
Packaging Satisfaction	Equal variances assumed	2.093	.149	.980	298	.328	.122	.124	-.123	.366
	Equal variances not assumed			.985	297.555	.325	.122	.124	-.122	.365
Packaging Design towards Purchasing Decision	Equal variances assumed	.860	.354	1.408	298	.160	.167	.119	-.066	.401
	Equal variances not assumed			1.414	297.789	.158	.167	.118	-.065	.400
Low Quality Packaging	Equal variances assumed	.000	.999	.451	298	.652	.060	.133	-.201	.321
	Equal variances not assumed			.451	295.785	.652	.060	.133	-.201	.321

Packaging Presentation

It turns out female and male have a significant different perception about retailer's private label brand product's packaging presentation.   The score of probability error seems to be lower than .05. In order to find which gender agrees that retailer's private label brand product's packaging presentation plays an important role show in following table:

Gender	Mean	N	Std. Deviation
Male	3.70	144	.837
Female	3.92	156	.767
Total	3.82	300	.807

Referring to above table, female respondent believe that presentable packaging plays important role in their purchasing decision. While male respondent slightly disagree with female's opinion. The factor that influence this perception is might be female purchase look into first impression while man purchase for as long the goods are packed in a proper packaging without any damage on the internal goods (Rundh, B. 2009).

Conclusions

The researcher had achieved the objectives to determine the reasons that become the obstacle of popularity of retailer's private label. In the end of this research, we able to identify three major reasons that become the obstacles or barriers as follow; (i.) retailer's private label is lack of ability to compete with manufacture brand quality, (ii.) Purchasing decision influenced by the consumer preference and (iii.) Presentable packaging plays important role in their purchasing decision in purchasing private label goods. Malaysian consumer strongly feels that these retail branding are unable to compete with retail brand in term of quality. Majority of the consumer believe that manufacture brand offer better quality compared to retail brand. Furthermore, every consumer have their of product preference which they start using those product for very long time. In order to learn using retail brand, it requires lots of effort to make them trust this retail brand. In overall, we can simply conclude that consumers look into price and quality as their first priority followed by brand image and packaging to determine the adaptation of private labels in organized retail branding among Malaysians.

Acknowledgements

References

Mogelonsky (1995), Cautiously Reaching for the Cloud,
[Online]. Available: https://www.hospitalitynet.org/opinion/4087874.html
Fernie, J. and McKinnon (2011), The interface between retailers and logistics service providers in the online market [Online]. Available:
http://j.pelet.free.fr/publications/design/The_interface_between_retailers_and_logistics_service_providers_in_the_online_market.pdf
Hazliza Hassan & Abu Bakar Sade, (2013), Self-service Technology for Hypermarket Checkout Stations [Online]. Available:
file:///C:/Users/Anniselam%20Francis/Downloads/33118-111985-1-SM.pdf
Vrechnopoulos, A.P, Siomkos, G.J., & Doukidis, G. I. 2001."Internet Shopping Adoption by
Greek Consumers" , European Journal of Innovation management, 4(3),
Wheatley, J.J, Chui, J.SY., and Goldman, A. (1981), ―Physical Quality, Price, And Perception of Product Quality: Implication for Retailers‖, Journal of Retailing, Vol.57, No.2, pp.100-116
Schiffman, L.G. and Kanuk, L.L.,2000,Consumer Behaviour, 7th edition, United States of
America, Prentice Hall,pg 122,146.
Yoon, E. and Valerie, K., 1997," Dynamics of the relationship between product features,
quality evaluation, and pricing", online, Pricing Strategy & Practise, Vol 5, Number 2, pp 45-60 in Emerald Library.
Richardson, P.S., Dick, A.S. and Jain, A.K. (1994), "Extrinsic and intrinsic cue effects on

Rose,S. and Nabil, T.,2004,"Perception of generic products : a macro and micro view", online, International Journal of Quality & Reliability Management, Vol 19, number 4, pp
93-108 in Emerald Library.
Research Report: Factors influencing the adaptation of private labels in organized retail branding among Malaysians
Osman . M (2015), The Customers Satisfaction on Retailers' Brand Products: A Study on
Selected Areas in Klang Valley [Online]. Available: https://ac.els
cdn.com/S2212567116000526/1-s2.0-S2212567116000526-main.pdf?_tid=4e7eacf2
dd23-4309-936d
347281d7b06b&acdnat=1527232736_48397ea51b42a7fdb5341c817f014846
Jin, B. and Brenda,S.,2003,"The influence of retail environment on price
perception",online,International Marketing Review,Vol 20,number 6,pp 643-660 in Emerald Library
Kalita, K.J.,Sharan,J.,Donald,R.L,2004"Do high price signal high quality?A theoretical model
and empirical result",online, Journal of Product & Brand Management, Vol 13, number 4,pp 279-288 in emerald library
Prendergast, G.P. and Marr, N.E. (1997), ―Generic products: who buys them and how do they
perform relative to each other?European Journal of Marketing, Vol.31, No.2, pp.94-109.
Shanmugan. J & Pradeep (2015), Brand Influence on Buying FMCG Products in UAE: An
Empirical Study [Online]. Available:
file:///C:/Users/Anniselam%20Francis/Downloads/8037-10522-1-PB.pdf
Justin Beneke (2010), Consumer perceptions of private label brands within
the retail grocery sector of South Africa [Online]. Available:
http://www.academicjournals.org/article/article1380703674_Beneke.pdf
Kotler,P. and Armstrong,G.2001, Principle of Marketing, 9th edition, United States of America,
Prentice Hall,pg 371,405.
Fahy, John, and David Jobber. Foundations of Marketing. 4th ed. New York: McGraw-Hill,
2012.
Aaker. (1996). Measuring brand equity across products and markets. California Management
Review, 38, pp 108.
Research Report: Factors influencing the adaptation of private labels in organized retail branding among Malaysians
Aaker, D. (1996). What is a strong brand? Building Strong Brands, pp 1-26.
Kata, B., & Linda, F. (2012). You get what you pay for, Improve brand equity through rebranding.UPPSALA, Sweden. Retrieve from:
http://uu.divaportal.org/smash/get/diva2:546965/FULLTEXT01.pdf den 10 1 20141
Adams, D. (March 2012). Awareness vs. Familiarity. Retrieve from:
http://www.mertonadams.com/2012/03/awareness-vs-familiarity "Brand", Retrieve from: http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Brand#Brand_awareness
Grimes, A. & Doole, I. (1998) Exploring the Relationship Between Colour and International

Branding : A Cross Cultural Comparison of the UK and Taiwan, Journal Marketing Management, Vol. 14, pp. 799-817

Sundaram, D., & Cynthia, W. (1999). "Advances in Consumer Research". Retrieve from:http://www.acrwebsite.org/search/view-conference

proceedings.aspx?Id=8342sustainability, Q. r. (1 January – 31 March 2013).

Fill, C. (2002), Marketing Communications:Contexts, Strategies and Applications, 3rd ed.,

Prentice-Hall, London,

Baltas, G. (1997). Determinant of store brand, Behavioral analysis. Warwck Business school.

Richardson, P.S,Jain,A.K and Dick ,A. (1996). House Hold store Brand Proness:a framework. Journal of retailing, 72(2), pp159-185.

Xia, L., Monroe, K. B. and Cox, J.L. (2004). The price is unfair! A conceptual framework of price fairness perceptions. Journal of Marketing, 68(October), 1-15.

Vikas, V. (2011).Pros and Cons of Penetration Pricing Strategies.

Yeoman, I. and McMahon-Beattie, U. (2004).Revenue Management and Pricing: Case Studies and Applications, Thompson Learning, London

PRIDE, W. M. and FERRELL, O. C., 2010: Marketing Concepts and Strategies, (10th ed.),

New York, Houghton Miffl in Co.

Research Report: Factors influencing the adaptation of private labels in organized retail branding among Malaysians

LOY, J.-P. and C. WEISS (2003), Staggering and Synchronisation of Pricing Behaviour:

New Evidence from German Food Retailers. "Agribusiness – An International Journal", Vol.18, No. 4, S. 437-457.

Krider, R. E., Raghubir, P. & Krishna, A. (2001). Pizzas: Pi or Square? Psychological Biases

in Area Comparisons. Marketing Science, 20, (4), 405-425.

Luna, D. & Kim, H. (2009). How Much was Your Shopping Basket? Working Memory Processes in Total Basket Price Estimation. Journal of Consumer Psychology, 19, (3), 346-355.

Sinha, I. and M.F. Smith, 2000. Consumer perceptions of promotional framing on price. Psychol. Market., 17(3): 257-275.

Muller, H., Vogt, B. & Kroll, E. B. (2012). To Be or Not to Be Price Conscious – a Segment-

Based Analysis of Compromise Effects in Market-Like Framings. Psychology and Marketing, 29, (2), 107-116.

Kristina Shampanier, Nina Mazar and Dan Ariely (2007) "Zero as a Special Price: The True

Value of Free Products". Marketing Science. Vol. 26, No. 6, 742 – 757.

Heyman, J., D. Ariely. 2004. Effort for payment: A tale of two markets. Psych. Sci. 15(11)

787–793.

Raju, Jagmohan S., V. Srinivasan, Rajiv Lal. 1990. The effects of brand loyalty on competitive price promotional strategies. Management Sci. 36(3) 276–304.

Dunne, P.M., Lusch. J.R. & Curver, J.R. (2014). Retailing. Ohio: Cengage Learning.

Daly, J.L. (2002). Pricing for Profitability: Activity-Based Pricing for Competitive Advantage. New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Sonneveld, K., James, K., Fitzpatrick, L. & Lewis, H. 2005. Sustainable Packaging: How do
we Define and Measure It? Melbourne: 22nd IAPRI Symposium 2005.
Sook Kim, Q. 2000, This Potion's Power in in its Packaging. Wall Street Jornal, 1(2):360361

Research Report: Factors influencing the adaptation of private labels in organized retail branding among Malaysians

Prendergast, P.G. a L. PITT (1996). Packaging, marketing, logistics and the environment: are
there trade-offs? International Journal of Physical Distribution & Logistics
Management. 6(26), 60-72
RETTIE, R. a C. BREWER (200). The verbal and visual components of package design.
Journal of Product & Brand Management, 9, 56-70. [Online] DOI:
http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/10610420010316339. ISSN 1061-0421.
Steenkamp JEM, Van Trijp HCM (1996), "Quality guidance: A consumer based approach to
food quality improvement using partial least squares", Eur. Rev. Agric. Econ., 23(2): 195-215.
Brunso K, Fjord TA, Grunert KG (2002). Consumers' food choice and quality perception.
Working Paper n. 77, ISSN 09072101. June 2002.
Drewniany, B. L., & Jewler, A. J., (2011). Creative strategy in advertising (10th ed.). Boston:
Wadsworth/Cengage Learning.
Gofman, A., Moskowitz, H.R. & Mets, T. 2010. Accelerating structured consumer driven
package design. Journal of Consumer Marketing. Emerald Article. Accessed on 16 January 2013.
Rundh, B. 2009. Packaging design: creating competitive advantage with product packaging.
British Food Journal. Emerald Article. Accessed on 8 October 2012.
Silayoi, P. & Speece, M. 2007. The importance of packaging attributes: a conjoint analysis
approach. European Journal of Marketing. Emerald Article. Accessed on 16 January 2013.
Grossman, R. P., & Wisenblit, J. Z. (1999) What we know about consumers' color choices.
Journal of Marketing Practice: Applied Marketing Science, 5, 78–88
Ramsland, T. & Selin, J. 1993. Handbook on procurement of packaging. Helsinki: PRODEC

Research Report: Factors influencing the adaptation of private labels in organized retail branding among Malaysians
Costa, A. I. A. (2003). New insights into consumer-oriented food product design. Wageningen: Ponsen and Looijen.
Grunert, K. G., Larsen, H. H., Madsen, T. K., and Baadsgaard, A. (1996). Market orientation
in food and agriculture. Boston, MA: Kluwer.

Imran, N (1999), "The Role of Visual Cues in Consumer Perception and Acceptance of a

Food Product", Nutrition and Food Science, September/October, No.5, pp.224-228

Bech-Larsen, T., & Grunert, K. G. (2003). The perceived healthfulness of functional foods. A

conjoint study of Danish, Finnish and American consumers' perceptions of functional foods. Appetite, 40, 9–14.

Nancarrow, C., Wright, L. T., Brace, I. (1998). Gaining competitive advantage from packaging and labelling in marketing communications. British Food Journal 100(2), p. 110–118.

Drewniany, B.L., & Jewler, A.J. (2005). Creative Strategy in Advertising. Boston: Thomson

Wadsworth. Ninth Edition

Underwood RL, Klein NM, 2002. Packaging as brand communication: the impact of product

display and advertising slogan on consumer's responses to the package and brand. Journal of Marketing Theory and Practice. 10: 58-68.

Van Slyke, C., C.L. Comunale and F. Belanger (2002), "Gender Differences in Perceptions of

Webbased Shopping," Communications of Association For Computing Machinery, 45(8), 82-86.

Raj, S., Catherine C. (1999), "Factors influencing the price premiums that consumers pay for

national brands over store brands", Journal of Product & Brand Management, Vol. 8 No. 4, pp. 340-351.