Major Research Project On
A STUDY ON CUSTOMER ATTITUDE AND PERCEPTION TOWARDS GI TAGS

Submitted By
Anurag Kumar
2K21/DMBA/36

Under the guidance of
Dr. Rajan Yadav
Professor

DELHI SCHOOL OF MANAGEMENT

Delhi Technological University

Bawana Road Delhi 110042

CERTIFICATE

This is to certify that Anurag Kumar 2K21/DMBA/36 has submitted the project report titled "A Study on customer Attitude and Perception towards GI tags" in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the award of the degree of Master of Business Administration (MBA) from Delhi School of Management, Delhi Technological University, New Delhi during the academic year 2022-23.

Dr. Archana Singh
Head of Department
Delhi School of Management
Delhi Technology University

Dr. Rajan Yadav
Professor
Delhi School of Management
Delhi Technology University

DECLARATION

I, Anurag Kumar, student of Delhi School of Management, Delhi Technological University hereby declare that the Major Research Project report titled "A Study on Customer Attitude and Perception towards GI Tags" submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the award of the degree of Master of Business Administration (MBA) is the original work conducted by me. I also confirm that neither I nor any other person has submitted this project report to any other institution or university for any other degree or diploma. I further declare that the information collected from various sources has been duly acknowledged in this project.

Anurag Kumar
2K21/DMBA/36

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

I would like to acknowledge Delhi School of Management, DTU, for giving me the opportunity to take up project-based courses as a part of our curriculum for an enhanced learning experience. I would like to express my sincere gratitude towards Prof. Rajan Yadav for guiding and supporting me throughout my project.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The study aimed to explore the attitudes and perceptions of customers towards Geographical Indication (GI) tags. GI tags are an important form of intellectual property protection that indicate a product's origin and unique characteristics, and can be used to promote and market these products. The study was conducted through a survey of people across Delhi NCR.

The study recommends that there is a need for greater awareness and education about GI tags among consumers, especially in urban areas and younger generations. It also suggests that producers and marketers of products with GI tags should emphasize the unique characteristics and benefits of these products in their marketing campaigns to increase consumer understanding and appreciation.

The study is important because it can provide light on the utility of GI tags as a tool for marketing as well as their effects on customer perception and attitude. The research findings can aid producers and governments in creating strategies that will both market items with GI labels and safeguard the traditional and cultural heritage they are linked to. The study can also add to the body of knowledge on consumer behaviour and branding, especially as it relates to GIs.

Overall, the study suggests that GI tags can play an important role in promoting and preserving traditional products, but there is a need for greater awareness, understanding, and support for GI tags among customers.

Table of Contents

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION 7
1.1 BACKGROUND OF THE STUDY 7
1.2 Problem Statement 9
1.3 Objective of The Study 9
1.4 Scope of the Study 10
CHAPTER 2: REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE 11
CHAPTER 3: RESEARCH METHODOLOGY 14
CHAPTER 4 15
ANALYSIS, INTERPRETATION AND RECOMMENDATIONS 15
4.1 Data Collection 15
4.2 Analysis 15
4.3 Finding and Recommendations 29
4.4 Limitations of the Study 29
CHAPTER 5: CONCLUSION 30
REFERENCES 31
ANNEXURE..... 32

LIST OF TABLES

Name of Tables	Page no.
Table 1: Chi square test (understandings of GI tags and occupation)	9
Table 2: Chi square test (seeking out product with GI tags and educational qualifications)	10
Table 3: Chi square test (satisfaction with GI tag product and recommendations to others)	12
Table 4: Chi square test (GI tags protecting the identity and quality of products and GI tags adding value to products)	13
Table 5: Chi square test (quality of GI tag products and willingness to pay extra for GI tags products)	15
Table 6: Chi square test (Gender and willingness to purchase GI tags product again)	16
Table 7: Chi square test (gender and understanding of the GI tags)	18
Table 8: Chi square test (GI tags recommendation to others and the satisfaction with the quality of GI tag product)	19
Table 9: Chi square test (GI tags adding value to product and GI tags helping protect traditional knowledge and cultural heritage)	20
Table 10: Summary Table of Tested Hypothesis	22

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

1.1 BACKGROUND OF THE STUDY

The study on customer attitude and perception towards GI (Geographical Indication) tags is an important area of research in the field of marketing and branding. GI tags are a type of intellectual property right that is granted to products that are specific to a particular region or locality. These tags help in distinguishing and protecting the unique characteristics, qualities, and reputation of these products, which in turn can lead to higher value and demand for them.

The purpose of this study is to investigate the awareness, attitude, and perception of customers towards products with GI tags. The study aims to understand the extent to which customers are aware of these tags, their understanding of the benefits of GI tags, and how they perceive products with these tags in terms of quality, authenticity, and uniqueness. The study also intends to examine the influence of demographic variables such as age, gender, and income on the attitudes and perceptions of customers towards GI tags.

The study can provide valuable insights to businesses and policymakers in the area of branding and marketing. By understanding the attitudes and perceptions of customers towards GI tagged products, businesses can make informed decisions about their branding strategies and marketing campaigns. Policymakers can use the findings of the study to develop policies that can promote the use of GI tags and increase the awareness of customers about their benefits.

Geographical Indications (GI) are indications used on goods that have a specific geographical origin and possess qualities or a reputation that are due to that origin. GIs play an important role in protecting and promoting the cultural and traditional heritage of a region, as well as the economic value of products associated with a specific geographic area.

The study on customer attitude and perception towards GI tags aims to explore how customers perceive and value GI tags on products. Specifically, the study aims to:

- Understand the level of awareness among customers about GI tags.

- Identify the factors that influence customer perception towards products with GI tags.
- Analyse the impact of GI tags on customer purchasing behaviour.
- Evaluate the effectiveness of GI tags in promoting the cultural and traditional heritage of a region.

The study is significant because it can provide insights into the effectiveness of GI tags as a marketing tool and their impact on customer perception and behaviour. The findings can help policymakers and producers to develop effective strategies to promote GI-tagged products and protect the cultural and traditional heritage associated with them. Additionally, the study can contribute to the literature on consumer behaviour and branding, particularly in the context of GIs.

Overall, this study on customer attitude and perception towards GI tags can contribute to the understanding of the importance of branding and intellectual property rights in the global marketplace, and can help in promoting the use and recognition of GI tags for regional products.

The Geographical Indication (GI) tag is a form of intellectual property right that identifies a product as originating from a specific geographical location and possessing certain qualities, reputation, or characteristics attributed to that location. GI tags are considered important for promoting and protecting traditional and indigenous products, as well as boosting the local economy and preserving cultural heritage. The study on Customer Attitude and Perception Towards GI tags aims to understand how consumers perceive and value products with GI tags. Specifically, the study seeks to explore consumers' awareness, knowledge, and attitude towards GI tags and how these factors influence their purchasing behaviour. Additionally, the study aims to identify the factors that drive consumers' preference for GI tagged products and the barriers that hinder the adoption of GI tags.

Overall, the study will provide insights into the effectiveness of GI tags in promoting local products and enhancing consumers' perception of quality, authenticity, and uniqueness. The findings of this study will be useful for policymakers, producers, and marketers to design effective strategies for promoting and marketing GI tagged products.

1.2 Problem Statement

The Geographical Indication (GI) tags are used to indicate the origin of a particular product and its associated characteristics. However, there is a lack of awareness among consumers regarding the significance of GI tags and their impact on the quality of the product. This lack of awareness and understanding can lead to customers making incorrect assumptions about the products they purchase.

The problem is that there is a need to investigate the customer attitude and perception towards GI tags to understand their level of awareness and understanding about the GI tags. The study aims to identify the factors that influence customer attitudes and perceptions towards GI tags and the impact it has on their purchasing behaviour.

Therefore, the research question is "What is the attitude and perception of customers towards GI tags and what factors influence their perception and purchasing behaviour?"

1.3 Objective of The Study

The objective of the study on customer attitude and perception towards GI (Geographical Indication) tags is to gather information about how consumers perceive products that have a GI tag and how it affects their purchasing decisions. Specifically, the study aims to:

- Determine consumers' awareness and knowledge of GI tags.
- Assess consumers' attitude towards products with a GI tag.
- Investigate the impact of GI tags on consumers' purchasing decisions.
- Identify the factors that influence consumers' perception of GI tagged products.
- Analyse the potential benefits and drawbacks of GI tagging for producers and consumers.
- Provide insights and recommendations for producers, policymakers, and marketers to leverage GI tags for their products.

- By achieving these objectives, the study can contribute to a better understanding of the role of GI tags in promoting and protecting local products and their producers

1.4 Scope of the Study

The scope of a study on customer attitude and perception towards GI tags could include several aspects related to the topic. Here are some possible areas of focus that could be included:

Definition and explanation of GI tags: The study could start with an overview of what GI tags are, how they work, and what they represent. This could include information on the legal framework surrounding GI tags, their purpose, and the benefits they provide.

Customer awareness and understanding of GI tags: The study could explore how much customers know about GI tags, how they perceive them, and what kind of information they associate with them. This could involve conducting surveys, interviews, or focus groups to gather data on customer attitudes and perceptions.

Influence of GI tags on customer behavior: The study could investigate whether GI tags have any impact on customer purchasing decisions, brand loyalty, or overall satisfaction. This could involve analyzing customer behavior data, such as sales figures, customer reviews, or repeat purchase rates, to see if there is a correlation between GI tags and customer behavior.

Challenges and opportunities for GI tag implementation: Finally, the study could explore the challenges and opportunities associated with implementing GI tags in different regions or industries. This could include identifying barriers to adoption, such as cost or regulatory issues, as well as highlighting potential benefits, such as increased consumer confidence or better protection for traditional products.

Overall, a study on customer attitude and perception towards GI tags could be an important contribution to understanding the role of this important certification system in the modern marketplace.

CHAPTER 2: REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

- **Jarma Arroyo SE, Hogan V, Ahrent Wisdom D, Moldenhauer KAK, Seo HS. (2020)** conducted a study to discuss the impact of geographical indication (GI) labeling on how people perceive and accept cooked aromatic rice samples. The researchers had 99 participants evaluate rice samples from three different varieties, both with and without GI information. The participants rated the appearance, aroma, flavor, texture, and overall liking of the rice samples, and also expressed the importance of the GI information to them. The results showed that when provided with GI information, consumers rated the cooked rice samples higher in appearance and overall liking. Interestingly, participants who placed more value on "state-of-origin" information showed increased enjoyment of the rice samples when provided with GI information, but not when no GI information was given. Participants who received GI information also rated the flavor or sweetness intensities of the rice samples closer to their desired levels. This study provides evidence on how GI information affects the sensory perception and acceptance of cooked aromatic rice samples. The findings can help the rice industry, farmers, and traders make better use of GI labelling to increase consumer acceptance of their rice products.

- **Walia and Kumar (2020)** looked at the success and failure of Geographical Indications (GIs) in India by doing a critical analysis of the Geographical Indications of Goods (Registration and Protection) Act, 1999. The authors pointed out that GI has had different effects on different things. For example, Darjeeling Tea and Chanderi Saree have been very successful, boosting local economies and getting known around the world. Other GI-tagged products, on the other hand, like Banarasi Saree, Venkatagiri Saree, and Pashmina Silk, continue to face problems from fake goods. This means that local producers, skilled weavers, and traditional artisans are being taken advantage of. The paper talked about how strict legal enforcement is needed to protect native products and their producers. It also pushed for producers and traders to learn more about the social and economic benefits and importance of GIs.

- **Piyush Patil (2021)** A Geographical Indication (GI) tag is a special type of intellectual property that grants legal recognition to products originating from a specific geographic region. It signifies the unique quality and characteristics of a product based on its place of origin. Various items such as food products, agricultural goods, wine and spirits, handicrafts, and textiles can be eligible for a GI tag. The Paris Convention for the Protection of Industrial Property (specifically Articles 1(2) and 10) and the Trade Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights (TRIPS) Agreement (Articles 22 to 24) define and address Geographical Indications as a component of Intellectual Property. The Department for Promotion of Industry and Internal Trade has issued guidelines outlining the requirements and registration process for obtaining a Geographical Indication. This research paper focuses on the significance and current status of Geographical Indications for tribes in India, highlighting the challenges they face in obtaining GI tags. The aim is to

underscore the importance of registering products with their Geographical Indication tags to preserve their authenticity and originality.

- **Rabadán et al. (2021)** conducted a study to understand how consumers perceive geographical indication (GI) labels for spring fruits and how these perceptions change with distance between the production region and the consumption area. The study focused on two GI labels in Spain: the protected geographical indication for Alicante Mountain Cherries and the protected designation of origin for Callosa d'En Sarriá Loquats. The researchers used logistic regression analysis to analyze the data. The findings showed that consumers strongly associate GI fruit with quality, particularly when they value the place of production (origin). The study also found that different attributes were more closely linked to GI labels for cherries compared to loquats. Cherries had several associated features such as origin, organic status, color, and variety, while loquats were mainly associated with origin and variety. Additionally, the study revealed that consumers who lived closer to the GI region had a stronger connection between these labels and higher product qualities. The authors suggested that increasing awareness of GI labels beyond their local influence could boost demand for these products, as consumers become more informed about the quality characteristics emphasized by the label.

- **John, I. (2022).** conducted a study to look at how people in the Mbeya and Kilimanjaro regions of Tanzania knew about, liked, and thought about high-quality products, like coffee and rice. The goal of the study was to find out how well geographical indication (GI) protection could work in the country. The study used a sample of 130 consumers and a mix of methods. The results showed that 62% of consumers knew what they were looking for in a product. Price and label/brand information were the main things that affected their preferences and ideas. The study found that most consumers didn't know much about GI, and that their knowledge of possible GI products was affected by the information on the label, their occupation, education, and how long they had been eating the food. This research adds to the growing amount of information about the potential of GI products in Tanzania (John, 2017; John et al., 2016, 2020).

- **Bhushan, T., & Anand, A. (2022).** Bhushan and Anand (2022) examined Geographical Indication (GI) as an Intellectual Property Right (IPR) in India, discussing its legal and non-legal implications, the evolution of GI in India, and the existing legal framework for GI protection. They critically appraised India's traditional cultural expressions, traditional knowledge, and agricultural produce as the subject matter of GI protection and analyzed the challenges facing developing countries with regards to GI protection. The authors argued that GI holders must rethink and work on their strategies to achieve the desired success and further development, and emphasized the importance of implementing post-production control and other protective measures to ensure the quality and authenticity of GI-tagged products. They also discussed the need for better awareness among stakeholders, the

establishment of quality control mechanisms, and the formulation of more producer-centric legal frameworks to protect GI-tagged products effectively

- **Singh, S., & Bharti, N. (2023)** Geographical Indications (GI) refer to products that come from a specific geographical environment and possess unique traditional knowledge that distinguishes them from similar products. Certification of GI products benefits both producers and consumers. Producers can command higher prices for their certified products, while consumers are willing to pay more for the assurance of quality. GIs also contribute to rural sustainable development by promoting the conservation of resources within the local community. Bibliometric analysis, on the other hand, involves the scientific examination of all academic research conducted on a particular topic. It helps to organize and summarize the existing body of work in a specific field and identifies areas that require further research. The primary objective of this paper is to analyze the overall academic research on the development of GI and identify its trends.

CHAPTER 3: RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The study was conducted through a survey questionnaire that was distributed to a sample of customers who had purchased products with GI tags. The survey included questions about the customers' attitudes towards GI tags, their awareness of the concept, and the impact of the GI tags on their purchasing behavior.

Data Source

Primary Data - The primary data was collected through the means of questionnaires filled by people of different age groups.

Sample Size – 37

Sampling Area – Delhi NCR

Sampling Method – Convenience Sampling

Tools of data collection: A structured questionnaire was prepared and sent to the People of different age Groups to know their Attitude and Perception towards GI Tags. Nominal Scale and Ordinal Scale is used in this research .

CHAPTER 4

ANALYSIS, INTERPRETATION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

4.1 Data Collection

The data was collected by questionnaire of 16 questions. The questionnaire was on Nominal Scale and Ordinal Scale.

A Google Form was made to make it easier to collect the data. I gathered factual information from genuine Customers. The potential to reach a huge number of responders, convenience of use, and minimal cost are just a few benefits of using a Google Form to gather data

4.2 Analysis

Chi Square tests are is used in this research for Analysis.

Hypothesis 1

H0: There is no significant association between understandings of GI tags and occupation.

H1: There is significant association between understandings of GI tags and occupation.

Table 1: Chi square test (understandings of GI tags and occupation)

Chi-Square Tests			
	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	5.798[a]	8	.670
Likelihood Ratio	8.535	8	.383
N of Valid Cases	37		
a. 13 cells (86.7%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .11.			

Interpretation: The crosstabulation table shows the distribution of understandings of GI tags among different occupations. The table suggests that most of the respondents (27 out of 37) understand that GI tags are a certification mark for products that are unique to a particular geographical location. In contrast, only 5 respondents think that GI tags indicate the quality of a product, and 2 respondents think that it indicates the origin and authenticity of a product. Two respondents think that it is a government tax on certain products, and one respondent has given an answer other than the given options.

Result

The above said hypothesis is tested with a 5% level of significance. In the above table Pearson Chi-Square statistic (5.798) and p value (0.670) of Chi-Square is greater than 0.05, the null hypothesis is accepted. This leads to the conclusion that There is no significant association between understandings of GI tags and occupation.

Hypothesis 2

H0: There is no significant association between seeking out product with GI tags and educational qualifications.

H1: There is significant association between seeking out product with GI tags and educational qualifications.

*Table 2: Chi square test (*seeking out product with GI tags and educational qualifications*)*

Chi-Square Tests			
	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	1.710[a]	2	.425
Likelihood Ratio	2.809	2	.246
N of Valid Cases	37		
a. 3 cells (50.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 1.14.			

Interpretation**:** The crosstabulation table shows the distribution of responses for whether or not respondents actively seek out products with GI tags, based on their highest level of education. Out of the 37 respondents, 14 said they do not actively seek out products with GI tags, 7 are not sure and 16 said they actively seek out products with GI tags. When we look at the responses by educational level, 3 out of 6 respondents with a Bachelor's degree said they actively seek out products with GI tags while 11 out of 31 respondents with a Master's degree said they actively seek out products with GI tags.

The interpretation of this data suggests that the respondents with higher education levels (Master's degree) are more likely to actively seek out products with GI tags than those with a lower level of education (Bachelor's degree). However, we cannot make any conclusive statements about the association between education level and seeking out products with GI tags since we do not have information about other potential factors that may influence this behaviour.

Result

The above said hypothesis is tested with a 5% level of significance. In the above table Pearson Chi-Square statistic (1.710) and p value (0.425) of Chi-Square is greater than 0.05, the null hypothesis is accepted. This leads to the conclusion that There is no significant association between seeking out product with GI tags and educational qualifications.

Hypothesis 3

H0: There is no significant association between satisfaction with GI tag product and recommendations to others.

H1: There is significant association between satisfaction with GI tag product and recommendations to others.

*Table 3: Chi square test (*satisfaction with GI tag product and recommendations to others*)*

Chi-Square Tests			
	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	10.337[a]	6	.111
Likelihood Ratio	12.335	6	.055
N of Valid Cases	37		
a. 9 cells (75.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .27.			

Interpretation**:** The crosstabulation table shows the association between respondents' satisfaction with the price of products with GI tags and their willingness to recommend such products to others. Out of the 37 respondents, 7 were not willing to recommend products with GI tags to others, 5 were not sure, and 25 were willing to recommend such products.

When we look at the responses by satisfaction with the price of products with GI tags, we can see that out of the 9 respondents who were neutral about the price, 5 were willing to recommend such products to others. Out of the 2 respondents who were somewhat dissatisfied with the price, 2 were not sure about recommending such products to others. Among the 18 respondents who were somewhat satisfied with the price, 10 were willing to recommend products with GI tags to others. Lastly, all 8 respondents who were very satisfied with the price were willing to recommend such products to others.

The interpretation of this data suggests that respondents who were very satisfied with the price of products with GI tags were more likely to recommend such products to others than those who were only somewhat satisfied or neutral about the price. However, it is important to note that this is a small sample size, and the association

between satisfaction with the price and willingness to recommend products with GI tags should be explored in more detail with a larger sample size.

Overall, the data suggests that there is a positive association between satisfaction with the price of products with GI tags and willingness to recommend such products to others, but further research and analysis are needed to fully understand this association.

Result

The above said hypothesis is tested with a 5% level of significance. In the above table Pearson Chi-Square statistic (10.337) and p value (0.11) of Chi-Square is greater than 0.05, the null hypothesis is accepted. This leads to the conclusion that there is no significant association between satisfaction with GI tag product and recommendations to others.

Hypothesis 4

H0: There is no significant association between GI tags protecting the identity and quality of products and GI tags adding value to products.

H1: There is significant association between GI tags protecting the identity and quality of products and GI tags adding value to products.

*Table 4: Chi square test (*GI tags protecting the identity and quality of products and GI tags adding value to products)

Chi-Square Tests			
	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	9.386[a]	6	.153
Likelihood Ratio	10.537	6	.104
N of Valid Cases	37		
a. 9 cells (75.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .24.			

Interpretation**:** The crosstabulation table shows the association between respondents' perception of the importance of GI tags in protecting the identity and quality of products and their belief that GI tags add value to products. Out of the 37 respondents, 10 did not think GI tags add value to products, 9 were not sure, and 18 believed that GI tags add value to products.

When we look at the responses by the importance of GI tags in protecting the identity and quality of products, we can see that out of the 6 respondents who thought GI tags were neither important nor unimportant, 5 believed that GI tags add value to products. The one respondent who thought GI tags were not very important did not believe that GI tags add value to products. Among the 19 respondents who thought GI tags were somewhat important in protecting the identity and quality of products, 6 were not sure if GI tags add value to products, 7 believed that GI tags add value to products, and 6 did not believe that GI tags add value to products. Lastly, among the 11 respondents who thought GI tags were very important in protecting the identity and quality of products, all 7 respondents who believed that GI tags add value to products agreed that GI tags are important in protecting the identity and quality of products.

The interpretation of this data suggests that there is a positive association between respondents' perception of the importance of GI tags in protecting the identity and quality of products and their belief that GI tags add value to products. Respondents who believed that GI tags are important in protecting the identity and quality of products were more likely to believe that GI tags add value to products. However, there were some respondents who believed that GI tags add value to products even if they did not think that GI tags were very important in protecting the identity and quality of products.

Overall, the data suggests that respondents see a value in GI tags, but further research and analysis are needed to fully understand the association between the importance of GI tags in protecting the identity and quality of products and the belief that GI tags add value to products.

Result

The above said hypothesis is tested with a 5% level of significance. In the above table Pearson Chi-Square statistic (9.386) and p value (0.153) of Chi-Square is greater than 0.05, the null hypothesis is accepted. This leads to the conclusion that there is no significant association between GI tags protecting the identity and quality of products and GI tags adding value to products.

Hypothesis 5

H0: There is no significant association between quality of GI tag products and willingness to pay extra for GI tags products.

H1: There is significant association between quality of GI tag products and willingness to pay extra for GI tags products.

*Table 5: Chi square test (*quality of GI tag products and willingness to pay extrafor GI tags products*)*

Chi-Square Tests			
	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	14.407[a]	4	.006
Likelihood Ratio	16.778	4	.002
N of Valid Cases	37		
a. 6 cells (66.7%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 3.24.			

Interpretation: The table shows the cross tabulation between willingness to pay extra for products with GI tags and satisfaction with the quality of the product. Out of the 37 respondents, 13 said they would not be willing to pay extra for such products, 12 were unsure, and 12 said they would be willing to pay extra.

Of those who said they would not be willing to pay extra, 6 were neutral about the quality of the product, 5 were somewhat satisfied, and 2 were very satisfied. Among those who were unsure about paying extra, 4 were neutral about quality, 7 were somewhat satisfied, and 1 was very satisfied. Among those who said they would be willing to pay extra, none were neutral about quality, 4 were somewhat satisfied, and 8 were very satisfied.

This suggests that there is a correlation between willingness to pay extra for GI-tagged products and satisfaction with the quality of the product. Those who were very satisfied with the quality of the product were more likely to be willing to pay extra for GI-tagged products. However, there were some respondents who were satisfied with the quality of the product but not willing to pay extra for GI-tagged products, indicating that other factors may be at play in their purchasing decisions.

Result

The above said hypothesis is tested with a 5% level of significance. In the above table Pearson Chi-Square statistic (14.407) and p value (0.006) of Chi-Square is less than 0.05, the null hypothesis is rejected. This leads to the conclusion that there is significant association between quality of GI tag products and willingness to pay extra for GI tags products.

Hypothesis 6

H0: There is no significant association between gender and willingness to purchase GI tags product again.

H1: There is significant association between gender and willingness to purchase GI tags product again.

*Table 6: Chi square test (G*ender and willingness to purchase GI tags product again*)*

Chi-Square Tests			
	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	1.668[a]	2	.434
Likelihood Ratio	1.729	2	.421
N of Valid Cases	37		
a. 3 cells (50.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 3.46.			

Interpretation**:** The crosstabulation table shows the association between gender and likelihood of purchasing products with GI tags again in the future. The table shows that among the 37 respondents, there were 16 females and 21 males.

Among the females, 2 respondents said they were neutral about purchasing products with GI tags again, 8 were somewhat likely, and 6 were very likely. Among the males, 6 respondents were neutral, 10 were somewhat likely, and 5 were very likely.

Overall, the majority of both males and females were somewhat likely to purchase products with GI tags again in the future. However, there were more males who were neutral or somewhat likely compared to females. It is important to note that this analysis only shows the association between gender and likelihood of purchasing products with GI tags again, and it does not establish causality or other potential factors that may influence the likelihood of future purchases.

Result

The above said hypothesis is tested with a 5% level of significance. In the above table Pearson Chi-Square statistic (1.668) and p value (0.434) of Chi-Square is greater than 0.05, the null hypothesis is accepted. This leads to the conclusion that there is no significant association between gender and willingness to purchase GI tags product again.

Hypothesis 7

H0: There is no significant association between gender and understanding of the GI tags.

H1: There is significant association between gender and understanding of the GI tags.

*Table 7: Chi square test (*gender and understanding of the GI tags*)*

Chi-Square Tests			
	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	2.202[a]	4	.699
Likelihood Ratio	2.673	4	.614
N of Valid Cases	37		
a. 8 cells (80.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .43.			

Interpretation: This crosstabulation table shows the distribution of understanding of GI tags among the respondents based on their gender. The categories of understanding of GI tags are "It indicates the quality of a product", "It indicates the origin and authenticity of a product", "It is a certification mark for products that are unique to a particular geographical location", "It is a government tax on certain products", and "Other". The categories of gender are "Female" and "Male".

Looking at the table, it appears that both females and males have a similar understanding of GI tags. The most common understanding among both genders is that GI tags indicate the certification mark for products that are unique to a particular geographical location. This is followed by the understanding that GI tags indicate the origin and authenticity of a product. Only a few respondents in both genders understood that GI tags indicate the quality of a product.

Overall, this table suggests that gender may not be a significant factor in understanding GI tags.

Result

The above said hypothesis is tested with a 5% level of significance. In the above table Pearson Chi-Square statistic (2.202 and p value (0.614) of Chi-Square is greater

than 0.05, the null hypothesis is accepted. This leads to the conclusion that there is no significant association between gender and understanding of the GI tags.

Hypothesis 8

H0: There is no significant association between GI tags recommendation to others and the satisfaction with the quality of GI tag product.
H1: There is significant association between GI tags recommendation to others and the satisfaction with the quality of GI tag product.

*Table 8: Chi square test (*GI tags recommendation to others and the satisfaction with the quality of GI tag product)

Chi-Square Tests			
	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	13.574[a]	4	.009
Likelihood Ratio	15.252	4	.004
N of Valid Cases	37		
a. 6 cells (66.7%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 1.35.			

Interpretation: This crosstabulation shows the association between respondents' willingness to recommend products with GI tags to others and their satisfaction with the quality of the product. Out of the total 37 respondents, 25 (67.6%) indicated that they would recommend products with GI tags to others. Among those who would recommend the products, the majority (36 out of 41, or 87.8%) were either somewhat satisfied or very satisfied with the quality of the product. This suggests that satisfaction with the product is a significant factor in determining whether someone would recommend products with GI tags to others.

On the other hand, out of the seven respondents who would not recommend products with GI tags to others, five were either somewhat satisfied or very satisfied with the quality of the product, indicating that satisfaction with the quality alone may not be sufficient to guarantee a recommendation. Other factors such as price, availability, and personal preferences may also play a role in this decision.

Result

The above said hypothesis is tested with a 5% level of significance. In the above table Pearson Chi-Square statistic (13.574) and p value (0.009) of Chi-Square is less than 0.05, the null hypothesis is rejected. This leads to the conclusion that There is significant association between GI tags recommendation to others and the satisfaction with the quality of GI tag product.

Hypothesis 9

H0: There is no significant association between GI tags adding value to product and GI tags helping protect traditional knowledge and cultural heritage.

H1: There is significant association between GI tags adding value to product and GI tags helping protect traditional knowledge and cultural heritage.

*Table 9: Chi square test (*GI tags adding value to product and GI tags helping protect traditional knowledge and cultural heritage*)*

Chi-Square Tests			
	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	6.717[a]	4	.152
Likelihood Ratio	6.626	4	.157
N of Valid Cases	37		
a. 6 cells (66.7%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .49.			

Interpretation**:** This crosstabulation shows the distribution of responses based on the two questions: "Do you think GI tags add value to products?" and "Do you think that GI tags help protect traditional knowledge and cultural heritage?" The rows represent responses to the first question, while the columns represent responses to the second question.

Out of the 37 respondents, 18 believed that GI tags add value to products, and all of them believed that GI tags help protect traditional knowledge and cultural heritage. On the other hand, 9 respondents were not sure whether GI tags add value to products, and 6 of them believed that GI tags help protect traditional knowledge and cultural heritage. Finally, 10 respondents did not believe that GI tags add value to products, and 7 of them did not believe that GI tags help protect traditional knowledge and cultural heritage.

The interpretation of this data is that a majority of respondents who believed that GI tags add value to products also believed that GI tags help protect traditional knowledge and cultural heritage. This indicates that there is a positive association between the perceived value of GI tags and their role in protecting traditional knowledge and cultural heritage. On the other hand, those who did not believe that GI tags add value to products were split in their beliefs about whether GI tags help protect traditional knowledge and cultural heritage. This suggests that some people may not see the value in GI tags as a means of protecting traditional knowledge and cultural heritage.

Result

The above said hypothesis is tested with a 5% level of significance. In the above table Pearson Chi-Square statistic (6.717) and p value (0.152) of Chi-Square is greater than 0.05, the null hypothesis is accepted. This leads to the conclusion that There is no significant association between GI tags adding value to product and GI tags helping protect traditional knowledge and cultural heritage.

Summary of Tested Hypothesis

The table below summarizes the results of hypothesis obtained from the statistical analysis.

Table 10: Summary Table of Tested Hypothesis

Hypothesis	**Statement**	**Remarks**
$H0_1$	There is no significant association between understandings of GI tags and occupation.	Null Hypothesis got accepted
$H0_2$	There is no significant association between seeking out product with GI tags and educational qualifications.	Null Hypothesis got accepted
$H0_3$	There is no significant association between satisfaction with GI tag product and recommendations to others.	Null Hypothesis got accepted
$H0_4$	There is no significant association between GI tags protecting the identity and quality of products and GI tags adding value to products.	Null Hypothesis got accepted
$H0_5$	There is no significant association between quality of GI tag products and willingness to pay extra for GI tags products.	Null Hypothesis got rejected
$H0_6$	There is no significant association between gender and willingness to purchase GI tags product again.	Null Hypothesis got accepted
$H0_7$	There is no significant association between gender and understanding of the GI tags.	Null Hypothesis got accepted
$H0_8$	There is no significant association between GI tags recommendation to others and the satisfaction with the quality of GI tag product.	Null Hypothesis got rejected
$H0_9$	There is no significant association between GI tags adding value to product and GI tags helping protect traditional knowledge and cultural heritage.	Null Hypothesis got accepted

4.3 Finding and Recommendations

From the above research we can draw the following conclusions

- There is no significant association between understandings of GI tags and occupation.
- There is no significant association between seeking out products with GI tags and educational qualifications.
- There is a significant association between the quality of GI tag products and willingness to pay extra for GI tag products.
- There is no significant difference between males and females in their willingness to purchase GI tag products again.

4.4 Limitations of the Study

There are several limitations to this study that should be acknowledged:

- Small sample size: The study is based on a relatively small sample size, which may limit the generalizability of the findings.
- Limited geographical scope: The study was conducted in a single city, which may not be representative of the broader population in other cities or regions.
- Self-report bias: The data collected in this study is self-reported, which may introduce bias into the findings. Participants may not accurately recall or report their behaviours or experiences.
- Lack of causal inference: The study is cross-sectional, meaning that the data is collected at a single point in time. This limits the ability to draw conclusions about causality between variables.
- Lack of diversity: The study sample may not be representative of the broader population, as it is limited to a specific age range and may not include individuals from diverse racial, ethnic, or socioeconomic backgrounds

CHAPTER 5: CONCLUSION

Based on this research, several conclusions can be drawn. The study aimed to investigate the awareness, attitude, and perception of customers towards products with GI tags and the factors that influence their purchasing behaviour. The findings provide valuable insights into the effectiveness of GI tags as a marketing tool and their impact on customer perception and behaviour.

Firstly, the study found that there is no significant association between understanding of GI tags and occupation. This suggests that the awareness and understanding of GI tags are not limited to a specific group of consumers and that marketing efforts can target a broad audience.

Secondly, the study found that there is no significant association between seeking out products with GI tags and educational qualifications. This indicates that the knowledge and appreciation of GI tags are not influenced by formal education and that consumers across education levels are equally likely to seek out GI-tagged products.

Thirdly, the study found a significant association between the quality of GI tag products and willingness to pay extra for them. This highlights the importance of maintaining the quality standards of GI-tagged products to increase their value and demand among consumers.

Lastly, the study found no significant difference between males and females in their willingness to purchase GI tag products again. This suggests that both genders perceive the value of GI tags similarly, and marketing efforts can target both genders equally.

In conclusion, the study provides valuable insights into the effectiveness of GI tags in promoting local products and enhancing consumers' perception of quality, authenticity, and uniqueness. The findings can be useful for policymakers, producers, and marketers to design effective strategies for promoting and marketing GI-tagged products

REFERENCES

Jarma Arroyo SE, Hogan V, Ahrent Wisdom D, Moldenhauer KAK, Seo HS. Effect of Geographical Indication Information on Consumer Acceptability of Cooked Aromatic Rice. Foods. 2020 Dec 11;9(12):1843. doi: 10.3390/foods9121843. PMID: 33322325; PMCID: PMC7763253.

Walia, Y., & Kumar, S. (2020). The Success and Failure of GI Tag in India: A Critical Analysis of the Working of Geographical Indications of Goods (Registration and Protection) Act, 1999. E-Journal of Academic Innovation and Research in Intellectual Property Assets (E-JAIRIPA), 1(01), 232-254. https://cnlu.ac.in/storage/2022/08/15-Yashna-Walia-and-Shreya-Kumar.pdf

Piyush Patil , Importance of GI Tag for Tribes in India, 4 (5) IJLMH Page 660 - 667 (2021), DOI: https://doij.org/10.10000/IJLMH.111958

Rabadán, A., Martínez-Carrasco, L., Brugarolas, M., & Bernabéu, R. (2021). Perceptions of geographical indication labels as quality indicators inside and outside the labels' area of influence: the case of spring fruits. Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0014479721000264

John, I. (2022). Consumer Perceptions, Preferences and Awareness Towards Potential Geographical Indication of Products in Tanzania. Tanzanian Economic Review, 12(2), 43-56. https://doi.org/10.56279/ter.v12i2.121

Bhushan, T., & Anand, A. (2022). Roadmaps of G.I Tags in India vis-à-vis Legal Implications and International Position of G.I Tag. NTUT Journal of Intellectual Property Law & Management, 11(1), 40-50 https://pure.jgu.edu.in/id/eprint/4480/1/Roadmaps%20of%20G.I%20Tags%20in%20India%20vis-%C3%A0-vis%20Legal%20Implications%20and%20International.pdf

Singh, S., & Bharti, N. (2023). Geographical Indication and Rural Sustainable Development: A Bibliometric Analysis. Australasian Accounting, Business and Finance Journal, 17(1), 32-50.

ANNEXURE

1. What is your age? *

_____

2. What is your gender ? *

Mark only one oval.

- ◯ Male
- ◯ Female
- ◯ Prefer not to say

3. What is your highest level of education ? *

Mark only one oval.

- ◯ High school
- ◯ Bachelor's degree
- ◯ Master's degree
- ◯ Doctoral degree
- ◯ Other

4. What is your occupation? *

Mark only one oval.

- ◯ Student
- ◯ Employed
- ◯ SelfEmployed
- ◯ Retired
- ◯ Other

5. What is your occupation? *

Mark only one oval.

- Student
- Employed
- SelfEmployed
- Retired
- Other

6. Have you heard of GI tags before? *

Mark only one oval.

- Yes
- No

7. If yes, what is your understanding of GI tags ? *

Mark only one oval.

- It indicates the quality of a product.
- It is a certification mark for products that are unique to a particular geographical location.
- It indicates the the origin and authenticity of a product
- Other

8. Do you actively seek out products with GI tags ? *

Mark only one oval.

- Yes
- No
- Not Sure

9. How important do you think GI tags are in protecting the identity and quality of products ? *

Mark only one oval.

- Very important
- Somewhat important
- Neither Important nor Unimportant
- Not very important
- Not at all important

10. Do you think GI tags add value to products ? *

Mark only one oval.

- Yes
- No
- Not sure

11. Have you paid extra for products with GI tags ? *

Mark only one oval.

- Yes
- No
- Not Sure

12. If yes, were you satisfied with the quality of the product ? *

Mark only one oval.

- Very satisfied
- Somewhat satisfied
- Neutral
- Somewhat dissatisfied
- Very dissatisfied

13. If yes, were you satisfied with the price of the product ? *

Mark only one oval.

- ◯ Very satisfied
- ◯ Somewhat satisfied
- ◯ Neutral
- ◯ Somewhat dissatisfied
- ◯ Very dissatisfied

14. Would you recommend products with GI tags to others ? *

Mark only one oval.

- ◯ Yes
- ◯ No
- ◯ Not Sure

15. How likely are you to purchase products with GI tags again in the future ? *

Mark only one oval.

- ◯ Very likely
- ◯ Some Likely
- ◯ Neutral
- ◯ Somewhat unlikely
- ◯ Very unlikely

16. Do you think that GI tags help protect traditional knowledge and cultural heritage ? *

Mark only one oval.

- ◯ Yes
- ◯ No
- ◯ Not Sure

PAPER NAME

Anurag 036 MRP.docx

WORD COUNT

5304 Words

CHARACTER COUNT

28394 Characters

PAGE COUNT

21 Pages

FILE SIZE

46.1KB

SUBMISSION DATE

May 18, 2023 7:07 AM GMT+5:30

REPORT DATE

May 18, 2023 7:08 AM GMT+5:30

8% Overall Similarity

The combined total of all matches, including overlapping sources, for each database.

- 7% Internet database
- 6% Publications database
- Crossref database
- Crossref Posted Content database
- 7% Submitted Works database

Excluded from Similarity Report

- Bibliographic material
- Quoted material
- Small Matches (Less then 14 words)