# THE ROLE OF NUTRITION LABLES AND ADVERTISING CLAIMS IN ALERTING CONSUMER'S EVALUTION AND CHOICE TOWARDS COIMBATORE CITY

Dr. M. PRAKASH. M.com., MBA., M.Phil., PGDCA., PhD.

**Professor** 

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE WITH COMPUTER APPLICATIONSDR . N.G.P ARTS
AND SCIENCE COLLEGE COIMBATORE - 48

Ms. MONIKA K

Ms. SHIVANGI VERMA R

B. COM.CA DR. N.G.P ARTS AND SCIENCE COLLEGE COIMBATORE - 48

#### ABSTRACT:

Despite policy efforts, consumers' well-informed healthful choice is a challenge. Due to increasing number of benefit claims advertising taste or health front of pack (FOP), consumers face the dilemma to trade taste for health. To understand the mechanisms underlying food evaluation, this study investigates the health-pleasure trade-off and its effect on consumers' choice. 240 EU consumers took part in a taste experiment, after being presented with the product FOP. Half of the products carried a nutrition label FOP, respectively, reduced fat for potato chips, reduced sugar for cereal bars. Further, one third of the products carried health benefit claim, one third taste benefit claim, and one third no additional claim FOP. Attention to information and its effect on experienced taste, health perception and the buying intention were measured. The results show that the message displayed FOP altered consumers evaluation and choice. The effectiveness of the FOP message further depended on consumers' health motivation and the healthfulness perception of carrier products. The outcomes are summarized in a framework of health-pleasure trade-off. Current findings call for the establishment of standards to avoid the use of misleading information FOP.

#### **INTRODUCTION:**

Consumers well-informed healthful choice is still a challenge as often the actual experience after consuming the product does not meet prior product-related expectations (e.g., on taste, health, quality). To comply with the needs of today's market, increasing number of labels and claims has been introduced promoting health and taste benefits of new products. As a result, consumers are often

confronted with the dilemma to trade off health and taste benefits offered. The health-pleasure trade- off effect seems to be very pronounced as consumers believe that food could not be made healthier without sacrificing on taste. Taste is often related with hedonic food experiences, which may explain why products advertised with hedonic benefit have been perceived as less healthy than products advertised with health or diet benefit contrast, health claims front- of pack (FOP) appear to significantly reduce the hedonic appraisal when food products are perceived to have overall unhealthyimage.

As consumers often categorize products as being healthful or unhealthful, one may argue that beliefs about the healthfulness of food products may affect consumers evaluation and choice. It was further assumed that the use and the impact of labels promoting certain health benefits (such as a reduction in fat, sugar or salt) is biased by the product category under consideration.

#### **OBJECTIVES OF THE PROJECT**

- 1) Analyze how socio-economic factors may affect the interpretation of nutrition information.
- 2) Asses the impact of nutrition labels on consumer awareness and understanding in Coimbatore.
- 3) Investigate the influence of advertising claims on consumer perceptions of food products in thecity.
- 4) Examine the level of trust consumers place in nutrition labels and advertising claims.
- 5) Offer suggestions and conclusions.

#### SCOPE OF THE STUDY

This study focuses on exploring the impact of nutrition labels and advertising claims on consumer awareness and decision-making within Coimbatore city. Through a comprehensive study, the research aims to investigate how these factors influence the evolution of consumer choices, shedding light on the significance of informed decision-making in the context of nutrition-related information. By examining the relationship between nutrition labels, advertising claims, and consumer preferences, the study contributes to a deeper understanding of the dynamics shaping consumer behavior in the specific urban context of Coimbatore. This research is crucial for both consumers and stakeholders in the food industry, providing insights that can enhance consumer awareness and contribute to the development of more transparent and consumer-friendly food marketing practices.

#### **RESEARCH METHODOLOGY:**

The main objective of this research is to study the awareness of the nutrion labels and advertising claims in consumers evaluation choice and satisfaction level of the consumers with special reference to coimbatore city.

#### 1. Source of data

Primary data

#### Primary data

The primary data for a study on factors and challenges of NUTRITION LABELS AND ADVERTISING CLAIMS among people with special reference to coimbatore city focuses on collecting information from 175 respondents. Data is collected using the questionnarie method among the beneficiaries.

#### I. Sample size

Data has been collected from 175 respondents of a study on factors and challenges of nutrition labels and advertising claims among people with special reference to coimbatore city.

#### II. Sampling method

The convenience sampling method was used for this study with a sample size of 175 respondents.

#### III. Tools used

- Simple percentage analysis
- Weighted Average and Ranking method

#### IV. Period of the study

The period considered for study is from December 2023 to March 2024.

### V. Area of the study

This study was conducted in coimbatore city of peoples from hospitals and colleges.

#### LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

- 1) The study was limited to Coimbatore City. So the results and findings are confined to limited area.
- 2) Respondents lack of time to give information and casual attitudes.
- 3) The respondents opinion may be biased and sample size is 175 responses.

#### ANALYSIS AND INTREPRETATIONSIMPLE PERCENTAGE ANALYSIS:

The Percentage Analysis is used, mainly to find the distribution of each category as the value are expressed in percentage, it facilities comparison. It is the method to represent raw stream of data as a percentage for better understanding of collected data.

#### **FORMULA:**

Simple percentage = Number of respondents /Total of respondents\*100

| S.NO | VARIABLES                 | CATEGORIES  | NO.OF<br>RESPONDENTS | PERCENTAGE |
|------|---------------------------|---|----------------------|------------|
| 01.  | Gender                    | Male  | 102                  | 42%        |
|      |                           | Female<br>18 - 25                                   | 73<br>126            | 58%<br>72% |
| 02.  | Age                       | 26 - 35   | 37                   | 21%        |
|      | 111461                    | 36 - 45   | 12                   | 7          |
| 03.  | Educati <mark>onal</mark> | High School Bachelor's  Degree Master's Degree Ph.D | 27<br>100<br>34      | 15%<br>57% |
|      | Backdround                | or <mark>Equi</mark> valent                         | 14                   | 19%<br>8%  |
|      | Key                       | Employed Unemployed                                 | 14                   | 8%         |
| 04.  | EmploymentStatus          | Student   | 75                   | 43%        |
| 01.  |                           | Retired   | 84                   | 48%        |
|      |                           |   | 2                    | 1%         |

|     | T                    | T  |           |      |
|-----|----------------------|--|-----------|------|
|     |                      | Always Often Occasionally                  | 56        | 32%  |
|     |                      | Rarely                                     | 28        | 16%  |
| 05. | food products        | Never                                      | 51        | 29%  |
|     | with reading         |  | 31        | 2970 |
|     | nutrition labels     |  | 26        | 15%  |
|     |                      |  | 14        | 8%   |
|     |                      | Calorie ContentFat Content                 | 50        | 240/ |
|     |                      | Sugar Content Protein Conten               | 52        | 24%  |
|     | Information on       | Vitamin & MineralInformation               |           | 25%  |
| 06. | nutrition labels i   | Vitanim & Willeranniormation               | 35        | 17%  |
|     | most important       |  | 25        |      |
|     |                      |  | 13        | 19%  |
|     | 4                    |  | 13        | 15%  |
|     | Nutrition labels b   | VacNo                                      |           |      |
|     | influencing you      |  | 105       |      |
| 07. | purchasing decision  |  |           | 60%  |
| 07. | in the               |  | 70        | 40%  |
|     |                      |  |           |      |
|     | past                 | Alexandr Often Octavilla                   | 4.1       | 220/ |
|     |                      | Always Often Occasionally                  | 41        | 23%  |
|     | Noticing advertising | Rarely                                     | 45        | 26%  |
| 08. |                      | Never                                      | 50        | 29%  |
|     | products             |  |           |      |
|     |                      |  | 23        | 13%  |
|     |                      |  | 16        | 9%   |
|     |                      | Or <mark>gani</mark> c Low-Fat Gluten-Free | 50        | 29%  |
|     | Most appealing of    | Sugar-Free All-Natural                     | 39        | 22%  |
| 09. | influential type of  | earch Throu                                | gh Innova | RION |
| 03. | advertising claims   |  | 27        | 15%  |
|     | advertising claims   |  | 36        | 21%  |
|     |                      |  | 23        | 13%  |
|     | Advertising Claims   | Yes  | 93        | 53%  |
| 10. | by                   | No   |           |      |
|     |                      |  | 82        | 47%  |

|     | influencing your        |                                  |           |           |
|-----|-------------------------|----------------------------------|-----------|-----------|
|     | purchasing decisions    |                                  |           |           |
|     | in the                  |                                  |           |           |
|     | past                    |                                  |           |           |
|     |                         | Nutrition Label Advertising      | 50        | 20        |
|     |                         |                                  | 50        | 29        |
|     |                         | ClaimsBrand Reputation Price     | 30        | 17%       |
| 11. | healthiness of a foo    |                                  | 38        | 22%       |
|     | product befor           |                                  |           |           |
|     | purchasing              |                                  | 28        | 16%       |
|     |                         |                                  | 29        | 17%       |
|     |                         | CompletelySomewhat Netural       | 54        | 31%       |
|     | Accuracy of             | Not Vowy Much                    | 42        | 240/      |
|     | nutrition labels an     |                                  | 42        | 24%       |
| 12. | advertising claims o    | Not <mark>At </mark> All         | 44        | 25%       |
|     | food products           |                                  | 19        | 11%       |
|     |                         |                                  |           |           |
|     |                         | Strongly Influences              | 16<br>48  | 9%<br>27% |
|     | City's reputationof     |                                  | 4 9 9     | 2170      |
|     | health and              | Moderately Influences Neutral    | 43        | 25%       |
| 13. | wellness influence      | Slightly Influences              | 40        | 23%       |
|     | y <mark>o</mark> urfood | Does Not Influence               | rearch Id | hurool    |
|     | choices                 | Boos 1 (of mindence              | 28        | 16%       |
|     |                         |                                  | 16        | 9         |
|     |                         | Extremely Important Very         | 43        | 25%       |
|     | Important source        | Im <mark>port</mark> ant Neutral | 51        | 29%       |
| 14. | food products is        | Not Very Important               | 42        | 240/      |
| 14. | locally or              | tvot very important              | 42        | 24%       |
|     | regionally              | Not Important At All             | 20        | 11%       |
|     |                         |                                  | 19        | 11%       |
|     | Trends or Diets         | Plant-based DietKeto-Diet        | 64        | 37%       |
|     | have you tried of       |                                  | 4.4       | 250/      |
| 15. |                         |                                  | 44        | 25%       |
|     |                         | Mediterranean Diet               | 39        | 22%       |
|     | trying                  |                                  | 28        | 16%       |
| L   | 1                       | 1                                | 1         | 1         |

|     | Factors influence   | Freshness of Produce                           | 59 | 34% |
|-----|---|--|----|-----|
|     | your decision t   | Authentically of LocalFlavors                  | 30 | 17% |
| 16. | purchase food   | Price Affordability                            | 48 | 27% |
|     | markets or stree  | Support for LocalBussinesses Social Experience | 21 | 12% |
|     | vendors   |  | 17 | 9%  |
|     |   | Extremely ImportantVery                        | 42 | 24% |
|     | Support local or Important Neutral regional food producers in Important Neutral Not Very Important No | Important Neutral                              | 52 | 30% |
| 17. |   | Not Very Important Not                         | 43 | 25% |
|     | coimbatore  | Important At All                               | 24 | 14% |
|     | 4   |  | 14 | 8%  |
|     | Actively seek out   | Always Often Occasionally                      | 50 | 29% |
|     | sourcing and  | Rarely Never                                   | 41 | 23% |
| 18. | production methods  |  | 50 | 29% |
|     | of the purchasing food  |  | 19 | 11% |
|     | purchasing 1000   |  | 15 | 9%  |

#### (SOURCE: PRIMARY DATA)INTREPRETATION

The above table shows that Mostly 42% of the respondents are Male. Majority 72% of the respondents are between the age group of 18-25. Mostly 15.4% of the respondents are High School. Mostly 8% of the respondents are Employed. Mostly 32% of the respondents are Always read the nutrition labels on purchasing of food products. Mostly 24% of the respondents are Calorie Content.

Majority 60% of the respondents are familiar in the influencing your purchasing decisions in the past. Mostly 23.4% of the respondents are Always noticing advertising claims on food products. Mostly 29% of the respondents are Organic is the most appealing or influencing type of advertising claims. Majority 53% of the respondents are familiar in the advertising claims by influencing your purchasing decisions in tha past. Mostly 29% of the respondents are before purchasing the food products of healthiness in

Nutrition Label. Mostly 31% of the respondents are Completing accuracy of nutrition labels and advertising claims on food products. Mostly 27.4% of the respondents are Strongly Influenced from City's reputation. Mostly 25% of the respondents are Extremely important in the sources of food products is locally or regionally. Mostly 37% of the respondents are Plant-based Diet from food trends or diet. Mostly 24% of the respondents are Extremely important from food producers in Coimbatore. Mostly 29% of the respondents are Always in Actively seek out from sourcing and production methodsof the purchasing food.

#### WEIGHTED AVERAGE AND RANKING ANALYSIS

The term weight stands for relative importance of different items. Weights have been assigned to various ranks. The weighted score is calculating by multiplying the number of respondents in a cell with their relative weights and the whole number is summed up to give the weighted score for the factors. It is computed by using the formula:

Where;

 $\sum_{\mathbf{X}\mathbf{W}} \mathbf{x} = \underline{\qquad}$ 

Where;

 $\sum xw = weighted arithmetic mean$ 

 $\sum$ wx = value of items

 $\sum$ w = weight of items

#### HEALTHINESS OF A FOOD PRODUCT BEFORE PURCHASING

| S.NO | FACTORS  | TOTAL | RANK |
|------|--|-------|------|
| 01.  | Value of the Nutriton lables                         | 730   | I    |
| 02.  | Advertising claims with alerting consumers evalution | 626   | I    |
| 03.  | Brand reputation                                     | 623   | п    |
| 04.  | Price  | 567   | V    |
| 05.  | Taste  | 569   | V    |
| 06.  | Recommenations from friends or family                | 562   | VI   |
| 07.  | Online reviews                                       | 607   | I    |

#### (SOURCE: PRIMARY DATA)INTERPRETATION:

The above table shows the ranking of Nutrition Labels and Advertising Claims from I to VII. Values of the Nutrition labels ranks I. Advertising claims with alerting consumers evalution ranks II. Brand reputation ranks III. Online reviews ranks IV. Taste and Preferences ranks V. Price of the Products ranks VI. Recommenations from friends or family ranks VII.

#### RANKING BASED THE NUTRITION LABELS AND ADVERTISING CLAIMS

| S.NO | FACTORS                                       | TOTAL | RANK |
|------|---|-------|------|
| 01.  | Nutritio <mark>n La</mark> be <mark>ls</mark> | 352   | V    |
| 02.  | Advertising Claims                            | 430   | IV   |
| 03.  | Brand Reputation                              | 455   | Ш    |
| 04.  | Price   | 515   | II   |
| 05.  | Taste   | 534   | I    |

#### (SOURCE: PRIMARY DATA)INTERPRETATION:

The above shows the ranking of Nutrition Labels and Advertising Claims from I to V. Taste ranks I Price ranks II. Brand reputation ranks III. Advertising Claims ranks IV. Nutrition Labels ranks V.

## RANK BASED THE NUTRITION LABELS WITH BEING THE MOST IMPORTANT ANDBEING THE LEAST IMPORTANT

| S.NO | FACTORS         | TOTAL | RANK |
|------|-----------------|-------|------|
| 01.  | Calorie Content | 376   | V    |
| 02.  | Fat Content     | 455   | III  |
| 03.  | Sugar Content   | 420   | IV   |
| 04.  | Protein Content | 591   | I    |
| 05.  | Fiber Content   | 524   | II   |

#### (SOURCE: PRIMARY DATA)INTERPRETATION:

The above shows the ranking of Nutrition Labels and Advertising Claims from I to V. Protein Content ranks I. Fiber Content ranks II. Fat Content ranks III. Sugar Content ranks IV. Calorie Contentranks V.

## RANK BASED THE ADVERTISING CLAIMS BASED TYPES ON THEIR APPEAL OR INFLUENCE WITH BEING THE MOST APPEALING AND BEING THE LEAST APPEALING

| S.NO | FACTORS  | TOTAL | RANK |
|------|--|-------|------|
| 01.  | Organic Organi | 381   | V    |
| 02.  | Non- G <mark>MO</mark>   | 461   | III  |
| 03.  | Low-Fat  | 454   | IV   |
| 04.  | Gluten- Free   | 461   | on i |

|  | Sugar- Free | 504 | II |
|--|-------------|-----|----|
|--|-------------|-----|----|

#### (SOURCE: PRIMARY DATA)

#### **INTERPRETATION:**

The above shows the ranking of Nutrition Labels and Advertising Claims from I to V.Gluten-Free ranks I. Sugar-Free ranks II. Non-GMO ranks III. Low-Fat ranks IV. Organic ranks V.

#### THE CONTRIBUTION LEVEL OF YOUR DECISION TO SHOP GROCIES ONLINE

| S.NO | FACTORS              | TOTAL | RANK |
|------|----------------------|-------|------|
| 01.  | Convenience          | 711   | I    |
| 02.  | Variety of Products  | 626   | п    |
| 03.  | Time-Saving          | 612   | III  |
| 04.  | Discounts and Offers | 549   | IV   |
| 05.  | Delivery Options     | 540   | V    |

#### (SOURCE: PRIMARY DATA)INTERPRETATION:

The above shows the ranking of Nutrition Labels and Advertising Claims from I to V. Convenience ranks I. Variety of Products ranks II. Time-Saving ranks III. Discounts and Offers ranks IV. Delivery Options ranks V.

#### **FINDINGS**

- Mostly 42% of the respondents are Male.
- Majority 72% of the respondents are between the age group of 18-25.
- Mostly 15.4% of the respondents are High School.
- Mostly 8% of the respondents are Employed.

- Mostly 32% of the respondents are Always read the nutrition labels on purchasing of foodproducts.
- Mostly 24% of the respondents are Calorie Content.
  - Majority 60% of the respondents are familiar in the influencing your purchasing decisions in thepast.
- Mostly 23.4% of the respondents are Always noticing advertising claims on food products.
  - Mostly 29% of the respondents are Organic is the most appealing or influencing type of advertising claims.
  - Majority 53% of the respondents are familiar in the advertising claims by influencing your purchasing decisions in tha past.
  - Mostly 29% of the respondents are before purchasing the food products of healthiness in NutritionLabel.
  - Mostly 31% of the respondents are Completing accuracy of nutrition labels and advertising claims on food products.
- Mostly 27.4% of the respondents are Strongly Influenced from City's reputation.
  - Mostly 25% of the respondents are Extremely important in the sources of food products is locally or regionally.
- Mostly 37% of the respondents are Plant-based Diet from food trends or diet.
- Mostly 24% of the respondents are Extremely important from food producers in Coimbatore.
  - Mostly 29% of the respondents are Always in Actively seek out from sourcing and production methods of the purchasing food.
- Majority of the respondents are satisfied in using Values of the Nutrition labels.
- Majority of the respondents ranks I for Taste.
- Majority of the respondents ranks I Protein Content.
- Majority of the respondents ranks I Gluten-Free.
- Majority of the respondents ranks I Convenience.

#### **SUGGESTIONS**

- Instead of simply giving nutritional value of chemicals in milligrams or percentages, it may be considered to indicate where exactly two nutrients work. E.g. for healthy eyes, cholesterol inhibitors, blood thinners, memory enhancers, etc.
- The study expects that food manufacturers/ producers will take into account the findings of the study and enhance the label design to make a broader spectrum of the population to benefit from reading their nutrition label.

- Manufacturers may consider including contra indicators.
  - a) Side effects
  - c) Timing
  - b) Dosage
  - d) Age
- Clearly display serving size information to help consumers understand portion control.
- Highlight total calories per serving to aid in calorie-conscious decision-making.
- Specify the number of servings per container for accurate nutritional intake assessment.
- Include a breakdown of macronutrients (carbohydrates, proteins, and fats) per serving.
- Highlight saturated and trans fat content for those monitoring their heart health.
- Clearly list cholesterol content to inform individuals with specific dietary concerns.
- Display total carbohydrate content, including dietary fiber and sugars.
- Emphasize protein content to cater to consumers focused on protein intake.
- Provide a comprehensive list of vitamins and minerals with their respective percentages.
- Clearly state allergen information for individuals with dietary restrictions or allergies.
- Mention the absence of artificial additives or preservatives for health-conscious consumers.
- Use simple language to describe the nutritional benefits of the product.
- Include a call-to-action promoting a balanced diet and healthy lifestyle alongside the product.

#### **CONCLUSION**

The study was made on the awareness of nutrition label facts in the Coimbatore district giving importance to the consumer belonging to middle class who are willing to pay for nutrition value labeling having an awareness knowing the consequences of malnutrition. The objective was to know about the awareness of the people noticing, reading the nutrition label and the study reveals that people are ready to pay for higher priced products and organic foods. And if the producer's consider the suggestion given it will help both the producers and the consumers.

Transparent and informative nutrition labels, coupled with honest advertising claims, play a pivotal role in guiding consumers towards healthier dietary choices. By prominently featuring serving sizes, calorie content, and a detailed breakdown of macronutrients, individuals can make more informed decisions about their nutritional intake. The inclusion of allergen information and the absence of artificial additives cater to specific dietary needs, fostering a sense of trust between consumers and producers. Furthermore, emphasizing the nutritional benefits of a product through

clear language contributes to consumer education. As we navigate a marketplace inundated with diverse food options, these comprehensive labels and claims empower individuals to make choices aligned with their health goals, ultimately promoting a balanced and mindful approach to nutrition.

#### **BIBLIOGRAPHY**

- (Nutrition Labeling, 2024) Terms such as "functional foods" or "nutraceuticals" https://www.fda.gov/food/food-labeling-nutrition
- 2. (Nutrition Facts, 2022) The proposed changes to the definition of "healthy" are aligned withcurrent nutrition science, the Dietary Guidelines for Americans. https://www.federalregister.gov/documents/
- (Food and Drug Administration, 2020) The U.S. Food and Drug Administration today released a final rule to establish compliance requirements for fermented and hydrolyzed foods, or foods that contain fermented or hydrolyzed ingredients, that bear the "gluten-free" claim. https://www.glutenfreewatchdog.org/news/
- (Kelly, Roseman et al., 2019), Effects of Health Education Campaigns, consumer behavior regarding nutrition labels and advertising claims and Role of Technology and Online Information, online research and shopping with digital platforms.https://www.researchgate.net/publication/
- (Chandon, Popkin & Reardon et al., 2018), Role of Branding and Packaging, Investigate studies and Temporal Changes in Consumer Preferences, Examine literature - How consumer preferences regarding nutrition labels and advertising claims with nutritional science. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/
- (Roberto, Hollands et al., 2017), Impact of label design and visual cues on consumer attentionand comprehension - How consumers perceive and use nutritional information and Psychological and Emotional Factors with consumers responses to nutritional information and advertising claims.
- https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC9690506/
- (Hawley, Mozaffarian et al., 2016), Consumers research indicates the presence of the nutritionlables with purchasing decisions with food choices and Long term health outcomes of consumers is influenced by nutrition labels and advertising claims. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/221750863
- (Petrovici, Vemula, Wansink & Sonka 2014), Study of the consumers trusts in nutrition labels & advertising claims is crucial Study on the use of food label information by urban consumers. To investigate Perceived Healthiness vs. Actual Nutritional with discrepancy influences choices, https://mdpires.com/books/book/5420/Perception.pdf

- **9.** (**Besler et al., 2012**), Study of benefits to nutritional information generates trust betweenconsumers and organizations. <a href="http://www.udsspace.uds.edu.gh/bitstream/.pdf">http://www.udsspace.uds.edu.gh/bitstream/.pdf</a>
- 10. (Grunert et al., 2010), Importance of nutrition labels in aiding consumers with highlights. Study the importance of Nutrition information on food labels with investigates.

http://eprints.usm.my/47725/1/AN%20INVESTIGATION%20INTO%20INFORMATION.pdf

- **11.** (**Hawkes, 2009**), Impact of Food Regulations and Policies with discussing practices. https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC9991667/
- **12.** (**Thaler & Sunstein, 2008**), Making behavioral economics concepts with theory. <a href="https://www.jstor.org/stable/26697581">https://www.jstor.org/stable/26697581</a>
  - 13. (Dixon, Ares & Gámbaro et al., 2007), Study the Impact on Vulnerable Populations with literature of nutrition labels and advertising claims. Studies with consumer responses to nutrition labels and advertising claims with different countries.

https://kobra.unikassel.de/bitstream/handle/123456789/11446/DissertationJohannPhilipSteinhauser.pdf

#### **BOOK REFERENCE**

- 1. Swetha Kodali and Neeraja Telaprolu (2018). Food Label and its influence on Consumer Buying Behavior: A Review of Research Studies. International Journal of Science and Research, Volume 7,Issue 6.
- 2. Begum, V. (2015). Effects of Kellogg's Nutritional Label on Consumer Buying Behaviour inDubai, UAE. Procedia Social and Behavioral Sciences, 211, 1195–1202. doi: 10.1016/j.sbspro.2015.11.159
- 3. Andrews, J. Craig, Jordan Lin, Alan S. Levy, and Serena Lo. (2014) "Consumer Research Needsfrom the Food and Drug Administration on Front-of-Package Nutritional Labeling", Journal of Marketing and Public Policy volume 35 pages 95-106.
- **4.** Singla, M. 2010. Usage and understanding of food and nutritional labels among Indianconsumers. British Food Journal. 112(1): 83 –92.
- 5. P.H.K.Prathi<mark>raja</mark> and A.Ariyawardana (2003). Impact of Nutritional Labeling on ConsumerBuying Behavior. Sri Lankan Journal of Agricultural Economics.

Research Through Innovation