Chapter 5

Cognitive, Affective, and Social Drivers Influencing the Customers Towards Counterfeit Products in Kerala

Contents

5.1 Introduction

The chapter explores the cognitive, affective, and social driving factors that induce consumers in Kerala to purchase counterfeit products, along with the socio-demographic disparities among these consumers. This research examines the general aspects of the cognitive, affective, and social inducements that influence the buying of counterfeit items. In order to conduct a comprehensive data analysis, the researcher considered several socio-demographic and counterfeit purchase factors, such as gender, age, educational qualification, annual income, distinguishing ability to identify counterfeit products from the original products, and the particular types of counterfeit products that individuals intended to procure.

5.2 Research Objective

Objective I: *To investigate the cognitive, affective, and social drivers influencing the customers to purchase counterfeit products in Kerala.*

The extent of different motivating factors that influence customers to buy counterfeit products was the focal point of the first objective of the research. Descriptive statistics like the mean and standard deviation as well as inferential analytic techniques like the one-sample t-test, the independent t-test, and ANOVA with Tukey's HSD Post-hoc analysis were employed to accomplish the aforementioned objective of the study.

SECTION - A

5.3 Cognitive, Affective, and Social Drivers Influencing the Customers Towards Counterfeit Products in Kerala.

The objective of the chapter aims at investigating the cognitive, affective, and social drivers of the customers in Kerala that influence them to buy counterfeit products. In order to accomplish this objective of the study, descriptive statistics, such as the mean and the standard deviation, as well as inferential analysis, such as the one sample t-test, the independent t-test, and the one-way analysis of variance with Tukey's HSD Post-hoc analysis, were utilised.

It is important to know what all are the driving forces that would stimulate the customers to have a favourable approach towards counterfeit products and it is more important to know the extent to which these factors influences their buying habits towards counterfeits. The following twelve constructs are considered as motives or factors that influence them to buy counterfeit products by the customers in Kerala.

(I) Cognitive Drivers

a. *Price Consciousness*
b. *Price-Quality Inference*
c. *Value Consciousness*
d. *Perceived Risk*

(II) Affective Drivers

a. *Risk Averseness*
b. *Integrity*
c. *Personal Gratification*
d. *Novelty Seeking*

(III) Social Drivers

a. *Information Susceptibility*
b. *Normative Susceptibility*
c. *Status Consumption*
d. *Social Influence*

5.3.1 Extent of Cognitive, Affective, and Social Drivers Influencing the Customers to Purchase Counterfeit Products in Kerala

H_0 5.1: Cognitive drivers of the customers in Kerala that influence them to buy counterfeit products are at an average level

Table 5.1

One Sample T-Test for Measuring the Cognitive Drivers of the Customers Towards Counterfeit Products in Kerala

Cognitive Drivers	Mean	Standard Deviation	Mean Difference	T Value	P Value	Rank (Mean)
Price Consciousness	4.25	0.60	1.22	55.73	<0.001**	**I**
Price-Quality Inference	3.52	0.69	0.52	20.81	<0.001**	**III**
Value Consciousness	4.22	0.66	1.22	50.61	<0.001**	**II**
Perceived Risk	3.23	0.58	0.23	11.05	<0.001**	**IV**

Source: Primary Data
*** denotes significant at 1% level*

The P value in the case of all factors of cognitive drivers stands below 0.01, leading to rejection of the null hypothesis at a significance level of 1%. The data suggests that the cognitive factors driving customers in Kerala to purchase counterfeit products are not at an average level. This indicates that it could be either below or above the average level. The mean scores of the cognitive drivers that influence customers in Kerala to purchase counterfeit products indicate that all scores are above average (> 3). This indicates that the cognitive factors that drive customers in Kerala to buy counterfeit products are above average. The cognitive drivers that influence customers in Kerala to purchase counterfeit products have been ranked based on their mean scores. The results showed that the potential customers are highly price conscious (4.25), followed by value consciousness (4.22), price-quality inference (3.52), and perceived risk (3.23). It is possible to conclude

from these findings that potential customers of counterfeit products are more price and value conscious.

H0 5.2: Affective drivers of the customers in Kerala that influence them to buy counterfeit products are at an average level

Table 5.2

One Sample T-Test for Measuring the Affective Drivers of the Customers Towards Counterfeit Products in Kerala

Affective Drivers	Mean	Standard Deviation	Mean Difference	T Value	P Value	Rank (Mean)
Risk Averseness	3.50	0.28	0.50	48.37	<0.001**	**III**
Integrity	4.43	0.38	1.43	101.36	<0.001**	**I**
Personal Gratification	4.03	0.70	1.03	40.23	<0.001**	**II**
Novelty Seeking	3.14	1.00	0.14	4.10	<0.001**	**IV**

Source: Primary Data
*** denotes significant at 1% level*

Given that the P value related to all factors of affective driving forces stands lower than 0.01, the null hypothesis can be rejected at the 1% confidence level. It suggests that the affective drivers of the buyers in Kerala that stimulate them to purchase counterfeit product are not at an average level. It suggests that the level may be either below or above the standard level. The affective drivers of the customers in Kerala that lead them to purchase counterfeit products all have mean scores that are above the average (> 3), which shows that all of the mean scores are high. It indicates that there are affective drivers of customers in Kerala, which would push the customers to purchase counterfeit products at above average levels.

Based on the results of the mean scores, the integrity (4.43) of the customers in Kerala is the most significant factor that influence the buying decision regarding counterfeit goods, followed by personal gratification (4.03), risk averseness (3.50), and novelty seeking (3.14). From these results, it's possible to draw the conclusion that personal integrity is a big influential factor behind why they intend to buy counterfeit products, followed by the element of personal gratification.

H0 5.3: Social drivers of the customers in Kerala that influence them to buy counterfeit products are at an average level

Table 5.3

One Sample T-Test for Measuring the Social Drivers of the Customers Towards Counterfeit Products in Kerala

Social Drivers	Mean	Standard Deviation	Mean Difference	T Value	P Value	Rank (Mean)
Information Susceptibility	4.06	0.79	1.06	36.76	<0.001**	**I**
Normative Susceptibility	3.27	1.00	0.27	7.49	<0.001**	**II**
Status Consumption	3.10	0.78	0.10	3.78	<0.001**	**III**
Social Influence	2.33	1.10	-0.66	-16.50	<0.001**	**IV**

Source: Primary Data
*** denotes significant at 1% level*

Given that the P value in terms of all sub-variables of social drivers shows values below 0.01, the null hypothesis is considered to be rejected at a significance level of 1%. The findings suggest that the social factors motivating consumers in Kerala to buy counterfeit products are not at an average level. This indicates that it may fall below or exceed the mean level. The results indicate that the mean scores for the social drivers of customers in Kerala, which influence their decision to purchase counterfeit products, exceed the average threshold (> 3). This indicates that the social factors that motivate consumers in Kerala to buy counterfeit products are prevalent at a higher-than-average level except the factor of social influence.

The study has revealed that the customers in Kerala are primarily influenced by information susceptibility (mean score of 4.06) when purchasing counterfeit products. This is followed by normative susceptibility (mean score of 3.27), status consumption (mean score of 3.10), and social influence (mean score of 2.23). Based on these findings, one may infer that individuals who are inclined towards purchasing counterfeit products exhibit higher levels of information susceptibility and possess greater knowledge about such products. This may potentially influence their future purchasing decisions. The study also revealed that these individuals exhibit a lack of social influence, resulting in a diminished likelihood of being persuaded to purchase counterfeit products.

SECTION – B

5.4 Customer Motives Towards Counterfeit Products Across Socio-Demographic, Economic and Counterfeit Purchase Factors

The following socio-demographic, economic and counterfeit purchase factors are considered for the analysis of customer motives towards counterfeit products in the context of Kerala.

1. *Gender*
2. *Educational Qualification*
3. *Age*
4. *Annual Income*
5. *Distinguishing ability*
6. *The specific types of counterfeit products that customers intended to purchase*

5.4.1 Cognitive Drivers Towards Counterfeit Products Across Socio-Demographic, Economic and Counterfeit Purchase Factors

Under cognitive driving forces, the sub-variables of price consciousness, price-quality inference, value consciousness and perceived risk levels of the customers were considered. The assessments of differences across socio-demographic, economic and counterfeit purchase factors in terms of cognitive drivers are analysed on the basis of independent t test, ANOVA, and if the test finds significance in the results of ANOVA, Tukey's HSD post-hoc analysis is used further.

H0 5.4: There is no significant difference in terms of cognitive drivers between male and female customers towards counterfeit products in Kerala

Table 5.4

T- Test for Significant Difference in Terms of Cognitive Drivers Between Male and Female Customers Towards Counterfeit Products

Factors of Cognitive Drivers	Gender				T Value	P Value
	Male		Female			
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD		
Price Consciousness	4.39	0.55	4.04	0.59	8.295	<0.001**
Price-Quality Inference	3.49	0.78	3.55	0.57	-1.202	0.230^{NS}
Value Consciousness	4.12	0.77	4.33	0.49	-4.235	<0.001**
Perceived Risk	3.25	0.60	3.21	0.56	0.736	0.462 ^{NS}

Source: Primary Data *** denotes significant at 1% level*

^{NS} *denotes not significant*

Given that the P value in terms of factors of cognitive drivers of purchasing counterfeit products such as price consciousness and value consciousness stands less than 0.01, the null hypothesis is rejected at the 1% significance level for male and female customers. As a result, there exists a significant difference between the male and female customers with respect to the factors of cognitive drivers of purchasing counterfeit products such as price consciousness and value consciousness. In other words, male and female customers do not have the same cognitive drivers of acquiring counterfeit products in terms of price consciousness and value consciousness. In the case of price-quality inference and perceived risk, the P value is greater than 0.05. Therefore, the null hypothesis is accepted. It indicates that there is no significant difference between the male and female customers with respect to the factors of cognitive drivers of purchasing counterfeit products in terms of price-quality inference and perceived risk. Male and female customers are clearly equal in terms of cognitive drivers of purchasing counterfeit products, such as price-quality inference and perceived risk.

H0 5.5: There is no significant difference in terms of cognitive drivers between the graduate and post graduate customers towards counterfeit products in Kerala

Table 5.5

T- Test for Significant Difference in Terms of Cognitive Drivers Between Graduate and Postgraduate Customers Towards Counterfeit Products

Factors of Cognitive Drivers	Educational Qualification				T Value	P Value
	Graduates		Post Graduates			
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD		
Price Consciousness	4.21	0.63	4.24	0.53	-0.496	0.620^{NS}
Price-Quality Inference	3.58	0.65	3.41	0.74	3.138	0.002**
Value Consciousness	4.37	0.47	3.96	0.84	8.366	<0.001**
Perceived Risk	3.23	0.51	3.23	0.69	0.011	0.991 ^{NS}

Source: Primary Data *** denotes significant at 1% level*

^{NS} *denotes not significant*

If a customer is purchasing counterfeit goods, the mean score indicates that the male buyers are more concerned about the price than the female customers.

Concurrently, female customers are more likely to be value-conscious than male customers when it comes to acquiring counterfeit products. The P value in terms of factors of cognitive drivers of purchasing counterfeit products such as price-quality inference and value consciousness is < 0.01, the null hypothesis is rejected at the 1% significance level for graduate and post graduate customers. As a result, there exists a significant difference between the graduate and postgraduate customers with respect to the factors of cognitive drivers of purchasing counterfeit products such as price-quality inference and value consciousness. In other words, graduate and postgraduate customers do not have the same cognitive drivers of acquiring counterfeit products in terms of price-quality inference and value consciousness.

In the case of price consciousness and perceived risk, the P value is > 0.05 leading to the acceptance of the null hypothesis. It indicates that there is no significant difference between the graduate and postgraduate customers with respect to the factors of cognitive drivers of purchasing counterfeit products in terms of price consciousness and perceived risk. Graduate and postgraduate customers are clearly equal in terms of cognitive drivers of purchasing counterfeit products, such as price consciousness and perceived risk. According to the mean score, graduate customers have more value consciousness and price-quality inference than postgraduate customers regarding purchases of counterfeit products.

H_0 5.6: There is no significant difference between the distinguishing abilities of the customers in terms of cognitive drivers towards counterfeit products in Kerala

Table 5.6

T- Test for Significant Difference Between Distinguishing Abilities of the Customers in Terms of Cognitive Drivers Towards Counterfeit Products

Factors of Cognitive Drivers	Distinguishing Ability				T Value	P Value
	Yes		No			
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD		
Price Consciousness	4.21	0.59	4.51	0.75	-2.502	0.013*
Price-Quality Inference	3.55	0.68	2.78	0.09	5.774	<0.001**
Value Consciousness	4.24	0.64	3.63	0.82	4.744	<0.001**
Perceived Risk	3.24	0.58	3.11	0.52	1.075	0.283^{NS}

Source: Primary Data
*** denotes significant at 5% level*
*** denotes significant at 1% level*
^{NS} denotes not significant

Since P value is less than 0.01, the null hypothesis is rejected at 1% significance level for customers who are able to distinguish a counterfeit product from original products and those who are unable to distinguish the same with respect to factors of cognitive drivers of purchasing counterfeit products such as price-quality inference and value consciousness. As a result, there is a significant difference between the customers who are able to distinguish a counterfeit product from an original one and those who are unable to distinguish a counterfeit product from an original product with respect to factors of cognitive drivers of purchasing counterfeit products such as price-quality inference and value consciousness.

In the case of price consciousness, the P value is less than 0.05. So, the null hypothesis is rejected at 5% significant level for customers who are able to distinguish a counterfeit product from an original product and those who are unable to distinguish a counterfeit product from an original product with respect to the price consciousness factor of cognitive drivers of purchasing counterfeit products. It indicates that there is a significant difference between the customers who are able to distinguish counterfeit products from originals and those who are unable to distinguish a counterfeit product from an original product with respect to the price consciousness factor of cognitive drivers of purchasing counterfeit products.

The null hypothesis is accepted in the case of perceived risk, given that the P value is > 0.05. Therefore, it indicates that there is no significant difference between the customers who are able to distinguish a counterfeit product from an original product and those who are unable to distinguish a counterfeit product from an original product with respect to perceived risk factors of cognitive drivers of purchasing counterfeit products. Customers who possess the distinguishing ability and who do not possess the same are obviously similar in terms of perceived risk factor of cognitive drivers of acquiring counterfeit items.

According to the mean score, customers who can detect a counterfeit product from originals have higher price-quality inference and value consciousness than customers who cannot differentiate a counterfeit product from an original product while purchasing counterfeit products. Customers who are unable to distinguish a counterfeit product from an original product are more price-conscious when

considering the purchase of counterfeit goods, in comparison to customers who are able to distinguish counterfeit products from the genuine products.

H0 5.7: There is no significant difference in terms of cognitive drivers among the age categories of the customers towards counterfeit products in Kerala

Table 5.7
ANOVA for Significant Difference in Terms of Cognitive Drivers Among the Age Categories of Customers Towards Counterfeit Products

Factors of Cognitive Drivers	Age Categories of the Customers			F Value	P Value
	< 25	26 - 35	> 36		
	Mean and SD	Mean and SD	Mean and SD		
Price Consciousness	4.09 (0.58)	4.40 (0.63)	4.30 (0.56)	17.353	<0.001**
Price-Quality Inference	3.57 (0.70)	3.36 (0.84)	3.55 (0.53)	5.182	0.006**
Value Consciousness	4.13 (0.53)	3.95 (0.95)	4.49 (0.49)	41.224	<0.001**
Perceived Risk	3.31 (0.66)	3.19 (0.50)	3.15 (0.49)	6.203	0.002**

Source: Primary Data *** denotes significant at 1% level*
Values within ( ) indicates Standard Deviation

The P value in terms of all sub-variables of cognitive drivers stands < 0.01 leading to the rejection of the null hypothesis at 1% level. It implies that there exists a significant difference among the age of the customers with respect to factors of cognitive drivers of purchasing counterfeit products. The factors of cognitive drivers of purchasing counterfeit products includes, price consciousness, price-quality inference, value consciousness and perceived risk. This confirms that customers of various age categories differ in terms of price consciousness, price-quality inference, value consciousness and perceived risk of purchasing counterfeit products.

5.4.1.1 Post-hoc Test of ANOVA – Age Categories

Although the test indicates a significant difference, it does not necessarily mean that each age category is significantly different from every other age category. In order to determine significant differences between these age categories, a "post-hoc" test is employed using the "Tukey HSD" method. The outcome of the post-hoc test is presented in the table below.

Table 5.8

Post-hoc Test for Significant Difference Among the Age Categories of Customers in Terms of Cognitive Drivers Towards Counterfeit Products

Factors of Cognitive Drivers	Age (I)	Age (J)	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	P Value
Price Consciousness	< 25	26 - 35	-0.307	0.057	<0.001**
		> 36	-0.208	0.048	<0.001**
	26 - 35	> 36	0.099	0.060	0.229^{NS}
Price-Quality Inference	< 25	26 - 35	0.206	0.067	0.006**
		> 36	0.013	0.056	0.970 ^{NS}
	26 - 35	> 36	-0.193	0.070	0.017*
Value Consciousness	< 25	26 - 35	0.180	0.061	0.010**
		> 36	-0.361	0.051	<0.001**
	26 - 35	> 36	-0.541	0.064	<0.001**
Perceived Risk	< 25	26 - 35	0.126	0.056	0.067 ^{NS}
		> 36	0.160	0.047	0.002**
	26 - 35	> 36	0.033	0.059	0.839 ^{NS}

Source: Primary Data *** denotes significant at 1% level*
** denotes significant at 5% level* *^{NS} denotes not significant*

According to the Tukey HSD Post-hoc test, the following significant difference was found among the age of the customers with respect to factors of cognitive drivers of purchasing counterfeit products. In terms of price consciousness, Customers under the age of 25 differ drastically from those aged 26 to 35 and 36 and above. In the case of price-quality inference, customers in the ages of below 25 are significantly different from those in the age category of 26 to 35. At the same time, customers in the age groups of 26 to 35 are significantly different from those in the ages of 36 and above. When it comes to value consciousness, customers in the ages of below 25 are significantly different from those in the age category of 26 to 35 and 36 and above. Customers in the age category of 26 to 35 different greatly from those in the ages of 36 and above Considering the perceived risk, customers in the age group of below 25 are different significantly from those in the ages of 36 and above. According to the mean score, customers aged 26 to 35 are more price conscious than those aged under 25 when planning to purchase counterfeit products. Customers aged 36 and up are also more price concerned than those aged under 25. Customers under the age of 25 have a higher price-quality

inference than those between the ages of 26 and 35. At the same time, customers aged 36 and up have a better understanding of the price and quality of purchasing counterfeit products than those aged 26 to 35. If the customers plan to buy counterfeit products, customers under the age of 25 are more value aware than customers between the ages of 26 and 35. Customers aged 36 and above are more concerned about the worth of counterfeit products than those aged below 25 and 26 to 35. Customers under the age of 25 would perceive a greater risk of acquiring counterfeit products than those aged 36 and above.

H0 5.8: There is no significant difference among the annual income of the customers in terms of cognitive drivers towards counterfeit products in Kerala

Table 5.9
ANOVA for Significant Difference Among the Annual Income of Customers in Terms of Cognitive Drivers Towards Counterfeit Products

Factors of Cognitive Drivers	Annual Income				F Value	P Value
	< 2,00,000	2,00,001 - 4,00,000	4,00,001 - 6,00,000	6,00,001 - 8,00,000		
	Mean and SD	Mean and SD	Mean and SD	Mean and SD		
Price Consciousness	4.07 (0.56)	4.41 (0.55)	4.30 (0.70)	4.20 (0.42)	16.480	<0.001**
Price-Quality Inference	3.59 (0.65)	3.67 (0.69)	3.08 (0.67)	3.48 (0.44)	25.020	<0.001**
Value Consciousness	4.21 (0.55)	4.45 (0.48)	3.97 (1.04)	3.93 (0.11)	20.087	<0.001**
Perceived Risk	3.33 (0.57)	3.17 (0.57)	3.19 (0.54)	2.96 (0.68)	7.492	<0.001**

Source: Primary Data *** denotes significant at 1% level*
Values within ( ) indicates Standard Deviation

Since the P value in terms of all factors of cognitive drivers stands less than 0.01, thus the null hypothesis is rejected at 1% level. It states that there exists a significant difference among the annual income of the customers with respect to factors of cognitive drivers of purchasing counterfeit products such as, price consciousness, price-quality inference, value consciousness and perceived risk. It specifies that customers with various annual incomes differ in terms of price consciousness, price-quality inference, value consciousness and perceived risk of purchasing counterfeit products. It clearly states that customers with different annual

incomes are not equal in terms of the above-mentioned cognitive drivers of acquiring counterfeit products.

5.4.1.2 Post-hoc Test of ANOVA – Annual Income

Table 5.10
Post-hoc for Significant Difference Among the Annual Income of Customers in Terms of Cognitive Drivers Towards Counterfeit Products

Factors of Cognitive Drivers	Annual Income (I)	Annual Income (J)	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	P Value
Price Consciousness	< 2,00,000	2,00,001 - 4,00,000	-0.341	0.050	<0.001**
		4,00,001 - 6,00,000	-0.230	0.059	<0.001**
		6,00,001 - 8,00,000	-0.125	0.091	0.512^{NS}
	2,00,001 - 4,00,000	4,00,001 - 6,00,000	0.111	0.063	0.300^{NS}
		6,00,001 - 8,00,000	0.215	0.093	0.099^{NS}
	4,00,001 - 6,00,000	6,00,001 - 8,00,000	0.104	0.099	0.718^{NS}
Price-Quality Inference	< 2,00,000	2,00,001 - 4,00,000	-0.079	0.056	0.491^{NS}
		4,00,001 - 6,00,000	0.508	0.067	<0.001**
		6,00,001 - 8,00,000	0.113	0.102	0.683^{NS}
	2,00,001 - 4,00,000	4,00,001 - 6,00,000	0.588	0.071	<0.001**
		6,00,001 - 8,00,000	0.193	0.105	0.259^{NS}
	4,00,001 - 6,00,000	6,00,001 - 8,00,000	-0.394	0.111	0.002**
Value Consciousness	< 2,00,000	2,00,001 - 4,00,000	-0.238	0.054	<0.001**
		4,00,001 - 6,00,000	0.244	0.065	<0.001**
		6,00,001 - 8,00,000	0.283	0.099	0.023*
	2,00,001 - 4,00,000	4,00,001 - 6,00,000	0.482	0.069	<0.001**
		6,00,001 - 8,00,000	0.522	0.102	<0.001**
	4,00,001 - 6,00,000	6,00,001 - 8,00,000	0.039	0.108	0.984^{NS}
Perceived Risk	< 2,00,000	2,00,001 - 4,00,000	0.154	0.049	0.010**
		4,00,001 - 6,00,000	0.138	0.058	0.086^{NS}
		6,00,001 - 8,00,000	0.362	0.089	<0.001**
	2,00,001 - 4,00,000	4,00,001 - 6,00,000	-0.015	0.062	0.995^{NS}
		6,00,001 - 8,00,000	0.208	0.092	0.111^{NS}
	4,00,001 - 6,00,000	6,00,001 - 8,00,000	0.223	0.097	0.103^{NS}

Source: Primary Data
** denotes 5% level of significance*
***denotes 1% level of significance*
^{NS} refers to not significant

On the basis of Tukey HSD Post-hoc test, the following significant differences were found among the annual income of the customers with respect to factors of cognitive drivers of purchasing counterfeit products. In terms of price consciousness, customers with an annual income below 2,00,000 differ drastically from those with an annual income of 2,00,001 to 4,00,000 and 4,00,001 to 6,00,000. In the case of price-quality inference, customers with an annual income below 2,00,000 are significantly different from those with an annual income of 4,00,001 to 6,00,000. At the same time, customers with an annual income of 2,00,001 to 4,00,000 are significantly different from those with an annual income of 4,00,001 to 6,00,000. Customers with an annual income of 4,00,001 to 6,00,000 are also significantly different from those with an annual income of 6,00,001 to 8,00,000.

When it comes to value consciousness, customers with an annual income below2,00,000 are significantly different from those who fall under the annual income categories of 2,00,001 to 4,00,000, 4,00,001 to 6,00,000 and 6,00,001 to 8,00,000. Customers with an annual income of 2,00,001 to 4,00,000 are different greatly from those with an annual income of 4,00,001 to 6,00,000 and 6,00,001 to 8,00,000. Considering the perceived risk, customers with an annual income below 2,00,000 are significantly different from those with an annual income of 2,00,001 to 4,00,000 and 6,00,001 to 8,00,000.

According to the mean score, customers with an annual income of 2,00,001 to 4,00,000 are more price conscious than those with an annual income below 2,00,000 when they intend to purchase counterfeit products. Customers with an annual income of 4,00,001 to 6,00,000 are also more price-conscious than those with an annual income below 2,00,000. Customers with an annual income below 2,00,000 have a higher price-quality inference than those with an annual income of 4,00,001 to 6,00,000. At the same time, customers with an annual income of 2,00,001 to 4,00,000 have a better understanding of the price and quality of purchasing counterfeit products than those with an annual income of 4,00,001 to 6,00,000. Customers with an annual income of 6,00,001 to 8,00,000 have more price-quality inference than those with an annual income of 4,00,001 to 6,00,000.

Customers with an annual income of 2,00,001 to 4,00,000 are more value aware than those with an annual income below 2,00,000 when it comes to purchasing counterfeit products. Customers with an annual income below 2,00,000 are more concerned about the worth of counterfeit products than those with an annual income of 4,00,001 to 6,00,000 and 6,00,001 to 8,00,000. Customers with an annual income of 2,00,001 to 4,00,000 are found to be more value aware than those with an annual income of 4,00,001 to 6,00,000 and 6,00,001 to 8,00,000. Customers with an annual income below 2,00,000 perceive a greater risk of acquiring counterfeit products than those with an annual income of 2,00,001 to 4,00,000 and 6,00,001 to 8,00,000.

H_0 5.9: There is no significant difference among the types of counterfeit products intended to purchase in terms of cognitive drivers

Table 5.11

ANOVA for Significant Difference Among the Types of Counterfeit Products Intended to Purchase in Terms of Cognitive Drivers Towards Counterfeit Products

Factors of Cognitive Drivers	Types of Counterfeit Products Intended to Purchase			F Value	P Value
	Automobile Components	Electronic Devices and Equipment	Clothing and Accessories		
	Mean and SD	Mean and SD	Mean and SD		
Price Consciousness	4.20 (0.45)	4.25 (0.67)	4.20 (0.54)	0.520	0.595^{NS}
Price-Quality Inference	3.30 (0.70)	3.58 (0.70)	3.52 (0.65)	7.115	<0.001**
Value Consciousness	4.20 (0.28)	4.08 (0.83)	4.39 (0.44)	18.048	<0.001**
Perceived Risk	3.13 (0.56)	3.35 (0.55)	3.12 (0.60)	15.411	<0.001**

Source: Primary Data
*** denotes significant at 1% level*
^{NS} denotes not significant
Values within ( ) indicates Standard Deviation

Considering the P value for the factors of price-quality inference, value consciousness, and perceived risk stands less than 0.01 at the 1% level, the null

hypothesis is rejected. It indicates that there is a considerable difference among the types of counterfeit items that people in Kerala intend to purchase in terms of cognitive drivers of acquiring counterfeit products such price-quality inference, value consciousness, and perceived risk. It explains that buyers who aim to purchase various types of counterfeit items differ in terms of price-quality inference, value consciousness, and perceived risk of acquiring counterfeit products. It indicates that the customers who intend to purchase different types of counterfeit products are not equal in terms of the above-mentioned cognitive drives of acquiring counterfeit products.

5.4.1.3 Post-hoc Test of ANOVA - Types of Counterfeit Products Intended to Purchase

Table 5.12

Post-hoc Test for Significant Difference Among the Types of Counterfeit Products Intended to Purchase in Terms of Cognitive Drivers

Factors of Cognitive Drivers	Counterfeit Products Intended to Purchase More (I)	Counterfeit Products Intended to Purchase More (J)	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	P Value
Price-Quality Inference	Automobile Components	Electronic Devices and Equipment	-0.288	0.076	<0.001**
		Clothing and Accessories	-0.222	0.078	0.013*
	Electronic Devices and Equipment	Clothing and Accessories	0.066	0.054	0.433^{NS}
Value Consciousness	Automobile Components	Electronic Devices and Equipment	0.116	0.072	0.245^{NS}
		Clothing and Accessories	-0.190	0.074	0.028*
	Electronic Devices and Equipment	Clothing and Accessories	-0.307	0.051	<0.001**
Perceived Risk	Automobile Components	Electronic Devices and Equipment	-0.224	0.064	<0.001**
		Clothing and Accessories	0.011	0.065	0.983^{NS}
	Electronic Devices and Equipment	Clothing and Accessories	0.235	0.045	<0.001**

Source: Primary Data
*** denotes significant 5% level*
**** denotes significant at 1% level*
^{NS} denotes not significant

Focusing on the Tukey HSD Post-hoc test, the following significant difference was discovered across the types of counterfeit intending to purchase in terms of cognitive drivers of acquiring counterfeit products. Customers who want to acquire automobile components differ greatly from customers who aim to purchase electronic gadgets and equipment, as well as clothing and accessories, in terms of price-quality inference. When it comes to value consciousness, customers who intend to purchase automobile components are greatly different from those who intend to purchase clothing and accessories.

At the same time, customers who have the desire to purchase electronic devices and equipment differ significantly from those who intend to buy clothing and accessories. Considering the perceived risk, customers who intend to purchase automobile components are greatly different from those who intend to purchase electronic devices and equipment, whereas those who intend to purchase electronic devices and equipment are greatly different from those who intend to purchase clothing and accessories.

Customers who aim to acquire automobile components proved to have a lower price-quality inference, according to the mean score, than those who expect to purchase electronic devices and equipment, as well as clothes and accessories. Customers who aim to purchase clothing and accessories are more value conscious than those who intend to acquire automobile components, as well as electronic devices and equipment. Customers who prefer to buy electronic items and equipment perceive a higher risk of getting counterfeit products than those who desire to buy automobile components, as well as clothing and accessories.

5.4.2 Affective Drivers Towards Counterfeit Products Across Socio-Demographic, Economic and Counterfeit Purchase Factors

Affective driving forces consist of the sub-variables such as risk averseness, integrity, personal gratification and novelty-seeking nature of the customers. The assessments of differences across socio-demographic, economic and counterfeit purchase factors in terms of affective drivers are analysed on the basis of independent t-test, ANOVA, and if the test finds significance in the results of ANOVA, Tukey's HSD post-hoc analysis is used further.

H0 5.10: There is no significant difference in terms of affective drivers between the male and female customers towards counterfeit products in Kerala

Table 5.13

T- Test for Significant Difference in Terms of Affective Drivers Between the Male and Female Customers Towards Counterfeit Products

Factors of Affective Drivers	Gender				T Value	P Value
	Male		Female			
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD		
Risk Averseness	3.45	0.24	3.55	0.30	-5.286	<0.001**
Integrity	4.38	0.36	4.49	0.40	-4.068	<0.001**
Personal Gratification	3.94	0.77	4.13	0.60	-3.676	<0.001**
Novelty Seeking	3.08	1.03	3.22	0.95	-1.897	0.058^{NS}

Source: Primary Data
*** denotes significant at 1% level*
^{NS} denotes not significant

Since P value with respect to the factors of affective drivers of purchasing counterfeit products such as risk averseness, integrity and personal gratification is < 0.01, the null hypothesis stands rejected at 1% significance level for male and female customers. As a result, there is a significant difference between the male and female customers with respect to the factors of affective drivers of purchasing counterfeit products such as risk averseness, integrity and personal gratification. In other words, in terms of risk averseness, integrity and personal gratification of affective drivers of purchasing counterfeit products, the male and female customers shows difference.

In the case of novelty seeking, the P value is > 0.05 leading to the acceptance of the null hypothesis. This indicates that there is no significant difference between the male and female customers with respect to the factors of affective drivers of purchasing counterfeit products in terms of novelty seeking. Male and female customers are clearly equal in terms of novelty seeking factor of affective drivers of purchasing counterfeit products.

According to the mean score, the female customers in Kerala who intent to purchase counterfeit products demonstrate higher levels of risk aversion, integrity, and personal gratification than male customers do in this regard.

H0 5.11: There is no significant difference between the graduate and postgraduate customers in terms of affective drivers towards counterfeit products in Kerala

Table 5.14

T- Test for Significant Difference Between the Graduate and Postgraduate Customers in Terms of Affective Drivers Towards Counterfeit Products

Factors of Affective Drivers	Educational Qualification				T Value	P Value
	Graduates		Post Graduates			
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD		
Risk Averseness	3.46	0.26	3.56	0.30	-4.800	<0.001**
Integrity	4.44	0.39	4.43	0.37	0.352	0.725^{NS}
Personal Gratification	4.10	0.55	3.90	0.90	3.862	<0.001**
Novelty Seeking	3.16	0.81	3.13	1.26	0.395	0.693 ^{NS}

Source: Primary Data
*** denotes significant at 1% level*
^{NS} denotes not significant

Since the P value with respect to the factors of affective drivers of purchasing counterfeit products such as risk averseness and personal gratification is less than 0.01, the null hypothesis stands rejected at 1% significance level for graduate and postgraduate customers. As a result, there is a significant difference between the graduate and postgraduate customers with respect to the factors of affective drivers of purchasing counterfeit products such as risk averseness and personal gratification. In short, in terms of risk averseness and personal gratification of affective drivers of purchasing counterfeit products, the graduate and postgraduate customers are not the same.

In the case of integrity and novelty seeking, the P value is greater than 0.05. Therefore, the null hypothesis is accepted. It indicates that there is no significant difference between the graduate and postgraduate customers with respect to the factors of affective drivers of purchasing counterfeit products in terms of integrity and novelty seeking. Graduate and postgraduate customers are clearly equal in terms

of integrity and novelty seeking factors of affective drivers of purchasing counterfeit products. Regarding purchases of counterfeit products, postgraduate customers exhibit more risk averseness than graduate customers whereas, graduates exhibit more personal gratification than postgraduate customers in the case of counterfeit products.

H0 5.12: There is no significant difference between the distinguishing abilities of the customers in terms of affective drivers towards counterfeit products in Kerala

Table 5.15

T- Test for Significant Difference Between the Distinguishing Abilities of the Customers in Terms of Affective Drivers Towards Counterfeit Products

Factors of Affective Drivers	Distinguishing Ability				T Value	P Value
	Yes		No			
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD		
Risk Averseness	3.50	0.28	3.32	0.27	3.389	<0.001**
Integrity	4.44	0.39	4.17	0.18	3.608	<0.001**
Personal Gratification	4.03	0.71	4.00	0.27	0.269	0.788^{NS}
Novelty Seeking	3.19	0.99	2.03	0.09	6.025	<0.001**

Source: Primary Data
*** denotes significant at 1% level*
^{NS} denotes not significant

As the P value is less than 0.01, so the null hypothesis is rejected at 1% significance level for customers who are able to distinguish a counterfeit product from the original products and those who are unable to distinguish a counterfeit product from the originals with respect to factors of affective drivers of purchasing counterfeit products such as risk averseness, integrity and novelty seeking. As a result, there is a significant difference between the customers who are able to distinguish a counterfeit product from original products and those who are unable to distinguish a counterfeit product from an original product with respect to factors of affective drivers of purchasing counterfeit products such as risk averseness, integrity and novelty seeking.

In the case of personal gratification, the P value is greater than 0.05 leading to the acceptance of the null hypothesis. It indicates that there is no significant difference between the customers who are able to distinguish a counterfeit product from original products and those who are unable to distinguish a counterfeit product from an original product with respect to personal gratification factor of affective drivers of purchasing counterfeit products. Customers who have the distinguishing ability and who do not have the same are clearly equal in terms of personal gratification factor of affective drivers of purchasing counterfeit products.

Based on the mean score, customers who are able to distinguish a counterfeit product from a genuine one tends to have a higher level of risk aversion, integrity, and a desire for novelty compared to those who are unable to differentiate between the two when purchasing counterfeit products.

H_0 5.13: There is no significant difference among the age categories of the customers in terms of affective drivers towards counterfeit products in Kerala

Table 5.16

ANOVA for Significant Difference Among the Age Categories of Customers in Terms of Affective Drivers Towards Counterfeit Products

Factors of Affective Drivers	Age Categories of the Customers			F Value	P Value
	< 25	26 - 35	> 36		
	Mean and SD	Mean and SD	Mean and SD		
Risk Averseness	3.51 (0.31)	3.42 (0.25)	3.53 (0.25)	6.916	<0.001**
Integrity	4.45 (0.42)	4.32 (0.33)	4.48 (0.35)	9.310	<0.001**
Personal Gratification	4.07 (0.59)	3.78 (1.13)	4.13 (0.43)	12.451	<0.001**
Novelty Seeking	3.12 (1.00)	2.79 (1.18)	3.39 (0.78)	18.413	<0.001**

Source: Primary Data
*** denotes significant at 1% level*
Values within ( ) indicates Standard Deviation

The P value in terms of all factors of affective drivers stands less than 0.01 leading to a rejection of the null hypothesis at 1% level. It indicates that there is a significant difference among the age categories of the customers with respect to factors of affective drivers of purchasing counterfeit products. This shows that customers of different age categories differ in their risk averseness, integrity, personal gratification and novelty seeking when it comes to purchasing counterfeit products.

5.4.2.1 Post-hoc Test of ANOVA – Age Categories

The post-hoc test was carried out to know if there are any significant differences between the age groups of the customers on account of affective drivers towards counterfeit products.

Table 5.17

Post-hoc Test for Significant Difference in Terms of Affective Drivers Among the Age Categories of Customers Towards Counterfeit Products

Factors of Affective Drivers	Age (I)	Age (J)	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	P Value
Risk Averseness	< 25	26 - 35	0.086	0.027	0.005**
		> 36	-0.017	0.023	0.742^{NS}
	26 - 35	> 36	-0.103	0.028	<0.001**
Integrity	< 25	26 - 35	0.137	0.037	<0.001**
		> 36	-0.025	0.031	0.691^{NS}
	26 - 35	> 36	-0.163	0.039	<0.001**
Personal Gratification	< 25	26 - 35	0.284	0.068	<0.001**
		> 36	-0.058	0.057	0.561^{NS}
	26 - 35	> 36	-0.343	0.071	<0.001**
Novelty Seeking	< 25	26 - 35	0.328	0.095	0.002**
		> 36	-0.275	0.080	0.002**
	26 - 35	> 36	-0.604	0.100	<0.001**

Source: Primary Data
***denotes 1% level of significance*
^{NS} refers to not significant

With respect to the factors of affective drivers of purchasing counterfeit products, the following significant difference was found among the age categories of the customers according to the Tukey HSD Post-hoc test. In terms of risk averseness, customers under the age of 25 differ drastically from those aged 26 to 35 whiles, customers in the age group of 26 to 35 are different greatly from those in the ages of 36 and above. In the case of integrity, customers in the ages of below 25 are significantly different from those in the age category of 26 to 35. Whereas, customers in the age groups of 26 to 35 are significantly different from those in the ages of 36 and above. When it comes to personal gratification, customers in the ages of below 25 are significantly different from those in the age category of 26 to 35. Customers in the age category of 26 to 35 differed greatly from those in the ages of 36 and above. In terms of novelty seeking, consumers under the age of 25 differed considerably from those between the ages of 26 to 35 and 36 and above, however customers between the ages of 26 and 35 differed significantly from those between the ages of 36 and above.

Based on the mean score, customers under the age of 25 have more risk averseness of purchasing counterfeit products than those between the ages of 26 and 35. Customers aged 36 and more are also be more risk averse than those in the ages of 26 to 35. Customers under the age of 25 have stronger integrity than those between the ages of 26 to 35, and those aged 36 and up have better integrity than those aged 26 to 35. In the event of customers procuring counterfeit merchandise, individuals aged below 25 years are likely to experience a higher degree of personal gratification compared to those aged between 26 and 35 years. Individuals who are 36 years of age or older experienced a greater degree of personal gratification when acquiring counterfeit merchandise in comparison to those who are between the ages of 26 and 35.

The proclivity for novelty seeking among customers purchasing counterfeit products varies across different age groups. Specifically, customers under the age of 25 exhibit a greater inclination towards novelty seeking compared to those aged between 26 and 35. Conversely, customers aged 36 and above showed a greater propensity towards novelty seeking than their younger counterparts aged under 25 and those between 26 and 35.

H0 5.14: There is no significant difference among the annual income of the customers in terms of affective drivers towards counterfeit products in Kerala

Table 5.18

ANOVA for Significant Difference Among the Annual Income of Customers in Terms of Affective Drivers Towards Counterfeit Products

Factors of Affective Drivers	Annual Income				F Value	P value
	< 2,00,000	2,00,001 - 4,00,000	4,00,001 - 6,00,000	6,00,001 - 8,00,000		
	Mean and SD	Mean and SD	Mean and SD	Mean and SD		
Risk Averseness	3.49 (0.31)	3.49 (0.28)	3.55 (0.21)	3.41 (0.21)	3.306	0.020*
Integrity	4.47 (0.41)	4.40 (0.37)	4.51 (0.34)	4.13 (0.22)	12.854	<0.001**
Personal Gratification	4.07 (0.62)	4.13 (0.48)	3.67 (1.07)	4.31 (0.47)	16.895	<0.001**
Novelty Seeking	3.12 (0.98)	3.13 (0.83)	2.97 (1.18)	3.90 (0.97)	10.714	<0.001**

Source: Primary Data *** denotes significant at 1% level*
** denotes significant at 5% level* *Values within ( ) indicates Standard Deviation*

The P value in the case of integrity, personal gratification and novelty-seeking nature of the customers stands less than 0.01, hence the null hypothesis is rejected at 1% level. It indicates that there exists a significant difference among the annual income of the customers with respect to factors of affective drivers of purchasing counterfeit products such as integrity, personal gratification and novelty seeking. It contends that when it comes to purchasing counterfeit products, customers with varying annual incomes differ in their integrity, personal gratification, and novelty seeking behaviour.

In the case of risk averseness, the P value is < 0.05 leading to rejection of the null hypothesis at 5% level of significance. It claims that there exists a significant difference among the annual income of the customers with respect to risk averseness factor of affective drivers of purchasing counterfeit products. It explains that

customers with varying annual incomes are different when it comes to purchasing counterfeit products on the basis of risk averse nature.

5.4.2.2 Post-hoc Test of ANOVA - Annual Income

The post-hoc test was carried out to know if there are any significant differences between the annual income categories of the customers on account of affective drivers towards counterfeit products.

Table 5.19

Post-hoc Test for Significant Difference Among the Annual Income of Customers in Terms of Affective Drivers Towards Counterfeit Products

Factors of Affective Drivers	Annual Income (I)	Annual Income (J)	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	P Value
Risk Averseness	< 2,00,000	2,00,001 - 4,00,000	0.001	0.024	1.000[NS]
		4,00,001 - 6,00,000	-0.058	0.028	0.174 [NS]
		6,00,001 - 8,00,000	0.085	0.044	0.209 [NS]
	2,00,001 - 4,00,000	4,00,001 - 6,00,000	-0.060	0.030	0.204 [NS]
		6,00,001 - 8,00,000	0.084	0.045	0.247 [NS]
	4,00,001 - 6,00,000	6,00,001 - 8,00,000	0.144	0.047	0.014*
Integrity	< 2,00,000	2,00,001 - 4,00,000	0.061	0.032	0.229 [NS]
		4,00,001 - 6,00,000	-0.044	0.038	0.665 [NS]
		6,00,001 - 8,00,000	0.332	0.059	<0.001**
	2,00,001 - 4,00,000	4,00,001 - 6,00,000	-0.105	0.041	0.052 [NS]
		6,00,001 - 8,00,000	0.270	0.060	<0.001**
	4,00,001 - 6,00,000	6,00,001 - 8,00,000	0.376	0.064	<0.001**
Personal Gratification	< 2,00,000	2,00,001 - 4,00,000	-0.058	0.058	0.747 [NS]
		4,00,001 - 6,00,000	0.397	0.069	<0.001**

Factors of Affective Drivers	Annual Income (I)	Annual Income (J)	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	P Value
		6,00,001 - 8,00,000	-0.245	0.106	0.098 NS
	2,00,001 - 4,00,000	4,00,001 - 6,00,000	0.456	0.074	<0.001**
		6,00,001 - 8,00,000	-0.186	0.109	0.323 NS
	4,00,001 - 6,00,000	6,00,001 - 8,00,000	-0.643	0.116	<0.001**
Novelty Seeking	< 2,00,000	2,00,001 - 4,00,000	-0.013	0.083	0.998 NS
		4,00,001 - 6,00,000	0.142	0.100	0.483 NS
		6,00,001 - 8,00,000	-0.782	0.152	<0.001**
	2,00,001 - 4,00,000	4,00,001 - 6,00,000	0.156	0.106	0.459 NS
		6,00,001 - 8,00,000	-0.768	0.157	<0.001**
	4,00,001 - 6,00,000	6,00,001 - 8,00,000	-0.924	0.166	<0.001**

Source: Primary Data
***denotes 1% level of significance*
** denotes 5% level of significance*
NS refers to not significant

The following significant differences were found among the annual income of the customers with respect to factors of affective drivers such as risk averseness, integrity, personal gratification and novelty-seeking natures towards purchasing counterfeit products depending on Tukey HSD Post-hoc test. In terms of risk averseness, customers with an annual income of 4,00,001 to 6,00,000 differ drastically from those with an annual income of 6,00,001 to 8,00,000.

In the case of integrity, customers with an annual income below 2,00,000 are significantly different from those with an annual income of 6,00,001 to 8,00,000. At the same time, customers with an annual income of 2,00,001 to 4,00,000 are significantly different from those with an annual income of 6,00,001 to 8,00,000. Customers with an annual income of 4,00,001 to 6,00,000 are greatly different from those with an annual income of 6,00,001 to 8,00,000.

When it comes to personal gratification, customers with an annual income below 2,00,000 are significantly different from those with an annual income of 4,00,001 to 6,00,000. Customers with an annual income of 2,00,001 to 4,00,000 are differed greatly from those with an annual income of 4,00,001 to 6,00,000. Customers with an annual income of 4,00,001 to 6,00,000 are significantly different from those with an annual income of 6,00,001 to 8,00,000.

Considering novelty-seeking nature, customers with an annual income below 2,00,000 are significantly different from those with an annual income of 6,00,001 to 8,00,000. Customers with an annual income of 2,00,001 to 4,00,000 are significantly different from those with an annual income of 6,00,001 to 8,00,000. Customers with an annual income of 4,00,001 to 6,00,000 are significantly different from those with an annual income of 6,00,001 to 8,00,000.

Customers with yearly incomes ranging from 400,001 to 600,000 are more risk averse, according to the mean score, than those with other annual income groups. Customers with an annual income of less than 200,000 have greater integrity than those with annual incomes ranging from 600,001 to 800,000. At the same time, customers with an annual income of 2,00,001 to 4,00,000 have more integrity of purchasing counterfeit products than those with an annual income of 6,00,001 to 8,00,000. Customers who earn an annual income between 4,00,001 and 6,00,000 have a higher level of integrity compared to those who earn between 6,00,001 and 8,00,000. Customers with an annual income below 2,00,000 have more personal gratification than those with an annual income of 4,00,001 to 6,00,000 when it comes to purchasing counterfeit products.

Customers with an annual income of 2,00,001 to 4,00,000 have more personal gratification of counterfeit products than those with an annual income of 4,00,001 to 6,00,000. Individuals earning an annual income between 6,00,001 to 8,00,000 experience a higher level of personal gratification compared to those earning between 4,00,001 to 6,00,000 annually. Customers with an annual income of 6,00,001 to 8,00,000 are more interested in the novelty of purchasing counterfeit products than those with an annual income below 2,00,000, 2,00,001 to 4,00,000 and 4,00,001 to 6,00,000.

H0 5.15: There is no significant difference among the types of counterfeit products intended to purchase in terms of affective drivers

Table 5.20

ANOVA for Significant Difference Among the Types of Counterfeit Products Intended to Purchase in Terms of Affective Drivers

Factors of Affective Drivers	Types of Counterfeit Products Intended to Purchase			F Value	P Value
	Automobile Components	Electronic Devices and Equipment	Clothing and Accessories		
	Mean and SD	Mean and SD	Mean and SD		
Risk Averseness	3.45 (0.37)	3.46 (0.25)	3.56 (0.27)	10.738	<0.001**
Integrity	4.45 (0.41)	4.41 (0.37)	4.46 (0.40)	1.102	0.333^{NS}
Personal Gratification	4.10 (0.50)	3.94 (0.87)	4.12 (0.49)	5.594	0.004**
Novelty Seeking	3.07 (1.11)	3.22 (1.09)	3.07 (0.82)	2.164	0.116^{NS}

Source: Primary Data *** denotes significant at 1% level*
^{NS} denotes not significant *Values within ( ) indicates Standard Deviation*

The null hypothesis is rejected at the 1% level since the P value is less than 0.01. It indicates that there is a considerable difference among the types of counterfeit items that people intend to purchase in terms of affective drivers of acquiring counterfeit products such risk averseness and personal gratification. It explains that buyers who aim to purchase various types of counterfeit items differ in terms of risk averseness and personal gratification of acquiring counterfeit products. This indicates that customers who intend to purchase different types of counterfeit products are not equal in terms of the above-mentioned affective drivers of acquiring counterfeit products.

In terms of integrity and novelty seeking the P value is higher than 0.05. Hence it is clear that there exists no significant difference among the types of

counterfeit products intended to purchase with respect to factors of affective drivers of purchasing counterfeit products such as integrity and novelty seeking.

5.4.2.3 Post-hoc Test of ANOVA - Types of Counterfeit Products Intended to Purchase

Table 5.21

Post-hoc Test for Significant Difference Among the Types of Counterfeit Products Intended to Purchase in Terms of Affective Drivers

Factors of Affective Drivers	Counterfeit Products Intended to Purchase More (I)	Counterfeit Products Intended to Purchase More (J)	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	P Value
Risk Averseness	Automobile Components	Electronic Devices and Equipment	-0.012	0.031	0.922[NS]
		Clothing and Accessories	-0.106	0.032	0.003**
	Electronic Devices and Equipment	Clothing and Accessories	-0.094	0.022	<0.001**
Personal Gratification	Automobile Components	Electronic Devices and Equipment	0.154	0.078	0.119 [NS]
		Clothing and Accessories	-0.021	0.080	0.961 [NS]
	Electronic Devices and Equipment	Clothing and Accessories	-0.176	0.055	0.004**

Source: Primary Data
*** denotes significant at 1% level*
[NS] denotes not significant

Based on Tukey HSD Post-hoc test, the following significant difference was found among the types of counterfeits intended to purchase with respect to factors of affective drivers of purchasing counterfeit products. Customers who prefer to purchase automobile components differ significantly from those who prefer to purchase clothing and accessories, and customers who prefer to purchase electronic devices and equipment differ significantly from those who prefer to purchase clothing and accessories. Customers who intend to acquire electronic items and

equipment differ greatly from customers who intend to purchase clothing and accessories in terms of personal gratification.

According to the mean score, respondents who expect to purchase clothing and accessories are more risk averse than those who intend to acquire automobile components or electronic devices and equipment. Those respondents who express an interest in buying clothing and accessories experience a higher level of personal gratification than those respondents who express an interest in buying electronic devices and equipment.

5.4.3 Social Drivers Towards Counterfeit Products Across Socio-Demographic, Economic and Counterfeit Purchase Factors

Social driving forces consist of the sub-variables such as information and normative susceptibility, status consumption and social influence. The assessments of differences across socio-demographic, economic and counterfeit purchase factors in terms of social drivers are analysed on the basis of independent t-test, ANOVA, and if the test finds significance in the results of ANOVA, Tukey's HSD post-hoc analysis is used further.

H0 5.16: There is no significant difference in terms of social drivers between the male and female customers towards counterfeit products in Kerala

Table 5.22

T-Test for Significant Difference in Terms of Social Drivers Between Male and Female Customers Towards Counterfeit Products

Factors of Social Drivers	Gender				T Value	P Value
	Male		Female			
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD		
Information Susceptibility	3.87	0.99	4.27	0.38	-7.119	<0.001**
Normative Susceptibility	3.20	1.00	3.35	1.00	-2.120	0.034*
Status Consumption	3.06	0.79	3.15	0.77	-1.665	0.096^{NS}
Social Influence	2.53	1.19	2.10	0.95	5.475	<0.001**

Source: Primary Data
*** denotes significant at1% level*
** denotes significant at5% level*
^{NS} denotes not significant

The P value with respect to the factors of social drivers of purchasing counterfeit products such as information susceptibility and social influence shows less than 0.01, the null hypothesis is rejected at 1% significance level on the basis of gender of the customers. As a result, there is a significant difference between the male and female customers with respect to the factors of social drivers of purchasing counterfeit products such as information susceptibility and social influence. In other words, in terms of information susceptibility and social influence of social drivers of purchasing counterfeit products, the male and female customers are not the same.

Considering normative susceptibility, the P value is < 0.05. Therefore, the null hypothesis is rejected at 5 percent level. It indicates that there is a significant difference between the male and female customers with respect to the normative susceptibility factor of social drivers of purchasing counterfeit products.

In the case of status consumption, the P value is greater than 0.05 directing to the acceptance of the null hypothesis. It indicates that there is no significant difference between the male and female customers with respect to the factors of social drivers of purchasing counterfeit products in terms of status consumption. Male and female customers are clearly equal in terms of status consumption factor of social drivers of purchasing counterfeit products.

The mean scores of female customers are 4.27 for information susceptibility, 3.35 for normative susceptibility and 2.10 for social influence constructs whereas the mean scores of male customers are 3.87 for information susceptibility, 3.20 for normative susceptibility and 2.53 for social influence constructs. The scores for information susceptibility and normative susceptibility are above the average whereas it falls below the average regarding the construct of social influence.

Thus, based on the mean score, female customers are more likely susceptible to information and normative influence when considering the purchase of counterfeit products compared to male customers. Male customers tend to have more social influence than female customers when it comes to purchasing counterfeit products.

H0 5.17: There is no significant difference between the graduate and postgraduate customers in terms of social drivers towards counterfeit products in Kerala

Table 5.23

T- Test for Significant Difference Between the Graduate and Postgraduate Customers in Terms of Social Drivers Towards Counterfeit Products

Factors of Social Drivers	Educational Qualification				T Value	P Value
	Graduates		Post Graduates			
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD		
Information Susceptibility	4.23	0.45	3.76	1.11	8.149	<0.001**
Normative Susceptibility	3.24	0.99	3.32	1.03	-0.927	0.354^{NS}
Status Consumption	3.11	0.74	3.09	0.85	0.361	0.718 ^{NS}
Social Influence	2.34	1.09	2.30	1.12	0.455	0.649 ^{NS}

Source: Primary Data *** denotes significant at 1% level*

^{NS} denotes not significant

On account of the information susceptibility factor among social drivers of purchasing counterfeit products, the P value is less than 0.01 leading to rejection of the null hypothesis at 1% significance level for graduate and postgraduate customers. As a result, there is a significant difference between the graduate and postgraduate customers with respect to the information susceptibility factor of social drivers of purchasing counterfeit products. It means, in terms of information susceptibility of social drivers of purchasing counterfeit products the graduate and postgraduate customers expressed different perceptions and opinions.

Considering normative susceptibility, status consumption and social influence, the P value is greater than 0.05. Therefore, the null hypothesis is accepted. It indicates that there exists no significant difference between the graduate and postgraduate customers with respect to the factors of social drivers of purchasing counterfeit products in terms of normative susceptibility, status consumption and social influence. Graduate and postgraduate customers are clearly equal in terms of factors of social drivers of purchasing counterfeit products such as normative susceptibility, status consumption and social influence.

With regard to the purchase of counterfeit products, graduates have higher information susceptibility than postgraduate customers, as per the mean score.

H0 5.18: There is no significant difference between the distinguishing abilities of the customers in terms of social drivers towards counterfeit products in Kerala

Table 5.24

T- Test for Significant Difference Between the Distinguishing Abilities of the Customers in Terms of Social Drivers Towards Counterfeit Products

Factors of Social Drivers	Distinguishing Ability				T Value	P Value
	Yes		No			
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD		
Information Susceptibility	4.08	0.78	3.35	0.72	4.819	<0.001**
Normative Susceptibility	3.32	0.99	2.06	0.17	6.541	<0.001**
Status Consumption	3.14	0.77	2.08	0.10	7.074	<0.001**
Social Influence	2.33	1.10	2.33	1.26	-0.006	0.995^{NS}

Source: Primary Data
*** denotes significant at 1% level*
^{NS} denotes not significant

The P value with respect to the factors of social drivers of purchasing counterfeit products such as information susceptibility, normative susceptibility and status consumption stands less than 0.01 leading to a rejection of the null hypothesis at 1% significance level for customers who are able to distinguish counterfeit products from the original products and those who are unable to distinguish counterfeit products from originals. As a result, there is a significant difference between the customers who possess the distinguishing ability and who do not have the same with respect to factors of social drivers of purchasing counterfeit products such as information susceptibility, normative susceptibility and status consumption.

In the case of social influence, the P value is greater than 0.05. So, the null hypothesis is accepted for customers who are able to distinguish a counterfeit product from an original product and those who are unable to distinguish a counterfeit product from an original product with respect to factors of social drivers

of purchasing counterfeit products such as social influence. It indicates that there is no significant difference between the customers who have the distinguishing ability and those who do not have the same with respect to social influence factors of social drivers of purchasing counterfeit products.

According to the mean score, customers who are able to distinguish a counterfeit product from an original product are likely to have higher levels of information susceptibility, normative susceptibility, and status consumption compared to those who cannot distinguish a counterfeit product when considering purchasing such products.

H0 5.19: There is no significant difference among the age categories of the customers in terms of social drivers towards counterfeit products in Kerala

Table 5.25

ANOVA for Significant Difference Among the Age Categories of Customers in Terms of Social Drivers Towards Counterfeit Products

Factors of Social Drivers	Age Categories of the Customers			F Value	P Value
	< 25	26-35	> 36		
	Mean and SD	Mean and SD	Mean and SD		
Information Susceptibility	4.21 (0.51)	3.74 (1.29)	4.05 (0.64)	18.782	<0.001**
Normative Susceptibility	3.48 (0.91)	3.00 (0.94)	3.15 (1.10)	15.248	<0.001**
Status Consumption	3.09 (0.83)	2.97 (0.92)	3.20 (0.61)	4.229	0.015*
Social Influence	2.30 (1.11)	2.20 (1.09)	2.43 (1.09)	2.060	0.128^{NS}

Source: Primary Data
** denotes significant at51% level*
Values within ( ) indicates Standard Deviation
*** denotes significant at 1% level*
^{NS} denotes not significant

The factors of social drivers of purchasing counterfeit products such as information susceptibility and normative susceptibility shows the P value which is less than 0.01, leads to the rejection of the null hypothesis at 1% level indicating that

there is a significant difference among the different age categories of the customers. It states that customers of different ages differ in their information susceptibility and normative susceptibility when it comes to purchasing counterfeit products.

In the case of status consumption, the P value is < 0.05. Thus, the null hypothesis is rejected at 5% level. It states that there is a significant difference among the age of the customers with respect to the status consumption factor of social drivers of purchasing counterfeit products. It claims that, in terms of purchasing counterfeit products, the customers with various age groups are different based on status consumption. Regarding social influence, the P value is greater than 0.05. So, the null hypothesis is accepted. Thus, there is no significant difference among the age categories of the customers with respect to social influence factor of social drivers of purchasing counterfeit products.

5.4.3.1 Post-hoc Test of ANOVA - Age Categories

Table 5.26

Post-hoc Test for Significant Difference in Terms of Social Drivers Among the Age Categories of Customers Towards Counterfeit Products

Factors of Social Drivers	Age (I)	Age (J)	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	P Value
Information Susceptibility	< 25	26 - 35	0.463	0.075	<0.001**
		> 36	0.160	0.063	0.032*
	26 - 35	> 36	-0.303	0.079	<0.001**
Normative Susceptibility	< 25	26 to 35	0.479	0.096	<0.001**
		> 36	0.330	0.081	<0.001**
	26 - 35	> 36	-0.149	0.101	0.304^{NS}
Status Consumption	< 25	26 to 35	0.124	0.076	0.237 ^{NS}
		> 36	-0.107	0.064	0.220 ^{NS}
	26 - 35	> 36	-0.231	0.080	0.011*

Source: Primary Data
***denotes 1% level of significance*
** denotes 5% level of significance*
^{NS} refers to not significant

The following significant differences were found among the age categories of the customers with respect to factors of social drivers of purchasing counterfeit

products depending on Tukey HSD Post-hoc test. In terms of informative susceptibility, customers under the age of 25 differ drastically from those aged 26 to 35 and 36 and above. Customers in the ages of 26 to 35 are greatly different from those in the ages of 36 and above. In the case of normative susceptibility, customers in the ages of below 25 are significantly different from those in the age category of 26 to 35 and 36 and above. When it comes to status consumption, customers in the age category of 26 to 35 different greatly from those in the ages of 36 and above

According to the mean score, customers aged below 25 experienced more information susceptibility than those in the age category of 26 to 35 and 36 and above when thinking of purchasing counterfeit products. Customers aged 36 and up experienced more information susceptibility than those aged between 26 to 35. Customers under the age of 25 experienced higher normative susceptibility than those between the ages of 26 and 35 and 36 and up. Individuals who are 36 years old or older are more likely to experience a sense of status consumption when considering the purchase of counterfeit products, compared to those who are between the ages of 26 and 35.

H0 5.20: There is no significant difference among the annual income of the customers in terms of social drivers towards counterfeit products in Kerala

Table 5.27

ANOVA for Significant Difference Among the Annual Income of Customers in Terms of Social Drivers Towards Counterfeit Products

Factors of Social Drivers	Annual Income				F Value	P Value
	< 2,00,000	2,00,001 - 4,00,000	4,00,001 - 6,00,000	6,00,001 - 8,00,000		
	Mean and SD	Mean and SD	Mean and SD	Mean and SD		
Information Susceptibility	4.25 (0.48)	4.06 (0.75)	3.58 (1.25)	4.05 (0.32)	25.233	<0.001**
Normative Susceptibility	3.26 (0.98)	3.24 (0.98)	3.06 (1.14)	4.07 (0.11)	12.561	<0.001**
Status Consumption	2.98 (0.80)	3.09 (0.65)	3.14 (0.75)	3.94 (0.84)	22.411	<0.001**
Social Influence	2.45 (1.03)	2.50 (1.24)	1.86 (0.98)	1.92 (0.76)	13.805	<0.001**

Source: Primary Data *** denotes significant at 1% level*
Values within ( ) indicates Standard Deviation

The null hypothesis is rejected at 1% level, since the P value with respect to factors of social drivers of purchasing counterfeit products such as information susceptibility, normative susceptibility, status consumption and social influence stands less than 0.01. This indicates that there is a significant difference among the annual income of the customers. It contends that when it comes to purchasing counterfeit products, customers with varying annual incomes differs in their information susceptibility, normative susceptibility, status consumption and social influence.

5.4.3.2 Post-hoc Test of ANOVA - Annual Income

The post-hoc test was carried out to know if there are any significant differences between the annual income categories of the customers on account of social drivers towards counterfeit products.

Table 5.28

Post-hoc Test for Significant Difference Among the Annual Income of Customers in Terms of Social Drivers Towards Counterfeit Products

Factors of Social Drivers	Annual Income (I)	Annual Income (J)	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	P Value
Information Susceptibility	< 2,00,000	2,00,001 - 4,00,000	0.186	0.064	0.021*
		4,00,001 - 6,00,000	0.670	0.077	<0.001**
		6,00,001 - 8,00,000	0.192	0.117	0.360^{NS}
	2,00,001 - 4,00,000	4,00,001 - 6,00,000	0.484	0.082	<0.001**
		6,00,001 - 8,00,000	0.006	0.121	1.000^{NS}
	4,00,001 - 6,00,000	6,00,001 - 8,00,000	-0.478	0.128	<0.001**
Normative Susceptibility	< 2,00,000	2,00,001 - 4,00,000	0.017	0.084	0.997^{NS}
		4,00,001 - 6,00,000	0.197	0.100	0.200^{NS}
		6,00,001 - 8,00,000	-0.815	0.153	<0.001**
	2,00,001 - 4,00,000	4,00,001 - 6,00,000	0.179	0.107	0.336^{NS}
		6,00,001 - 8,00,000	-0.833	0.157	<0.001**

Factors of Social Drivers	Annual Income (I)	Annual Income (J)	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	P Value
	4,00,001 - 6,00,000	6,00,001 - 8,00,000	-1.012	0.166	<0.001**
Status Consumption	< 2,00,000	2,00,001 - 4,00,000	-0.104	0.064	0.368 NS
		4,00,001 - 6,00,000	-0.159	0.077	0.164 NS
		6,00,001 - 8,00,000	-0.960	0.117	<0.001**
	2,00,001 - 4,00,000	4,00,001 - 6,00,000	-0.054	0.082	0.910 NS
		6,00,001 - 8,00,000	-0.855	0.121	<0.001**
	4,00,001 - 6,00,000	6,00,001 - 8,00,000	-0.801	0.128	<0.001**
Social Influence	< 2,00,000	2,00,001 - 4,00,000	-0.057	0.092	0.925 NS
		4,00,001 - 6,00,000	0.583	0.110	<0.001**
		6,00,001 - 8,00,000	0.522	0.168	0.011*
	2,00,001 - 4,00,000	4,00,001 - 6,00,000	0.640	0.117	<0.001**
		6,00,001 - 8,00,000	0.579	0.173	0.005**
	4,00,001 - 6,00,000	6,00,001 - 8,00,000	-0.060	0.183	0.987 NS

Source: Primary Data
***denotes 1% level of significance*
** denotes 5% level of significance*
NS refers to not significant

The following significant differences were found among the annual income of the customers with respect to factors of social drivers of purchasing counterfeit products on the basis of Tukey HSD Post-hoc test. In terms of information susceptibility, Customers with annual income below 2,00,000 differ drastically from those with an annual income of 2,00,001 to 4,00,000 and 4,00,001 to 6,00,000. In the case of customers with an annual income of 2,00,001 to 4,00,000 are significantly different from those with an annual income of 4,00,001 to 6,00,000. Customers with an annual income of 4,00,001 to 6,00,000 are significantly different from those with an annual income of 6,00,001 to 8,00,000.

In the case of normative susceptibility, customers with an annual income below 2,00,000 are significantly different from those with an annual income of

6,00,001 to 8,00,000. At the same time, customers with an annual income of 2,00,001 to 4,00,000 are significantly different from those with an annual income of 6,00,001 to 8,00,000. Customers with an annual income of 4,00,001 to 6,00,000 are greatly different from those with an annual income of 6,00,001 to 8,00,000.

When it comes to status consumption, customers with an annual income below 2,00,000 are significantly different from those with an annual income of 6,00,001 to 8,00,000. Customers with an annual income of 2,00,001 to 4,00,000 are different greatly from those with an annual income of 6,00,001 to 8,00,000. Customers with an annual income of 4,00,001 to 6,00,000 are different from those with an annual income of 6,00,001 to 8,00,000. Considering social influence, customers with an annual income below 2,00,000 are significantly different from those with an annual income of 4,00,001 to 6,00,000 and 6,00,001 to 8,00,000. Customers with an annual income of 2,00,001 to 4,00,000 are different from those with an annual income of 4,00,001 to 6,00,000 and 6,00,001 to 8,00,000.

Based on the mean score, customers who have an annual income below 200,000 are more susceptible to information than those who earn between 200,001 to 400,000 and 400,001 to 600,000 annually. Customers with an annual income of 2,00,001 to 4,00,000 experienced more information susceptibility than those with an annual income of 4,00,001 to 6,00,000. At the same time customers with an annual income of 6,00,001 to 8,00,000 have greater information susceptibility than those with an annual income of 4,00,001 to 6,00,000. Customers with an annual income of 6,00,001 to 8,00,000 have a higher normative susceptibility than those with the annual income below 2,00,000, 2,00,001 to 4,00,000 and 4,00,001 to 6,00,000.

Customers with an annual income of 6,00,001 to 8,00,000 have more status consumption than those with an annual income below 2,00,000, 2,00,001 to 4,00,000 and 4,00,001 to 6,00,000, when it comes to purchasing counterfeit products. Customers who earn less than 2,00,000 annually are more susceptible to the social influence of counterfeit products compared to those who earn between 4,00,001 to 6,00,000 and 6,00,001 to 8,00,000 annually. Customers who have an annual income between 2,00,001 to 4,00,000 are likely to have a greater social influence compared to those with an annual income of 4,00,001 to 6,00,000 and 6,00,001 to 8,00,000.

H0 5.21: There is no significant difference among the types of counterfeit products intended to purchase in terms of social drivers

Table 5.29

ANOVA for Significant Difference Among the Types of Counterfeit Products Intended to Purchase in Terms of Social Drivers

Factors of Social Drivers	Types of Counterfeit Products Intended to Purchase			F Value	P Value
	Automobile Components	Electronic Devices and Equipment	Clothing and Accessories		
	Mean and SD	Mean and SD	Mean and SD		
Information Susceptibility	4.25 (0.46)	3.87 (1.00)	4.21 (0.48)	18.924	<0.001**
Normative Susceptibility	3.67 (1.01)	3.27 (0.99)	3.13 (0.97)	11.464	<0.001**
Status Consumption	2.86 (0.65)	3.21 (0.93)	3.06 (0.58)	9.060	<0.001**
Social Influence	2.30 (0.88)	2.32 (1.18)	2.35 (1.08)	0.126	0.881 NS

Source: Primary Data
*** denotes significant at 1% level*
NS denotes not significant
Values within ( ) indicates Standard Deviation

The null hypothesis is rejected at the 1% level since the P value is less than 0.01. It indicates that there exists a significant difference among the types of counterfeit items that people intend to purchase in terms of social drivers of acquiring counterfeit products such information susceptibility, normative susceptibility and status consumption. It explains that buyers who aim to purchase various types of counterfeit items differ in terms of information susceptibility, normative susceptibility and status consumption of acquiring counterfeit products. It indicates that customers who intend to purchase different types of counterfeit products are not equal in terms of the above-mentioned social drivers of acquiring counterfeit products.

The P value for social influence is more than 0.05. As a result, there is no discernible difference between the various types of counterfeit products intended to

be purchased in terms of the social influence factor of social drivers of purchasing counterfeit products.

5.4.3.3 Post-hoc Test of ANOVA - Types of Counterfeit Products Intended to Purchase

Table 5.30

Post-hoc Test for Significant Difference Among the Types of Counterfeit Products Intended to Purchase in Terms of Social Drivers

Factors of Social Drivers	Counterfeit Products Intended to Purchase More (I)	Counterfeit Products Intended to Purchase More (J)	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	P Value
Information Susceptibility	Automobile Components	Electronic Devices and Equipment	0.370	0.086	<0.001**
		Clothing and Accessories	0.030	0.088	0.936 NS
	Electronic Devices and Equipment	Clothing and Accessories	-0.339	0.061	<0.001**
Normative Susceptibility	Automobile Components	Electronic Devices and Equipment	0.401	0.111	<0.001**
		Clothing and Accessories	0.544	0.113	<0.001**
	Electronic Devices and Equipment	Clothing and Accessories	0.142	0.078	0.164 NS
Status Consumption	Automobile Components	Electronic Devices and Equipment	-0.353	0.087	<0.001**
		Clothing and Accessories	-0.198	0.089	0.068 NS
	Electronic Devices and Equipment	Clothing and Accessories	0.155	0.061	0.032*

Source: Primary Data
*** denotes significant 5% level*
**** denotes significant at 1% level*
NS denotes not significant

According to the Tukey HSD Post-hoc test, the following significant difference was discovered across the types of CF intending to purchase in terms of social drivers of acquiring counterfeit products. In terms of information

susceptibility, customers who intend to purchase automobile components differ significantly from those who are hoping to purchase electronic devices and equipment, and those who hope to purchase electronic devices and equipment differ significantly from those who intend to purchase clothing and accessories. In terms of normative susceptibility, customers who intend to purchase automobile components are significantly different from customers who intend to purchase electronic devices and equipment and clothing and accessories. When it comes to status consumption, customers who want to buy automobile components are vastly different from those who want to buy electronic items and equipment. At the same time, customers who want to buy electronic items and equipment differ significantly from those who want to buy clothing and accessories.

According to the mean score, respondents who want to buy automobile components are more susceptible to information than those who want to buy electronic gadgets and equipment. Similarly, those who want to buy clothing and accessories would be more susceptible to information than those who want to acquire electronic items and equipment. Customers who prefer to purchase automobile components have a higher normative susceptibility than customers who want to buy electronic devices and equipment as well as clothing and accessories. Customers who like to buy electronic devices and equipment have higher status consumption than those who prefer to buy automobile components and electronic devices and equipment.

5.5 Conclusion

This chapter examined the cognitive, affective, and social drivers of the customers in Kerala that influence them to buy counterfeit products and its socio-demographic differences among the customers. Cognitive, Affective and Social drivers of purchasing counterfeit products are considered as broad dimensions of the study. Gender, age, educational qualification, annual income, ability to distinguish counterfeit products from the originals and types of counterfeit product intended to purchase are taken as socio-demographic, economic and counterfeit purchase factors for the data analysis. The potential customers were found to be more price and value conscious on the examination of cognitive motives of customers. The factors of

integrity and personal gratification proved to be the most influential affective drivers and the factors of information and normative susceptibility exhibited higher levels of influence on the analysis of social drivers. Different customer motives revealed differences in customer perceptions towards the counterfeit products in Kerala depending on the socio-demographic and economic characteristics as well as counterfeit purchase factors. The manufacturers of original branded products need to focus on the most influential factors that prompt customers towards counterfeits so that such tendencies can be demotivated to curb the problem of counterfeiting practices from the economy.