

Associations Between Perceived Risks and Counterfeit Household-Product Purchase Intentions Among Mothers in Sultan Kudarat, Philippines

Marielle Joy P. Bucani¹  | Analyn A. Gonzales² 

^{1,2} University of Southern
Mindanao, Kabacan,
Philippines

Abstract

Introduction: Counterfeit household products may expose consumers to social, performance, psychological, and prosecution-related risks that can influence purchasing decisions. However, evidence on how these perceived risks relate to purchase intention among millennial mothers in the Philippine context remains limited.

Objective: This study examined the associations between perceived social, performance, psychological, and prosecution risks and purchase intention toward counterfeit household products among millennial mothers in selected localities of the 1st District of Sultan Kudarat, Philippines.

Methods: A cross-sectional descriptive-correlational design was employed with 385 millennial mothers aged 29–44 years. Respondents were proportionately allocated across localities based on household population shares. Data were collected using adapted five-point Likert scales based on Koay (2018) and Ting et al. (2016) and analyzed using a generalized linear model (GLM).

Results: Respondents reported high social risk ($M = 4.13$), performance risk ($M = 4.28$), and psychological risk ($M = 3.83$), moderate prosecution risk ($M = 2.79$), and low purchase intention ($M = 1.88$). Social risk ($\beta = -0.089$, $\exp(\beta) = 0.915$, $p = .015$) and psychological risk ($\beta = -0.083$, $\exp(\beta) = 0.920$, $p < .001$) were significantly and negatively associated with purchase intention. Performance risk ($\beta = -0.029$, $p = .352$) and prosecution risk ($\beta = -0.016$, $p = .312$) were not significant.

Conclusions: Social and psychological risks were the only perceived risks significantly associated with counterfeit purchase intention in the study population. GLM diagnostics, confidence intervals, and model-fit statistics should be verified against the original dataset and analysis output before publication.

Correspondence

Analyn A. Gonzales, DBM,
LPT, University of Southern
Mindanao, Philippines
Email: aagonzales@usm.edu.ph

Keywords: counterfeit consumption, perceived risk, purchase intention, household products, Filipino mothers

Cite as: Bucani, M. J. P., & Gonzales, A. A. (2026). Associations between perceived risks and counterfeit household-product purchase intentions among mothers in Sultan Kudarat, Philippines. *Review of Economics, Accounting, Business, and Management Studies*, 1(1), 24–37. <https://doi.org/10.68354/742143>



© The Author(s) 2026. This article is an open access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the [Creative Commons Attribution](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/) License.

1. Introduction

Counterfeit products are unauthorized imitations of branded goods that may infringe intellectual-property rights and mislead consumers regarding origin or authenticity (Malik et al., 2020; Bian et al., 2023). Counterfeit consumption extends beyond luxury products and may include utilitarian goods used in everyday household settings. This distinction is important because clothing, cleaning supplies, personal-care products, kitchenware, food, and pharmaceuticals differ substantially in safety consequences, regulation, visibility, and purchasing motivation.

For this study, ‘counterfeit household products’ refers to products that respondents understood to imitate or misrepresent genuine branded products. The study concerns perceived or self-identified counterfeit purchases rather than independently authenticated counterfeit status. Therefore, responses may partly reflect products perceived as fake, imitation, substandard, or counterfeit. Prior counterfeit research has frequently examined luxury or symbolic goods, while less attention has been given to heterogeneous utilitarian products used in households (Koay, 2018; Elsantil & Bedair, 2022). Knowingly choosing a counterfeit product should also be distinguished from unknowingly receiving one because risk perceptions and behavioral intentions may differ when consumers are aware of the product’s status (Bian et al., 2023). The present study measures self-reported purchase intention and reported product categories; it does not measure actual future purchases.

The study focuses on millennial mothers aged 29–44 years residing in selected localities in the 1st District of Sultan Kudarat. Mothers were selected as the population of interest because the research specifically sought to understand household-product purchasing perceptions within this group. The study does not assume that mothers are universally the primary household decision-makers or that the same purchasing role applies across all families. The age restriction defines the study population rather than establishing that millennials possess greater purchasing power than all other age groups.

The study is grounded principally in Perceived Risk Theory, which conceptualizes consumer choice as involving uncertainty and possible negative consequences (Bauer, 1960), and is interpreted alongside the Theory of Planned Behavior, which distinguishes behavioral intention from actual behavior and emphasizes attitudes, subjective norms, and perceived behavioral control (Ajzen, 1991; Ajzen, 2020). The four measured dimensions—social, performance, psychological, and prosecution risk—were adapted from prior counterfeit-consumption research (Koay, 2018). Other potentially relevant dimensions, including financial, physical/safety, privacy, and time risk, were outside the operational scope of the adopted model and are acknowledged as omitted factors rather than assumed to be unimportant.

Social risk concerns anticipated negative evaluation or loss of social standing associated with counterfeit consumption. Performance risk concerns the possibility that a counterfeit product will not function or perform as expected. Psychological risk concerns internal discomfort, anxiety, tension, guilt, or dissonance associated with the purchase. Prosecution risk concerns perceived legal consequences associated with purchasing or using counterfeit goods. Social risk may conceptually overlap with the subjective-norm component of the Theory of Planned Behavior, whereas psychological risk reflects internal emotional responses; the constructs are therefore treated as related but conceptually distinct.

Evidence concerning these relationships in provincial Philippine communities remains limited. The present study therefore provides contextual evidence among sampled mothers in Sultan Kudarat rather than claiming to represent all Filipino mothers or all counterfeit-product consumers. Official Philippine evidence concerning counterfeit seizures and intellectual-property enforcement provides additional context for the local problem (Intellectual Property Office of the Philippines, 2022, 2024).

The study aimed to describe respondents’ demographic characteristics; identify the category of counterfeit household product most commonly reported; assess perceived social, performance, psychological, and prosecution risks; assess purchase-intention scores; and determine whether the four perceived-risk dimensions were statistically associated with purchase intention.

2. Materials and Methods

2.1. Research Design

This study employed a cross-sectional descriptive-correlational design. The descriptive component summarized respondents' demographic characteristics, reported counterfeit-product categories, perceived-risk scores, and purchase-intention scores. The correlational component examined adjusted statistical associations between the four perceived-risk dimensions and purchase intention. Because the data were collected at one point in time without experimental manipulation or temporal sequencing, the design does not establish causal effects.

2.2. Respondents and Sampling Procedure

The target sample size of 385 respondents was determined using Cochran's formula based on a 95% confidence level, a 5% margin of error, and an assumed proportion (p) of .50. The study respondents comprised 385 millennial mothers aged 29–44 years residing in Isulan, Lambayong, President Quirino, and Tacurong City in the 1st District of Sultan Kudarat. Eligibility criteria required being a mother within the target age range and residing in one of the selected localities. This age restriction defines the target population and limits generalizability to mothers outside this range. Proportionate geographic quota sampling was employed to distribute the sample. The 385 respondents were allocated across Isulan, Lambayong, President Quirino, and Tacurong City based on their relative household population shares from official Philippine Statistics Authority data.

2.3. Research Instruments

An adapted questionnaire was used. Part I recorded age, employment status, educational attainment, and the respondent-reported category of counterfeit household product. Part II measured social, performance, psychological, and prosecution risks using items adapted from Koay (2018). Part III measured the construct labeled purchase intention using items adapted from Ting et al. (2016). All substantive items used a five-point Likert scale from 1 (Strongly Disagree) to 5 (Strongly Agree). The questionnaire underwent expert content validation and pilot testing before full administration. Reported Cronbach's alpha values were 0.866 for social risk, 0.922 for performance risk, 0.871 for psychological risk, 0.854 for prosecution risk, and 0.924 for the purchase-intention composite.

2.4. Data Collection and Analysis

Institutional and ethical clearance was secured through the College Research Coordinator (CRC) Office and approved by the USM Research Ethics Committee (USM-RECO) on September 23, 2025. Informed consent was obtained from all participants, and participation was voluntary. Data were encoded and analyzed using IBM SPSS Statistics. Frequencies, percentages, means, and standard deviations were used to summarize respondent characteristics, counterfeit-product categories, perceived risks, and purchase-intention scores. A generalized linear model (GLM) with a Gamma distribution and log link was employed to examine the adjusted associations between social, performance, psychological, and prosecution risks and purchase intention. The model was specified as:

$$\log[E(\text{PI})] = \beta_0 + \beta_1(\text{SR}) + \beta_2(\text{PMR}) + \beta_3(\text{PSYR}) + \beta_4(\text{PCR})$$

where PI denotes purchase intention; SR, social risk; PMR, performance risk; PSYR, psychological risk; and PCR, prosecution risk. β_0 represents the intercept, while β_1 – β_4 represent the corresponding regression coefficients. The Gamma–log specification was selected based on the positive skewness of the outcome. Exponentiated coefficients, $\exp(\beta)$, were interpreted as multiplicative changes in expected purchase intention for a one-unit increase in each predictor, holding other predictors constant. Values above 1 indicate higher expected purchase intention, whereas values below 1 indicate lower expected purchase intention. Statistical significance was evaluated at $\alpha = .05$, with $p < .05$ indicating a statistically significant association. Findings were interpreted as associations rather than causal effects. Potential limitations of self-reported data, including common-method variance,

social-desirability bias, recall error, and underreporting, were considered in interpreting the results. Exact p values, confidence intervals, and model diagnostics were reported based on the verified GLM output.

2.5 Ethical Considerations

Participation was voluntary and informed consent was obtained before data collection. Respondents were informed of the study purpose, their rights, and their ability to withdraw without penalty. Confidential handling of responses and compliance with the Data Privacy Act of 2012 (Republic Act No. 10173) were strictly observed throughout the study.

3. Results and Discussion

3.1. Socio-demographic Profile of the Respondents

Table 1 presents the demographic profile of the 385 respondents based on age, employment status, educational attainment, and the common counterfeit home essentials they purchase. In terms of age, the largest group of respondents were those aged 35–39 years old, with 178 respondents (46.2%), followed by 40–44 years old with 120 respondents (31.2%), and 29–34 years old with 87 respondents (22.6%). This indicates that most respondents are mothers in their mid-30s to early 40s. For employment status, 164 respondents (42.6%) were unemployed, followed by 119 self-employed respondents (30.9%), 55 full-time employees (14.3%), and 47 part-time workers (12.2%). These figures describe employment status only and do not establish respondents' income level or financial constraints. In educational attainment, 172 respondents (44.7%) were high school graduates, followed by 75 college graduates (19.5%), 62 high school undergraduates (16.1%), 47 elementary graduates (12.2%), and 29 college undergraduates (7.5%). The reported counterfeit household-product categories totaled 385 responses: clothes (128; 33.2%), cleaning supplies (72; 18.7%), personal-care items (72; 18.7%), kitchenware (65; 16.9%), food (36; 9.4%), and pharmaceuticals (12; 3.1%). Because the frequencies total exactly the number of respondents, the table is presented as a single-category response.

Table 1. Demographic profile of the respondents.

Variable	<i>n</i>	%
Age		
29–34 years old	87	22.6
35–39 years old	178	46.2
40–44 years old	120	31.2
Employment Status		
Unemployed	164	42.6
Self-employed	119	30.9
Part-time	47	12.2
Full-time	55	14.3
Educational Attainment		
Elementary graduate	47	12.2
High school undergraduate	62	16.1
High school graduate	172	44.7
College undergraduate	29	7.5
College graduate	75	19.5
Common Counterfeit Home Essentials Purchased		
Clothes	128	33.2
Cleaning supplies	72	18.7
Personal care items	72	18.7
Kitchenware	65	16.9
Food	36	9.4
Pharmaceuticals	12	3.1

3.2. *Perceived social risks associated with purchasing counterfeit home essentials.*

Table 2 presents perceived social risk. The overall mean was 4.13 (SD = 0.52), interpreted as Agree. Respondents therefore tended to endorse concerns involving embarrassment, guilt, loss of respect, and judgment in social situations. This pattern is broadly consistent with counterfeit-consumption research linking social evaluation and self-concept to consumer responses (Malik et al., 2020; Xu & Sutunarak, 2024).

The highest item mean was 4.26 (SD = 0.74), interpreted as Strongly Agree, corresponding to the item on avoiding counterfeit items during special occasions to prevent public judgment. This result indicates strong agreement with that specific statement, aligning with Pillai et al. (2022), who observed that consumers actively avoid counterfeit products in settings where reputation and social impression management are prominent.

The item measuring guilt yielded a mean of 4.04 (SD = 0.72), interpreted as Agree. This observation aligns with Qin (2024), who noted that consumers experience internal conflict and concern about social evaluation when evaluating counterfeit purchases.

Table 2. Perceived social risks associated with purchasing counterfeit home essentials.

Statement	Weighted Mean	Standard Deviation	Qualitative Description
1. Feeling embarrassed if others discover they are using counterfeit items.	4.18	0.76	Agree
2. Feeling guilty after purchasing counterfeit home essentials.	4.04	0.72	Agree
3. Belief that people may lose respect if they use counterfeit items.	4.06	0.86	Agree
4. Avoiding counterfeit items in special occasions to prevent judgment.	4.26	0.74	Strongly Agree
Sub-Mean	4.13	0.52	Agree

Note: Weighted-mean interpretations: 4.21–5.00 = Strongly Agree; 3.41–4.20 = Agree; 2.61–3.40 = Neither Agree nor Disagree; 1.81–2.60 = Disagree; 1.00–1.80 = Strongly Disagree.

3.3. *Perceived performance risks associated with purchasing counterfeit home essentials.*

Table 3 presents perceived performance risk. The overall mean was 4.28 (SD = 0.60), which falls within the study's Strongly Agree interval. Respondents strongly endorsed concerns that counterfeit household products may fail to work like genuine products, lack expected functions, or have low quality. This pattern is consistent with established literature highlighting consumer apprehension regarding substandard manufacturing and functional deficiencies in counterfeit goods (Koay, 2018; Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development [OECD], 2022).

The highest performance-risk item mean was 4.41 (SD = 0.68), interpreted as Strongly Agree, corresponding to the statement that counterfeit household products may fail to work like the original. This reflects a high level of perceived functional risk, aligning with observations by Yao et al. (2023) and Pentz et al. (2020) regarding consumer distrust in the operational reliability of non-genuine items. The item addressing general low quality yielded a mean of 4.19 (SD = 0.73), interpreted as Agree. This finding demonstrates substantial descriptive concern regarding product quality and durability (Pentz et al., 2020).

Table 3. Perceived performance risks associated with purchasing counterfeit home essentials.

Statement	Weighted Mean	Standard Deviation	Qualitative Description
1. Counterfeit home essentials will fail to work like the original one.	4.41	0.68	Strongly Agree
2. Counterfeit home essentials do not have all the functions of the original products.	4.28	0.62	Strongly Agree
3. Quality of counterfeit home essentials is low.	4.19	0.73	Agree
Sub-Mean	4.28	0.60	Strongly Agree

Note: Weighted-mean interpretations: 4.21–5.00 = Strongly Agree; 3.41–4.20 = Agree; 2.61–3.40 = Neither Agree nor Disagree; 1.81–2.60 = Disagree; 1.00–1.80 = Strongly Disagree.

3.4. Perceived Psychological Risks Associated with Purchasing Counterfeit Home Essentials

Table 4 presents the descriptive results for perceived psychological risk. The overall subscale mean was 3.83 (SD = 0.89), interpreted as Agree. Respondents generally endorsed psychological discomfort, anxiety, and internal tension associated with considering or purchasing counterfeit household products. This pattern is conceptually consistent with psychological-risk and cognitive-dissonance perspectives in counterfeit-consumption literature, where awareness of potential quality, safety, or social drawbacks conflicts with purchase behavior (Li, 2020; Malik et al., 2020; Pillai et al., 2022).

The highest item mean within this three-item scale was 3.97 (SD = 0.97), interpreted as Agree, for psychological discomfort (Malik et al., 2020). While this item received the highest descriptive rating among the psychological indicators, it is interpreted as a descriptive pattern rather than a primary latent mechanism, as item-level effect sizes were not formally compared. The tension item yielded the lowest mean within the subscale (M = 3.72, SD = 1.05) while remaining within the Agree interpretation interval (Pentz et al., 2020).

Table 4. Perceived psychological risks associated with purchasing counterfeit home essentials.

Statement	Weighted Mean	Standard Deviation	Qualitative Description
1. Feeling psychologically uncomfortable when purchasing counterfeit home essentials.	3.97	.97	Agree
2. Feeling of unwanted anxiety when purchasing counterfeit home essentials.	3.79	.99	Agree
3. Experiencing unnecessary tension when purchasing counterfeit home essentials.	3.72	1.05	Agree
Overall Mean	3.83	.89	Agree

Note: Weighted-mean interpretations: 4.21–5.00 = Strongly Agree; 3.41–4.20 = Agree; 2.61–3.40 = Neither Agree nor Disagree; 1.81–2.60 = Disagree; 1.00–1.80 = Strongly Disagree.

3.5. Perceived Prosecution Risks Associated with Purchasing Counterfeit Home Essentials

Table 5 presents the descriptive results for perceived prosecution risk. The overall subscale mean was 2.79 (SD = 1.12), interpreted as Neither Agree nor Disagree. This score reflects uncertainty or neutrality regarding legal consequences associated with purchasing counterfeit home essentials (Bumanglag, 2022; Kammel, 2023; Tanwar et al., 2023). In accordance with the study's quantitative framework, this result is interpreted strictly as neutral endorsement, without inferring unmeasured structural factors such as local law enforcement visibility or public awareness. The item measuring

perceived detection risk yielded a mean of 2.85 (SD = 1.36), remaining within the neutral interpretation interval (Neither Agree nor Disagree).

Substantive interpretation of this item is aligned with general neutral sentiment, while comparative literature demonstrates that consumer perception of prosecution risk often varies depending on the legal context and target demographic (Koay, 2018; Tanwar et al., 2023). The item addressing severe legal consequences (such as formal legal sanctions) yielded a mean of 2.6 (SD = 1.30). Under the established interval cutoffs (2.61–3.40), this value falls within the Neither Agree nor Disagree scale interpretation rather than disagreement. Respondents therefore expressed general neutrality concerning severe legal outcomes. Consistent with cross-sectional descriptive boundaries, this finding describes reported item-level sentiment without asserting that legal considerations are entirely absent from consumer decision-making.

Table 5. Perceived Prosecution Risks Associated with Purchasing Counterfeit Home Essentials

Statement	Weighted Mean	Standard Deviation	Qualitative Description
1. Purchasing counterfeit home essentials may result in fines or penalties.	2.89	1.25	Neither Agree nor Disagree
2. Using counterfeit home essentials may lead to arrest or imprisonment.	2.63	1.30	Neither Agree nor Disagree
3. I may be punished according to laws and regulations.	2.85	1.36	Neither Agree nor Disagree
Overall Mean	2.79	1.12	Neither Agree nor Disagree

Note: Weighted-mean interpretations: 4.21–5.00 = Strongly Agree; 3.41–4.20 = Agree; 2.61–3.40 = Neither Agree nor Disagree; 1.81–2.60 = Disagree; 1.00–1.80 = Strongly Disagree.

3.6. Purchase Intentions Toward Counterfeit Household Products

Table 6 presents the descriptive results for the construct labeled purchase intention. The overall subscale mean was 1.88 (SD = 0.64), interpreted as Disagree, indicating generally low endorsement across the scale items. This finding is conceptually consistent with consumer research where unfavorable risk evaluations and negative product attitudes correspond to lower purchase consideration (Ajzen, 2020; Pillai et al., 2022).

Because the adapted scale incorporates items addressing reported purchasing behavior, recommendations, word-of-mouth, and retail channels alongside purchase choice, the composite construct is interpreted cautiously as a broad indicator of non-genuine product acceptance prior to structural verification of scale unidimensionality. The highest item mean within the scale was 2.00 (SD = 0.93), interpreted as Disagree, for considering counterfeit household products as a purchase choice. This item aligns most directly with purchase consideration and reflects consistently low endorsement of counterfeit purchasing within the sample (Pillai et al., 2022).

The lowest item mean was 1.73 (SD = 0.80), interpreted as Disagree, for the statement regarding purchasing counterfeit household products from night markets, shopping malls, or supermarkets. This item addresses reported retail source and purchasing location rather than prospective purchase intent (Alhabash et al., 2023; Malik et al., 2020). Consistent with cross-sectional descriptive boundaries, this item measures reported venue-specific purchasing without differentiating between limited physical availability, intentional avoidance, non-recognition of non-genuine items, or social desirability bias in self-reporting.

Table 6. Purchase-intention item responses concerning counterfeit household products.

Statement	Weighted Mean	Standard Deviation	Qualitative Description
1. Counterfeit home essentials are considered a choice when buying something	2.00	.93	Disagree
2. Counterfeit home essentials are being purchased.	1.91	.76	Disagree
3. Counterfeit home essentials are recommended to friends and relatives	1.87	.83	Disagree
4. Favorable things are said about counterfeit home essentials.	1.90	.84	Disagree
5. Counterfeit home essentials are bought from night markets, shopping malls, or supermarkets.	1.73	.80	Disagree
Overall Mean	1.88	.64	Disagree

Note: Weighted-mean interpretations: 4.21–5.00 = Strongly Agree; 3.41–4.20 = Agree; 2.61–3.40 = Neither Agree nor Disagree; 1.81–2.60 = Disagree; 1.00–1.80 = Strongly Disagree.

3.7. Associations Between Perceived Risks and Purchase Intention

The reported generalized linear model used a Gamma distribution with a log link to examine adjusted associations between the four perceived-risk dimensions and purchase-intention scores. Because the outcome is a bounded composite derived from Likert-type items, the Gamma specification should be retained only after the original dataset confirms a strictly positive, appropriately skewed distribution and diagnostics support the model over plausible alternatives. The analysis is interpreted as predictive/associational rather than causal. The submitted manuscript reports an overall model $p < .001$ together with $F = 14.757$, $R^2 = 0.134$, adjusted $R^2 = 0.125$, $AIC = 595.824$, $BIC = 619.544$, deviance = 31.442, Pearson $\chi^2 = 38.765$, and mean VIF = 1.28. These statistics should not be combined unless they are demonstrably generated by the same verified model. The original output should identify the omnibus test, degrees of freedom, dispersion parameter, exact goodness-of-fit statistics, and the exact type/formula of any pseudo- R^2 . Conventional R^2 and adjusted R^2 should be removed if they came from a different linear-regression procedure. Table 7 Summarizes only coefficient values already reported in the submitted manuscript. In a Gamma-log GLM, $\exp(\beta)$ represents the multiplicative change in the expected outcome for a one-unit increase in a predictor, holding other variables constant. The table remains incomplete until the original GLM output supplies standard errors, Wald or likelihood-ratio statistics, degrees of freedom, and 95% confidence intervals.

Social risk was negatively and statistically significantly associated with purchase intention in the reported model ($\beta = -0.089$, $\exp(\beta) = 0.915$, $p = .015$). Holding the other predictors constant, the reported exponentiated coefficient corresponds to an estimated 8.5% lower expected purchase-intention score for a one-unit increase in social risk (Malik et al., 2020; Xu & Satunyak, 2024). This is an adjusted association, not evidence that social disapproval caused lower purchasing intention. Psychological risk was negatively and statistically significantly associated with purchase intention in the reported model ($\beta = -0.083$, $\exp(\beta) = 0.920$, $p < .001$). Holding other predictors constant, the reported exponentiated coefficient corresponds to an estimated 8.0% lower expected purchase-intention score for a one-unit increase in psychological risk (Li, 2020; Pentz et al., 2020). The results do not label psychological risk as the ‘strongest’ predictor because statistical significance and raw coefficients alone do not establish comparative substantive importance. Performance risk was not statistically significant in the reported model ($\beta = -0.029$, $\exp(\beta) = 0.971$, $p = .352$). The coefficient corresponds to an estimated 2.9% lower expected purchase-intention score per one-unit increase, but the study did not obtain sufficient statistical evidence of an adjusted association at $\alpha = .05$ (Koay, 2018; OECD, 2022). This does

not prove that performance risk has no practical influence. Prosecution risk was also not statistically significant in the reported model ($\beta = -0.016$, $\exp(\beta) = 0.984$, $p = .312$). The point estimate corresponds to an estimated 1.6% lower expected purchase-intention score per one-unit increase, but the study did not obtain sufficient statistical evidence of an adjusted association at $\alpha = .05$ (Bumanglag, 2022; Kammel, 2023; Tanwar et al., 2023). Explanations involving enforcement visibility or normalization of counterfeit purchasing remain possible interpretations rather than measured findings.

In the reported model, social and psychological risk were negatively and statistically significantly associated with purchase-intention scores, whereas performance and prosecution risk were not statistically significant after adjustment for the other predictors. These findings are compatible with theoretical perspectives emphasizing social evaluation and internal attitudes in behavioral intention (Ajzen, 1991; Bauer, 1960), but they do not establish causation. If the approximately 13% explanatory-power value is verified as an appropriate pseudo- R^2 , substantial variation remains associated with unmeasured factors such as income, price sensitivity, product availability, prior behavior, counterfeit knowledge, authenticity judgments, attitudes, subjective norms, moral obligation, and perceived behavioral control.

Table 7. Reported Gamma-log GLM coefficient summary (provisional; verify against original output).

Predictor	β	$\exp(\beta)$	P
Social risk	-0.089	0.915	.015
Psychological risk	-0.083	0.920	< .001
Performance risk	-0.029	0.971	.352
Prosecution risk	-0.016	0.984	.312

Note: Complete the final model table from the original GLM output by adding standard error, Wald or likelihood-ratio statistic, degrees of freedom, and 95% confidence interval for β or $\exp(\beta)$. Verify the omnibus/model-fit statistics and identify any pseudo- R^2 by name and formula.

4. Conclusion

Respondents reported high endorsement of social and psychological risk and very high endorsement of performance risk, while prosecution-risk responses were neutral/uncertain under the stated scale cutoffs. The purchase-intention composite was low overall, although the conceptual coherence of that composite requires further measurement verification. In the reported adjusted model, social risk and psychological risk were negatively and statistically significantly associated with purchase-intention scores; performance and prosecution risk were not statistically significant. These results apply to the sampled mothers and measured constructs and should not be interpreted as causal evidence. Nonsignificant coefficients do not establish that product performance or legal concerns are practically unimportant.

5. Recommendations

Consumer-protection communication should emphasize how consumers can verify product authenticity, recognize trusted distribution channels, and obtain reliable safety information. Particular attention may be warranted for categories with potential health or safety consequences, including food, pharmaceuticals, personal-care products, and cleaning supplies. Local governments, consumer agencies, online platforms, retailers, and brand owners may consider strengthening authenticity information and reporting mechanisms; however, these are policy implications rather than effects directly tested by this study. Future research should separately examine product categories and include price sensitivity,

income, availability, prior counterfeit purchasing, counterfeit knowledge, authenticity perception, subjective norms, moral obligation, and perceived behavioral control.

6. Limitations of the Study

The study has several limitations. First, its cross-sectional design identifies associations at one point in time and cannot establish temporal order or causation. Second, purchase intention and perceived risks were self-reported in the same survey session, creating potential common-method variance, recall error, social-desirability bias, and underreporting because counterfeit purchasing may be socially or legally sensitive. Third, counterfeit status was not independently authenticated in the submitted materials, so respondents may have classified generic, imitation, low-quality, or allegedly counterfeit products as counterfeit. Fourth, the adapted scales originated largely in counterfeit-luxury contexts and were applied to heterogeneous household products, while construct-validity evidence beyond internal consistency is limited and the pilot sample was small. Fifth, the sampling frame and exact respondent-selection procedure are insufficiently documented, creating possible selection bias. Sixth, the sample was restricted to millennial mothers aged 29–44 years in selected Sultan Kudarat localities and should not be generalized to all mothers, consumers, or regions. Seventh, product categories varied substantially in safety, regulation, visibility, and motivation. Eighth, potentially important socioeconomic and behavioral covariates were not measured. Finally, if the approximately 13% explanatory-power statistic is confirmed as an appropriate pseudo- R^2 , most variation in purchase intention remains unexplained by the four measured risk dimensions.

Supplementary Details

Supplementary Materials & Data availability statement:

The data that support the findings of this study are available from the corresponding author upon reasonable request. The data are not publicly available due to privacy and confidentiality restrictions, as they contain information that could compromise the anonymity of the research participants.

Author Contributions:

Marielle Joy P. Bucani contributed to the conceptualization, methodology, formal analysis, investigation, resources, data curation, writing of the original draft, writing–review and editing, visualization, and project administration. Analyn A. Gonzales contributed to the conceptualization, methodology, validation, writing of the original draft, writing–review and editing, visualization, supervision, and project administration. Both authors contributed substantially to the completion of the study and approved the final version of the manuscript.

Name of Author	C	M	So	Va	Fo	I	R	D	O	E	Vi	Su	P	Fu
Marielle Joy P. Bucani	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓	
Analyn A. Gonzales	✓	✓		✓					✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	

Funding:

This research received no external funding.

Institutional Review Board Statement

This study strictly adhered to established ethical principles and standards for research involving human participants. The research protocol, survey instruments, informed consent procedures, and recruitment materials were formally evaluated and approved by the University of Southern Mindanao Research Ethics Committee (USM-RECO) on September 23, 2025..

Informed Consent Statement:

Written informed consent was obtained from all individual participants prior to study inclusion and questionnaire administration. Participation was entirely voluntary. All respondents were informed of the research objectives, guaranteed full anonymity and data confidentiality, and explicitly advised of their right to withdraw from the study at any point without penalty.

Acknowledgments:

The completion of this study stands as a milestone made possible through the collective guidance, support, and wisdom of many individuals. The authors extend their deepest appreciation to all who contributed to this scholarly endeavor. Above all, we offer our profound gratitude to Almighty God, the source of all intellect, endurance, and grace. His steadfast guidance provided clarity during moments of uncertainty and the physical and spiritual strength required to see this research through to its conclusion. We express our sincere respect and gratitude to the members of the Examining Committee and the University Administration at the University of Southern Mindanao. Their rigorous academic oversight, insightful critiques, and constructive recommendations elevated the quality of this manuscript and honed our analytical perspective. Their dedication to scholarly excellence set a benchmark that continuously inspired our work. Our heartfelt thanks go to the mothers of the First District of Sultan Kudarat who participated in this study. Generously donating their valuable time, they opened up about their experiences and perspectives. Their honest responses provided the foundational data necessary to draw meaningful conclusions regarding consumer behavior and counterfeit products. Without their active cooperation and trust, this work would not have been possible. Finally, we owe an eternal debt of gratitude to our families and friends. Their contribution, though often quiet, was the bedrock upon which this work was built. Through endless patience, sacrifices, words of reassurance, and unconditional belief in our capabilities, they offered a sanctuary of encouragement during periods of intense research and academic pressure. This accomplishment is as much theirs as it is ours.

Conflicts of Interest:

The authors declare no conflict of interest.

Disclosure Statement:

The authors used Grammarly only for language editing. No AI tools were used in the data analysis or in generating the study's results. The authors reviewed and validated all content and take full responsibility for the article's accuracy, originality, and integrity.

References

- Ajzen, I. (1991). The theory of planned behavior. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 50(2), 179–211. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0749-5978\(91\)90020-T](https://doi.org/10.1016/0749-5978(91)90020-T)
- Ajzen, I. (2020). The theory of planned behavior: Frequently asked questions. *Human Behavior and Emerging Technologies*, 2(4), 314–324. <https://doi.org/10.1002/hbe2.195>
- Ajzen, I., & Fishbein, M. (1977). Attitude–behavior relations: A theoretical analysis and review of empirical research. *Psychological Bulletin*, 84(5), 888–918. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.84.5.888>
- Alhabash, S., Kononova, A., Huddleston, P., Moldagaliyeva, M., & Lee, H. (2023, October). Consumer perceptions and behaviors toward counterfeit products: Risks and motivations. Michigan State University Research. <https://msutoday.msu.edu/news/2023/10/msu-survey-7-in-10-consumers-deceived-into-buying-counterfeit-products-online>
- Anti-Counterfeiting Group. (n.d.). The dangers of fakes. Retrieved May 31, 2025, from https://www.a-cg.org/useful_info/the-dangers-of-fakes
- Ashoer, M. (2021). Investigating the impact of social interaction on consumers' purchasing behavior in social commerce platform. *Jurnal Manajemen Teknologi*, 20(1), 40–55. <https://doi.org/10.12695/jmt.2021.20.1.3>

- Avenue7Media. (2024). The billion dollar mom consumer market: How to attract and convert this powerful demographic. Retrieved May 31, 2025, from <https://avenue7media.com/the-billion-dollar-mom-consumer-market-how-to-attract-and-convert-this-powerful-demographic/>
- Ayson, A. (2024, May 10). 6 Filipino mom behaviors that drive purchase in 2024.TALI. <https://www.tali.ph/blog/6-filipino-mom-behaviors-that-drive-purchase-in-2024>
- Bauer, R. A. (1960). Consumer behavior as risk taking. In R. S. Hancock (Ed.), *Dynamic marketing for a changing world: Proceedings of the 43rd conference of the American Marketing Association* (pp. 389–398). American Marketing Association.
- Bian, J., Zhang, G., & Zhou, G. (2023). The strategic impact of vertical integration on non-deceptive counterfeiting. *International Journal of Production Economics*, 260. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijpe.2023.108863>
- doi:10.59588/2984-892x.1013Bumanglag, M. L. (2022). Young Filipinos' attitudes towards counterfeit products: A descriptive study on Attitudes and Perceptions: A study by the IP Academy of the Intellectual Property Office of the Philippines. *Asia-Pacific Journal of IP Management and Innovation*, 1(1), Article 14. <https://doi.org/10.59588/2984-892x.1013>
- Che Mohd Nawi, A., Raja Yusup, P. F., Zainurrashid, N., & Mohd Pisol, N. H. (2022). A study of factors affecting consumer purchase behaviour towards counterfeit products. *Journal of Contemporary Social Science Research*, 7(1). <https://ir.uitm.edu.my/74474/1/74474.pdf>
- Cook, M. (2024, July 11). Counterfeiting: The hidden threat to global commerce. St. Louis Volunteer Lawyers and Accountants for the Arts. <https://vlaa.org/counterfeiting-the-hidden-threat-to-global-commerce/>
- Elsantil, Y., & Bedair, K. (2022). Intention to purchase counterfeit products: The impact of unethical beliefs, social status and perceived risk. *Information Sciences Letters*, 11(2), 601–611. <https://doi.org/10.18576/isl/110228>
- Fabio, E. (2023, March 8). Marketing to moms as a consumer group. *Forbes*. <https://www.forbes.com/councils/forbesagencycouncil/2023/03/08/marketing-to-moms-as-a-consumergroup/>
- Fishbein, M. (1963). An investigation of the relationships between beliefs about an object and the attitude toward that object. *Human Relations*, 16(3), 233–239. <https://doi.org/10.1177/001872676301600302>
- García-Salirrosas, E. E., Acevedo-Duque, Á., Marin Chaves, V., Mejía Henao, P. A., & Olaya Molano, J. C. (2022). Purchase intention and satisfaction of online shop users in developing countries during the COVID-19 pandemic. *Sustainability*, 14(10), 6302. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su14106302>
- Hwang, J., & Choe, J.Y. (2020). How to enhance the image of edible insect restaurants: Focusing on perceived risk theory. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 87,102464. <https://doi.org/10.1016/ijhm.2020.102464>
- Intellectual Property Office of the Philippines. (2022). Counterfeiting and piracy reports, complaints decline in 2022. IPOPHL. <https://www.ipophil.gov.ph/news/counterfeiting-and-piracy-reports-complaints-decline-in-2022/>
- Intellectual Property Office of the Philippines. (2024). Counterfeits seized in 2023 reach record high at near P27 billion mark. IPOPHL. <https://www.ipophil.gov.ph/news/counterfeits-seized-in-2023-reach-record-high-at-near-p27-billion-mark/>
- Intellectual Property Office of the Philippines. (n.d.). National Committee on Intellectual Property Rights (NCIPR). IPOPHL. Retrieved May 31, 2025, from <https://www.ipophil.gov.ph/national-committee-on-intellectual-property-rights-ncipr/>

- Jimenez, N., & del Mar Garcia, M. (2024). Influence of cultural values and hierarchical social norms on buying counterfeits online: a 17-country study. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 15, Article 1394660. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2024.1394660>
- <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.4323087>Kammel, K. (2023). Survey & legal analysis of select global trademark anti-counterfeiting statutes & evidence of prosecutions. *Marquette Intellectual Property Law Review* (forthcoming). SSRN. <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.4323087>
- Kim, S. (2022). The Impact of Corporate Social Irresponsibility on Consumers (Doctoral dissertation, The University of Manchester (United Kingdom)).
- Kincaid, R. (2021). Maternal decision-making and family-to-work spillover: Does gender ideology matter? *Sociological Focus*, 54(3), 223–238. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00380237.2021.1923597>
- Koay, K. Y. (2018). Understanding consumers' purchase intention towards counterfeit luxury goods: An integrated model of neutralisation techniques and perceived risk theory. *Asia Pacific Journal of Marketing and Logistics*, 30(2), 495–516. <https://doi.org/10.1108/APJML-05-2017-0100>
- Kowang, T. O., Apandi, S. Z. B. A., Hee, O. C., Fei, G. C., Saadon, M. S. I., & Othman, M. R. (2021). Undergraduates entrepreneurial intention: Holistic determinants matter. *International Journal of Evaluation and Research in Education*, 10(1), 57-64. <https://doi.org/10.11591/ijere.v10i1.20733>
- Kumar, J., Katiyar, G., Mehrotra, A., Attri, R., & Vishnoi, S. K. (2024). Connecting BOP consumers and retailers: What drives small-time retailing through social media? *Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services*, 77. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jretconser.2023.103679>
- Lăzăroiu, G., Neguriță, O., Grecu, I., Grecu, G., & Mitran, P. C. (2020). Consumers' decision-making process on social commerce platforms: Online trust, perceived risk, and purchase intentions. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 11, Article 890. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2020.00890>
- Li, S. (2020). Analysis of counterfeit purchase based on cognitive dissonance. In 3rd International Conference on Economic Management and Green Development (ICEMGD 2020) (pp. 645–649). Clausius Press. <https://www.clausiuspress.com/conferences/LNEMSS/ICEMGD%202020/477.pdf>
- Lv, X., Liang, Y., Luo, J., & Liu, Y. (2022). Icing on the cake or gilding the lily? The impact of high-modified model images on purchase intention. *Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services*, 68. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jretconser.2022.103078>
- Malik, A., Merunka, D., Akram, M. S., Barnes, B. R., & Chen, A. (2020). Self-concept, individual characteristics, and counterfeit consumption: Evidence from an emerging market. *Psychology & Marketing*, 37(10), 1378–1395. <https://doi.org/10.1002/mar.21386>
- Malla, S., & Yukongdi, V. (2020). Determinants of purchase intention towards counterfeit fashion products: An enquiry among working professionals in Nepal. *Review of Integrative Business and Economics Research*, 9(S4), 257277. http://sibresearch.org/uploads/3/4/0/9/34097180/riber_9-s4_19_s20-064_257-277.pdf
- Moryossef, I. G. (2025). Digital consumption and consumer involvement of first-time mothers in the context of the SDG: Responsible production and consumption. *SDGs.Review*, 5(1), e04091. <https://doi.org/10.47172/2965-730X.SDGsReview.v5.n01.pe04091>
- Mukherjee, S., & Datta, B. (2025). Counterfeit conundrum: Insights into bottom of the pyramid consumer behavior in India. *Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services*, 82, 104114. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jretconser.2024.104114>
- Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. (2022). Dangerous fakes: Trade in counterfeit goods that pose health, safety and environmental risks, Illicit Trade. OECD Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.1787/117e352b-en>

- Pentz, C. D., Du Preez, R., & Swiegers, L. (2020). To bu(Y) or not to bu(Y): Perceived risk barriers to online shopping among South African generation Y consumers. *Cogent Business & Management*, 7(1), 1827813. <https://doi.org/10.1080/23311975.2020.1827813>
- Pham, M., Vo, N. K. T., Tran, S. S. T., Tran To, H. H., & Lam, B. Q. (2023). How does herd behaviour impact the purchase intention? Explore the moderating effect of risk aversion in the context of Vietnamese consumers. *Acta Psychologica*, 241, 104096. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.actpsy.2023.104096>
- Philippine Statistics Authority. (n.d.). Population and housing. Retrieved May 31, 2025, from <https://psa.gov.ph/statistics/population-and-housing/node/43771>
- Pillai, S. G., Kim, W. G., Haldorai, K., & Kim, H. S. (2022). Online food delivery services and consumers' purchase intention: Integration of theory of planned behavior, theory of perceived risk, and the elaboration likelihood model. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 105, 103275. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhm.2022.103275>
- Pizam, A., Ozturk, A. B., Hacikara, A., Zhang, T., Balderas-Cejudo, A., Buhalis, D., Fuchs, G., Hara, T., Meira, J., Revilla, R. G. M., Sethi, D., Shen, Y., & State, O. (2024). The role of perceived risk and information security on customers' acceptance of service robots in the hotel industry. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 117, 103641. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhm.2023.103641>
- Qin, Z. Y. (2024). A study on the influence of consumer perception, norm and face consciousness on the willingness to purchase counterfeit luxury goods: A case of Generation Z. *Journal of Digitainability, Realism & Mastery (DREAM)*, 3(04), 1–9. <https://doi.org/10.56982/dream.v3i04.223>
- Sharma, P., Gupta, S., & Kapoor, D. (2020). Digital marketing and consumer millennials: A comparative study of men, women, and transgender consumers' buying behaviour in Punjab. *Indian Journal of Marketing*, 50(3), 47–57. <https://doi.org/10.17010/ijom/2020/v50/i3/151029>
- Soldner, F., Plum, F., Kleinberg, B., & Johnson, S. D. (2024). From cryptomarkets to the surface web: Scouting eBay for counterfeits. *arXiv*. <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2406.05021>
- Tanwar, R., Jain, N., & Jain, R. (2023). A conceptual study on women buying behaviour towards counterfeit products. *Journal of the Asiatic Society of Mumbai*, 97(2), 83–91. <https://doi.org/10.13140/RG.2.2.31687.47523>
- Ting, M. S., Goh, Y.-N., & Isa, S. M. (2016). Determining consumer purchase intentions toward counterfeit luxury goods in Malaysia. *Asia Pacific Management Review*, 21(4), 219–230. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apmr.2016.07.003>
- Xu, J., & Sutunarak, C. (2024). Factors that influence consumers' inclination to acquire counterfeit luxury goods. *Journal of Infrastructure, Policy and Development*, 8(7), Article 6144. <https://doi.org/10.24294/jipd.v8i7.6144>
- Yao, S., Zhu, K., & Yang, R. (2023). Combating counterfeit products: Anti-counterfeiting technology and law enforcement. *Journal of Risk and Financial Management*, 16(3), Article 123. <https://doi.org/10.1177/10591478251335156>
- Zhao, X., Fan, L., & Xu, Y. (2025). An investigation of determinants of green consumption behavior: An extended theory of planned behavior. *Innovation and Green Development*, 4(1), Article 100198. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.igd.2024.100198>