



A study on consumer perception about soft drink products

Dr.S.G.Parekh

Assistant Professor, Faculty of Business Administration, Dharmsinh Desai University, Nadiad, Gujarat, India Email: sg_parekh@yahoo.com

Abstract: Most of the people use soft drink in their life frequently. In this paper it is tried to know choice of the people for flavour of soft drink, their favourite brand, their consideration about brand, and their opinion regarding packaging size of soft drink products. It is observed that many people drinks soft drink more than five times a week, more than 39% of people are interested in orange flavour. 46% of people give importance to particular brand. It is also observed that people's opinion is not much different about packaging of soft drink. In this paper SPSS is used for testing the different hypotheses.

Keywords: Brand choice, Chi-square, Consumer perception, Soft drink, SPSS.

INTRODUCTION

The first marketed soft drinks appeared in the 17th century as a mixture of water and lemon juice sweetened with honey. In 1676 the Compagnie de Limonadiers was formed in Paris and granted a monopoly for the sale of its products. In 1850 A manual hand & foot operated filling & corking device, first used for bottling soda water. 1876 Root beer mass produced for public sale. 1885 Charles Aderton invented "Dr Pepper" in Waco, Texas. 1886 Dr. John S. Pemberton invented "Coca-Cola" in Atlanta, Georgia. Soft drinks aren't just flavored carbonated beverages. "Soft Drink" refers to nearly all beverages that do not contain significant amounts of alcohol (hard drinks). The term "soft drink" though is now typically used exclusively for flavoured carbonated beverages. This is actually due to advertising. The oligopoly market structure is very apparent in the soft drink industry. Two large producers, Coke and Pepsi, maintain a dominant role in the industry. High barriers to entry prevent smaller firms from making a large impact. Pepsi's William C. Munro once confessed, "The soft drink is not a serious thing. No one need it".

Today, soft drinks have become a significant part of people. They have a frequent presence at our dinner tables, in snacks and in restaurants all over the world. Many researchers are working on soft drink products now a days. They have also studied about effect of soft drinks in the different market. Hansen, L. P. (1982) has studies large sample properties of generalized method of moments estimators with reference to soft drink products. McFadden, D. (1989) simulated moments for estimation of discrete response models without numerical integration. Pakes, A. and D. Pollard (1989) made study on simulation and the asymptotic of optimization estimators. In the carbonated soft drink industry Muris, et.al.(1992) have studied strategy and transaction costs. Hausman, J. A., G. K. Leonard and J. D. Zona (1994) have made competitive analysis with differentiated products. Walsh, J.W. (1995) observed about flexibility in consumer purchasing for uncertain future tastes. Keane, M.P. (1997)

studied modelling heterogeneity and state dependence in consumer choice behaviour. Hendel, I. (1999) has estimating multiple-discrete choice models on application to computerization returns.

OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

The following are the objectives of the study

1. To study the frequency of drinking soft drink during a week
2. To survey choice of people for flavour of cold drink
3. To study their favourite brand
4. To study the consideration of respondents for selecting brand
5. To study their opinion regarding packaging size of soft drink products.

HYPOTHESES

1. There is no association between consumption of soft drink and Gender.
2. There is no association between flavour of soft drink and Gender.
3. There is no association between importance of a particular brand of soft drink and Gender.
4. There is no association between favourite brand of soft drink and Gender.
5. There is no association between consideration of soft drink and Gender.
6. There is no association between size of soft drink and Gender.
7. There is no association between price of soft drink and Gender.
8. There is no association between package of soft drink and Gender.

SCOPE OF THE STUDY

The present study has been carried out at Nadiad town, Gujarat, for studying the perception of people about choice of flavour, favourite brand and their opinion regarding packaging size of soft drink products. Data is collected from different areas of Nadiad town.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Research Design	Descriptive in Nature
Sampling Frame	People who drink soft drink at Nadiad Town
Sampling Unit	People from different age groups, gender and locations
Sampling Size	500
Sampling Method	Convenience sampling
Nature of Data	Primary as well as secondary data were collected from respondents and journals and from previous research related to soft drink product.
Method of Data Collection	Personal interview with respondents
Type of Questionnaire	Structured questionnaire with suitable scaling.
Type of Questions	Open ended, closed ended, Likert scale and multiple choice questions.
Pre-testing of questionnaire	Pre-testing questionnaire was done among selected respondents on judgement basis and corrections were made in the questionnaire, wherever required.
Statistical tools used	Chi-square test

DATA ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION

Table 1: Frequency of drinking soft drink during a week

	Male	Female	Total	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Less than two times	122	113	235	47.0	47.0
Between 2 to 5 times	96	97	193	38.6	85.6
Above 5 times	39	33	72	14.4	100.0
Total	257	243	500	100.0	

From the above Table 1, it can be inferred that there are only 14.4 percentage people who are drinking soft drink more than five times a week. More people are interested in drinking soft drinks less than two times in a week.

Table 2: Regarding flavour of soft drink

	Male	Female	Total	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Cola	87	91	178	35.6	35.6
Orange	97	102	199	39.8	75.4
Mango	34	23	57	11.4	86.8
Lemon	32	21	53	10.6	97.4
Other	7	6	13	2.6	100.0
Total	257	243	500	100.0	

From the above Table 2, we can say that most favourite flavour of people is orange. More than 39% of people are interested in orange flavour.

Table 3: Importance of brand

	Male	Female	Total	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Very Much	129	104	233	46.6	46.6
Moderate	89	98	187	37.4	84.0
Low	39	41	80	16.0	100.0
Total	257	243	500	100.0	

From the above table 3, it is observed that more than 46% of people prefer a particular brand and 16% people are not interested in brand name.

Table 4: consideration while selecting a soft drink

	Male	Female	Total	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Brand Name	56	49	105	21.0	21.0
Availability	52	45	97	19.4	40.4
Taste	53	55	108	21.6	62.0
Advertisement	43	47	90	18.0	80.0
Price	53	47	100	20.0	100.0
Total	257	243	500	100.0	

From the above Table 4, it can be observed that most of the people consider taste and name of the soft drink. 18% people consider soft drink due to advertisement and 20% people consider price while purchasing soft drink.

Table 5: Regarding size of soft drink

	Male	Female	Total	Percent	Cumulative Percent
200ml	87	88	175	35.0	35.0
300ml	93	80	173	34.6	69.6
500ml	77	75	152	30.4	100.0
Total	257	243	500	100.0	

From the above Table 5, we can say that most of the people prefer 200ml or 300ml size of the soft drink.

Table 6: Regarding price of soft drink

	Male	Female	Total	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Rs. 10	51	61	112	22.4	22.4
Rs. 15	42	45	87	17.4	39.8
Rs. 20	71	44	115	23.0	62.8
Rs. 25	44	38	82	16.4	79.2
More than Rs. 25	49	55	104	20.8	100.0
Total	257	243	500	100.0	

From the above Table 6, we can observed that most people are in favour of normal price of cold drink that is Rs. 10 or Rs. 20.

Table 7: Regarding package of soft drink

	Male	Female	Total	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Glass Bottle	66	51	117	23.4	23.4
Can	58	66	124	24.8	48.2
Tetra pack	72	66	138	27.6	75.8
Take Home Pack	61	60	121	24.2	100.0
Total	257	243	500	100.0	

From the above Table 7, it can be inferred that people's opinion is not much different about Packaging of soft drink.

TESTING OF HYPOTHESIS

Hypothesis 1

H_0 : There is no association between consumption of soft drink and Gender.

H_1 : There is association between consumption of soft drink and Gender.

Table 8: Chi-Square Value

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	.458(a)	2	.795
Likelihood Ratio	.458	2	.795
Linear-by-Linear Association	.010	1	.922
N of Valid Cases	500		

Here P value is greater than 0.05 there for H_0 is accepted that is consumption of soft drink and gender are not associated.

Hypothesis 2

H_0 : There is no association between flavour of soft drink and Gender.

H_1 : There is association between flavour of soft drink and Gender.

Table 9: Chi-Square Value

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	4.310(a)	4	.366
Likelihood Ratio	4.336	4	.362
Linear-by-Linear Association	2.745	1	.098
N of Valid Cases	500		

Here P value is greater than 0.05 there for H_0 is accepted that is flavour of soft drink and gender are not associated.

Hypothesis 3

H_0 : There is no association between importance of a particular brand of soft drink and Gender.

H_1 : There is association between importance of a particular brand of soft drink and Gender.

Table 10: Chi-Square Value

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	2.776(a)	2	.250
Likelihood Ratio	2.779	2	.249
Linear-by-Linear Association	1.936	1	.164
N of Valid Cases	500		

Here P value is greater than 0.05 there for H_0 is accepted that is importance of a particular brand of soft drink and gender are not associated.

Hypothesis 4

H_0 : There is no association between favourite brand of soft drink and Gender.

H_1 : There is association between favourite brand of soft drink and Gender.

Table 11: Chi-Square Value

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	2.674(a)	2	.263
Likelihood Ratio	2.677	2	.262
Linear-by-Linear Association	.383	1	.536
N of Valid Cases	500		

Here P value is greater than 0.05 there for H_0 is accepted that is favourite brand of soft drink and gender are not associated.

Hypothesis 5

H_0 : There is no association between consideration of soft drink and Gender.

H_1 : There is association between consideration of soft drink and Gender.

Table 12: Chi-Square Value

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	1.156(a)	4	.885
Likelihood Ratio	1.156	4	.885
Linear-by-Linear Association	.156	1	.693
N of Valid Cases	500		

Here P value is greater than 0.05 there for H_0 is accepted that is consideration of soft drink and gender are not associated.

Hypothesis 6

H_0 : There is no association between size of soft drink and Gender.

H_1 : There is association between size of soft drink and Gender.

Table 13: Chi-Square Value

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	.617(a)	2	.734
Likelihood Ratio	.618	2	.734
Linear-by-Linear Association	.041	1	.840
N of Valid Cases	500		

Here P value is greater than 0.05 there for H_0 is accepted that is size of soft drink and gender are not associated.

Hypothesis 7

H_0 : There is no association between reasonable price of soft drink and Gender.

H_1 : There is association between reasonable price of soft drink and Gender.

Table 14: Chi-Square Value

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	7.735(a)	4	.102
Likelihood Ratio	7.790	4	.100
Linear-by-Linear Association	.299	1	.584
N of Valid Cases	500		

Here P value is greater than 0.05 there for H_0 is accepted that is reasonable price of soft drink and gender are not associated.

Hypothesis 8

H_0 : There is no association between package of soft drink and Gender.

H_1 : There is association between package of soft drink and Gender.

Table 15: Chi-Square Value

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	2.318(a)	3	.509
Likelihood Ratio	2.322	3	.508
Linear-by-Linear Association	.343	1	.558
N of Valid Cases	500		

Here P value is greater than 0.05 there for H_0 is accepted that is package of soft drink and gender are not associated.

FINDINGS OF THE RESEARCH STUDY:

The present study was conducted with the purpose of understanding the choice of the people of Nadiad town about flavour, consideration about brand, and their opinion regarding **packaging** size of soft drink products. It is observed that many people drinks soft drink more than five times a week, more than 39% of people are interested in orange flavour. 46% of people give importance to particular brand while purchasing soft drink. Only 16% people are not interested in brand name. Most of the people consider brand name and taste of soft drink, while 20% people consider price while purchasing soft drink. It is also observed that most of the people prefer 200ml

or 300ml size of the soft drink. Rs. 10 or Rs. 20 are affordable for soft drink. Regarding packaging people's opinion is not much different.

References

- [1] Hansen, L. P. (1982). "Large Sample Properties of Generalized Method of Moments Estimators." *Econometrica*, 50, 1092-1054.
- [2] Hausman, J. A., G. K. Leonard and J. D. Zona (1994). "Competitive Analysis with Differentiated Products." *Annales de l'Institut de Statistique*, 0, 159-80.
- [3] Hendel, I. (1999). "Estimating Multiple-Discrete Choice Models: An Application to Computerization Returns." *Review of Economic Studies*, 66, 423-446.
- [4] Keane, M.P. (1997), "Modeling Heterogeneity and State Dependence in Consumer Choice Behavior." *Journal of Business and Economic Statistics*, 15, 310-27.
- [5] McFadden, D. (1989). "A Method of Simulated Moments for Estimation of Discrete Response Models without Numerical Integration." *Econometrica*, 57, 995-1026.
- [6] Muris, T.J., D.T. Scheffman and P. T. Spiller (1992). "Strategy and Transaction Costs: The Organization of Distribution in the Carbonated Soft Drink Industry." *Journal of Economics and Management Strategy*, 1, 83-128.
- [7] Pakes, A. and D. Pollard (1989). "Simulation and the Asymptotics of Optimization Estimators." *Econometrica*, 57, 1027-57.
- [8] Walsh, J.W. (1995), "Flexibility in Consumer Purchasing for Uncertain Future Tastes." *Marketing Sciences*, 14, 148-165.
- [9] <http://www.beveragedigest.com>> data & statistics.
- [10] <http://www.businessweek.com>