CONSUMER PERCEPTION WITH REFERENCE TO PODARAN SOFT DRINKS (P) LTD , TIRUPUR DISTRICT

*A.JOHN WILLIAM ** E.GOVINDARAJ *** S.NAGAMANI

*Assistant Professor, Department of MBA, Karpagam College of Engineering, Coimbatore
**II-MBA, Department of Management Studies, Karpagam College of Engineering, Coimbatore
***Assistant Professor, Department of MBA, EASA College of Engineering, Coimbatore

ABSTRACT

The Study focused towards the consumer perception of podaran soft drinks the study was conducted in tirupur district since it was unknown population a sample of 384 respondents were questioned using a structured questionnaire method and the research is basically descriptive in nature further the study portray the factors and its impact and the reasons for the caused were analyzed in the study

Key Works: Consumer perception, Podaran soft drink ,descriptive study , 384 respondents

INTRODUCTION

The 50-bn-rupee soft drink industry is growing now at 6 to 7% annually. In India, Coke and Pepsi have a combined market share of around 95% directly or through franchisees. Cola has a 1% share, and the rest is divided among local players. Industry watchers say, fake products also account for a good share of the balance. There are about 110 soft drink producing units in the country, employing about 125,000 people. There are two distinct segments of the market, cola and non-cola drinks. The cola segment claims a share of 62%, while the non-cola segment includes soda, clear lime, cloudy lime and drinks with orange and mango flavor.

REVIEW OF LITERACTURE:

Olson and Reynolds (1983), concrete attributes refer to the product that can be represented as a "distinct" material form, whereas abstract attributes refer to the product that can be represented for its "indistinct" qualities. And features can be easily observed, dissected, engaged and understood by the consumers while "indistinct" product qualities are less tangible and cannot be easily dissected and understood.

Beach-Larsen and neielsen (1999) defined concrete attributes as the visible characteristics of the product including extrinstic cues whereas abstract attributes were defined as characteristics that cannot be judged prior to experiential use of the product additionally, abstract attributes are often highly correlated to "psychological" consequences such as social status and self-identity while concrete attributes are more related to "functional" consequences such as performance.

Garvin (1983) discusses product –based quality. Product – based quality refers to amounts of specific attributes or ingredients of a product. Manufacturing – based quality involves conformance to manufacturing specifications or service standards. In the prevailing. Japanese philosophy, quality means "zero defects – doing it right the first time." Conformance to requirements and incidence of internal and external failures are other definitions that illustrate manufacturing – oriented notions of quality.

Monroe and Krishnan (1985) content that most past price – perceived quality research has been exploratory and has not succeeded in resolving the question of when price is used to infer quality. Contingencies affecting the use of price as a quality indicator fit into thee groups: informational factor, individual factors, and product category factors. The first category of factors believed to affect the price-perceived quality relationship consists of other information available to the consumer. When intrinsic cues to quality are readily accessible, when brand names provide evidence of a company's reputation, or when level of advertising communicates the company's belief in the brand, the consumer may prefer to use those cues instead of price. Several individual difference factor may account for the variation in the use of price as a quality signal.

STATEMENT OF PROBLEM:
1. Lacks in purchase duration
2. Awareness among the customer
3. Pricing decision

OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY:
1. To study the factors influencing consumer perception
2. To analyze the variations its purchase duration
3. To analyze the causes for lack in awareness
4. To investigate the pricing variations

ANOVA
TABLE-1
WHAT FLAVOUR TO YOU LIKE AND FAVOURITE PRODUCT LINE

H_0= There is no relationship between flavour to you like the respondents and favourite product line

Product line / Flavour	Mango drink	Panner soda	Lemon flavour	Orange flavour	Total
Orange flavour	52	62	0	38	152
Lemon flavour	34	60	14	10	118
Mango drink	34	4	36	10	84
Mixed fruit	0	10	18	2	30
Total	120	136	68	60	384

H_1= There is a relationship between flavour to you like the respondents and favourite product line

Correction factor = T^2/n

$= 384^2/16$

$= 147456/16$

$= 9216.$

Total sum of square (TSS) $= \sum\sum X_{ij}^2 - T^2/n$

$= (2704+1156+0+3844+3600+16+100+0+289+1296+324+ 1444+100+100+4)$

$= 14977 - 9216$

$= 5761$

Column sum of squares (CSS) $= \sum T_j^2/n_j - T^2/n$

$= [14400/4+18496/4+4624/4+3600/4]$

$= 10280$

$= 10280 - 9216 \quad = 1064$

Row sum of square (RSS) $= \sum T_i^2/n_i - T^2/n$

$= [152/4+118/4+84/4+30/4]$

$= 11246 - 9216$

$= 2030$

Residual sum of square = TSS-CSS-RSS = 5761-1064-2030 = 2067

SOURCE OF VARIANCE	SUM OF SQUARE	DEGREE OF FREEDOM	MEAN SUM OF SQUARE	F-RATIO
BETWEEN COLOMN	1064	3	354.6	1.544
BETWEEN ROW	2030	3	676.6	
RESIDUALS	2067	9	229.6	2.946
TOTAL	5161	15		

INFERENCE:
No. of rows: 4 No. of columns: 4
Degree of freedom = (4-1)(4-1)=3
Table value=3.86, calculated value=1.544
Table value=3.86, calculated value=2.946
From the above calculation it is clear that calculated value is (1.544) < tabulated value(3.86). So there is no relationship between factors for product line and flavour. Hence Null Hypothesis H0 is accepted.
From the above calculation it is clear that calculated value is (2.946) < tabulated value(3.86). So there is no relationship between factors for product line and flavour. Hence Null Hypothesis H0 is accepted.

PURPOSE OF DRINKING AND WHAT FLAVOUR DO YOU LIKE

H_0=There is no relationship between Purpose of drinking the respondents and What flavour do you like
H_1=There is a relationship between Purpose of drinking the respondents and What flavour do you like
Correction factor = T^2/n   Column sum of squares (CSS) =$\sum T_j^2 /n_j - T^2$/n

Purpose of drinking / Flavour do you like	Taste	Thrist	Freshness	I do not drink soda	Total
Orange flavor	52	30	40	0	122
Lemon flavor	52	34	42	10	138
Mango drink	16	6	40	4	66
Mixed fruit	20	18	18	2	58
Total	140	88	140	16	384

=384^2/16   = [19600/4+7744/4+19600/4+256/4]
=147456/16 = 2584   =11800   = 11800-9216   =9216.
Total sum of square (TSS) =$\sum\sum X_{ij}^2 - T^2$/n   Residual sum of square = TSS-CSS-RSS
=(2704+2704+256+400+900+1156+36+324+1600+   = 4672-2584-1007   = 1081
1764+1600+324+0+100+16+4) = 13888-9216
   =4672 = [122/4+138/4+66/4+58/4] = 10223-9216 = 1007

SOURCE OF VARIANCE	SUM OF SQUARE	DEGREE OF FREEDOM	MEAN SUM OF SQUARE	F-RATIO
BETWEEN COLOMN	2584	3	861.3	7.117
BETWEEN ROW	1007	3	335.6	
RESIDUALS	1081	9	120.1	2.794
TOTAL	4672	15		

INFERENCE:
No. of rows: 4 No. of columns: 4
Degree of freedom = (4-1)(4-1)=3
Table value=3.86, calculated value=7.117
Table value=3.86, calculated value=2.794
From the above calculation it is clear that calculated value is (7.117) > tabulated value(3.86). So there is relationship between factors purpose of drink and what flavor you like. Hence Null Hypothesis H0 is Rejected.
From the above calculation it is clear that calculated value is (2.794) < tabulated value(3.86). So there is no relationship between factors purpose of drink and what flavor you like. Hence Null Hypothesis H0 is accepted.

PERIOD OF CONSUMPTION AND QUANTITY OF PURCHASE

H_0= There is no relationship between Do you consume Podaran soft drinks generally prefer pack size of the respondents
H_1= There is a relationship between Do you consume Podaran soft drinks generally prefer pack size of the respondents

How do you Consume / Pack size prefer	Once in a week	Twice in a week	Occasionally	Daily	Total
200 ml	56	52	30	14	152
300 ml	46	72	14	6	138
500 ml	10	38	14	10	72
1 ltr	4	10	6	2	22
Total	116	172	64	32	384

CALCULATION:

Correction factor = T^2/n Column sum of squares (CSS) = $\sum T_j^2/n_j - T^2/n$

         $= 384^2/16$ $= [13456/4+29584/4+4096/4+1024/4]$

         $=147456/16$ $=12040$

         $=9216.$ $= 12040-9216$ $= 2824$

Total sum of square (TSS) = $\sum\sum X_{ij}^2 - T^2/n$

         $=(3136+2116+100+16+2704+5184+1444+100+900+196+196+$

           $+36+196+36+100+4)$

        $= 16464-9216$

        $= 7248$

Row sum of square (RSS) = $\sum T_i^2/n_i - T^2/n$ Residual sum of square = TSS-CSS-RSS

        $= [23104/4+19044/4+5184/4+484/4]$ $= 7248-2824-2738$

        $= 11954-9216$ $= 1686$

        $= 2738$

SOURCE OF VARIANCE	SUM OF SQUARE	DEGREE OF FREEDOM	MEAN SUM OF SQUARE	F-RATIO
BETWEEN COLOMN	2824	3	941.3	5.025
BETWEEN ROW	2738	3	912.6	
RESIDUALS	1686	9	187.3	4.872
TOTAL	7248	15		

INFERENCE:

No. of rows: 4 No. of columns: 4

Degree of freedom = (4-1) (4-1)=3

Table value=3.86, calculated value=5.025

Table value=3.86, calculated value=4.872

From the above calculation it is clear that calculated value is (5.025) > tabulated value(3.86). So there is relationship between factors consume podaran soft drinks and generally prefer pack size. Hence Null Hypothesis H0 is rejected.

From the above calculation it is clear that calculated value is (4.872) > tabulated value(3.86). So there is relationship between factors consume podaran soft drinks and generally prefer pack size. Hence Null Hypothesis H0 is rejected.

TABLE - 4

OPINION ABOUT PRICE OF THE RESPONDENTS AND DO YOU CONSUME PODARAN SOFT DRINKS

H0=There is no relationship between Opinion about price of the respondents And Do you consume Podaran soft drinks

H1=There is a relationship between Opinion about price of the respondents And Do you consume Podaran soft drinks

Opinion about price / How do you Consume	Satisfied	Highly satisfied	Dis satisfied	Neither satisfied nor dis satisfied	Total
Once in a week	50	38	20	6	114
Twice in a week	74	68	20	8	170
Occasionally	28	20	10	8	66
Daily	14	18	2	0	34
Total	166	144	52	22	384

Correction factor = T^2/n

$= 384^2/16$

$= 147456/16$

$= 9216.$

Column sum of squares (CSS) $= \sum T_j^2/n_j - T^2/n$

$= [27556/4 + 20736/4 + 2704/4 + 484/4]$

$= 12870$

$= 12870 - 9216 \qquad = 3654$

Total sum of square (TSS) $= \sum\sum X_{ij}^2 - T^2/n$

$= (2500 + 5476 + 784 + 196 + 1444 + 4624 + 400 + 324 + 400 + 400 + 100 +$

$+ 4 + 36 + 64 + 64 + 0) \qquad = 16816 - 9216$

$= 7600$

Row sum of square (RSS) $= \sum T_i^2/n_i - T^2/n$

$= [12996/4 + 28900/4 + 4356/4 + 1156/4]$

$= 11852 - 9216$

$= 2636$

Residual sum of square = TSS-CSS-RSS

$= 7600 - 3654 - 2636$

$= 1310$

SOURCE OF VARIANCE	SUM OF SQUARE	DEGREE OF FREEDOM	MEAN SUM OF SQUARE	F-RATIO
BETWEEN COLOMN	3654	3	1218	8.371
BETWEEN ROW	2636	3	878.6	
RESIDUALS	1310	9	145.5	
TOTAL	7600	15		6.038

INFERENCE:

No. of rows: 4 No. of columns: 4
Degree of freedom = (4-1)(4-1)=3
Table value=3.86, calculated value= 8.371
Table value=3.86, calculated value= 6.308
From the above anova table it was found that between column and have significant there is no relationship between the opinion about the price and do you consume podaran soft drinks calculated value (8.371) is greather than the table value (3.86) as significance level H0 null hypothesis is accepted.

From the above anova table it was found that between row and have significant there is no relationship there is no relationship between the opinion about the price and do you consume podaran soft drinks since the calculated value (6.038) is greather than the table value (3.86) as significance level H0 null hypothesis is accepted.

OVER ALL SATISFACTION AND PURPOSE OF DRINKING

H_0=There is no relationship between Over all satisfaction And Purpose of drinking
H_1=There is a relationship between Over all satisfaction And Purpose of drinking

Over all satisfaction / Purpose of drinking	Highly Satisfied	Satisfied	Highly dissatisfied	Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	Total
Taste	76	64	6	0	146
Thirst	30	48	0	10	88
Freshness	60	60	4	6	130
I do not drink soda	2	16	2	0	20
Total	168	188	12	16	384

Correction factor = T^2/n Column sum of squares (CSS) = $\sum T_j^2/n_j - T^2/n$

$=384^2/16$ = [28224/4+35344/4+144/4+256/4]

$=147456/16$ = 15992   = 15992-9216

$=9216$ = 6776

Total sum of square (TSS) = $\sum\sum X_{ij}^2 - T^2/n$ Row sum of square (RSS) = $\sum T_i^2/n_i - T^2/n$

=(5776+900+3600+4+4096+2304+3600+256+36+0+16+4+   = [21316/4+7744/4+16900/4+400/4]

0+100+36+0)   = 20728-9216   = 11590-9216 = 2374

              = 11512   Residual sum of square = TSS-CSS-RSS

              = 11512-6776-2374   = 2362

SOURCE OF VARIANCE	SUM OF SQUARE	DEGREE OF FREEDOM	MEAN SUM OF SQUARE	F-RATIO
BETWEEN COLOMN	6776	3	2258.6	8.607
BETWEEN ROW	2374	3	793	
RESIDUALS	2362	9	262.4	
TOTAL	11512	15		3.022

INFERENCE:

No. of rows: 4 No. of columns: 4

Degree of freedom = (4-1)(4-1)=3

Table value=3.86, calculated value= 3.022

Table value=3.86, calculated value= 8.607

From the above anova table it was found that between column and have significant there is no relationship between the over all satisfaction and purpose of drinking since the calculated value (8.607) is greather than the table value (3.86) as significance level H0 null hypothesis is aaccepted

From the above anova table it was found that between column and have significant there is relationship between the over all satisfaction and purpose of drinking drinks since the calculated value (3.022) is Less than the table value (3.86) as significance level H0 null hypothesis is Rejected

ANOVA

❖ From the anova it is clear that calculated value is (1.544) < tabulated value(3.86). So there is relationship between factors for product line and flavour. Hence Null Hypothesis H0 is Rejected.
❖ From the above calculation it is clear that calculated value is (2.946) < tabulated value(3.86). So there is relationship between factors for product line and flavour. Hence Null Hypothesis H0 is Rejected
❖ .From the anova table it was found that between column and have significant there is no relationship between the purpose of drinking and what flavour do you like. calculated value (7.117) is greather than the table value (3.86) as significance level H0 null hypothesis is accepted
❖ From the anova table it was found that between Row and have significant there is relationship between the purpose of drinking and what flavour do you like calculated value (2.794) is Less than the table value (3.86) as significance level H0 null hypothesis is Rejected.
❖ From the anova table it was found that between column and have significant relationship since there is no relationship between consume podaran soft drinks and generally prefer the size the calculated value (5.025) is greather than the table value (3.86) as significance level H0 null hypothesis is accepted.
❖ From the anova table it was found that between row and have significant relationship since there is no relationship between consume podaran soft drinks and generally prefer the size the calculated value (4.872) is greather than the table value (3.86) as significance level a H0 null hypothesis is accepted

❖ From the anova table it was found that between column and have significant there is no relationship between the opinion about the price and do you consume podaran soft drinks calculated value (8.371) is greather than the table value (3.86) as significance level H0 null hypothesis is accepted.
❖ From the above anova table it was found that between row and have significant there is no relationship there is no relationship between the opinion about the price and do you consume podaran soft drinks since the calculated value 6.038 is greather than the table value (3.86) as significance level H0 null hypothesis is accepted.

❖ From the anova table it was found that between column and have significant there is no relationship between the over all satisfaction and purpose of drinking since the calculated value (8.607) is greather than the table value (3.86) as significance level H0 null hypothesis is accepted.

❖ From the anova table it was found that between column and have significant there is relationship between the over all satisfaction and purpose of drinking drinks since the calculated value (3.022) is Less than the table value (3.86) as significance level H0 null hypothesis is Rejected.

Conclusion

The study focuses to identify the consumer perception towards soft drinks. Since there are huge player in the market like coca cola, pepsi and there are soft drinks players who highly dominates the domestic market against the international brands so good promotional strategy and a proper consumer retention. May support the company to achieve their regular targets considering the factor urther in todays business scenario the many soft drink industry's migrated to another business in such case proper understanding of consumer perception will certainly support the firm to standartized their in product in the market.

References

❖ Olson, J.C (1997) price as an information cue: effects in product evaluation, in consumer and industrial buying behavior woodside, A.G., Sheth, J.N., And bennet, P.D. (eds.), New York : North Holland Publishing Company, 267-86

❖ Bech –Larsen, T. and Neilsen N.A.(1999) .A comparison of five elicitation techniques for elicitation of attributes of low involvement products, Journal of Economic psychology, 20(3): 315-341

❖ Garvin David A.(1983) "Quality of the line," Harvard business review, 61
   (1987) "competing on the eight dimensions of quality," Harvard business review,65

❖ Monroe, kent B, and R, Krishnan (1985), "The effect of price on subjective product evaluations," in perceived quality. J.Jacoby and J. Olson eds. Lexington MA: Lexington Books,209-32

❖ Myers , J.H. and Shocker, A.D. (1981) the nature of product –related attributes, research in marketing, 5:211-236.