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## OBJECTIVES

- To analyze the consumers brand preferences for Chocolates
- To evaluate consumers attitude towards the usage of Chocolates
- To evaluate consumers perception about the important factors pertaining to Chocolates purchase decision


## HYPOTHESES

- Sales of different brand of Chocolates are uniformly distributed i.e. there is no significant difference in the sales of different Chocolates brands.
- There is no significant difference among the consumers of Chocolates on the factors like age, gender etc towards their attitude about the usage of chocolate.
- Different factors which are important in the purchase decision of Chocolates for consumers do not differ significantly.
- There is no significant difference in the ranking of different chocolate brands by consumers


## HYPOTHESIS (1)

## To test hypothesis 1, chi square test was applied.

| Brand | Count |
| :---: | :---: |
| Cadbury | 51 |
| Nestle | 23 |
| Amul | 17 |
| Total | $\mathbf{1 0 1}$ |

- Chi square value $($ calculated $)=\mathbf{2 1 . 7 1}$
- Critical Chi square value $(0.05,2)=5.995$
- Chi square value (calculated) is greater than critical chi square value, hence hypothesis 1 is rejected and it can be concluded that sales of different brand of chocolates are not uniformly distributed


## HYPOTHESIS (2)

Hypothesis 2 (a): Consumers of the different age group do not differ significantly on their attitude towards consumption of chocolates.

To test this hypothesis ANOVA was applied with following results.

## Anova Single Factor

| Groups | Count | Sum | Average | Variance |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Under 18-25 | 59 | 3443 | 58.35593 | 32.26768 |
| $\mathbf{2 6 - 3 5}$ | 19 | 1059 | 55.73684 | 26.539801 |
| $\mathbf{3 6 - 4 5}$ | 9 | 498 | 55.3333 | 40.5 |
| $\mathbf{4 6 - 5 5}$ | 7 | 398 | 56.85714 | 104.8095 |

Anova

| Source of <br> Variation | $\underline{\text { SS }}$ | $\underline{\text { Df }}$ | $\underline{\text { F }}$ | $\underline{\text { P-value }}$ | F-crit. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Between <br> Groups | 146.9119 | 3 | 1.334727 | 0.268099 | 2.705838 |
| Within Groups | 3302.067 | 90 |  |  |  |
| Total | 3448.979 | 93 |  |  |  |

Since $F$ calculated is less than $F$ critical at $95 \%$ significance level, hence Null hypothesis is accepted. So, it can be concluded that consumes of the different age group do not differ significantly on their attitude towards consumption of chocolates.

Hypothesis 2 (b): Male and female consumers do not differ significantly in their attitude towards consumption of chocolate

To test this hypothesis $z$ test was applied with following results

|  | Mean | $\underline{\underline{n}}$ | $\underline{\text { Z value }}$ | $\underline{\text { Z-critical }}$ | Result |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Male | 57 | 49 | -0.706 | 1.95 | Insignificant |
| Female | 57.88 | 45 |  |  | Accept the <br> null <br> hypothesis |

Since the calculated z value is less than z critical (two tailed) at .05 significance level, hence null hypothesis is accepted and it can be said that there is no significant difference in the attitude of male and female consumers on their attitude towards consumption of chocolates

Hypothesis 2 (c): Married and unmarried consumers do not differ significantly in their attitude towards consumption of chocolate.

To test this hypothesis z test was applied with following results

|  | $\underline{\text { Mean }}$ | $\underline{\mathbf{N}}$ | $\underline{\mathbf{Z} \text { value }}$ | $\underline{\mathbf{Z} \text { critical }}$ | $\underline{\text { Result }}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Married | 56.61 | 36 | -0.99 | 1.95 | Insignificant |
| Unmarried | 57.93 | 58 |  |  | Accept the <br> null <br> hypothesis |

Since the calculated z value is less than z critical (two tailed) at $\mathbf{. 0 5}$ significance level, hence null hypothesis is accepted and it can be said that there is no significant difference in the attitude of married and unmarried consumers on their attitude towards consumption of chocolates

## HYPOTHESIS (3)

Different factors which are important in the purchase decision of Chocolates for consumers do not differ significantly

To test this hypothesis ANOVA was applied with following results

## Anova Single Factor

| Groups | Count | Sum | Average | Variance |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Price | 94 | 394 | 4.191489 | 0.737131 |
| Brand | 94 | 420 | 4.468085 | 0.509723 |
| Taste | 94 | 421 | 4.478723 | 0.617822 |
| Package Design | 94 | 353 | 3.755319 | 1.004004 |


| ANOVA |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Source of |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Variation | $\underline{\text { SS }}$ | $\underline{\text { df }}$ | MS | $\underline{\text { F }}$ | P-value | $\underline{\text { F crit }}$ |
| Between <br> Groups | 32.44681 | 3 | 10.8156 | 15.08095 | $2.78 \mathrm{E}-09$ | 2.628903 |
| Within <br> Groups | 266.7872 | 372 | 0.71717 |  |  |  |

Total $299.234 \quad 375$
Since F calculated is greater than F critical at $\mathbf{9 5 \%}$ significance level,
hence Null hypothesis is rejected.

So, it can be concluded that different factors which are important in the purchase decision of Chocolates for consumers differ significantly

## HYPOTHESIS (4)

There is no significant difference in the ranking of different chocolate brands by consumers.

To test this hypothesis, Friedman Test of Non - Parametric statistic was applied

Chi square value (calculated by Friedman equation)
= 34.10

Critical Chi square value (0.05, 2 ) $=\mathbf{5 . 9 9 5}$

Chi square value (calculated) is greater than critical chi square value, hence this hypothesis is rejected and it can be concluded that there is significant difference in the ranking of different chocolate brands by consumers

## DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS ANALYSIS

Most popular brand:
Cadbury


## RANKING PERFORMANCE

|  | Cadbury | Nestle | Amul |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Rank |  |  |  |
| $\boldsymbol{1}$ | 54 | 26 | 14 |
| $\boldsymbol{R a n k}$ |  |  |  |
| $\boldsymbol{2}$ | 25 | 44 | 25 |
| $\boldsymbol{R a n k}$ |  |  |  |
| $\mathbf{3}$ | 15 | 24 | 55 |



## CONSUMER PROFILE

## AGE PROFILE

| UNDER 18-25 | 59 |
| :--- | :---: |
| $26-35$ | 19 |
| $36-45$ | 9 |

$$
46-55 \quad 7
$$

## Age Profile



## GENDER

| $\square \mathrm{MALE} \quad \square \mathrm{FEMALE}$ |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| $49 \%$ | $51 \%$ |

## Marital status



## Momthly liamilly imecome(RR s.)

| Below 20,000 | 11 |
| :--- | :--- |
| $20,000-$ <br> 40,000 | 35 |
| $40,000-$ | 18 |
| 60,000 |  |
| Above 20,000 | 31 |

$\square$ below 20,000 ■ 20,000-40,000
$\square$ 40,000-60,000 $\square$ above 20,000


## Educational qualifications

| Under <br> graduate | 8 |
| :--- | :---: |
| Graduate | 50 |
| Post-graduate | 36 |
| others | 0 |



## OCCUPATION

| STUDENT | 46 | $\square$ students $\square$ service | $\square$ bsiness |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |
|  | 11 | 20\% |  |
| BUSINESS | 16 | 17\% |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { PROFESSIO } \\ & \text { NALS } \end{aligned}$ | 19 | 12\% |  |
| OTHERS | 2 |  |  |
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