A Study of Brand Preference and Consumption Pattern of Beer in Bareilly

* *Manish Gupta*

ABSTRACT

The present paper is an attempt to understand how brand preferences and consumption pattern of beer changes across demographic and other variables and more importantly, which product attributes are associated with these changes. The purpose of this paper is to investigate the various factors of brand preference towards beer, and additionally, it also throws some light on the behavioural aspects of the consumers such as frequency of consumption of an alcoholic beverage - beer. In this paper, respondents were selected randomly, and the data was analyzed and interpreted with the help of SPSS software. Hypotheses framed for the research work have been tested with the help of the chi- square test to measure the variance and to accept or reject the null hypothesis. This study made a methodical effort of studying brand preference and consumption pattern of beer by analyzing the factors associated with brand preference - frequency of beer consumption amongst beer drinkers, studying the effect of demographic variables on specific brand choice, and analyzing the relationship between monthly income of the respondents and their expenditure on beer. The study reveals that demographic variables have a significant impact on brand preference and consumption pattern of beer. It can also act as a powerful tool for marketers for strategy determination in the areas of beer production and management, marketing, brand positioning, pricing policy, and distribution.

Keywords : beer, brand preference, demographic variables, alcoholic beverage

A variety of settings, environments, motivations and factors influence the people's preference to consume a certain brand of beer. They may drink beer alone, with friends, on the beach, at parties, or while having dinner. Within these settings, one may prefer Kingfisher when drinking alone, Budweiser when having a party, or may consume Tuborg while hanging out with friends. Consumption patterns such as frequency and quantity of consumption also change across settings, motivations. Hence, it is increasingly important for marketers to understand how brand preferences and consumption patterns change across people, situations, environment, motivations and more importantly, which product attributes are associated with these changes. The purpose of this paper is to study the general consumer profile of a beer drinker, to investigate the various factors influencing the brand preference of beer, examining the factors affecting beer consumption amongst beer drinkers, and additionally, it also throws some light on the behavioural aspects of the consumers such as the frequency of consumption of beer.

OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

The present study serves to explore the following research objectives:

1) To study the factors influencing brand preference of beer amongst beer drinkers ;
2) To study the frequency of consumption of beer amongst beer drinkers ;
3) To study the effect of demographic variables on specific brand choice ;
4) To study the relationship between monthly income of the respondents and their expenditure on beer.

LITERATURE REVIEW

A number of psychographic, demographic, and beer attribute factors in various combinations influence beer consumers' preferences for various brands of beer. The isolation of the more powerful determinants of brand preference among beer consumers provides a powerful tool for strategy determination in the areas of beer production and management, marketing, brand positioning, pricing policy, and distribution (Mitchell & Amioka,1985). The source of brand preference is the usefulness of a brand in helping individuals effect an impact on their environment. It is ,therefore, in the organization's interest that its brand responds to conditions that allocate people's resources. Portraying such conditions is an organization's means of engaging the attention of its targets in the audiences of media

---

Dean Academics, Invertis University Bareilly, NH-24 Near Transport Nagar, P O Rajau, Bareilly - 243123, Uttar Pradesh.
E-mail: manish.g@invertis.org

vehicles. Promising and delivering an outcome that is responsive to motivating conditions for which the brand is positioned is a source of value for the user and of return on investment for the producer (Allenby & Yang, 2002). Kim and Chintagunta (2012) used a unique dataset on U.S. beer consumption ; they investigated brand preferences of consumers across various social group and context-related consumption scenarios . They found that brand preferences vary considerably across different social groups and consumption contexts as well as across different consumer segments. Their analysis provides useful guidance to brand managers of the smaller brands whose overall preference level might be low, but which enjoy a customer franchise in a particular segment or in a particular context or a social group setting.

Ulrich (2005) employed a consumer sample to compare two models explaining consumer preferences for craft beer brands. Using hierarchical stepwise multiple regression analysis, the predictor variables for craft beer preferences were identified. One model was based on product attribute utility, the other one on dimensions of brand equity. Both models explained a significant percentage of variance in consumer preferences for nine craft beer brands. The study suggested that brand equity dimensions (such as functional quality, price, social and emotional utility) have a higher predictive ability than product attributes. A Study by Newlands (2001) threw light on the beer purchasing behaviour of adults at convenience stores (c-store) in the United States. It also focused on preferences of consumers for domestic premium brands, recognition of c-stores as the outlet of choice for beer purchasing, and difference between beer purchasing behaviour between men and women. Another stream of research has documented intra-individual variation in brand preferences (Alienby & Lenk, 1994; Erdem, 1996; Kahn et al., 1986; McAlister & Pessemier, 1982; McAlister, 1982 ; Yang & Alienby, 2000) due to variety seeking, carryover, state dependence, and variables such as price, but little is understood about the role played by the objective environment and motivating conditions. As McFadden (1986) noted, since econometric models based on "revealed market data" are inadequate in describing the underlying mechanisms that govern behaviour, it is important to make use of psychometric data to help better understand and predict consumer behaviour.

THE INDIAN BEER INDUSTRY

The Indian beer industry has been witnessing a steady growth of 10 - 17% per year over the last ten years. The rate of growth has increased in recent years, with volumes passing 170 m cases during the 2008-2009 financial years. With the average age of the population on the decrease and income levels on the increase, the popularity of beer in the country continues to rise. The Indian market for alcohol, mostly spirits and beer, as well as wine totalled $14 billion in 2011, and were one of the fastest-growing alcohol markets in the world. Imports account for only a tiny fraction of that, but with India booming while demand elsewhere stalls, no international beverage company can afford to ignore the Indian market. Over the next five years, the Indian market for alcohol is projected to grow at 10% a year, more than that of China, the U.S., and Europe combined, according to an estimate by KPMG. Also, India has got a sizable population, a growing middle class, and a growing economy. Drinking patterns in India are unlike those of any other major market. Hard liquor is far more popular than beer and wine, with spirits accounting for about 70% of the market, and nearly all of that is whiskey. In the meantime, beer companies have found other ways to get their products into Indian glasses. Brewers have used joint ventures, dedicated local breweries, and local contract farmers to expand distribution and lower their costs (Euromonitor: Beer in India Report, 2012).

Table 1: Production of Beer in India		
Sr. No.	Year	Production in kilolitres
1	2004-05	270446
2	2005-06	295515
3	2006-07	372194
4	2007-08	407665
5	2008-09	451001
Source: CMIA Data, 2010		

Table 2: Uttar Pradesh Beer Consumption Statistics-Yearly		
S No	Year	Number of bottles
1	1996-97	19089347
2	1997-98	21302634
3	1998-99	19555069
4	1999-00	25913094
5	2000-01	25974697
6	2001-02	35205981
7	2002-03	40425698
8	2003-04	38784212
9	2004-05	41949685
10	2005-06	48936485
11	2006-07	59712600
12	2007-08	66257414
13	2008-09	72361148
14	2009-10	90380824
15	2010-11	117166049
16	2011-12	147240045
Source: www.upexice.in accessed on December 14, 2012		

The Table 1 depicts the production of beer in India. It can be seen from the table that every year, there has been an increase in production of beer from 2004-05 to 2008-09. In 2004-05, the production of Beer was 270446 kilolitres, whereas in 2008-09, it rose up to 451001 kilolitres. The Table 2 denotes the Uttar Pradesh beer consumption yearly statistics; the Table 2 depicts that there has been a remarkable increase in the consumption of beer in the State. In 1997, the consumption was 19089347 bottles, whereas in 2011-12, it rose to a whopping 147240045 bottles; this indicates the growing popularity of beer across different demographic segments.

❖ **Effect of Government Pricing Policy on Beer Consumption:** The Indian beer industry operates in a highly controlled environment, and beer is categorized with other alcoholic products for licensing and taxation purpose. Movement of beer among the states in India requires an export and import license; export fee is imposed in the states where beer is manufactured and import fees is levied on the state where it is sold. On absolute alcohol basis, beer is taxed higher than spirits in most of the states in India, including Uttar Pradesh. There are about twenty six different alcohol specific taxes that constitute 60% of the consumer price, which is among the highest in the world. In India, beer taxes are levied by individual states, and taxes are also paid between states. There are a number of different mechanisms available to the Government by which it can influence the price of alcohol, including the use of excise taxes, minimum pricing and policies that restrict price discounting and promotions. The effect of these policies can vary because different types of drinkers based on their demographic and psychographic profiles will respond differently to changes in price.

RESEARCH HYPOTHESES

❖ **H1 :** There is no significant relationship between demographic variables of the respondents and factors influencing brand preference of beer.

❖ **H2 :** There is no significant relationship between demographic variables of the respondents and frequency of beer consumption.

❖ **H3 :** There is no significant relationship between the demographic variables of the respondents and preference of a specific beer brand.

❖ **H4 :** There is no significant relationship between monthly income of the respondents and expenditure on beer.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

For the present study, the data was collected from the respondents (beer drinkers) spotted in bars, beer shops, social settings (clubs), informal gatherings, etc., through a structured and undisguised questionnaire comprising of twenty six closed-ended questions.

The population area for the study were different bars, beer shops in Bareilly, since a majority of the beer drinkers across different age groups, educational background, income etc., were expected to consume beer in these locations. For the present study, convenience sampling method was applied ; based on the parameters of interest, an optimum sample size of 150 respondents (beer drinkers) was selected to fulfill the sample requirements of representation, flexibility, and reliability, and the questionnaires were administered personally to the respondents. The survey was conducted during April 2011 - June 2011.

❖ **Data Analysis and Methods :** Data and information gathered from different sources after filtration generated relevant data, which was edited and coded subsequently. The data was analyzed and interpreted with the help of SPSS software. Hypotheses framed for the research work were tested with the help of the chi square test to measure the variance and to accept or reject the null hypotheses.

❖ **Limitations of the Study**

❖ As the study was conducted in the vicinity of Bareilly, Uttar Pradesh, hence, the findings cannot be generalized for other territories.

❖ Due to the language barrier, some respondents were hesitant to furnish the required information, although they were made comfortable by translating the questions in the language they understood, but this may have resulted in a semantic barrier affecting the quality of the responses.

Table 3 : Demographic Characteristics of the Respondents (N=150)			
Characteristics	**Sub categories**	**Number**	**Percentage**
Age	17-25 Years	44	29.3
	26-35 Years	63	42
	35 Years & above	43	28.7
	Total	**150**	**100**
Occupation	Service	58	38.7
	Business	42	28
	Students	50	33.3
	Total	**150**	**100**
Marital Status	Unmarried	63	42
	Married	87	58
	Total	**150**	**100**
Education	Undergraduate	22	14.7
	Graduate	31	20.7
	Post Graduate	56	37.3
	Professionally qualified	41	27.3
	Total	**150**	**100**
Monthly Income	Low	20	13.3
	Medium	47	31
	High	83	55.3
	Total	**150**	**100**
Source: Primary Data			

❖ Respondents became extra cautious when they were asked to provide their personal information in relation to their occupation, income etc., and they may have provided misleading information affecting the quality of the research.

❖ The data was collected from the respondents (beer drinkers) spotted in bars and beer shops only, although people can enjoy beer in other settings and locations as well. Generalizing from these findings could be misleading.

Table 4 : Cross Tabulation of Educational Qualification of the Respondents and Factors Influencing Brand Preference of Beer				
Educational Qualification	Factors Influencing Brand Preference			Total
	Brand/Status	Kick	Availability	
Undergraduate	5 (22.7)	9 (40.9)	8 (36.4)	22 (100)
Graduate	9 (29)	12 (38.7)	10 (32.3)	31 (100)
Postgraduate	18 (32.1)	17 (30.4)	21 (37.5)	56 (100)
Professionally Qualified	26 (63.4)	14 (34.1)	1 (2.4)	41 (100)
Total	58 (38.7)	52 (34.7)	40 (26.7)	150 (100)
Note: Figures in Parenthesis are in percentage Source: Primary Data				

Table 5: Test Statistics			
Chi square value	Df	Sig value	Significant or Not Significant
22.626	6	.001	Significant

The Table 3 shows that 44 respondents (29.3%) were in the age group of 17-25 years, 63 respondents (42%) were in the age group of 26-35 years, and 43 (28.7%) respondents were in the age group of 35 years and above. 58 (38.7%) respondents were in service, 42 (28%) were in business, and 50 (33.3%) respondents were students. 63 (42%) respondents were unmarried and 87 (58%) respondents were married. 22 (14.7%) respondents were undergraduates, 31 (20.7%) were graduate and 56 (37.3%) respondents were post graduates; 41 (27.3%) respondents were professionally qualified. 20 (13.3%) respondents were from the low income group, 47 (31%) respondents were from the medium income group and 83 (55.3%) participants were from the high income group.

ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION

In terms of objectives, the present study is divided into four broad categories:

OBJECTIVE 1 : To study the factors influencing the brand preference of beer amongst beer drinkers.

Table 6 : Cross Tabulation of Marital Status of the Respondents and Factors Influencing Brand Preference of Beer				
Marital Status	Factors of Brand Preference			Total
	Brand/Status	Kick	Availability	
Unmarried	19 (30.2)	21 (33.3)	23 (36.5)	63 (100)
Married	39 (44.8)	31 (35.6)	17 (19.5)	87 (100)
Total	58 (38.7)	52 (34.7)	40 (26.7)	150 (100)
Note: Figures in Parenthesis are in percentage				
Source: Primary Data				

Table 7: Test Statistics			
Chi square value	Df	Sig value	Significant or Not Significant
6.034	2	.049	Significant

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN FACTORS INFLUENCING BRAND PREFERENCE OF BEER, DEMOGRAPHIC AND OTHER VARIABLES OF THE RESPONDENTS

❖ **Educational Qualification of the Respondents**

❖ **Hypothesis: There is no significant relationship between educational qualification of the respondents and factors influencing brand preference of beer.**

The Tables 4 and 5 depict the relationship between educational qualification of the respondents and factors influencing brand preference of beer at 5% level of significance. For a majority of the undergraduates (40.9) and graduates (38.7), "Kick" was the major factor for building the preference followed by "Availability". For a majority of the post graduates (63.4), "Brand/status" was a major factor for building brand preference. Post graduates were almost uniformly distributed across different factors of brand preference. The Table 5 states that at the 5% level, the chi-square value (.001) is significant. Hence, the null hypothesis is rejected and it is concluded that there is a significant relationship between educational qualification of the respondents and factors influencing brand preference of beer.

❖ **Marital Status of the Respondents**

❖ **Hypothesis: There is no significant relationship between marital status of the respondents and factors influencing brand preference of beer.**

The Tables 6 and 7 depict the relationship between marital status of the respondents and factors influencing brand

Table 8 : Cross Tabulation of Occupation of the Respondents and Factors Influencing Brand Preference of Beer				
Occupation	Factors Influencing Brand Preference			Total
	Brand/Status	Kick	Availability	
Govt. Service	21(36.2)	24 (41.4)	13 (22.4)	58
Business	23 (54.8)	10 (23.8)	9 (21.4)	42
Student	14 (28)	18 (36)	18 (36)	50
Total	58 (38.7)	52 (34.7)	40 (26.7)	150 (100)
Note: Figures in Parenthesis are in percentage				
Source: Primary Data				

Table 9: Test Statistics			
Chi square value	Df	Sig value	Significant or Not Significant
9.042	4	.030	Significant

Table 10 : Cross Tabulation of Monthly Income of the Respondents and Factors Influencing Brand Preference of Beer				
Monthly Income	Factors Influencing Brand Preference			Total
	Brand/Status	Kick	Availability	
Low	8 (40)	6 (30)	6 (30)	20 (100)
Medium	18 (38.3)	16 (34)	13 (27.7)	47 (100)
High	32 (38.6)	30 (36.1)	21 (25.3)	83 (100)
Total	58 (38.7)	52 (34.7)	40 (26.7)	150 (100)
Note: Figures in Parenthesis are in percentage				
Source: Primary Data				

Table 11: Test Statistics			
Chi square value	Df	Sig value	Significant or Not Significant
0.353	4	.986	Not Significant

preference of beer at 5% level of significance. For a majority of the unmarried (36.5) respondents, "Availability"; and for a majority of the married (44.8) respondents, "Brand/status" was a major factor for building brand preference towards beer brands. The Table 7 states that at the 5% significance level, the chi-square value (.049) is significant. Hence, the null hypothesis is rejected, and it is also concluded that there is a significant relationship between marital status of the respondents and factors influencing brand preference of beer.

❖ **Occupational Status of the Respondents :**

❖ **Hypothesis: There is no significant relationship between occupation of the respondents and factors influencing brand preference of beer.**

The Tables 8 and 9 depict the relationship between occupation of the respondents and factors influencing brand preference of beer at 5% level of significance. For people in govt. services (41.4), the factor "Kick" and for self - employed people (having a business) (54.8), "Brand/status" was the major factor for building brand preference. For students, "Kick" and "Availability" were the major factor for building brand preference. The Table 9 depicts that at the 5% level, the chi square value (.030) is significant, and hence, the null hypothesis is rejected and it is also concluded that there is a significant relationship between occupation of the respondents and factors influencing brand preference of beer.

Table 12 : Cross Tabulation of Age Profile of the Respondents and Factors Influencing Brand Preference of Beer				
Age Profile	**Factors Influencing Brand Preference**			**Total (N=150)**
	Brand/Status	**Kick**	**Availability**	
17-25 Years	15 (34.1)	14 (31.8)	15 (34.1)	44 (100)
26-35 Years	24 (38.1)	20 (31.7)	19 (30.2)	63 (100)
35 Years & above	19 (44.2)	18 (41.9)	6 (14)	43 (100)
Total	**58 (38.7)**	**52 (34.7)**	**40 (26.7)**	**150 (100)**
Note: Figures in Parenthesis are in percentage				
Source: Primary Data				

Table 13: Test Statistics			
Chi square value	**Df**	**Sig value**	**Significant or Not Significant**
5.286	4	.259	Not Significant

Table 14 : Cross Tabulation of Preferred Pack Size and Factors Influencing Brand Preference of Beer				
Preferred Pack Size	**Factors Influencing Brand Preference**			**Total**
	Brand/Status	**Kick**	**Availability**	
Beer Cane	10 (38.5)	5 (19.2)	11 (42.3)	26 (100)
Small Bottle	0 (0)	14 (100)	0 (0)	14 (100)
Big Bottle	48 (43.6)	33 (30)	29 (26.4)	110 (100)
Total	58 (38.7)	52 (34.7)	40 (26.7)	150 (100)
Note: Figures in Parenthesis are in percentage				
Source: Primary Data				

Table 15: Test Statistics			
Chi square value	**Df**	**Sig value**	**Significant or Not Significant**
31.955	4	.000	Significant

❖ **Monthly Income of the Respondents**
❖ **Hypothesis: There is no significant relationship between income level of the respondents and factors influencing brand preference of beer.**

The Tables 10 and 11 depict the relationship between monthly income of the respondents and factors influencing brand preference of beer at 5% level of significance. Across all income categories, "Brand/status" was the major factor for building preference for a beer brand followed by "Kick" and then "Availability". The Table 11 states that at the 5% level, the chi-square value (.986) is not significant, and hence, the null hypothesis is accepted, and it is also concluded that there is no significant relationship between income of the respondents and factors influencing brand preference of beer.

❖ **Age Profile of the Respondents**
❖ **Hypothesis: There is no significant relationship between age of the respondents and factors influencing brand preference of beer.**

The Tables 12 and 13 depict the relationship between age of the respondents and factors influencing brand preference towards beer at 5% level of significance. Across all age categories, "Brand/status" was the major factor for building the preference followed by "Kick", and then "Availability". The Table 13 states that at the 5% level, the chi-

Table 16 : Cross Tabulation of Place of Consumption and Factors Influencing Brand Preference of Beer				
Consumption Place	Factors Influencing Brand Preference			Total
	Brand/Status	Kick	Availability	
Bar	6 (16.7)	16 (44.4)	14 (38.9)	36 (100)
Home	30 (56.6)	15 (28.3)	8 (15.1)	53 (100)
Outside	9 (33.3)	8 (29.6)	10 (37)	27 (100)
Beer shop	13 (38.2)	13 (38.2)	8 (23.5)	34 (100)
Total	**58 (38.7)**	**52 (34.7)**	**40 (26.7)**	**150 (100)**
Note: Figures in Parenthesis are in percentage				
Source: Primary Data				

Table 17: Test Statistics			
Chi square value	Df	Sig value	Significant or Not Significant
16.944	6	.009	Significant

Table 18 : Cross Tabulation of Monthly Expenditure on Beer and Factors Influencing Brand Preference of Beer				
Monthly expenditure on beer	Factors Influencing Brand Preference			Total
	Brand/Status	Kick	Availability	
Up to ₹ 200	23 (53.5)	10 (23.3)	10 (23.3)	43 (100)
₹ 200-500	24 (31.6)	30 (39.5)	22 (28.9)	36 (100)
₹ 500 & above	11 (35.5)	52 (38.7)	8 (25.8)	71 (100)
Total	**58 (38.7)**	**52 (34.7)**	**40 (26.7)**	**150 (100)**
Note: Figures in Parenthesis are in percentage				
Source: Primary Data				

Table 19: Test Statistics			
Chi square value	Df	Sig value	Significant or Not Significant
6.124	4	.040	Significant

Table 20 : Cross Tabulation of Type of Beer and Factors Influencing Brand Preference of Beer				
Type of beer	Factors Influencing Brand Preference			Total
	Brand/Status	Kick	Availability	
Mild	32 (41.6)	20 (26)	25 (32.5)	77 (100)
Strong	26 (35.6)	32 (43.8)	15 (20.5)	73 (100)
Total	58 (38.7)	52 (34.7)	40 (26.7)	150 (100)
Note: Figures in Parenthesis are in percentage				
Source: Primary Data				

Table 21: Test Statistics			
Chi square value	Df	Sig value	Significant or Not Significant
5.787	2	.045	Significant

Table 22 : Cross Tabulation of Educational Qualification of the Respondents and Frequency of Beer Consumption				
Educational Qualification	Frequency of beer consumption			Total
	Regularly	Occasionally	Rarely	
Undergraduate	5 (22.7)	11 (50)	6 (27.3)	22 (100)
Graduate	18 (58.1)	6 (19.4)	7 (22.6)	31 (100)
Postgraduate	27 (48.2)	24 (42.9)	5 (8.9)	56 (100)
Professionally Qualified	21 (51.2)	17 (41.5)	3 (7.3)	41 (100)
Total	71 (47.3)	58 (38.7)	21 (14)	150 (100)
Note: Figures in Parenthesis are in percentage				
Source: Primary Data				

Table 23: Test Statistics			
Chi square value	Df	Sig value	Significant or Not Significant
14.502	6	.025	Significant

square value (.259) is not significant. Hence, the null hypothesis is accepted , and it is concluded that there is no significant relationship between age of the respondents and factors influencing brand preference of beer.

❖ **Preferred Pack Size of Beer**

❖ **Hypothesis: There is no significant relationship between preferred pack size of beer and factors influencing brand preference of beer.**

The Tables 14 and 15 depict the relationship between preferred pack size of beer and factors influencing brand preference of beer at 5% level of significance. "Kick" was the only factor for building brand preference for all those who preferred to have beer in a small bottle. "Availability" was a major factor for those who preferred having beer in a beer cane; and "Brand/ status" was the major factor for those who preferred to have beer in a big bottle. The Table 15 depicts that at the 5% level, the chi-square value (.000) is significant. Hence, the null hypothesis is rejected, and it is concluded that there is a significant relationship between preferred pack size and factors influencing brand preference of beer.

❖ **Consumption Place Preferred by the Respondents**

❖ **Hypothesis: There is no significant relationship between consumption place of beer and factors influencing brand preference of beer.**

The Tables 16 and 17 depict the relationship between place of consumption of beer and factors influencing brand

Table 24 : Cross Tabulation of the Marital Status of the Respondents and Frequency of Beer Consumption				
Marital Status	Frequency of beer consumption			Total
	Regularly	Occasionally	Rarely	
Un Married	32 (50.8)	18 (28.6)	13 (20.6)	63 (100)
Married	39 (44.8)	40 (46)	8 (9.2)	87 (100)
Total	71 (47.3)	58 (38.7)	21 (14)	150 (100)
Note: Figures in Parenthesis are in percentage				
Source: Primary Data				

Table 25: Test Statistics			
Chi square value	Df	Sig value	Significant or Not Significant
6.553	2	.038	Significant

Table 26 : Cross Tabulation of Occupation of the Respondents and Frequency of Beer Consumption				
Occupation	Frequency of beer consumption			Total
	Regularly	Occasionally	Rarely	
Govt. Service	30 (51.7)	20 (34.5)	8 (13.8)	58 (100)
Business	21 (50)	21 (50)	0 (0)	42 (100)
Student	20 (40)	17 (34)	13 (13)	50 (100)
Total	71 (47.3)	58 (38.7)	21 (14)	150 (100)
Note: Figures in Parenthesis are in percentage				
Source: Primary Data				

Table 27: Test Statistics			
Chi square value	Df	Sig value	Significant or Not Significant
13.831	4	.008	Significant

preference of beer at 5% level of significance. Those who consumed beer in a bar, "Kick" (44.4) followed by "Availability" (38.9) were the major factors for building the brand preference. Those who preferred to consume beer at home or at a beer shop, "Brand/status" was the major influencing factor. "Availability" was a major factor for those who consumed beer outside the home/beer shop. The Table 17 depicts that at the 5% level, the chi square value (.009) is significant. Hence, we reject the null hypothesis, and it is concluded that there is a significant relationship between consumption place of beer and factors influencing brand preference of beer.

❖ **Monthly Expenditure on Beer**
❖ **Hypothesis: There is no significant relationship between monthly expenditure on beer and factors influencing brand preference of beer.**

The Tables 18 and 19 depict the relationship between monthly expenditure on beer and factors influencing brand preference of beer at 5% level of significance. For those who spent up to ₹ 200 per month, "Brand/status" was the major factor (953.5) and for those spending between ₹ 200-500 and ₹ 500 and above per month, "Kick" was the major factor influencing brand preference of beer. The Table 19 depicts that at the 5% level, the chi square value (.040) is significant. Hence, we reject the null hypothesis and it is concluded that there is a significant relationship between expenditure on beer and factors influencing brand preference of beer.

❖ **Type of Beer**
❖ **Hypothesis: There is no significant relationship between type of beer intake and factors influencing brand**

Table 28 : Cross Tabulation of Monthly Income of the Respondents and Frequency of Beer Consumption				
Monthly Income	Frequency of beer consumption			Total
	Regularly	Occasionally	Rarely	
Low	9 (45)	11 (55)	0 (0)	20 (100)
Medium	27 (57.4)	16 (34)	4 (8.4)	47 (100)
High	35 (42.2)	31 (37.3)	17 (20.5)	83 (100)
Total	71 (47.3)	58 (38.7)	21 (14)	150 (100)
Note: Figures in Parenthesis are in percentage				
(Source: Primary Data collected from respondents)				

Table 29: Test Statistics			
Chi square value	Df	Sig value	Significant or Not Significant
9.486	4	.049	Significant

Table 30 : Cross Tabulation of Age profile of the Respondents and Frequency of Beer Consumption				
Age	Frequency of beer consumption			Total
	Regularly	Occasionally	Rarely	
17-25 Years	18 (40.9)	15 (34.1)	11 (25)	44 (100)
26-35 Years	39 (61.9)	22 (34.9)	2 (3.2)	63 (100)
35 Years & above	14 (32.6)	21 (48.8)	8 (18.6)	43 (100)
Total	71 (47.3)	58 (38.7)	21 (14)	150 (100)
Note: Figures in Parenthesis are in percentage				
(Source: Primary Data collected from respondents)				

Table 31: Test Statistics			
Chi square value	Df	Sig value	Significant or Not Significant
16.538	4	.002	Significant

preference of beer.

The Tables 20 and 21 depict the relationship between type of beer and factors influencing brand preference of beer at 5% level of significance. For respondents who consumed mild beer, "Brand/status" was more important followed by availability ; for respondents who consumed strong beer, "Kick" was more important followed by "Brand/status". The Table 21 depicts that at the 5% level, the chi square value (.045) is significant. Hence, we reject the null hypothesis and it is concluded that there is a significant relationship between type of beer intake and factors influencing brand preference of beer.

OBJECTIVE II: To study the frequency of consumption amongst beer drinkers.

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN FREQUENCY OF BEER CONSUMPTION AND DEMOGRAPHIC VARIABLES OF THE RESPONDENTS

❖ **Educational Profile of the Respondents**
❖ **Hypothesis: There is no significant relationship between educational qualification of the respondents and frequency of beer consumption**.

The Tables 22 and 23 depict the relationship between educational qualification of the respondents and frequency of

Table 32 : Respondents' Preference of Beer Brands		
Brand	**Frequency**	**Percentage**
Kingfisher	56	37.3%
Haywords	14	9.3%
Budweiser	21	14%
Foster	22	14.7%
Cobra	7	4.7%
Carlsberg	19	12.7
Any Other	11	7.3
Source: Primary Data		

Table 33 : Relationship between Demographic Variables of the Respondents and Specific Brand Choice of Beer				
Demographic factors	**Chi square value**	**df**	**Sig value**	**Sig/ Not Sig**
Education	64.109	18	.000	S
Marital Status	34.244	6	.000	S
Occupation	54.603	12	.000	S
Income	42.376	12	.000	S
Age	55.428	12	.000	S

beer consumption at the 5% level of significance. A majority of the graduates (58.1), post graduates (48.2), and professionally qualified (51.2) respondents consumed beer regularly. On the other hand, a majority of the undergraduates (50) consumed beer occasionally. The Table 23 depicts that at the 5% level, the chi square value (.025) is significant. Hence, we reject the null hypothesis and also conclude that there is a significant relationship between educational qualification and frequency of beer consumption.

❖ **Marital Status of the Respondents**
❖ **Hypothesis: There is no significant relationship between marital status of the respondents and frequency of beer consumption**.

The Tables 24 and 25 depict the relationship between marital status of the respondents and frequency of beer consumption at the 5% level of significance. A majority of the unmarried respondents (50.8) consumed beer regularly. On the other hand, a majority of the married (46) respondents consumed beer occasionally. The Table 25 depicts that at the 5% level, the chi square value (.038) is significant. Hence, we reject the null hypothesis and also conclude that there is a significant relationship between marital status of the respondents and frequency of beer consumption.

❖ **Occupational Profile of the Respondents**
❖ **Hypothesis: There is no significant relationship between occupational profile of the respondents and frequency of beer consumption.**

The Tables 26 and 27 depict the relationship between occupation of the respondents and frequency of beer consumption at the 5% level of significance. A majority of the respondents employed in govt. service (50.8) and students (40) consumed beer regularly. On the other hand, self-employed respondents consumed beer occasionally as well as regularly. The Table 27 depicts that at the 5% level, the chi square value (.008) is significant. Hence, we reject the null hypothesis and also conclude that there is a significant relationship between occupation of the respondents and frequency of beer consumption.

❖ **Income Profile of the Respondents**
❖ **Hypothesis: There is no significant relationship between monthly income of the respondents and frequency of beer consumption.**

Table 34 : Cross Tabulation of Monthly Income and Expenditure on Beer				
Monthly Income	Monthly Expenditure on beer			Total
	Up to ₹ 200	₹ 200-500	₹ 500 & above	
Low	1 (5)	19 (95)	0 (0)	20 (100)
Medium	7 (14.9)	28 (59.6)	12 (25.5)	47 (100)
High	35 (42.2)	29 (34.9)	19 (22.9)	83 (100)
	43 (28.7)	76 (50.7)	31 (20.7)	150 (100)
Note: Figures in Parenthesis are in percentage				
Source: Primary Data				

Table 35: Test Statistics			
Chi square value	Df	Sig value	Significant or Not Significant
29.713	4	.000	Significant

The Tables 28 and 29 depict the relationship between monthly income of the respondents and frequency of beer consumption at the 5% level of significance. A majority of the respondents falling in the low income group (55) consumed beer occasionally. On the other hand, a majority of the respondents falling in the middle income (57.4) as well as the high income (42.2) group consumed beer regularly. The Table 29 depicts that at the 5% level of significance, the chi square value (.049) is significant. Hence, we reject the null hypothesis and also conclude that there is a significant relationship between monthly income of the respondents and frequency of beer consumption.

❖ **Age Profile of the Respondents**

❖ **Hypothesis: There is no significant relationship between age of the respondents and frequency of beer consumption.**

The Tables 30 and 31 depict the relationship between marital status of the respondents and frequency of beer consumption at the 5% level of significance. Majority of the people in the age group of 35 years and above (48.8) consumed beer occasionally. On the other hand, a majority of the people between 17-25 years (40.9) and 26-35 years (61.9) of age consumed beer regularly. The Table 31 depicts that at the 5% level, the chi square value (.002) is significant. Hence, we reject the null hypothesis and also conclude that there is a significant relationship between age of the respondents and frequency of beer consumption.

OBJECTIVE III: To study the effect of demographic variables on specific brand choice of beer.

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN DEMOGRAPHIC VARIABLES OF THE RESPONDENTS AND SPECIFIC BRAND CHOICE OF BEER

❖ **Hypothesis: There is no significant difference between demographic variables of the respondents and preference of a specific beer brand.**

The Table 32 depicts the number and percentages of respondents who preferred different brands of beer. It is clear from the table that a majority of the respondents (37.3) preferred Kingfisher. The next preferred brand of beer was Foster (14.7). Chi square test was applied to find out if there is any significant difference between the demographic variables of the respondents and the beer brands preferred by them at the 5% level of significance. The Table 33 depicts that based on the chi square test, the demographic variables such as education, marital status, occupation, income, and age have a significant relationship with the respondent's preference of beer brands at the 5% level of significance. Hence, the hypothesis is rejected.

OBJECTIVE IV: To study the relationship between monthly income of the respondents and their expenditure on beer.

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN MONTHLY INCOME OF THE RESPONDENTS AND EXPENDITURE ON BEER

❖ **Hypothesis: There is no significant relationship between monthly income of the respondents and expenditure on beer.**

The Tables 34 and 35 depict the relationship between income level of the respondents and their expenditure on beer at 5% level of significance. A majority of the respondents in the lower income (95) as well as in the middle income (59.6) group spent ₹ 200-500 per month on beer, while a majority of the respondents in the high income group (42.2) spent only up to ₹ 200 per month on beer. The Table 35 depicts that at the 5% level, the chi square value (.000) is significant. Hence, we reject the null hypothesis and also conclude that there is a significant relationship between income level of the respondents and expenditure on beer.

CONCLUSION

We have established empirically that beer consumers perceive the various brands differently in terms of the brand's abilities to satisfy their needs and wants. A number of demographic and beer attribute factors influence beer consumers' preferences and beer consumption pattern for the various brands of beer. This study made a methodical effort in studying brand preference and consumption pattern of beer by analyzing the various factors of brand preference - frequency of beer consumption amongst beer drinkers, the effect of demographic variables on specific brand choices of beer, and analyzing the relationship between monthly income of the respondents and their monthly expenditure on beer. The study reveals that demographic factors have a significant relationship with factors influencing brand preference of beer. Frequency of beer consumption is also significantly influenced by education, marital status, income, and age of respondents.

The study showed that demographic variables such as education, marital status, occupation, income, and age have a significant relationship with the respondents' preference of beer brands. Kingfisher is the most preferred brand of beer in the region. The other preferred brands of beer are Foster, Budweiser, Carlsberg and Hayward in that order. There is also a significant relationship between income of the respondents and their expenditure on beer. Majority of the respondents in the lower income as well as in the middle income group spent ₹ 200-500 per month on beer consumption, while a majority of the respondents in the high income group spent only up to ₹ 200 per month on beer consumption. This clearly is in contrast with the normal notion that people belonging to the higher income group spend more on beer/alcohol consumption.

SCOPE FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

Future research studies may consider studying the factors influencing brand preference for other liquor categories (Whiskey, Rum, Vodka, etc.). Further research can be conducted in other regions of the country, and it may also incorporate more variables to get a better understanding of factors influencing the brand preference and consumption pattern of various types of alcohol.

REFERENCES

Adams, W J. (2006). "Beer in Germany and United States." *Journal of Economic Perspective, 20* (1), pp. 189-205.

Allenby, G. M., & Ginter, L. (1995). "Using Extremes to Design Products and Segment Markets." *Journal of Marketing Research, 32* (4), pp.392-403.

Department of U.P. Excise (2012). *"Yearly Consumption of Beer in Bottles."* Retrieved from www.upexcise.in/new form/yearly statistics

Erdem, T. (1996). "Dynamic Analysis of Market Structure Based On Panel Data." *Marketing Science, 15* (4), pp. 203-238.

Euromonitor International (2012). *"Beer in India."* Country Report, Retrieved from http://www.euromonitor.com/beer-in-india/report

Fennell, G. (1978). "Consumer's Perception of the Product Use Situation." *Marketing Science, 42* (1) pp. 38-47.

Kahn, B. E., Kalwani, M., & Morrison, D. (1986). "Measuring Variety-Seeking and Reinforcement Behaviours Using Panel Data." *Journal of Marketing Research, 23* (2), pp. 89-100.

Kim, M., & Chintagunta, P. (2012). "Investigating Brand Preferences across Social Groups and Consumption Context." *Journal of Quantitative Marketing & Economics, 10* (3), pp. 305-333.

Lenk, P. (1994). "Modelling Household Purchase Behaviour with Logistic Normal Regressions." *Journal of American Statistical Association*, *89* (December), pp. 1218-1231.

McFadden, D. (1986). "The Choice Theory Approach to Market Research." *Marketing Science, 5* (4), pp 275-297.

Mitchell I. S., & Amioka T. (1985). "Brand Preference Factors in Patronage and Consumption of Nigerian Beer." *Columbia Journal of World Business, 20* (1), pp 55-69.

Mitchell, I. S. (1977). *"Intercultural and Intercultural Differences between Psychographic and Demographic Markel Segmentation."* Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Georgia.

Netscribes (2012). *"Market Research on Beer Market."* Retrieved from www.netscribes.com/market research/beer market

Newland (2001). "Convenience Store Shopping Behaviour: Beer." *Convenience Store News, 37* (6), p.77.

Ulrich, K. (2005). "Consumer Brand Equity versus Product-Attribute Utility: A Comparative Approach for Craft Beer." *Journal of Food Products Marketing, 11* (4), pp 77-90.

Yang S., Allenby G., & Fennell G. (2002). "Modelling Variation in Brand Preference: The Role of Objective Environment & Motivating Conditions." *Marketing Science-INFORMS, 21* (1), pp. 14-31.