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ABSTRACT Consumer attitude towards the object continues to be one of the critical areas for marketing practitioners. As because some important attributes that affect the brand's choice behavior of soft drinks have identified where consumers give special emphasis. This study explores some attributes of soft drinks which have strong influence on consumer brand choice preference in Bangladesh. For comparative purposes, an empirical study is conducted on the top five different soft drink brands in Bangladesh based on ten attributes. In addition to the brand and the top attributes being measured, overall attitudes towards the brand and the impact of other attributes have been included. It reveals from the study that 7up bears highest and Pepsi bears lowest brand image among the selected brands to the consumers. Means differences of different attributes for different brands are measured through ANOVA for test of significance. The Duncan's Multiple Range Test has been applied for assessing and comparing different mean values and find out the range from one to another. Outcomes of the paper may be used as an index by the soft drinks manufacturing companies for improvement of their products and formulating marketing strategies as well.

### 1.0 Introduction

In our modern world living pattern and life style of the people have changed a lot. Soft drinks were common preference among all the individuals with the changing life style and income levels. People are shifting their consumption patterns. Soft drink is an important product item in modern society both urban and rural and becoming more popular in the consumer world.

Consumer attitudes are a composite of a consumer's (1) beliefs about, (2) feelings about, (3) and behavioral intentions toward some objects within the context of marketing, usually a brand or retail store. These components are viewed together since they are highly interdependent and together represent forces that influence how the consumer will react to the object.

Customers from all age groups start developing their preferences at a very early stage. Since in every product or service category the consumers have more choices and more information, it is essential for marketers to understand the choice of an individual. From the marketing perspective, the consumer's choice can be studied by the classical five steps (Need - Information - Search - Evolution of alternative - Purchase - Post - Purchase evaluation) (Kotler and Keller, 2006).

In current scenario, where the competition is tough, consumer choose preferred brand according to their pleasure. The company can achieve and compete in the market, only when they satisfy the needs of the customer by taking in to account their reason for brand preference.

This study examines key attitude of buying and branding perception that are considered as important cues, which lead people to select particular brand of soft drink.

### 2.0 Literature Review

### 2.1 Brand

Product includes intangible aspects such as the brand
name, quality perceptions, reputation etc. (De Chernatony and McDonald). Among the intangible aspects of the product, the brand is the most important, given that the majority of marketing strategies tend to highlight the brand including all of its added laments like logotype or slogan more than the product is being sold (Martinez and Jose, 2003).The brand has the power to differentiate the product (and service) and separate it from other competitive options, as well as to help motivate consumers in choosing and purchasing the product, thus making them satisfied and loyal (Tihomir and Ranko, 2003). Brands have the different roles for the consumer like: indentifying the origin of the product; defining the responsibility of the manufacturer; diminishing risk; diminishing the cost of searching for a product; a promise, guarantee or contract with the manufacturer; a symbolic means sign of quality (Keller, 1998). Aaker (1994) indicates that the associations are based on aspects such as attributes of the product, intangible factors (perceived quality, technological leadership etc.), benefits provided to the customer, relative price, use or application, the kind of user or customer, a known personage who serves as promotional presenter, lifestyle, brand personality, class of product, competitor products and country of origin. Keller (1993) presents a more structured classifying method for these variables, in addition to considering other dimensions, and indicates that brand associations may be broken down into attributes, benefits and attitudes. According to this author, consumers will evaluate the brand overall (attitudes), to the extent that the descriptive characteristics of the goods or pertinent service (attributes) adapt to the consumers (benefits).

### 2.2 Attitudes

Attitude is one of the pervasive notions in all of the marketing (Gillbart, 1995). The brand attitude of the consumers of a product depends on benefit expected from the concerned product and how will the product delivering the benefit (Mia, 1990). Brand benefits are the foundation of brand image. Chiranjeeb (1997) claimed that brand name itself is the foundation of brand image. Attitudes directly affect purchases
decision and these decisions in turn directly affect attitudes through experience for using selected products and services. In a broad sense, purchase decisions are based on almost solely upon attitude existing at the time of purchase. However these attitudes might have been formed (James, 1967). Attitude has been a key concept in psychology as well as marketing and at least 100 definitions and 500 measures of attitude have been proposed (Peter \& Olson, 1993).

### 2.3 Consumer Attitude

Fazio (1986) define consumer attitude as person's overall evaluations of a concept. An attitude is a person's enduring favorable or unfavorable evaluation's emotional feelings, and action tendencies toward some objects or ideas (Krech et al, 1962). Formally attitude is defined as a learned predisposition to response in a consistently favorable or unfavorable manner with respect to a given objects (Fishbein \& Ajzen, 1975). These learned predispositions are important because they influence intentions to be in various ways. Consumers have attitudes toward almost everything: religion, politics, clothes, music, food etc. Attitudes put them into a frame of mind liking or disliking an object (such as product/brand); moving toward or away from it (Kotler, 1999).

### 2.4 Soft Drink in Bangladesh

Once upon a time the soft drink was considered as prestigious product in Bangladesh which has become convenience and acceptable to every age group of people day by day. Today it has web in various parties, picnics, in gathering time etc. Gradually it's becoming more popular in the consumers world and demand is worldwide (Nuruzzaman, 1996). Soft drinks is an important product item in modern society both urban and rural areas. The first soft drink business was begun in 1783 as an artificial mineral water. Using the modern brand name, an Atlanta pharmacist began to sell Coca-Cola as a tonic in 1886 (Kotler, 1999). Mr. Sattar was the first entrepreneur to be involved with the marketing of soft drinks in 1965 in the East Pakistan (Solaiman \& Chowdury 1996). Consumers purchase decisions for soft drinks are always influenced by a number of quality factors which lead them to select a particular brand in preference.

### 3.0 Research Objectives

### 3.1 General objective

To identify the popular brands and attributes of concern brands those affect the consumer's attitudes on different brands of soft drink in Bangladesh.

### 3.2 Specific objectives

To attain the broad objective, the following specific objectives will be pursued.

To identify the customer's preference level on different brands of soft drink in Bangladesh.

To investigate the impact of consumer's perception on the qualities or attributes about the brand.

To provide suggestions to managers of brands and other related bodies for practical measurement of the brand image based on different attributes of quality perception.

### 4.0 Methodology of the study

### 4.1 Brands and Attributes Selection

Different brands of soft drinks are presently available in Bangladesh. Out of these brands 7up, Sprite, Pepsi, CocaCola and Mojo have been taken for the study. Ten attributes: Energetic, Refreshment, Meets Thrust, Good Taste, Cheap Cost, Lemon-Lime, Mineral, Less Side Effect, Less Calorie have been taken into consideration for the conven-
ience of the study based on researcher judgment from the different angles.

### 4.2 Population and Total Sample Size

Sample size for the study is 250 for five bands, 50 for each, containing 10 attributes for final study.

### 4.3 Data Collection Method and Procedures

The study is based on both primary and secondary research. For primary research, surveys have been taken on 250 respondents in Rajshahi Metropolitan City. Questionnaire is being used to collect primary data.

For secondary research, the study used relevant literatures, books, articles, newspapers, and magazines on employees and customer's attitudes and the relation between them.

### 4.4 Designs for the Study

To measure the attitude of consumers towards different soft drink brands in the Rajshahi Metropolitan City, model has been used. Selected five (5) brands and ten (10) attributes or features are briefly indicated; $X_{7}=7$ up, $X_{S}=$ Sprite, $X_{P}=$ Pepsi, $X_{C}=$ Coca-Cola, $X_{M}=$ Mojo.

1 = Energetic, 2 = Refreshment, 3 = Meets Thrust, 4 = Smell and Flavor, $5=$ Good Taste, $6=$ Cheap Cost, 7 = LemonLime, $8=$ Mineral, $9=$ Less Side Effect, $10=$ Less Calorie.

### 4.5 Designing Hypothesis

Research question of attributes of different brands for hypothesis testing to satisfy the requirement of ANOVA can be drawn as follows.

Are there any significant differences among the mean values of different soft drink brands for different attributes? The hypothesis may be, there is no significant differences among the mean values of different soft drink brands for a specific attribute (like - Refreshment) i.e. $X_{7}=X_{S}=X_{P}=X_{C}$.

Alternatively, it can be said that there are at least one significant difference among the mean values of all brands for different attributes. i.e. $X_{7} \neq X_{S} \neq X_{P} \neq X_{C} \neq X_{M}$. The following table shows the symbolic hypothesis for all attributes of all brands indicating $\mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{O}}=$ Null Hypothesis and $\mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{A}}=$ Alternative Hypothesis.

| Attributes | Null Hypothesis ( $\mathrm{H}_{0}$ ) | Alternative Hypothesis ( $\mathrm{H}_{1}$ ) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Energetic | ${ }_{1 \mathrm{j}}=0$ | ${ }_{1 \mathrm{j}} \neq 0$ (at least one equality does not hold) |
| Refreshment | ${ }_{2 \mathrm{j}}=0$ | ${ }_{2} \neq 0$ (at least one equality does not hold) |
| Meets Thrust | ${ }_{3 \mathrm{j}}=0$ | ${ }_{3 \mathrm{j}} \neq 0$ (at least one equality does not hold) |
| Smell And Flavor | ${ }_{4 j}=0$ | $\begin{aligned} & \neq 0 \text { (at least one } \\ & \text { 4j } \\ & \text { equality does not hold) } \end{aligned}$ |
| Good Taste | $5_{5 j}=0$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { sj } \neq 0 \text { (at least one } \\ & \text { equality does not hold) } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |
| Cheap Cost | ${ }_{6 j}=0$ | $\begin{aligned} & \neq 0 \text { (at least one } \\ & \text { equality does not hold) } \end{aligned}$ |
| Lemon-Lime | $7 \mathrm{j}=0$ | 7 7. $=0$ (at least one équality does not hold) |
| Mineral | $8_{8 j}=0$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { }=0 \text { (at least one } \\ & \text { equality does not hold) } \end{aligned}$ |
| Less Side Effect | ${ }_{9 j}=0$ | ${ }_{9 j} \neq 0$ (at least one equality does not hold) |
| Less Calorie | ${ }_{10} \mathrm{j}=0$ | ${ }_{10} j \neq 0$ (at least one equality does not hold) |

Table 1: Hypothesis of different attributes ( $\mathrm{j}=$ all brands)
Are there any significant differences among the mean values of
different soft drink brands for different attributes or features?
The hypothesis may be, there are no significant differences among the mean values of different soft drink brands for a specific features (like - energetic, refreshment etc.) i.e. $X_{7}=$ $X_{S}=X_{p}=X_{C}={ }_{M}$

Alternatively, it can be said that there are significant differences among the mean values of all soft drink brands for different features i.e. $X_{7} \neq X_{S} \neq X_{P} \neq X_{C} \neq X_{M}$.

Table 1 shows symbolic hypothesis for all attributes or features of all soft drink brands indicating $\mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{o}}=$ Null Hypothesis and $H_{A}=$ Alternative Hypothesis.

### 4.6 Data Analysis Procedures

The collected data has been analyzed using Excel and SPSS (Statistical Package for Social Science) software. The analyses have been done in the light of the analysis procedures used by Fishbeins' Multi-attribute Attitude Model for measuring attitudes of customers towards objects. Reliability, Frequency, Correlation, Demographic, ANOVA and Duncan's Multiple Range Test is performed by using SPSS software.

### 5.0 Findings of The Study

This part of the research has conducted to get a clear view about the overall evaluation regarding attributes for the following features; those are provided by different brands of soft drinks.

### 5.1 Demographic Analysis

| Gender | Age |
| :--- | :--- |
|  | $16-20:$ |
|  | $12.00 \%$ |
| Female: | $21-30 \%$ |
| $40.20 \%$ | $64.20 \%$ |
| Male: | $31-40:$ |
| $59.80 \%$ | $11.30 \%$ |
|  | $41-50 \%$ |
|  | $7.50 \%$ |
|  | 50 Above: |
|  | $5.00 \%$ |
| Occupation | Monthly Expenditure |
|  | $1001-2000:$ |
|  | $7.60 \%$ |
|  | $2001-3000:$ |
|  | $20.70 \%$ |
|  | $3001-4000:$ |
|  | $26.30 \%$ |
|  | $4001-5000:$ |
| $70.20 \%$ | $13.30 \%$ |
| Service Holders: | $5001-6000:$ |
| $16.30 \%$ | $11.40 \%$ |
| Businessmen: | $6001-7000:$ |
| $7.50 \%$ | $5.20 \%$ |
| Housewife: | $7001-10000:$ |
| $6.00 \%$ | $5.60 \%$ |
|  | $10001-20000:$ |
| No of Respondents: 250 | $5.60 \%$ |
|  | 20001 Above : |
|  | $4.30 \%$ |

### 5.2 Overall Consumer Attitudes towards Different Soft

 Drink BrandsThe Multi-attribute Attitude Model has been used to measure the attitudes of consumers regarding the features of soft drinks.

## Here:

$A_{0}=$ attitudes towards the object or service feature
$b i=$ strength of the belief that the feature has attribute $i$
ei $=$ evaluation of attribute $i$
$n=$ number of salient beliefs about the features
The Martin Fishbein's Model has been established as the most influential tool for analyzing the consumer's attitude. This Multi-attribute attitude model focuses on consumer's belief about multiple products or services attributes which are considered as a useful tool for investigating attitude formation and prediction attitude. The key proposition in Fishbeins's theory is that evaluations of salient beliefs cause overall attitude. Simply stated, people tend to like objects that are associated with "good" characteristics and dislike objects they believe have "bad" attributes. In Fishbein's Multi-attribute Model, overall attitude towards an object is a function of two factors: the strengths of the salient beliefs associated with the objects and the evaluations of those beliefs.

| Brand | Value |
| :--- | :--- |
| 7 up | 550.06 |
| Coca-Cola | 435.66 |
| Sprite | 416.54 |
| Mojo  <br> 351.90 340.36 <br> Pepsi ${ }^{2}$ |  |

Table 2: Overall Consumer Attitudes towards Different Soft Drink Brands
(Source: Data Compiled from field Survey)
From the above table, it can be said that overall consumer attitudes are most significant of 7up with the value of biei 550.06 and the least significant is Pepsi with the value of biei 340.36 among the five soft drink brands. Coca-Cola has placed second with the value of biei 435.66 other than the third of Sprite at the value of biei 416.54 and Mojo placed fourth with the value of biei 351.90
$5.3 A_{0}$ of each Soft Drink Brands' Features

| Features | 7 up | Sprite | Pepsi | Coca- <br> Cola | Mojo |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Energetic | 7.2732 | 6.1336 | 5.4464 | 5.772 | 5.37 |
| Refresh- <br> ment | 7.638 | 5.11 | 5.0688 | 6.1152 | 5.2416 |
| Meets <br> Thrust | 8.1144 | 7.144 | 5.328 | 7.7988 | 5.712 |
| Smell and <br> Flavor | 8.6028 | 4.752 | 3.6504 | 5.9136 | 3.944 |
| Good Taste | 7.956 | 5.5224 | 5.312 | 6.0816 | 4.77 |
| Cheap Cost | 2.046 | 0.29 | 1.168 | 2.3256 | 1.152 |
| Lemon Lime | 4.4288 | 3.888 | 1.6472 | 4.2976 | 2.9072 |
| Mineral | 3.6924 | 5.0808 | 4.8672 | 3.2248 | 4.608 |
| Less Side <br> Effect | 2.82 | 0.392 | 0.9344 | 1.80 | 0.96 |
| Less Calorie | 2.9952 | 1.6588 | 0 | 2.3244 | 0.8208 |

Table 3: Comparative Discussion on Consumer's Atti-
tudes towards the Features of Different SD Brands
（Source：Data Compiled from field Survey）

## 5．3．1 Comparative Discussion on Energetic

In case of Energetic，it is clearly visualized that 7up ob－ tained topmost attitude（ $A_{o}=7.27$ ）whereas the lowest at－ titude（ $A_{o}=5.37$ ）is for Mojo．It is also seen from the Table 3 that the attitude regarding Energetic Feature of Sprite $\left(A_{o}=6.13\right)$ ，Pepsi $\left(A_{o}=5.45\right)$ and Coca－Cola $\left(A_{o}=5.77\right)$ is carrying on closely to each other．

## 5．3．2 Comparative Discussion on Refreshment

Table shows that the maximum attitude of different soft drink brands in case of Refreshment，7up bears on the top－ most attitude（ $A_{0}=7.64$ ）whereas the lowest position（ $A_{\text {。 }}$ $=5.07)$ is for Pepsi．It is also clear that the attitude in case of Refreshment of Sprite（ $A_{o}=5.11$ ），Coca－Cola（ $A_{o}=6.12$ ） and Mojo（ $A_{o}=5.24$ ）is carrying on closely to each other．

## 5．3．3 Comparative Discussion on Meets Thrust

After analyzing，the result reveals that the maximum atti－ tudes of different soft drink brands in case of Meets Thrust carry on the highest attitude（ $A_{o}=8.11$ ）for 7up whereas the lowest position $\left(A_{o}=5.33\right)$ is for Pepsi．It is also clear that Sprite（ $A_{\circ}=7.14$ ），Coca－Cola（ $A_{\circ}=7.80$ ），Mojo（ $A_{o}=$ 5.71 ）are very close to each other．

## 5．3．4 Comparative Discussion on Smell and Flavor

In case of Smell and Flavor，it is clearly observed that 7up obtained topmost attitude（ $A_{o}=8.60$ ）whereas the lowest attitude $\left(A_{o}=3.65\right)$ is for Pepsi．It is also seen from the Ta－ ble 3 that the attitude regarding Smell and Flavor of Sprite （ $A_{o}=4.75$ ），Mojo（ $A_{o}=3.94$ ）and Coca－Cola（ $A_{o}=5.91$ ）is carrying on closely to each other．

## 5．3．5 Comparative Discussion on Good Taste

Table also shows that the maximum attitude of different soft drink brands in case of Good Taste，7up bears on the topmost attitude（ $A_{o}=7.96$ ）whereas the lowest position （ $A_{o}=4.77$ ）is for Mojo．It is also clear that the attitude in case of Refreshment of Sprite（ $A_{0}=5.52$ ），Coca－Cola（ $A_{0}=$ 6．08）and Pepsi（ $A_{o}=5.31$ ）is carrying on closely to each other．

## 5．3．6 Comparative Discussion on Cheap Cost

After analyzing，the result reveals that the maximum atti－ tudes of different soft drink brands in case of Cheap Cost carry on the highest attitude（ $A_{\circ}=2.33$ ）for Coca－Cola whereas the lowest position（ $A_{\circ}=0.29$ ）is for Sprite．It is also clear that 7up（ $A_{o}=2.05$ ），Pepsi（ $A_{o}=1.17$ ），Mojo（ $A_{\text {o }}$ $=1.15)$ are very close to each other．

## 5．3．7 Comparative Discussion on Lemon－Lime

In case of Lemon－Lime，it is clearly observed that 7up ob－ tained topmost attitude（ $A_{\circ}=4.43$ ）whereas the lowest at－ titude（ $A_{o}=1.65$ ）is for Pepsi．It is also seen from the Table 3 that the attitude regarding Lemon－Lime of Sprite（ $A_{\circ}=$ 3．89），Mojo（ $A_{o}=2.91$ ）and Coca－Cola（ $A_{o}=4.30$ ）is carry－ ing on closely to each other．

## 5．3．8 Comparative Discussion on Mineral

Table shows that the maximum attitude of different soft drink brands in case of Mineral，Sprite bears on the top－ most attitude（ $A_{o}=5.08$ ）whereas the lowest position（ $A_{\text {o }}$ $=3.22$ ）is for Coca－Cola．It is also clear that the attitude in case of Mineral of 7up（ $A_{o}=3.69$ ），Mojo（ $A_{o}=4.61$ ）and Pepsi $\left(A_{o}=4.87\right)$ is carrying on closely to each other．

## 5．3．9 Comparative Discussion on Less Side Effect

After analyzing，the result reveals that the maximum at－ titudes of different soft drink brands in case of Less Side Effect carry on the highest attitude（ $A_{0}=2.82$ ）for 7up whereas the lowest position（ $A_{0}=0.39$ ）is for Sprite．It is also clear that Coca－Cola（ $A_{\circ}=1.80$ ），Pepsi（ $A_{\circ}=0.93$ ）， Mojo（ $A_{o}=0.96$ ）are very close to each other．

## 5．3．10 Comparative Discussion on Less Calorie

In case of Less Calorie，it is clearly observed that 7up ob－ tained topmost attitude（ $A_{o}=2.99$ ）whereas the lowest at－ titude（ $A_{\circ}=00$ ）is for Pepsi．It is also seen from the Table 3 that the attitude regarding Less Calorie of Sprite（ $A_{o}=$ 1．66），Mojo（ $A_{\circ}=0.82$ ）and Coca－Cola（ $A_{\circ}=2.32$ ）is carry－ ing on closely to each other．

## 5．4 Correlation Analysis

| $$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{0}{0} \\ & \frac{0}{0} \\ & 0 \\ & \tilde{\sim} \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | － | $\stackrel{*}{\sim}$ | $\stackrel{\stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{2}}{\mathbf{m}}$ | $\stackrel{ \pm}{\sim}$ | $\stackrel{\star}{\stackrel{\star}{\underset{\sim}{c}}}$ | O | $\stackrel{*}{\underset{\sim}{*}}$ | $\stackrel{*}{N}$ | $\stackrel{\circ}{\dot{\sigma}}$ | $\stackrel{*}{\infty} \times$ |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & * \\ & \underset{\sim}{n} \\ & \end{aligned}$ | － | $\left\|\begin{array}{l} * \\ \hline \\ \hline \\ \hline \end{array}\right\|$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { * } \\ & \stackrel{1}{\circ} \\ & \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & * \\ & \stackrel{*}{\infty} \\ & \stackrel{1}{n} \end{aligned}$ | $\underset{\sim}{\circ}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{*}{\infty} \\ & \stackrel{\infty}{\circ} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { O } \\ & \text { No } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\underset{0}{N}$ | $\stackrel{*}{\sim}$ |
|  | $\stackrel{\stackrel{\leftrightarrow}{\mathbf{m}}}{\stackrel{2}{2}}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { \% } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | － | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{O} \\ & \hline 0 \end{aligned}$ | $\underset{\sim}{\underset{\sim}{*}}$ | O | $\stackrel{\circ}{\circ}$ | $\stackrel{\circ}{0}$ | $\stackrel{\text { No }}{\substack{\mathrm{o}}}$ | $\stackrel{*}{\sim}$ |
|  | $\stackrel{\substack{夫 \\ \underset{\sim}{m} \\ \hline}}{ }$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 華 } \\ & \stackrel{2}{\circ} \end{aligned}$ | O | － | $\begin{aligned} & \infty \\ & \stackrel{\infty}{\sim} \end{aligned}$ | $\hat{\sigma}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{*}{\infty} \\ & \stackrel{1}{n} \end{aligned}$ | O | $\underset{i}{N}$ | $\xrightarrow{\text { ¢ }}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & 0.0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | $\stackrel{夫}{\stackrel{\circ}{\mathrm{~N}}}$ | $\begin{aligned} & * \\ & \stackrel{*}{\infty} \\ & \stackrel{1}{2} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \ddagger \\ & \underset{\sim}{*} \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & * \\ & \stackrel{\infty}{\sim} \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | － | $\stackrel{n}{8}$ | $\stackrel{\star}{\underset{\tau}{*}}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { * } \\ & \stackrel{\infty}{n} \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | ¢ | $\stackrel{\text { \％}}{\stackrel{\sim}{\top}}$ |
|  | O. |  | $8$ | $\hat{\sigma}$ | O | － | $\underset{\sim}{N}$ | $\mathrm{m}_{0}^{\infty}$ | $\stackrel{\%}{\tau}$ | $\stackrel{*}{\infty}$ |
|  |  | $\begin{aligned} & * \\ & \stackrel{\infty}{\infty} \end{aligned}$ | O | $\stackrel{*}{\infty} \stackrel{\infty}{N}$ | $\underset{F}{*}$ | $\underset{\sim}{N}$ | － | $\stackrel{*}{\infty}$ | $\stackrel{*}{\tau}$ | ＋ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \overline{\sqrt{0}} \\ & \stackrel{1}{\omega} \\ & \stackrel{\Sigma}{\Sigma} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { N } \\ & \text { N̦ } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 3 } \\ & \text { ָ̀ } \end{aligned}$ | $\stackrel{\circ}{0}_{i}$ | \% | $\begin{aligned} & \text { * } \\ & \stackrel{\infty}{n} \\ & \end{aligned}$ | ${ }_{\infty}^{\infty}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{*}{\infty} \\ & \stackrel{\infty}{\sim} \end{aligned}$ | － | ҺัO． | ＋ |
|  | $\begin{array}{\|c} \circ \\ \stackrel{n}{\mathrm{O}} \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\underset{\sigma}{\tilde{\sigma}}$ |  | $\underset{i}{N}$ | ò | +o | $\dot{F}$ | ơ | － | $\stackrel{*}{\text { \％}}$ |
| － | $\begin{aligned} & \infty \\ & \infty \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\stackrel{*}{\underset{m}{m}}$ | $\stackrel{\stackrel{\leftrightarrow}{\mathrm{N}}}{\mathrm{~N}}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { ? } \\ & \text { On } \end{aligned}$ | $\stackrel{*}{N}$ | $\stackrel{*}{\infty}$ | $\stackrel{*}{\text { O}}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { O } \\ & \stackrel{n}{n} \end{aligned}$ | $\stackrel{⿻_{0}^{m}}{m}$ | $\checkmark$ |

Table 4：Correlations among different attributes of soft drink
＊＊Correlation is significant at the level 0.01 （2－tailed）．
＊Correlation is significant at the level 0.05 （2－tailed）．

### 5.5 ANOVA TEST

From the Fishbein's Model, it can be said that overall position of consumer's attitudes towards the individual brand based on different attributes. But it cannot say whether each attribute is statically for all brands. Therefore, for overcoming this limitation,

ANOVA has been followed for different attributes in the below table:

| ANOVA |  |  |  |  |  | Status |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Attributes | Sum of Squares | D.f. | Mean Square | F | Sig. |  |
| Energetic | 12.720 | 4 | 3.180 | 2.876 | . 024 | Accepted |
| Refreshment | 8.624 | 4 | 2.156 | 1.997 | 096 | Reject- <br> ed |
| Meets Thrust | 14.096 | 4 | 3.524 | 3.946 | . 004 | Accepted |
| Smell and Flavor | 16.616 | 4 | 4.154 | 4.914 | 001 | Accepted |
| Good Taste | 21.864 | 4 | 5.466 | 5.201 | 000 | Accepted |
| Cheap Cost | 2.664 | 4 | . 666 | . 652 | 626 | Somehow Ac cepted |
| LemonLime | 12.040 | 4 | 3.010 | 3.037 | 018 | Accepted |
| Mineral | 13.880 | 4 | 3.470 | 4.871 | 001 | Accepted |
| Less Side Effect | 1.936 | 4 | . 484 | . 454 | . 769 | Rejected |
| Less Calorie | 9.576 | 4 | 2.394 | 2.035 | 090 | Reject- <br> ed |

Table 5: The Result of Customer's Attitudes (One Way ANOVA)

### 6.0 RECOMMENDATIONS

Strength of belief (bi) is the perceived probability of association between an object and relevant features. Strength of belief is measured by having consumer rate in probability of association for each of their salient belief. This belief is associated with belief evaluation (ei) that reflects how favorably consumers perceived the features. It is clear from the table that features of different soft drink brands on the basis of Fishbein's Model are:

Attitude for $X_{7}$, i.e. 55.01
Attitude for $\mathrm{X}_{\mathrm{s}, \text {, }}$, i.e. 41.65
Attitude for $X_{p}$, i.e. 34.04
Attitude for $X_{c}$, i.e. 43.57
Attitude for $X_{M}$, i.e. 35.19
Findings involving different soft drink brands attitude suggest that company $\mathrm{X}_{7}$ is viewed the topmost favorable position because it has received total (biei) 55.01 on all de-
sired attributes. $X_{c}$ bears second topmost position among the soft drink brands by samples. Like these $X_{S}, X_{M}$ and $X_{P}$ bearing positions respectively based on overall 'attitude towards object. Indeed soft drink brand $X_{7}$ attains good rating on $X_{1}, X_{2}, X_{3}, X_{4}, X_{5}, X_{7}$ and $X_{8}$. Brand $X_{5}$ get maximum rating on ' $X_{1},{ }_{2}^{\prime} X^{\prime} X_{3}, X_{5}^{\prime}$ and $X_{8}$. Like these brand $X_{C}$ has $X_{2}$ $X_{3}, X_{4} X_{5}$ and $X_{7}$. Brand $X_{M}$ has $X_{1}, X_{2}, X_{5}$ and $X_{8}$. But no rating for $X_{p}$ like other brands.

In this position generally soft drink brand $\mathrm{X}_{7}$ should give the emphasis to improve features $X_{6}, X_{9}$ and $X_{10}$. Soft drink brand $X_{5}$ should give the emphasis to improve features $X_{4}$, $X_{6^{\prime}} X_{9}$ and $X_{10}$. Like these brand $X_{c}$ should emphasis to improve on $X_{1}, X_{6}, X_{7}, X_{8}, X_{9}$ and $X_{10}$. $X_{M}$ should emphasis on $X_{3}, X_{4}, X_{6}$ to $X_{10}$. Finally brand $X_{p}$ should emphasis on all features for continuing business along with others soft drink brands.

From the Fishbein's Model it can be said that overall position of consumers' behavior or attitudes towards the individual soft drink brand based on different attributes. But it cannot say whether each feature is statistically for all soft drink brands.

Again from the data analysis it is found that most of the respondents are highly fond of drinking 7up brand because of it high brand image, good flavor, refreshment power and for many other positive attributes or factors. Sprite, Coca-Cola and Pepsi are almost same range. It is also seen that the respondents are not fully satisfied with their existing chosen brand. They want low sugar, low calorie, constant price, more quantity, more quality etc. Here we see that most of the respondents are of the age of $20-30$. Again most of the respondents are male and most of the respondent's income is in the level of 30014000 taka. Attributes that influence in selecting the brand of soft drinks most are good flavor, high brand image, low price, refreshment etc. those are chosen by most of the respondents. There are some other attributes or factors told by the respondents but not in high percentages and affect very slightly to select a brand of soft drinks. It is also found that $20 \%$ of respondents feel problem using their chosen soft drinks whether the rest $80 \%$ feel no problem of using soft drinks. And when purchasing the soft drinks, then they can recall their existing brand at first. Besides choosing the selective brand, they can remember many other brands those are available in the market. So the attributes influencing much to create a brand image in consumer's mind to select a soft drinks.

### 7.0 LIMITATIONS AND FUTURE RESEARCH

Different limitations are found in this study and it should be addressed to encourage more sound research in the future. Only 250 consumers are taken as respondents for the study from various locations and places of Rajshahi Metropolitan City. Further research may be conducted to assess executives' perceptions of different brands benefits and risks for each attribute of soft drink with other categories. While preparing this report author may face following limitations:

Time constraint: Whole research done within three months.
Confidential factor: Some information is very important to know but they are confidential and unable to collect.

Help from the respondents: It was little bit difficult for the researcher to receive adequate helps from respondents.

### 8.0 Conclusion

This study was focused on the identification of different influential attributes that lead consumers to choose soft drinks. The research findings may help producers, policymakers to understand what key factors helped implement successful competitive strategies in the competitive market. The establishment of effective linkages between local organization and agencies is recommended in order to improve market competitiveness in the long run. Lastly, establishing effective cost strategies in providing different levels of quality and various types of attribute experiences can be recommended for developing market as a competitive business for the country.
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