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The purpose of this study was to study the factors influencing consumer choice of beer brand with a focus on EABL beers. The study was guided by the following research questions. How does external influencers affect consumer choice, how does external influencers affect consumer choice of beer, how does the marketing factors influence consumer choice of beer.

The research design used for the study was both descriptive and inferential, the study targeted beer consumers in Nairobi County. A population of 150,000 is EABL beer consumers, according to beershara.co.ke, from which a sample size of 399 was selected using the simple random sampling formula. The sampling technique used was clustering and simple random sampling of beer consumers across Nairobi, the sampling frame in this study involved the residents of Nairobi who are consumers of EABL beers. The data collection method used was questionnaires which employed the 5 Linkert scale in rating of various responses. Collected data was coded and analyzed using SPSS version 20 to generate the results. Correlation and regression analysis to generate the finding, the results were presented in tables and figures.

According to the findings of the study most of the respondents feel that internal factors greatly influence the consumer choice. Factors such as cost of beer, availability of cheaper alternatives, increase income, lifestyle and personality significantly affect their choice of beer. The findings revealed that income had a negative, but significant relationship with consumer choice of beer brand, and every increase in income results in a decrease in consumer choice due to the inverse relationship.

The study also revealed that external influencers had a significant effect on consumer choice, factors such as culture, religion, social class and family greatly influence consumer choice. The study showed that (culture, social structure, family, and demography) account for 57.7% of the consumer choice. According to the findings, culture had a positive significant relationship with consumer choice of beer brand, and every increase in culture results in an increase in consumer choice. Social structure had a positive significant relationship with consumer choice of beer brand, and every increase in social structure results in an increase in consumer choice.
Last but not least the study also revealed a significant relationship between marketing factors and choice of beer brand therefore factors such as price, product features, and promotion and distribution impact heavily in consumer choice of beer brand. The findings revealed the product features had a positive significant relationship with consumer choice of beer brand, and every increase in product results in an increase in consumer choice.

In light of the findings, the study concluded that there is a positive significant relationship between internal factors and beer brand choice factors such as income, age and gender showed a greater significance to beer choice, the study also concluded that there is a positive significance relationship between the external factors and beer brand choice however factors within external influences such as religion showed that there is little or no significance to beer brand choice. A look at the product factors the study showed that packaging and alcoholic percentages showed a positive influence towards beer brand choice, however product quality retained a low significance to beer brand choice, products price range and availability of offers and discounts had a significant relationship with choice of beer brand.

As regards cultural influencers it is recommended that EABL should allocate appropriate influencers for their marketing campaigns as this affects greatly the perception of the beer brand and therefore choice. The age, gender and lifestyle factors should be considered while considering the appropriate influencer. It is also recommended that EABL should focus on packaging aspects for its beers for different target markets as it affects beer choice significantly. It is recommend that EABL prices its products appropriately as per target age, gender and social class as this affects their choice country. Notably, the findings from this study form the basis of further study on the same field in other counties.
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CHAPTER ONE

1.0 INTRODUCTION
1.1 Background of the Study

Kenya has a flourishing Beer industry producing high quality beer recognized internationally. With the variety of product brands available in the market it’s necessary to understand how marketing factors influences product and brand choice. According to Kotler and Keller (2012), successful marketing requires that marketers gain a 360 understanding of their consumers while understanding their daily lives and the changes that occur during their lifetime so that the right products are matched with the right customers. In order to create this balance, it is prudent to ensure that any product fully meets the needs and wants of the consumer group (Singh & Sarma, 2015).

LeMay (2017) establishes that a product is anything offered to the market to satisfy a want or need. In planning its market offering, the marketer needs to address five product levels each level adds more customer value, and the five constitute a customer-value hierarchy. According to LeMay (2017), the concept of five-product level was coined by Philip Kotler to explicitly state the different marketing strategies applicable in product marketing. The fundamental level is the core benefit the service or benefit the customer is really buying e.g. a housekeeper buys detergent to clean, the purchaser of a hair dryer is buying to dry hair. Marketers must see themselves as benefit providers (Kotler & Keller, 2012).

At the second level, the marketer must turn the core benefit into a basic product. Thus a hotel room includes a bed, bathroom, towels, desk, dresser, and closet. At the third level, the marketer prepares an expected product, a set of attributes and conditions buyers normally expect when they purchase this product. Hotel guests minimally expect a clean bed, fresh towels, working lamps, and a relative degree of quiet. At the fourth level, the marketer prepares an augmented product that exceeds customer expectations. In many most cases brand positioning and competition take place at this level (Kotler & Keller, 2012).
At the fifth level stands the potential product, which encompasses all the possible augmentations and transformations the product or offering might undergo in the future. Here is where companies search for new ways to satisfy customers and distinguish their offering (Kotler & Keller, 2012). Singh and Sarma (2015) further qualify the rationale of product-customer satisfaction by justifying the importance of prioritizing products based on both the revenue generated and the market demand affiliated to each product.

According to Jonathan (2008), product management and subsequent marketing strategizing predicates substantially on the differentiation of products supported by Philip Kotler’s five product level model. Notably, when differentiation arises, competition increasingly occurs based on product augmentation which also leads the marketer to look at the user’s total consumption system: the way the user performs the tasks of getting and using products and related services. As postulated by Jonathan (2008), each augmentation adds cost, however, augmented benefits soon become expected benefits and necessary points-of parity in the category. If today’s hotel guests expect satellite television, high-speed internet access, and a fully equipped fitness center, competitors must search for still other features and benefits to differentiate themselves (Singh & Sarma, 2015).

According to Kotler, as some companies raise the price of their augmented product, others offer a stripped-down version for less. Thus, alongside the growth of fine hotels such as Kempinski and Raddison Blu, we see lower-cost hotels and motels emerge such as Kenya Comfort Inn, catering to clients who want simply the basic product. Striving to create an augmented product can be a key for success (Kotler & Keller, 2012).

Marketers must modify their price-setting logic when the product is part of a product mix. In product mix pricing, the firm searches for a set of prices that maximizes profits on the total mix. Pricing is difficult because the various products have demand and cost interrelationships and are subject to different degrees of competition. We can distinguish six situations calling for product mix. Product-line pricing is when companies develop product lines rather than single products and introduce price steps.
A men’s clothing store might carry men’s suits at three price levels: $300, $600, and $900, which customers associate with low-, average-, and high-quality. Singh and Sarma (2015) theorize that in any normal structured market, the customer preference and satisfaction reverted to a product depicts the measure of quality and brand potency. As such, based on the theory of product differentiation, customer preference and product performance, the seller’s task is to establish perceived quality differences that justify price differences (Singh & Sarma, 2015).

Optional feature pricing is when companies offer optional products, features, and services with their main product. A buyer of the 2010 Subaru Outback 2.5i can order four-way power passenger seats, an All-Weather package, and a power moon roof as optional features. Pricing options is a sticky problem, because companies must decide which to include in the standard price and which to offer separately. Many restaurants price their beverages high and their food low. The food revenue covers costs, and the beverages especially liquor produce the profit. Captive product pricing is where some products require the use of ancillary or captive products (Kotler & Keller, 2012).

Manufacturers of razors and cameras often price them low and set high markups on razor blades and film. Safaricom may give a cellular phone free if the person commits to buying their phone service. If the captive product is priced too high in the aftermarket, however, counterfeiting and substitutions can erode sales. Consumers now can buy cartridge refills for their printers from discount suppliers and save 20 percent to 30 percent off the manufacturer’s price. Product Bundling Pricing is where Sellers bundle products and features. Pure bundling occurs when a firm offers its products only as a bundle. A talent agency might insist that a “hot” actor can be signed to a film only if the film company also accepts other talents the agency represented (directors, writers). This is a form of tied-in sales (Singh & Sarma, 2015).

In mixed bundling, the seller offers goods both individually and in bundles, normally charging less for the bundle than if the items were purchased separately. An auto manufacturer might offer an option package at less than the cost of buying all the options separately. A theater will price a season subscription lower than the cost of buying all the
performances separately. Customers may not have planned to buy all the components, so savings on the price bundle must be enough to induce them to buy it.

Consumer behavior is the study of how individuals, groups, and organizations select, buy, use, and dispose of goods, services, ideas, or experiences to satisfy their needs and wants. Marketers must fully understand both the theory and reality of consumer behavior profile of American consumers. A consumer’s buying behavior is influenced by cultural, social, and personal factors. Of these, cultural factors exert the broadest and deepest influence (Singh & Sarma, 2015).

According to Kotler (2012) Culture, subculture, and social class are particularly important influences on consumer buying behavior. Culture is the fundamental determinant of a person’s wants and behavior. Virtually all human societies exhibit social stratification, most often in the form of social classes, relatively homogeneous and enduring divisions in a society, hierarchically ordered and with members who share similar values, interests, and behavior. One classic depiction of social classes in the United States defined seven ascending levels: lower lowers, upper lowers, working-class, middle class, upper middles, lower uppers, and upper uppers.

Social class members show distinct product and brand preferences in many areas, including clothing, home furnishings, leisure activities, and automobiles. They also differ in media preferences; upper-class consumers often prefer magazines and books, and lower-class consumers often prefer television. Even within a category such as TV, upper-class consumers may show greater preference for news and drama, whereas lower-class consumers may lean toward reality shows and sports. There are also language differences advertising copy and dialogue must ring true to the targeted social class (Kotler & Keller, 2012).

A person’s reference groups are all the groups that have a direct (face-to-face) or indirect influence on their attitudes or behavior. Groups having a direct influence are called membership groups. Some of these are primary groups with whom the person interacts fairly continuously and informally, such as family, friends, neighbors, and coworkers. People also belong to secondary groups, such as religious, professional, and trade-union
groups, which tend to be more formal and require less continuous interaction (Singh & Sarma, 2015).

Where reference group influence is strong, marketers must determine how to reach and influence the group’s opinion leaders. An opinion leader is the person who offers informal advice or information about a specific product or product category, such as which of several brands is best or how a particular product may be used. Opinion leaders are often highly confident, socially active, and frequent users of the category. Marketers try to reach them by identifying their demographic and psychographic characteristics, identifying the media they read, and directing messages to them (LeMay, 2017: Singhand Sarma, 2015).

Our taste in food, clothes, furniture, and recreation is often related to our age. Consumption is also shaped by the family life cycle and the number, age, and gender of people in the household at any point in time. In addition, psychological life-cycle stages may matter. Adults experience certain “passages” or “transformations” as they go through life. Their behavior as they go through these passages, such as becoming a parent, is not necessarily fixed but changes with the times. Marketers should also consider critical life events or transitions like marriage, childbirth, illness (Kotler & Keller, 2012).

Occupation also influences consumption patterns. Marketers try to identify the occupational groups that have above-average interest in their products and services and even tailor products for certain occupational groups: Computer software companies, for example, design different products for brand managers, engineers, lawyers, and physicians. As the recent recession clearly indicated, both product and brand choice are greatly affected by economic circumstances spendable income (level, stability, and time pattern), savings and assets (including the percentage that is liquid), debts, borrowing power, and attitudes toward spending and saving. Luxury-goods makers such as Gucci, Prada, and Burberry are vulnerable to an economic downturn (Singh & Sarma, 2015).

Each person has personality characteristics that influence his or her buying behavior. By personality, we mean a set of distinguishing human psychological traits that lead to relatively consistent and enduring responses to environmental stimuli (including buying
behavior). We often describe personality in terms of such traits as self-confidence, dominance, autonomy, deference, sociability, defensiveness, and adaptability. Consumers often choose and use brands with a brand personality consistent with their actual self-concept (how we view ourselves) although the match may instead be based on the consumer’s ideal self-concept (how we would like to view ourselves) or even on others’ self-concept how we think others see us (LeMay, 2017).

People from the same subculture, social class, and occupation may lead quite different lifestyles. A lifestyle is a person’s pattern of living in the world as expressed in activities, interests, and opinions. It portrays the “whole person” interacting with his or her environment. Marketers search for relationships between their products and lifestyle groups. A computer manufacturer might find that most computer buyers are achievement-oriented and then aim the brand more clearly at the achiever lifestyle (LeMay, 2017: Singhand & Sarma, 2015).

1.2 Statement of the Problem

Beer companies play a significant role in the country’s economic growth by generating revenue to the government through taxes, creating employment to the locals in the product manufacturing, packaging and distribution to the retail outlets. The number of beer companies has significantly increased in Kenya to over nine major alcoholic beverages companies to date.

The effect of this has been a reduction in market share, declining profitability and stiff competition. As a result companies have been forced to craft strategies in order to sustain or grow their market share, expand to new territories or markets, acquire new technologies, develop brand or line extensions, reduce costs and risks (Oliver, 1995). Alcoholic beverage companies in Kenya need to adopt distribution strategies that ensure they reach their markets efficiently (Mwangulu, 2014).

This study was necessary to address the product management gap associated with customer satisfaction that currently exists. Studies are required to help companies understand in depth customer behavior and their influencers. These include consumer ever changing lifestyles, demographics changes in the population over the years, product
lifecycles and the changing trends. Given the company strategies need to change every so often due to micro and macro environments. This study intended to address the opportunities, weaknesses and threats of EABL beer products.

According to the latest EABL SWOT Analysis report, the company faces weak customer service challenges which in turn affect EABL’s reputation and brand the long term effects of this affect the overall bottom line of the company. EABL also lacks a proper price scaling method meaning the company cost per unit of output is very high. A solution is required to increase volumes, while maintaining high quality (The Monitor, 2011).

EABL also suffers from a weak cost structure which therefore means the company costs are high in comparison to their competitors, also as threat of intense competition can lower EABL’s profit because competitors can entice consumers with superior products. EABL suffers the threat of consumers changing tastes and hence the company depends on understanding their customer’s wants and needs (Waweru & Mwendwa, 2012).

The opportunities that EABL look to explore are the potential acquisitions and synergies it can make in the market, to expand its market share and also to introduce new products since these are determined by consumer trends, which this study unveils. This study also served to add on to the body of knowledge since the last study that was done on EABL in Kenya was done in 2014 e.g. a study was done by Mwangulu (2014) which focused on factors influencing marketing of alcoholic beverages in Kenya.

There has not been significant in depth study to understand consumer choice when it comes to specifically EABL beers in Kenya, this study provided an updated report on the current trends and preferences in beers.

1.3 Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to determine the factors influencing consumer choice of beer brand in Kenya with a special focus on East Africa Breweries Beer Brands Selection.
1.4 Research Questions

1.4.1 How does the external influencers affect consumer choice of beer brands?
1.4.2 How does the internal influencers affect the consumer choice of beer brands?
1.4.3 How does the marketing factors influence consumer choice of beer brand?

1.5 Significance of the Study

1.5.1 Benefits EABL
The research findings are of benefit to EABL, its managers may be able to articulate informed marketing strategies aimed at winning and retaining their customers. The study provides an in depth understanding of their consumer choices in beers this may help them in identifying new market opportunities, improve on product offerings. EABL would benefit from the findings of the study especially when benchmarking. This research is important as it reveals the significance of including consumer-purchasing behavior when designing effective and functional marketing strategies focused on mass and niche markets. Marketing managers need the knowledge of consumer behavior in order to develop, evaluate, and implement effective marketing strategies.

1.5.2 Research and Academics
The study added value to the existing body of knowledge in the area of marketing, strategic responses companies should adopt in order to gain a competitive advantage. It also set foundation for scholars and researchers who wish to further understand the strategies that have been adopted by the different companies in Kenya or to improve on the knowledge of this study.

1.5.3 Benefit EABL Distributors
This study helps the beer distributors to understand their markets better to know the popular products e.g. which beers to sell to bars, wines and spirits shops and which geographical locations to approach for which beers for effecting distribution for maximum results.
1.5.4 Benefit Hotels and Restaurants
This study enables the hospitality industry to understand what to stock for their target markets, it also helps them in pricing and forecasting for food and beverages. It also aids in promotion of the beer brand at their properties.

1.5.5 Benefit other Marketing Organizations
This study enables marketing agencies/companies to gain insights about buyer behavior and consumer choice when it comes to beers and may be better equipped to advise their clients both existing and the prospecting companies that would like to set up a similar business in Kenya.

1.6 Scope of the Study
This research was confined within Nairobi City with a population of 3.3 million inhabitants and will limit the beer selection to EABL beers. The study sampled 5 major locations in Nairobi namely Eastlands, Westlands, Southlands, CBD, Thika Road, Nairobi West, Karen-Kilimani area. The respondents were people from varied ages between 18-70 years of age and varied social class levels for gender both male and female respondents were sampled. The data collection took approximately 2 months Feb 2018 to April 2018 and another 2 months May 2018 to July 2018 for analysis and reporting. The research was scheduled to take 5 months to complete. The respondents were at times not motivated to fill in a hard copy questionnaire to the end, the solution to this lied in developing an online interactive questionnaire also conducting interviews and filling in the forms for the respondents.

1.7 Definition of Terms
1.7.1 Consumer Behavior
The study of how individuals, groups, and organizations select, buy, use and dispose of goods, ideas or experiences to satisfy their needs and wants (Kotler, 2012).

1.7.2 Beer
An alcoholic drink made from yeast-fermented malt flavored with hops according to the brewers Association 1992.
1.7.3 Marketing Mix
As set of marketing tools that the firm uses to pursue its marketing objectives, they are classified into four groups product, price, place, promotion (McCarthy, 1999).

1.7.4 Socio-Economic Factors
These are lifestyles and values that characterize an individual social class and financial status and their perception by the society (Gale, 2006).

1.7.5 Brand
This is a name, term, sign, symbol or design intended to identify the goods or services of a company. A brand is a sellers promise to deliver to a specific set of features, benefits and service consistently to the buyer (Kotler, 2001).

1.8 Chapter Summary
This chapter presents the background on the importance of studying consumer purchasing behavior as an important factor to consider when designing marketing strategy for EABL beers. It outlines the problem statement, objectives for this study, conceptual framework and scope of the study.

Chapter two presents the literature review and provides insights into what other researchers have done in the field of buyer behavior and consumer choice and influence towards brand preference. Chapter three addresses the methodology used in conducting the study and the established protocols adopted for this study. Chapter four discusses in details the results and findings and the final chapter five concludes the study by providing the study’s discussions, conclusions and recommendations.
CHAPTER TWO

2.0 LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Introduction
This chapter comprises of related literature on the study subject as per the specific objectives. The specific objectives of this study are to determine the effect of external influencers on consumer choice of beer brands, to examine the effect of internal influencers on consumer choice of beer brands and to establish the effects of marketing factors on consumer choice of beer brand.

2.2 Effect of Internal Influencers on Consumer Choice
The internal influences include both personal and psychological factors. The personal factors include age, income, lifestyle and personality while the psychological factors include motivation, perception, learning, beliefs and attitudes (Kotler & Keller, 2012).

2.2.1 Personal Factors (Age)
It is well established that the types of goods and services sought by individuals change as they age and pass through the various lifecycle stages. Compared to their older counterparts, younger individuals are less committed to definite patterns and are more open to new perspectives and products (De Mooij, 2004). For example, younger people pay more attention to expressive product aspects than older people (Henry, 2002).

Advancing age brings about changes in consumers’ needs and abilities, some of which are beyond the control of the individual yet will impact on consumers’ food-related behavior in terms of purchase, preparation and consumption. The elderly have been identified as having marketplace needs which are different from other segments (Hillery et al., 1997) and the ageing process is recognized to alter an individual’s approach to food (Saba et al., 2008).

As a consumer becomes older their retail buying behavior changes, as does their food-related behavior. Increasing age is associated with changes in lifestyle, purchasing behavior and consumer perceptions. Retailers need to be aware of the way in which their customers behave and by being able to better differentiate between age segments, they
can then appropriately tailor their products and services to meet specific needs and demands. It is fair to say the physical consequences of ageing may not account exclusively for the changes demonstrated in behavior (Menely et al., 2009).

However, lifestyle changes which result from the ageing process may also impact upon how one behaves. These lifestyle changes are, however, age related and therefore the combination of both causes alterations in consumers’ actions. For too long, older consumers have been treated as one homogeneous group when in fact these findings show that significant differences are apparent within the age segments of the older population and they should be treated as a heterogeneous consumer group. Hence, age may be used as a variable to segment consumer behavior although caution must be observed in relying on it exclusively (Menely et al., 2009).

Older age consumers (more than 55 years) tend to make decisions that can be described as preventative. The behavior of older age participants could be influenced by their perceived vulnerability than their younger counter parts (Hardley, 2002). There is a negative, but significant (0.05) relationship between the age of the respondents and relative importance of the quality of beer that they usually drink. This is interesting, as the research has already shown that consumers claim the quality of the beer to be a key consideration, yet based on the above, it would appear that it is the younger consumers who are generally more concerned about the quality of the beer they drink (Swift, 2010).

This may be because the older the consumer, the more likely they are to have started drinking beer during the communist era, when they had little or no choice as to what they bought. Respondents aged 18 or over in 1990, would today be in their late-30 s and above, and as previously indicated, the group aged 41 and over, represents 34.2 per cent of respondents – approximately one-third (Swift, 2010).

2.2.2 Personal Factor (Income)
According to Ates and Ceylan (2010) findings of their research on income and milk consumption, the income level is an important factor influencing the form in which the milk is consumed. As the income increases, the amount of pasteurized and long-shelf-life milk increases. As the level of consumer education increases, so does the amount of
pasteurized milk consumption. This means that, in the rural areas, as the income and education level decreases, the milk is consumed in its raw form. On the other hand, in the urban areas, as the income and education levels increase milk is increasingly consumed in pasteurized form.

According to Singh and Sarma (2015), Occupation also influences consumption patterns. Marketers try to identify the occupational groups that have above-average interest in their products and services and even tailor products for certain occupational groups: Computer software companies, for example, design different products for brand managers, engineers, lawyers, and physicians. As the recent recession clearly indicated, both product and brand choice are greatly affected by economic circumstances: spendable income level, stability, and time pattern, savings and assets including the percentage that is liquid, debts, borrowing power, and attitudes toward spending and saving. Ideally, all these factors define the dynamics of business, management and product-customer relationship (Singh & Sarma, 2015).

Luxury-goods makers such as Gucci, Prada, and Burberry are vulnerable to an economic downturn. If economic indicators point to a recession, marketers can take steps to redesign, reposition, and reprice their products or introduce or increase the emphasis on discount brands so they can continue to offer value to target customers. Some firms such as Snap Fitness in the U.S are well-positioned to take advantage of good and bad economic times to begin with (Kotler et al., 2012).

The economic situation of any country also strongly influences the buying behavior of consumer. Mean the consumer choice strongly affect by economic circumstances. If the living standard of the people is high then they also purchase good food, clothes and other things. It also influence by the income level, political satiability, import and export and currency value. Income also strongly affects product choice, as higher-income consumers are better able to purchase expensive, status-enhancing items e.g. household appliances, consumer electronics, and luxury products (De Mooij, 2004).
2.2.3 Personal Factor (Lifestyle and Personality)

The consumer behavior literature states that lifestyle, including attitude, behavior and psychological profile, is an important influence on consumer consumption patterns, and can indicate attitudinal differences between segments. Lifestyle is thus deemed the main basis of segmentation. “Lifestyle segmentation” has been a useful tool for marketing management decision making. In marketing, “lifestyle segmentation” describes the life-like portrait of the consumer and classified potential consumers into segments with specific and identifiable lifestyle patterns. The life-style is closely associated with the economic level at which people live and how they spend their money. This study applies the life-style segmentation approach to identify the characteristics of consumer groups that typically favor high end beer brands and the middle level to lower end Brands.

People from the same subculture, social class, and occupation may lead quite different lifestyles. A lifestyle is a person’s pattern of living in the world as expressed in activities, interests, and opinions. It portrays the “whole person” interacting with his or her environment. Marketers search for relationships between their products and lifestyle groups. A computer manufacturer might find that most computer buyers are achievement-oriented and then aim the brand more clearly at the achiever lifestyle. The influences of brands on a demography or population depend on personal factors such as lifestyle, consumer preferences and other demographic oriented factors (LeMay, 2017).

Lifestyles are shaped partly by whether consumers are money constrained or time constrained. Companies aiming to serve money-constrained consumers will create lower-cost products and services. By appealing to thrifty consumers, Walmart has become the largest company in the world. Its “everyday low prices” have wrung tens of billions of dollars out of the retail supply chain, passing the larger part of savings along to shoppers in the form of rock-bottom bargain prices. Consumers who experience time famine are prone to multi-tasking, doing two or more things sat the same time. They will also pay others to perform tasks because time is more important to them than money. Companies aiming to serve them will create convenient products and service for this group (Kotler & Keller, 2012).
Each person has personality characteristics that influence his or her buying behavior. By personality, we mean a set of distinguishing human psychological traits that lead to relatively consistent and enduring responses to environmental stimuli (including buying behavior). We often describe personality in terms of such traits as self-confidence, dominance, autonomy deference, sociability, defensiveness, and adaptability (LeMay, 2017).

Personality can be a useful variable in analyzing consumer brand choices. Brands also have personalities, and consumers are likely to choose brands whose personalities match their own. We define brand personality as the specific mix of human traits that we can attribute to a particular brand. Stanford’s Jennifer Aaker researched brand personalities and identified the following traits: Sincerity — down-to-earth, honest, wholesome, and cheerful; Excitement — daring, spirited, imaginative, and up-to-date; Competence — reliable, intelligent, and successful; Sophistication — upper-class and charming; Ruggedness — outdoorsy and tough.

Consumers often choose and use brands with a brand personality consistent with their actual self-concept (how we view ourselves), although the match may instead be based on the consumer’s ideal self-concept (how we would like to view ourselves) or even on others’ self-concept (how we think others see us). These effects may also be more pronounced for publicly consumed products than for privately consumed goods. On the other hand, consumers who are high self-monitors that is, sensitive to how others see them are more likely to choose brands whose personalities fit the consumption situation. Finally, often consumers have multiple aspects of self (serious professional, caring family member, active fun-lover) that may be evoked differently in different situations or around different types of people. Some marketers carefully orchestrate brand experiences to express brand personalities (Mariëlle, 2010).

2.2.4 Psychological Factors
Marketing and environmental stimuli enter the consumer’s consciousness, and a set of psychological processes combine with certain consumer characteristics to result in decision processes and purchase decisions. The marketer’s task is to understand what happens in the Consumer’s consciousness between the arrival of the outside marketing
stimuli and the ultimate Purchase decisions. Four key psychological processes - motivation, perception, learning, and memory fundamentally influence consumer responses (Kotler & Keller, 2012).

2.2.5 Psychological Factor (Motivation)
Sigmund Freud assumed the psychological forces shaping people’s behavior are largely unconscious, and that a person cannot fully understand his or her own motivations. Someone who examines specific brands will react not only to their stated capabilities, but also to other, less conscious cues such as shape, size, weight, material, color, and brand name. A technique called laddering lets us trace a person’s motivations from the stated instrumental ones to the more terminal ones. Then the marketer can decide at what level to develop the message and appeal (LeMay, 2017).

Today, motivational researchers continue the tradition of Freudian interpretation. Jan Callebaut Identifies different motives a product can satisfy. For example, whiskey can meet the need for social relaxation, status, or fun. Different whiskey brands need to be motivationally positioned in one of these three appeals. Another motivation researcher, Clotaire Rapaille, works on breaking the “code” behind product behavior. Abraham Maslow sought to explain why people are driven by particular needs at particular times. His answer is that human needs are arranged in a hierarchy from most to least pressing physiological needs, safety needs, social needs, esteem needs, and self-actualization (LeMay, 2017).

People will try to satisfy their most important need first and then try to satisfy the next most important. For example, a starving man will not take an interest in the latest happenings in the art world, nor in how he is viewed by others, nor evening whether he is breathing clean air but when he has enough food and water, the next most important need will become salient (Kotler & Keller 2012).

The absence of dissatisfies is not enough to motivate a purchase; satisfiers must be present. For example, a computer that does not come with a warranty would be a dissatisfied. Yet the presence of product warranty would not act as a satisfier or motivator of a purchase, because it is not a source of intrinsic satisfaction. Ease of use would be a
satisfier. Herzberg’s theory has two implications. First, sellers should do their best to avoid dissatisfiers (for example, a poor training manual or a poor service policy). Although these things will not sell a product, they might easily unsell it. Second, the seller should identify the major satisfiers or motivators of purchase in the market and then supply them (Mariëlle, 2010). Motivation is rarely homogenous (Lindenberg & Steg, 2007), and consumers frequently strive to maximize goal fulfillment, and resolve goal conflict, by choosing means which satisfy multiple goals simultaneously (Kopetz, 2007) (Barbopolous & Johannson 2016).

The gain goal entails a heightened sensitivity to changes impersonal resources (Lindenberg & Steg, 2007). When the gain goal is active, consumers may be more sensitive to variations in cost and perceived value, while concerns about emotional, social or ethical consequences are of lesser importance. Indeed, strong economic motivations have been shown to displace or weaken other motivations, such as personal responsibility and moral obligations, a phenomenon referred to as “motivation crowding out” (Frey & Jegen, 2001). According to Lindenberg and Steg (2007), the gain goal may be related to sub-goals dealing with saving money, increasing one’s income and dealing with threats to one’s financial security (Barbopolous & Johannson 2016).

The hedonic goal makes consumers more sensitive to changes in pleasure, mood and energy levels, while economic utility and norms play a lesser role (Lindenberg & Steg, 2007). Consumers have, for example, been shown to be less price sensitive for hedonic goods compared to utilitarian goods (Wakefield & Inman 2003). Emotions and affect have been shown to be an important aspect of consumption in a wide variety of situations (Babin et al., 1994; Childers et al., 2001; Pohjanheimo et al., 2010), including in highly functional consumer decision contexts, such as the choice between public transport and the car (Steg, 2005). The hedonic goal is assumed to be related to sub-goals dealing with pleasure and excitement, as well as avoidance of effort and negative feelings (Lindenberg & Steg, 2007) (Barbopolous & Johannson 2016).

The normative goal is associated with a heightened sensitivity how one “ought” to act, according to personal norms, the opinions of others and the society as a whole (Lindenberg & Steg, 2007). As such, this goal is closely related to pro-social and pro-
environmental consumption. Although norms are highly influential, they can be displaced by other goals. Research has, for example, shown that, as costs of either resources or effort increase, normative concerns become less influential, a phenomenon referred to as the “low-cost hypothesis” (Diekmann & Preisendorfer, 2003). The normative goal is thought to be linked to sub-goals dealing with appropriateness, moral obligations and social norms (Dawes & Messick, 2000; Lindenberg & Steg, 2007; Barbopolous & Johannson, 2016).

2.2.6 Psychological Factor (Perception)
A motivated person is ready to act, how is influenced by his or her perception of the situation. In marketing, perceptions are more important than reality, because perceptions affect consumers’ actual behavior. Perception is the process by which we select, organize, and interpret information inputs to create a meaningful picture of the world. It depends not only on physical stimuli, but also on the stimuli’s relationship to the surrounding environment and on conditions within each of us. One person might perceive a fast-talking salesperson as aggressive and insincere; another, as intelligent and helpful. Each will respond to the salesperson differently. People emerge with different perceptions of the same object because of three perceptual processes: selective attention, selective distortion, and selective retention (Kotler & Keller 2012).

Attention is the allocation of processing capacity to some stimulus. Voluntary attention is something purposeful; involuntary attention is grabbed by someone or something. It’s estimated that the average person may be exposed to over 1,500 ads or brand communications a day. Because we cannot possibly attend to all these, we screen most stimuli out a process called selective attention. Selective attention means that marketers must work hard to attract consumers’ notice. The real challenge is to explain which stimuli people will notice. People are more likely to notice stimuli that relate to a current need (Waweru & Mwendwa, 2012).

Even noticed stimuli don’t always come across in the way the senders intended. Selective distortion is the tendency to interpret information in a way that fits our preconceptions. Consumers will often distort information to be consistent with prior brand and product beliefs and expectations. For a stark demonstration of the power of consumer brand
beliefs, consider that in “blind “taste tests, one group of consumers samples a product without knowing which brand it is, while another group knows. Invariably, the groups have different opinions, despite consuming exactly the same product (Singh & Sarma, 2015).

Most of us do not remember much of the information to which we’re exposed, but we do retain information that supports our attitudes and beliefs. Because of selective retention, we’re likely to remember good points about a product we like and forget good points about competing products. Selective retention again works to the advantage of strong brands.

It also explains why marketers need to use repetition - to make sure their message is not overlooked. The selective perception mechanisms require consumers’ active engagement and thought. A topic that has fascinated armchair marketers for ages is subliminal perception. They argue that marketers embed covert, subliminal messages in ads or packaging. Consumers are not consciously aware of them, yet they affect behavior. Although it’s clear that mental processes include many subtle subconscious effects, no evidence supports the notion that marketers can systematically control consumers at that level, especially enough to change moderately important or strongly held beliefs (Kotler & Keller, 2012).

2.2.7 Psychological Factor (Learning)

When we act, we learn. Learning induces changes in our behavior arising from experience. Most human behavior is learned, although much learning is incidental. Learning theorists believe learning is produced through the interplay of drives, stimuli, cues, responses, and reinforcement. Two popular approaches to learning are classical conditioning and operant (instrumental) conditioning (LeMay, 2017).

A drive is a strong internal stimulus impelling action. Cues are minor stimuli that determine when, where, and how a person responds. Suppose you buy an HP computer. If your experience is rewarding, your response to computers and HP will be positively reinforced. Later, when you want to buy a printer, you may assume that because it makes
good computers, HP also makes good printers. In other words, you generalize your response to similar stimuli (Kotler & Keller 2012).

A countertendency to generalization is discrimination. Discrimination means we have learned to recognize differences in sets of similar stimuli and can adjust our responses accordingly. Learning theory teaches marketers that they can build demand for a product by associating it with strong drives, using motivating cues, and providing positive reinforcement. A new company can enter the market by appealing to the same drives competitors use and by providing similar cues, because buyers are more likely to transfer loyalty to similar brands (generalization); or the company might design its brand to appeal to a different set of drives and offer strong cue inducements to switch discrimination (Mariëlle, 2010).

Some researchers prefer more active, cognitive approaches when learning depends on the inferences or interpretations consumers make about outcomes (was an unfavorable consumer experience due to a bad product, or did the consumer fail to follow instructions properly). The hedonic bias occurs when people have a general tendency to attribute success to themselves and failure to external causes. Consumers are thus more likely to blame a product than themselves, putting pressure on marketers to carefully explicate product functions in well-designed packaging and labels, instructive ads and Web sites, and so on (Kotler & Keller 2012).

2.2.8 Psychological Factor (Beliefs and Attitude)
Through experience and learning, people acquire beliefs and attitudes. These in turn influence buying behavior. A belief is a descriptive thought that a person holds about something. Just as important are attitudes, a person’s enduring favorable or unfavorable evaluations, emotional feelings, and action tendencies toward some object or idea. People have attitudes toward almost everything: religion, politics, clothes, music, and food. Attitudes put us into a frame of mind: liking or disliking an object, moving toward or away from it (LeMay, 2017; Mariëlle, 2010).
They lead us to behave in a fairly consistent way toward similar objects. Because attitudes economize on energy and thought, they can be very difficult to change. As a general rule, a company is well advised to fit its product into existing attitudes rather than try to change attitudes. If beliefs and attitudes become too negative, however, more serious steps may be necessary. With a controversial ad campaign for its pizza, Domino’s took drastic measures to try to change consumer attitudes (Kotler & Keller 2012).

2.3 Effect of External Influencers on Consumer Choice

The External influences include both Cultural and Social Factors. The Cultural factors include culture, sub culture and Social Class while the Social factors include family reference group, Role and Status (Mariëlle, 2010; LeMay, 2017).

2.3.1 Cultural Factors

Culture, subculture, and social class are particularly important influences on consumer buying behavior. Culture is the fundamental determinant of a person’s wants and behavior. Through family and other key institutions, a child growing up in the United States is exposed to values such as achievement and success, activity, efficiency and practicality, progress, material comfort, individualism, freedom, external comfort, humanitarianism, and youthfulness(Kotler & Keller 2012).

Each culture consists of smaller subcultures that provide more specific identification and socialization for their members. Subcultures include nationalities, religions, racial groups, and geographic regions. When subcultures grow large and affluent enough, companies often design. Specialized marketing programs to serve them. Virtually all human societies exhibit social stratification, most often in the form of social classes, relatively homogeneous and enduring divisions in a society, hierarchically ordered and with members who share similar values, interests, and behavior (LeMay, 2017; Mariëlle, 2010).

One classic depiction of social classes in the United States defined seven ascending levels: lower lowers, upper lowers, working class, middle class, upper middles, lower uppers, and upper uppers. Social class members show distinct product and brand preferences in many areas, including clothing, home furnishings, leisure activities, and automobiles. They also differ in media preferences; upper-class consumers often prefer
magazines and books, and lower-class consumers often prefer television. Even within a category such as TV, upper-class consumers may show greater preference for news and drama, whereas lower-class consumers may lean toward reality shows and sports. There are also language differences - advertising copy and dialogue must ring true to the targeted social class (Kotler & Keller, 2012).

It is valid to appreciate that any target market is basically predicated upon a cultural background. According to LeMay (2017), product advancement and reception in a population is significantly affected and determined by the culture of a target population. The stratification of a target population along cultural lines. Notably, the relevance of cultural factors are pivotal considerations that need to be taken to account when dealing with any marketing or business proposition. LeMay (2017) explicitly postulates that having a cultural understanding of a target population supplies business management with the relevant information that can be used to make viable business plans.

Past demographic studies that base on retrospective and prospective confirm the importance and relevance of cultural consideration when advancing product marketing prospects. It is prudent to affirm that cultural factors are part of the building blocks of any demography. Notably, a culturally diverse population gives grounds for deviancy in consumer preferences, product and brand acceptance and marketing strategies. According to Kotler and Keller (2013), consumer habits and trends show close synergy and basis to cultural factors. For instance, a consumer might prefer a certain product or disapprove it purely based on his/her cultural affiliation and background.

2.3.2 Social Factors (Reference Groups)

A person’s reference groups are all the groups that have a direct (face to face) or indirect influence on their attitudes or behavior. Groups having a direct influence are called membership groups. Some of these are primary groups with whom the person interacts fairly continuously and informally, such as family, friends, neighbors, and coworkers. People also belong to secondary groups, such as religious, professional, and trade-union groups, which tend to be more formal and require less continuous interaction (Singh & Sarma, 2015).
Reference groups influence members in at least three ways. They expose an individual to new behaviors and lifestyles, they influence attitudes and self-concept, and they create pressures for conformity that may affect product and brand choices. People are also influenced by groups to which they do not belong. Aspirational groups are those a person hopes to join; dissociative groups are those whose values or behavior an individual rejects. Where reference group influence is strong, marketers must determine how to reach and influence the group’s opinion leaders. An opinion leader is the person who offers informal advice or information about a specific product or product category, such as which of several brands is best or how a particular product may be used. Opinion leaders are often highly confident, socially active, and frequent users of the category. Marketers try to reach them by identifying their demographic and psychographic characteristics, identifying the media they read, and directing messages to them (Kotler & Keller, 2012).

2.3.3 Social Factor (Family)

The family is the most important consumer buying organization in society, and family members constitute the most influential primary reference group. There are two families in the buyer’s life. The family of orientation consists of parents and siblings. From parents a person acquires an orientation toward religion, politics, and economics and a sense of personal ambition, self-worth, and love. Even if the buyer no longer interacts very much with his or her parents, parental influence on behavior can be significant. Almost 40 percent of families have auto insurance with the same company as the husband’s parents (Singh & Sarma, 2015).

A more direct influence on everyday buying behavior is the family of procreation namely, the person’s spouse and children. In the United States, husband–wife engagement in purchases has traditionally varied widely by product category. The wife has usually acted as the family’s main purchasing agent, especially for food, sundries, and staple clothing items. Now traditional purchasing roles are changing, and marketers would be wise to see both men and women as possible targets. For expensive products and services such as cars, vacations, or housing, the vast majority of husbands and wives engage in joint decision making (Howland, 2016).
Men and women may respond differently to marketing messages, however. Research has shown that women value connections and relationships with family and friends and place a higher priority on people than on companies. Men, on the other hand, relate more to competition and place a high priority on action. Marketers are taking more direct aim at women with new Another shift in buying patterns is an increase in the amount of dollars spent and the direct and indirect influence wielded by children and teens. Direct influence describes children’s hints, requests, and demands. Indirect influence means that parents know the brands, product choices, and preferences of their children without hints or outright requests (Kotler & Keller, 2012).

Research has shown that more than two-thirds of 13- to 21-year-olds make or influence family. Right products, they watch what their friends say and do as much as what they see or hear in an adore are told by a salesperson in a store. Television can be especially powerful in reaching children, and marketers are using it to target them at younger ages than ever before with product tie-ins for just about everything Disney character pajamas, retro G.I. Joe toys and action figures, Harry Potter backpacks, and High School. By the time children are around 2 years old, they can often recognize characters, logos, and specific brands. They can distinguish between advertising and programming by about ages six or seven. A year or so later, they can understand the concept of persuasive intent on the part of advertisers. By nine or ten, they can perceive the discrepancies between message and product (Howland, 2016).

Howland (2016) justifies the logic that within any target population, the basic social unit of family affects market and product dynamisms. Ideally, the basic unit of a society is the family. Marketing prospects and interventions need to influence the lowest social unit (family) to ensure successful consumer influence and impact. The correlation between marketing approaches, product-brand creation and business success is justified by the affiliation to social factors.

2.3.4 Social Factors (Roles and Status)
We each participate in many groups’ family, clubs, and organizations. Groups often are an important source of information and help to define norms for behavior. We can define a person’s position in each group in terms of role and status. A role consists of the
activities a person is expected to perform. Each role in turn connotes a status. A senior vice president of marketing may be seen as having more status than a sales manager, and a sales manager may be seen as having more status than an office clerk. People choose products that reflect and communicate their role and their actual or desired status in society. Marketers must be aware of the status-symbol potential of products and brands (Kotler & Keller 2012).

2.4 Effect of Marketing Mix Factors on Consumer Choice

The marketing mix is a set of controllable marketing tools that an institution uses to produce the response it wants from its various target markets. It consists of everything that the university can do to influence the demand for the services that it offers. Tangible products have traditionally used a 4Ps model, the services sector on the other hand uses a 7P approach in order to satisfy the needs of the service provider’s customers: product, price, place, promotion, people, physical facilities and processes (Ivy, 2008).

People reflect, in part, internal marketing and the fact that employees are critical to marketing success. Marketing will only be as good as the people inside the organization. It also reflects the fact that marketers must view consumers as people to understand their lives more broadly and not just as they shop for and consume products and services (Kotler & Keller 2012).

Processes reflects all the creativity, discipline, and structure brought to marketing management. Marketers must avoid ad hoc planning and decision making and ensure that state-of-the-art marketing ideas and concepts play an appropriate role in all they do. Only by instituting the right set of processes to guide activities and programs can a firm engage in mutually beneficial long-term relationships. Another important set of processes guides the firm in imaginatively generating insights and breakthrough products, services, and marketing activities (Kotler & Keller 2012).

Programs reflects all the firm’s consumer-directed activities. It encompasses the old four Ps as well as a range of other marketing activities that might not fit as neatly into the old view of marketing. Regardless of whether they are online or offline, traditional or nontraditional, these activities must be integrated such that their whole is greater than the
sum of their parts and they accomplish multiple objectives for the firm (Singh & Sarma, 2015).

2.4.1 Product

Numerous studies confer that quality is markedly associated with customer purchase intentions. Earlier, Shawyer et al. (2002) concluded that the likelihood of a consumer making a purchase decision increases with consumer perception of product quality. Furthermore, perceived product quality affects consumer attitudes, faithfulness and repeat purchase behavior. Studies have also shown that consumer perceptions of a product or service as being of high quality directly or indirectly increase consumer purchase intentions (Creusen, 2010).

The importance of certain product aspects in buying products differs with demographic characteristics, such as gender, age, and social class (Henry, 2002; Holt, 1998; Williams, 2002). For example, younger people pay more attention to expressive product aspects than older people (Henry, 2002). Insight into differences in product aspect importance with demographic characteristics such as age, gender, education and income, will be of practical utility to product managers. In addition, this knowledge is useful for attuning marketing communication to specific target audiences (Creusen, 2010).

Concerning the influence of gender on the importance of certain product aspects, the following findings are found in the literature. (Henry, 2002) found that males use more functional purchase criteria than females. (Williams, 2002), who had respondents indicate the importance of several evaluative criteria for nine types of products, found that performance, durability and reliability (i.e. quality), and style/appearance were more important to females. Research into object attachment shows that males more often indicate functional items that are valued for their instrumental value as their favorite possessions (Creusen, 2010).

Henry (2002) found that younger people use more expressive purchase criteria. In addition, in research into object attachment, Wallendorf and Arnould (1988) found younger people to focus more on hedonic pleasures in choosing their favorite objects. Hsieh et al. (2004) found that older people are more sensitive to utilitarian brand image
aspects. However, Wallendorf and Arnould (1988) found older people less likely to choose functional as opposed to display items as favorite possessions. This seems to indicate an importance of symbolic value in buying products (Creusen, 2010). However, these possessions have symbolic value for older people as they represent something from their history (Csikszentmihalyi & Rochberg-Halton, 1981; Wallendorf & Arnould, 1988), which is something different than buying a product because it portrays a certain image to others.

One could expect older people to pay more attention to ease of use, as they may have more problems dealing with complex operation. For in getting older, cognitive abilities such as working memory capacity, symbol and language comprehension diminish (Rousseau et al., 1998). Based on these findings we expect that younger people pay more attention to aesthetic and symbolic product aspects than older people. We expect older people to pay more attention to utilitarian aspects in buying durable products, and will assess whether this applies to functionalities as well as quality and ease of use (Creusen, 2010).

Although somewhat surprising, studies suggest that income level does not correlate highly with social class (Williams, 2002; Coleman, 1983). Therefore we look at income level separately. There is little research about the relation of income to the importance of various evaluative criteria (Williams, 2002). Williams found a negative correlation between income and the importance of utilitarian purchase criteria, especially for less socially relevant products. We therefore expect that higher income leads to less importance of functional aspects and will assess whether this goes for functionalities as well as quality and ease of use. (Williams, 2002) did not find a relation between income and importance of expressive aspects (Creusen, 2010).

According to Creusen (2010) article, the package’s overall features can underline the uniqueness and originality of the product. Quality judgments are largely influenced by product characteristics reflected by packaging, and these play a role in the formation of brand preferences. If the package communicates high quality, consumers frequently assume that the product is of high quality. If the package symbolizes low quality,
consumers transfer this “low quality” perception to the product itself (Underwood et al., 2001; Silayoi & Speece, 2004).

Ali, (2014) says consumers also learn color associations, which leads them to prefer certain colors for certain product categories (Grossman & Wisenblit, 1999). Using color as a cue on packaging can foster a potentially strong association, especially when it is unique to a particular brand. However, people in different cultures are exposed to different color associations and develop color preferences based on their own culture. Marketers therefore must consider color as part of their strategies. Simply taking the colors of a particular logo, package, or product design from one market to another should only be done under a thorough understanding of how colors and the color combinations are perceived in each location (Madden et al., 2000).

2.4.2 Pricing
Margins can be manipulated by price setting, variation (discounts), price changes, and resale price control. The margin policy will determine what kinds of middlemen and how many will be available for the channel design. Many good middlemen usually require a higher margin policy.

Often well over half of the final consumer price is composed of middlemen’s margins. Factors influencing middlemen’s margins include degree of competition, cost of functions performed, desired profits, bargaining power, and resale price-control power. Channel policies involving degree of directness, selectivity, choice of middleman type, and number of channels will all interact with price. The multiple-channel approach is made more profitable if some form of price segmentation can be utilized (Ali, 2014).

According to Ali (2014) alcoholic beverage companies view prices in terms of their ability to generate profits, sales, and consumer traffic, as well as how they affect the stores image. In setting retail prices, the alcoholic beverage company is guided by the value chains set by the company, profits, sales or competitive objectives. Alcoholic beverage firms use price adjustments as adaptive mechanisms to accommodate changing market conditions and operating requirements. Both upward and downward adjustments
are needed from time to time to adapt to the dynamic retailing environment, (Lewinson & Delozier, 1982).

Consumers are becoming more increasingly price sensitive, (Eaglesham, 1990). Pricing is a major competitive tool. The economics of production only sets the bottom line limit and the company then has a wide range of strategies to set the price. The commonly used price strategies are: ‘Image’ pricing, the price here follows the image of the brand. Adidas shoes or Nike are priced high because of the premium value attached to the brand name. Price undercutting, some companies have used this strategy very successfully. For undercutting to succeed, the company has to offer the minimum performance standard (Ramanu, 1996). Aggressive or Penetration pricing, firms in this sector wishing to offer a high level of benefits at an average price (Ali, 2014).

2.4.3 Promotion

Promotion involves both providing the consumer information regarding the alcoholic beverages’ store and its product or service offering as well as influencing the consumer perceptions, attitudes, and behavior towards the store and what it has to offer. It is both an informative and persuasive communication process. Companies use newspaper ads, posters, TV, internet that stress its good prices (persuasive communication) and but instead of just listing the merchandise, the ads tell exactly why the manufacturer closed out the goods. That way, customers would not suspect that the products are irregular, damaged or counterfeit informative communication (Ali, 2014).

While assessing the target audience, companies look at the demographics and lifestyles, life stages, usage levels, understanding and perception of services and the organization and the buying process of the targets. While designing advertising messages, manufacturers use emotional and moral appeal, there is also use of rational messages and humor, one danger is that a wrongly chosen promotional strategy can bring negative reaction (Ali, 2014).

Sponsorship contributes to the building of the brand/product and corporate image. Direct marketing is an interactive system of marketing which use one or more advertising media to affect a measurable response and / or transactions at any location, Betts and York
(1994), it aims to create and exploit the dialogue between the service provider and the customer, and offer several potential benefits such as targeting precision, testing the market, providing new distribution channels and support existing ones, it also leads to cost effective advertising. There is a role for consumer promotions in the marketing of even the strongest brand, a role which is mainly tactical and which needs to be carefully planned. The alcoholic beverage distributors must be involved, since most promotions necessarily require their cooperation, but it should be the manufacturer who decides on the purpose of and budget for the schemes (Ali, 2014).

Trade promotions at the same time need negotiations with customers, but again the decision must be designed by the manufacturers and have specific targets Randall (1991). Personal selling is the direct face to face communication between a retail sales person and a retail consumer. Store displays are direct, impersonal in-store presentations and exhibitions of merchandise together with related information. Customers need and desire constant flow of factual information to use as a basis of making need- satisfying purchase decisions. They want to know stores hours, what specials are being run, what styles are in fashion, product features, and a host of all other things (Ali, 2014).

According Ali (2014) since alcoholic beverages desire to influence their customers to take desired course of action, retail communications must be well organized and designed so that each message contains the appropriate balance of information and persuasion. Retail advertising has two basic purposes: to get the customers into the store and to contribute to the stores image or the company. The first purpose is immediate: today’s advertising brings buyers into the store tomorrow; tomorrow’s advertising brings buyers into the store the next day. To accomplish this, the store must give buyers some specific reason to come to the store now Advertising can be of several kinds: product advertising, institutional and cooperative advertising (Hasty & Reardon 1997).

2.4.4 Distribution
To reach a target market, the marketer uses three kinds of marketing channels. Communication channels deliver and receive messages from target buyers and include newspapers, magazines, radio, television, mail, telephone, billboards, posters, fliers, CDs, audiotapes, and the Internet. Beyond these, firms communicate through the look of their
retail stores and Web sites and other media. Marketers are increasingly adding dialogue channels such as e-mail, blogs, and toll-free numbers to familiar monologue channels such as ads. The marketer uses distribution channels to display, sell, or deliver the physical product or service(s) to the buyer or user (Kotler & Keller, 2012).

These channels may be direct via the Internet, mail, or mobile phone or telephone, or indirect with distributors, wholesalers, retailers, and agents as intermediaries. To carry out transactions with potential buyers, the marketer also uses service channels that include warehouses, transportation companies, banks, and insurance companies. Marketers clearly face a design challenge in choosing the best mix of communication, distribution, and service channels for their offerings (Ali, 2014).

The supply chain is a longer channel stretching from raw materials to components to finished products carried to final buyers. The supply chain for coffee may start with Ethiopian farmers who plant, tend, and pick the coffee beans, selling their harvest to wholesalers or perhaps a Fair Trade cooperative. If sold through the cooperative, the coffee is washed, dried, and packaged for shipment by an Alternative Trading Organization (ATO) that pays a minimum of $1.26 a pound. The ATO transports the coffee to the developing world where it can sell it directly or via retail channels. Each company captures only a certain percentage of the total value generated by the supply chain’s value delivery system. When a company acquires competitors or expands upstream or downstream, its aim is to capture a higher percentage of supply chain value (LeMay, 2017).

The marketing environment consists of the task environment and the broad environment. The task environment includes the actors engaged in producing, distributing, and promoting the offering. These are the company, suppliers, distributors, dealers, and target customers. In the supplier group are material suppliers and service suppliers, such as marketing research agencies, advertising agencies, banking and insurance companies, transportation companies, and telecommunications companies. Distributors and dealers include agents, brokers, manufacturer representatives, and others who facilitate finding and selling to customers (Kotler & Keller, 2012).
The broad environment consists of six components: demographic environment, economic environment, social-cultural environment, natural environment, technological environment, and political-legal environment. Marketers must pay close attention to the trends and developments in these and adjust their marketing strategies as needed. New opportunities are constantly emerging that await the right marketing savvy and ingenuity (Singh & Sarma, 2015).

2.5 Chapter Summary
This chapter presents the literature review on previous studies done around consumer choice and buyer behavior. It outlines the in detail the internal and external influencers as well as Marketing mix factors towards brand choice. Chapter three presents the research methodology and covers the research design, target population, sampling procedure, data analysis techniques.
CHAPTER THREE

3.0 RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.1 Introduction
This chapter has various sections that cover the research design, target population, sampling procedure, data collection techniques and data analysis techniques.

3.2 Research Design
A research design is an integral aspect and factor to consider in any study. According to Bryman and Bell (2003), a research design is the applied strategy chosen to collectively integrate components of a study while addressing a research problem. This study used a descriptive survey design to analyze the factors affecting consumer choice of beer brand in Kenya. A descriptive survey design is a research approach and framework that seeks to explain and describe a certain trend, phenomenon or case interest. The rationale supporting descriptive research designs is that it measures variables using data collected from a representative sample and then to examine relationships among the variables (Bryman and Bell, 2003). In most instances, descriptive surveys attempt to capture attitude or patterns of past behavior (Hagan, 2000).

The research design identified was deemed necessary in conducting this research since it provided the latitude to explicitly analyze the factors affecting consumer choice of beer brand in Kenya using established variables. Moreover, using a descriptive research design, the relationship between the variables and outcomes of this study are able to be correlated and explained. The specific research technique chosen is the survey method. Survey research involves use of relevant data collection instruments/tools to collect data from sample that has been selected to represent a population to which the findings of the data can be generalized. The dependent variable is consumer choice while the independent variable is the beer brands.

3.3 Population Sampling Design
3.3.1 Population
According to Bryan and Bell (2003), a population is defined as a group of members within a given area. The population of study comprised of the Beer drinking population in
Kenya. Howland (2016) describes the beer drinking population in Kenya to be undefined but estimated to be over the 1 million mark. Ideally, Kenya is termed as an actively drinking nation together with the likes of Germany, Russia and Scotland. The lack of an exact quantification of the drinking population in Kenya is due to the sporadic trends of new entrants and exits made (Howland, 2016). The source of my population comprised of all beer-drinking persons in Nairobi County distributed among Westands, CBD, Eastlands, Thika Road, Nairobi West, Karen-Kilimani.

3.3.2 Sampling Design

3.3.2.1 Sampling Frame
The sampling frame is a fundamental aspect of any research. Bryman and Bell (2003) explicitly enumerate a sampling frame as the set of information, material or device from which a sample is derived. The sampling frame for this study included subjects of Nairobi residents who Consumer EABL beer. All the subjects will be from ages 18 and over and will include both men and women.

3.3.2.2 Sampling Technique
For purposes of this study, a combination of clustered random sampling and simple random sampling (SRS) were employed and effectively used to address the objectives of the study. Slinky and Singh (2016) explain that simple random sampling offers appropriate aspects of research when sampling an undefined or indefinite population such as the one in the case of this study. Justifiably, simple random sampling is designed in such a way as to ensure that every member of the population has an equal chance of being chosen and that every combination of N members has an equal chance of being chosen. Simple random sampling will be used to collect information from the sample size identified in an unbiased and random manner. The study used random sampling of beer customers in bars and otherwise within Nairobi business Area, then systematic sampling of 5 bars from every street/ area.

3.3.2.3 Sample Size
In order to arrive at an appropriate sample size in any empirical research study, it is recommended that an ideal sample size (n) be used to represent the population under study. This study allowed the error of sampling of 0.05. Notably, a predetermined target
population of 150,000 which is according to www.beershara.co.ke was used to represent the population size of EABL beer drinkers in Nairobi. Using Yamane (1973) sample size formula to calculate, a sample size of 399 participants is derived as the sample size.

The sample size determination method applicable for this study borrows from the SRS formula shown:

\[
n = \frac{150,000}{1 + 150,000 \times 0.05^2}
\]

\[
n = 399
\]

Where:
- \(n\) = Sample size
- \(N\) = Population size
- \(e\) = Error of sampling

### 3.4 Data Collection Methods

The research utilized primary data was obtained from questionnaires adopted for the study. For primary data sources, the data collection tools used a close-ended questionnaire that was administered to the participants of the study.

Questionnaires were used to obtain the primary data required for the project which are to be self-administered in the field. Questionnaires are best suited for surveys (Saunders et al., 2007). This research employed a 5 Likert scale in rating the various responses. The respondents were required to read, understand and tick an appropriate choice. The questionnaire offers a credible source of gaining first-hand information from the participants hence enabling the description and explanation of the research objectives.

### 3.5 Research Procedures

First, prior to conducting the main study, a pilot study was done to provide and act as a baseline for the final study. During the pilot study, 10 beer drinkers were randomly selected from within the identified sample areas of Karen, Wetlands and CBD. Test-re-test method was applied to appraise for issues of reliability and validity of the tools. The instruments were administered and re-administered to respondents after a period of two weeks.
Questionnaires offered a cheap way of deriving information from a large population. As a reliability check for the tools, a pre-test or pilot study was conducted prior to the main study. During this pilot study, all arising issues and concerns were identified and addressed to ensure that they are well mitigated and avoided during the main study.

According to Panton (2000) validity is the quality attributed to proposition or measures of the degree to which they conform to establish the truth. For this study, validity was achieved through a pilot test. The research employed the use of questionnaires. The purpose of construct validity is to show that the items measure and are correlated with what they purport to measure, and that the items do not correlate with other constructs. Cronbach’s alpha will be used to determine reliability, where Cronbach's coefficient, having a value of more than 0.5 is considered adequate for such exploratory work (Nunally, 1978).

Ideally, this approach is in line with the logic of Solanki and Singh (2016) who support the need to administer data collection tools at least twice and correlation between the two sets computed. Notably, the best approach for this is by using the Pearson’s Product-Moment correlation coefficient Formula.

After review, the final the questionnaires were administered to the customers by a research assistant to obtain more information and also obtain clarity of information obtained from the respondents. As a credibility check and final tool administration, the researcher contacted the respondent and give each a questionnaire they fill and data collected simultaneously.

### 3.6 Data Analysis Methods

Before processing the responses, the completed questionnaires were edited for completeness, consistency of answering questions and clarity. The data was then coded to enable the responses to be grouped into various categories. This research employed quantitative methods of analyzing data. In analysis, ratio scale was used in data measurement and both inferential and descriptive statistics will be used to analyze the data.
In descriptive statistics the research employed descriptive statistical tools frequencies, percentage, mean and standard deviation and use of tables and figures present data. Multiple linear regression, correlation and regression analysis in the form of inferential statistics analysis was used in determining the relationship between the dependent and independent variables. These models samples expressed below: Regression $Y = \beta_0 + \beta_1X_1 + \beta_2X_2 + \beta_3X_3 + \epsilon$. This was achieved via SPSS. The descriptive statistics was computed and the study findings presented using percentiles, tables and figures. From the findings, relevant interpretations were made.

3.7 Chapter Summary
This chapter presents the research methodology and has covered the research design, target population, sampling procedure, data analysis techniques. The questionnaire is also included in appendix two. The next chapter presents the findings of the research after data collection and analysis.
CHAPTER FOUR

4.0 RESULTS AND FINDINGS

4.1 Introduction

This chapter presents the results and findings from the data collection and analysis done described in the previous chapter. In this research, out of 399 questionnaires administered to the respondents a total of 387 questionnaires were returned. This represent 97% response rate that is deemed as satisfactory to make conclusions for the study. According to Rogers, Miller and Judge (2009) a response rate of 50% is acceptable for a descriptive study. According to Mugenda and Mugenda (1999) a response rate of 70% and above is rated very good. Fincham (2008) further asserts that response rates approximating 60% should be the goal of researchers for most research. Based on this assertion a response rate of 97% is therefore very good.

4.2 Background Information and Analysis

4.2.1 Gender

Figure 4.1 the respondents were asked about their gender the findings revealed that most of the respondents were male who represented 60% of the respondents and female were 40%. This indicates that most beer drinkers are male, which could be explained by the cultural belief in Kenya.

![Respondent Gender Chart]

Figure 4.1: Gender
4.2.2 Age

Figure 4.2 the respondents were asked about their age, the findings showed that between ages 18-25 the male respondents were the most at 81% in that age category while the females were only 19%. For ages between 26-35 years of age had more females at 61% and 55% male respondents. For ages 36-45 there were more males at 55% and female respondents at 45%. For ages 46-60 years of age there were no female respondents. For ages above 60 years there was an equal amount of male and female respondents.

![Segregated Respondent Age by Gender](image)

**Figure 4.2: Age**

4.2.3 Marital Status

Figure 4.3 the respondents we asked about their marital status, the findings showed the marital status of the respondents and it showed that 53% of the respondents were married while 47% of the respondents were single. None of the respondents was either widowed or divorced.
4.2.4 Level of Education

Figure 4.4 the respondents were asked about their level of Education, the findings shows that most of the respondents 43.4% were degree holders and the least 3.9% of the respondents had primary education only 10.6% of the respondents had no education. Secondary and postgraduate level respondents comprised of 23.5% and 18.6% respectively.

Figure 4.4: Level of Education
4.2.5 Source of Income

Figure 4.5 the respondents were asked to reveal their sources of income, the figure presents the results for whether respondents had a source of income. The figure shows that 87% of the respondents had a source of income while 13% did not have a source of income.

![Source of Income](image)

Figure 4.5: Source of Income

4.2.6 Basis of Income

Figure 4.6 presents the results for the basis of income, and from the results it showed that 43% of the respondents were on a monthly salary, 53% were self-employed, and 4% were casual laborers.

![Basis of Income](image)

Figure 4.6: Basis of Income
4.2.7 Monthly Income

Figure 4.7 shows the monthly income of the respondents, and most of the salaried respondents 19.6% earn between Ksh. 50000-100,000 per month, there was no one earning salary of between Ksh.150,000-200,000. The least number of respondents 2.6% earn above Ksh.200,000. The respondents earning between Ksh.10,000-50,000 were 31% and 19.1% were earning between Ksh.100,000-150,000.

![Monthly Income Graph]

Figure 4.7: Monthly Income

4.2.8 Brand Preference

Table 4.1 shows that the most preferred brand was Pilsner Lager at 15.2% followed by Tusker lager at 12.1% respondents. This was followed by Tusker Lite and Guinness at 10.9%, Tusker Cider at 9.8%, Baozi Lager at 8.8%, and White Cup Larger at 8.5%. These brands were followed by the least preferred brands which were Pilsner Ice at 4.1%, Tusker Malt at 3.9%, Alsop’s Larger at 3.6%, White Cup lite at 1.3% and Senator Lager at 1%. There was a representative of 9.9% of people who did not prefer EABL beer brands.
Table 4.1: Brand Preference

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EABL Beer Brand</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tusker Lager</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>12.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pilsner Lager</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>15.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pilsner Ice</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tusker Malt</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tusker Lite</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>10.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tusker Cider</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>9.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guinness</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>10.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baozi Lager</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alsop’s Lager</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whitecap Lager</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senator Lager</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whitecap Lite</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blank (Non-consumers of EABL products)</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>9.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>387</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.2.9 Weekly Consumption Rate

Figure 4.8 presents the weekly consumption rate of the respondents and it shows that most of the respondents consumed beer thrice a week at 64.6% followed by 24.8% of the respondents who drunk twice a week and 10.6% who only drunk once a week.

![Weekly Consumption Rate](image)

**Figure 4.8: Weekly Consumption Rate**
4.3 Effect of Internal Influencers on Consumer Choice

4.3.1 Rating of Internal Influencers of Consumer Choice

Table 4.2 shows that the cost of beer affects choice of beer brand since 60.4% indicated it was important, 31.7% noted it was most important, and 7.9% stated it was less important with a mean of 3.24 and a standard deviation of 0.583. Availability of a cheaper option affects choice of beer since 49.3% indicated it was less important, but 47% noted it was important, and 3.7% stated it was most important with a mean of 2.54 and a standard deviation of 0.568. An increase in income affects choice of beer since 68.1% indicated it was important, 27.7% noted it was most important, 4% stated it was least important and 0.3% stated it was less important with a mean of 3.20 and a standard deviation of 0.633.

The choice of beer brand correlates to lifestyle since 70% indicated it was important, 15% noted it was most important, and 15% stated it was less important with a mean of 3.00 and a standard deviation of 0.549. The brand image and product quality influences choice of beer since 40.6% indicated it was important, 31.7% noted it was most important, and 27.7% stated it was less important with a mean of 3.04 and a standard deviation of 0.770. The notion that beer preference depicts personality influences choice of beer since 55.1% indicated it was important, 28% noted it was most important, 12.7% stated it was less important and 4.2% stated it was least important with a mean of 3.07 and a standard deviation of 0.756.

Previous experience in beer drinking influences choice in beer since 52.5% indicated it was important, 31.7% noted it was less important, 11.3% stated it was most important and 4.5% stated it was least important with a mean of 2.71 and a standard deviation of 0.725. The belief that a certain brand is superior or inferior to others influences perception towards brands since 47% indicated it was less important, but 34% noted it was important, and 19% stated it was most important with a mean of 2.72 and a standard deviation of 0.764.

Age influences choice of beer since 67.5% indicated it was important, 12.4% noted it was most important, 11.9% stated it was less important and 8.2% stated it was least important with a mean of 2.84 and a standard deviation of 0.739. Personal beliefs and attitude towards beer affects choice of beer since 49.6% indicated it was important, 46.2% noted
it was less important, and 4.2% stated it was most important with a mean of 2.58 and a standard deviation of 0.573.

Table 4.2: Rating of the Internal Influencers of Consumer Choice

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Internal Influencers</th>
<th>LstI</th>
<th>LI</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>MI</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std Dev</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The cost of beer affects your choice of beer brand</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>60.4</td>
<td>31.7</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td>.583</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability of a cheaper option affects your choice of beer</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>49.3</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>2.54</td>
<td>.568</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An increase in income affects your choice of beer</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>68.1</td>
<td>27.7</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>.633</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your choice of beer brand correlates to your lifestyle</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>.549</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The brand image and product quality influences your choice of beer</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>27.7</td>
<td>40.6</td>
<td>31.7</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>.770</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The notion that your beer preference depicts your personality influences your choice of beer</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>55.1</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>.756</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previous experience in beer drinking influences your choice in beer</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>31.7</td>
<td>52.5</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>.725</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The belief that a certain brand is superior or inferior to others influences your perception towards brands</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td>.764</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your age influences your choice of beer</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>67.5</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>2.84</td>
<td>.739</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your personal beliefs and attitude towards beer affects your choice of beer</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>46.2</td>
<td>49.6</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>.573</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.3.2 Correlation of the Internal Influencers of Consumer Choice

Table 4.3 presents the correlation for internal influencers of consumer choice for beer brands. The table shows that income was significant to consumer choice for beer brands ($r=0.148$, $p<0.01$). Lifestyle was significant to consumer choice for beer brands ($r=0.471$, $p<0.01$).
p<0.01). Personality was significant to consumer choice for beer brands (r=0.554, p<0.01).

Table 4.3: Correlation of the Internal Influencers of Consumer Choice

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Consumer Choice</th>
<th>Income</th>
<th>Lifestyle</th>
<th>Personality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Consumer Choice</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td>.148**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.004</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lifestyle</td>
<td>.471**</td>
<td>.548**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personality</td>
<td>.554**</td>
<td>.168**</td>
<td>.456**</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed)

4.3.3 Regressions of the Internal Influencers of Consumer Choice

Table 4.4 presents the regression model summary for internal influencers of consumer choice for beer brands. The table shows that internal influencers (income, lifestyle, and personality) account for 37% of the consumer choice.

Table 4.4: Model Summary for Internal Influencers of Consumer Choice

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.613</td>
<td>.375</td>
<td>.370</td>
<td>.24415</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Predictors: (Constant): Income, Lifestyle, and Personality

Table 4.5 presents the regression coefficient for internal influencers on consumer choice for beer brands. The table shows that income had a negative, but significant relationship with consumer choice of beer brand, and every increase in income results in a 7.9% decrease in consumer choice due to the inverse relationship. Lifestyle had a positive significant relationship with consumer choice of beer brand, and every increase in lifestyle results in a 22% increase in consumer choice. Personality had a positive
significant relationship with consumer choice of beer brand, and every increase in personality results in a 28.5% increase in consumer choice.

Table 4.5: Regression Coefficients of the Internal Influencers of Consumer Choice

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 (Constant)</td>
<td>1.806</td>
<td>.110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td>-.079</td>
<td>.036</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lifestyle</td>
<td>.220</td>
<td>.035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personality</td>
<td>.285</td>
<td>.032</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: Consumer Choice

4.4 Effect of External Influencers on Consumer Choice

4.4.1 Rating of External Influencers of Consumer Choice

Table 4.6 shows that the element of values and beliefs influences choice of beer since 47.2% indicated it was important, 34.6% noted it was most important, 14% stated it was less important and 4.2% stated it was least important with a mean of 3.12 and a standard deviation of 0.801. Religion does not affect the drinking and choice of beer as a bar patron since 49.6% indicated it was less important, 26.9% noted it was important, and 23.5% stated it was least important with a mean of 2.03 a nd a standard deviation of 0.710. The choice of beer is influenced by what brand the people I aspire to be like drink since 50.4% indicated it was important, 26.4% stated it was less important, 19.5% noted it was most important, and 3.7% stated it was least important with a mean of 2.86 and a standard deviation of 0.767.

The social class (lower, middle or upper) influences beer brand preference since 49.6% indicated it was most important, 29.6% stated it was important, and 20.8% noted it was less important with a mean of 3.29 and a standard deviation of 0.790. The choice of beer is influenced by the celebrities or politicians in the society since 58.6% indicated it was important, 37.7% stated it was less important, and 3.7% noted it was most important with a mean of 2.66 and a standard deviation of 0.547. The choice of beer is influenced by
what peers (reference group) takes (band wagon effect) since 61.7% indicated it was important, 30.9% stated it was less important, 3.7% noted it was most important, and another 3.7% stated it was least important with a mean of 2.65 and a standard deviation of 0.612.

Bar patrons with family responsibilities prefer certain brands over others since 40.1% indicated it was less important, 37.7% stated it was important, 14.5% noted it was most important, and 7.7% stated it was least important with a mean of 2.59 and a standard deviation of 0.829. Patrons who are married prefer certain brands over others since 49.9% indicated it was important, 34% stated it was less important, 8.2% noted it was most important, and 7.9% stated it was least important with a mean of 2.58 and a standard deviation of 0.753. The role and status in the family did not influence choice of beer since 48.8% indicated it was less important, 35.1% stated it was important, 11.9% noted it was least important, and 4.2% stated it was most important with a mean of 2.32 and a standard deviation of 0.735.

Gender influences your choice of beer brand since 38.3% indicated it was most important, 34% stated it was important, 24% noted it was less important, and 3.7% stated it was least important with a mean of 3.07 and a standard deviation of 0.876. The country of origin affects the choice of beer since 54.9% indicated it was important, 21.9% stated it was less important, 19.5% noted it was most important, and 3.7% stated it was least important with a mean of 2.90 and a standard deviation of 0.744. The level of education affects the choice of beer since 43.5% indicated it was important, 29.3% stated it was less important, and 27.2% noted it was most important with a mean of 2.98 and a standard deviation of 0.752.
Table 4.6: Rating of the External Influencers of Consumer Choice

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>LstI</th>
<th>LI</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>MI</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std Dev</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The element of values and beliefs influences your choice of beer</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>47.2</td>
<td>34.6</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>.801</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your religion affects the drinking and choice of beer as a bar patron</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td>49.6</td>
<td>26.9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.03</td>
<td>.710</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your choice of beer is influenced by what brand the people you aspire to be like drink</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>26.4</td>
<td>50.4</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>.767</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your social class (lower, middle or upper) influences your beer brand preference.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>29.6</td>
<td>49.6</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>.790</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your choice of beer is influenced by the Celebrities or Politicians in your society.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>37.7</td>
<td>58.6</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>2.66</td>
<td>.547</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your choice of beer is influenced by what your peers (reference group) takes. Bandwagon Effect</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>30.9</td>
<td>61.7</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>.612</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bar patrons with family responsibilities prefer certain brands over others.</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>40.1</td>
<td>37.7</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>2.59</td>
<td>.829</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patrons who are married prefer certain brands over others.</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>49.9</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>.753</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your Role and status in the family influences your choice of beer</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>48.8</td>
<td>35.1</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td>.735</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender influences your choice of beer brand</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>38.3</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>.876</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The country of origin affects your choice of beer</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>21.9</td>
<td>54.9</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>.744</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your level of education affects your choice of beer</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>29.3</td>
<td>43.5</td>
<td>27.2</td>
<td>2.98</td>
<td>.752</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.3.2 Correlation of the External Influencers of Consumer Choice

Table 4.7 presents the correlation of the external influencers of consumer choice for beer brands. The table shows that culture was significant to consumer choice for beer brands ($r=0.648$, $p<0.01$). Social structure was significant to consumer choice for beer brands ($r=0.497$, $p<0.01$). Family was significant to consumer choice for beer brands ($r=0.340$, $p<0.01$).
p<0.01). Demography was significant to consumer choice for beer brands (r=0.540, p<0.01).

**Table 4.7: Correlation of the External Influencers of Consumer Choice**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Consumer Choice</th>
<th>Culture</th>
<th>Social Structure</th>
<th>Family</th>
<th>Demography</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culture</td>
<td>.648**</td>
<td>.497**</td>
<td>.340**</td>
<td>.540**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Structure</td>
<td>.497**</td>
<td>.408**</td>
<td>.094</td>
<td>.491**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.068</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family</td>
<td>.340**</td>
<td>.158**</td>
<td>.158**</td>
<td>.333**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demography</td>
<td>.540**</td>
<td>.333**</td>
<td>.164**</td>
<td>.164**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).**

**4.3.3 Regression of the External Influencers of Consumer Choice**

Table 4.8 presents the regression model summary for external influencers of consumer choice for beer brands. The table shows that external influencers (culture, social structure, family, and demography) account for 57.7% of the consumer choice.

**Table 4.8: Model Summary for External Influencers of Consumer Choice**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.763</td>
<td>.582</td>
<td>.577</td>
<td>.20004</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Predictors: (Constant): Culture, Social Structure, Family, and Demography

Table 4.9 presents the regression coefficient for external influencers on consumer choice for beer brands. The table shows that culture had a positive significant relationship with consumer choice of beer brand, and every increase in culture results in a 23.9% increase in consumer choice. Social structure had a positive significant relationship with consumer choice of beer brand, and every increase in social structure results in a 12.7% increase in consumer choice. Family had a positive significant relationship with consumer choice of
beer brand, and every increase in family results in an 11.1% increase in consumer choice. Demography had a positive significant relationship with consumer choice of beer brand, and every increase in demography results in an 11.5% increase in consumer choice.

Table 4.9: Regression Coefficients for External Influencers of Consumer Choice

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>1.405</td>
<td>.075</td>
<td>18.652</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Culture</td>
<td>.239</td>
<td>.022</td>
<td>.432</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Social Structure</td>
<td>.127</td>
<td>.022</td>
<td>.211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Family</td>
<td>.111</td>
<td>.016</td>
<td>.230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Demography</td>
<td>.115</td>
<td>.021</td>
<td>.219</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: Consumer Choice

4.5 Effect of Marketing Mix Factors on Consumer Choice

4.5.1 Rating of Marketing Mix Factors on Consumer Choice

Table 4.10 indicates that the packaging aspect of the beer product e.g. shape of the bottle, influences choice of beer since 73.1% of the respondents agreed, 14.8% disagreed, 7.9% strongly agreed, and 4.2% strongly disagreed with a mean of 2.85 and a standard deviation of 0.611. The quality aspect of beer did not influence choice of beer since 54.6% of the respondents disagreed, but a significant percentage of 38% agreed, and 7.4% strongly agreed with a mean of 2.53 and a standard deviation of 0.631. The alcoholic percentage of the beer brand affects choice of brand since 80.2% of the respondents agreed, while 15.8% disagreed, and 4% strongly disagreed with a mean of 2.76 and a standard deviation of 0.511.

Brands with a considerable price range influence choice of beer since 69.4% of the respondents agreed, 23.2% disagreed, and 7.4% strongly agreed with a mean of 2.84 and a standard deviation of 0.531. Availability of discounts affects choice of beer brands since 72.3% of the respondents agreed, while 23.5% disagreed, and 4.2% strongly disagreed with a mean of 2.68 and a standard deviation of 0.550. Availability of a cheaper product affects choice of beer since 45.6% of the respondents disagreed, while 38.8% agreed,
11.9% strongly agreed, and 3.7% strongly disagreed with a mean of 2.59 and a standard deviation of 0.745.

Table 4.10: Rating of the Marketing Mix Factors on Consumer Choice

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Questions</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std Dev</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The packaging aspect of the beer product e.g. shape of the bottle, influences my choice of beer</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>73.1</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>.611</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The quality aspect of beer influences my choice of beer</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>54.6</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td>.631</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Alcoholic percentage of the beer brand affects your choice of brand</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>80.2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.76</td>
<td>.511</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brands with a considerable price range influence my choice of beer</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>23.2</td>
<td>69.4</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>2.84</td>
<td>.531</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability of discounts affects my choice of beer brands</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td>72.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.68</td>
<td>.550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability of a cheaper product will affect my choice of beer</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>45.6</td>
<td>38.8</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>2.59</td>
<td>.745</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The promotion activations and direct selling influence my choice of beer</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>30.9</td>
<td>50.7</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>.692</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brand Awareness via social media affects my choice of beer brand</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>44.1</td>
<td>48.8</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>.614</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TV and Billboards advertisements affect my choice of beer brand</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>27.2</td>
<td>52.2</td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>.689</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The availability and accessibility of the brand in the bar and shops makes it preferable to me</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>30.6</td>
<td>53.3</td>
<td>3.37</td>
<td>.746</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability of a dial a delivery service will affect my choice of beer brand</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>51.5</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>2.97</td>
<td>.697</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability of the beer brand on an online shop affects my choice of beer brand</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>39.6</td>
<td>41.7</td>
<td>18.7</td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td>.736</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.10 shows that the promotion activations and direct selling influence my choice of beer since 50.7% of the respondents agreed, 30.9% disagreed, and 18.5% strongly agreed with a mean of 2.88 and a standard deviation of 0.692. Brand awareness via social media affects choice of beer brand since 48.8% of the respondents agreed, 44.1% disagreed, and
7.1% strongly agreed with a mean of 2.63 and a standard deviation of 0.614. TV and billboards advertisements affect choice of beer brand since 52.2% of the respondents agreed, 27.2% disagreed, and 20.6% strongly agreed with a mean of 2.93 and a standard deviation of 0.689.

The availability and accessibility of the brand in the bar and shops makes it preferable to me since 53.3% of the respondents strongly agreed, 30.6% agreed, and 16.1% disagreed with a mean of 3.37 and a standard deviation of 0.746. Availability of a dial a delivery service affect choice of beer brand since 51.5% of the respondents agreed, 25.5% disagreed, and 23% strongly agreed with a mean of 2.97 and a standard deviation of 0.697. Availability of the beer brand on an online shop affects choice of beer brand since 41.7% of the respondents agreed, 39.6% disagreed, and 18.7% strongly agreed with a mean of 2.79 and a standard deviation of 0.736.

### 4.5.2 Correlation of the Marketing Mix Factors on Consumer Choice

Table 4.11 presents the correlation of the marketing mix factors on consumer choice for beer brands. The table shows that product was significant to consumer choice for beer brands ($r=0.272$, $p<0.01$). Price was significant to consumer choice for beer brands ($r=0.296$, $p<0.01$). Promotion was insignificant to consumer choice for beer brands ($r=0.052$, $p>0.05$). Place was significant to consumer choice for beer brands ($r=0.242$, $p<0.01$).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Consumer Choice</th>
<th>Product</th>
<th>Price</th>
<th>Promotion</th>
<th>Place</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Consumer Choice</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Product</strong></td>
<td>.272**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Price</strong></td>
<td>.296**</td>
<td>.247**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Promotion</strong></td>
<td>.052</td>
<td>.161**</td>
<td>.137**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.313</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>.007</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Place</strong></td>
<td>.242**</td>
<td>-.005</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>.073</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.918</td>
<td>.974</td>
<td>.155</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed)
4.5.3 Regression of the Marketing Mix Factors on Consumer Choice

Table 4.12 presents the regression model summary for marketing mix factors on consumer choice for beer brands. The table shows that 3 marketing mix factors (product, price and place) account for 18.2% of the consumer choice.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.435</td>
<td>.189</td>
<td>.182</td>
<td>.27820</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Predictors: (Constant): Product, Price and Place

Table 4.13 presents the regression coefficient for marketing mix factors on consumer choice for beer brands. The table shows that product had a positive significant relationship with consumer choice of beer brand, and every increase in product results in a 21.6% increase in consumer choice. Price had a positive significant relationship with consumer choice of beer brand, and every increase in price results in a 19.8% increase in consumer choice. Place had a positive significant relationship with consumer choice of beer brand, and every increase in place results in a 13.1% increase in consumer choice.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 (Constant)</td>
<td>1.507</td>
<td>.167</td>
<td>.214</td>
<td>9.041</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Product</td>
<td>.216</td>
<td>.049</td>
<td>.243</td>
<td>4.451</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Price</td>
<td>.198</td>
<td>.039</td>
<td>.243</td>
<td>5.057</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place</td>
<td>.131</td>
<td>.025</td>
<td>.243</td>
<td>5.224</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: Consumer Choice

4.5.4 Correlations for Factors Influencing Consumer Choice

Table 4.14 presents the correlations for factors influencing consumer choice for beer brands. The table shows that internal influencers were significant to consumer choice for beer brands (r=0.584, p<0.01). External influencers were significant to consumer choice.
for beer brands ($r=0.746, p<0.01$). Marketing mix factors were significant to consumer choice for beer brands ($r=0.366, p<0.05$).

**Table 4.14: Correlations for Factors Influencing Consumer Choice**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Consumer Choice</th>
<th>Internal Influencers</th>
<th>External Influencers</th>
<th>Marketing Mix Factors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Consumer Choice</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal Influencers</td>
<td>.548**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External Influencers</td>
<td>.746**</td>
<td>.495**</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing Mix Factors</td>
<td>.366**</td>
<td>-.007</td>
<td>.089</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed)**

### 4.5.5 Regressions for Factors Influencing Consumer Choice

Table 4.15 presents the regression model summary for factors influencing consumer choice for beer brands. The table shows that internal influencers, external influencers, and marketing mix factors account for 69.5% of the consumer choice.

**Table 4.15: Model Summary for Factors Influencing Consumer Choice**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.835</td>
<td>.697</td>
<td>.695</td>
<td>.17004</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Predictors: (Constant): Internal Influencers, External Influencers, and Marketing Mix Factors

Table 4.16 presents the regression coefficient for factors influencing consumer choice for beer brands. The table shows that internal influencers had a positive and significant relationship with consumer choice of beer brand, and every increase in internal influencers, results in a 23.1% increase in consumer choice. External influencers had a positive significant relationship with consumer choice of beer brand, and every increase in external influencers, results in a 47.3% increase in consumer choice. Marketing mix factors...
factors had a positive significant relationship with consumer choice of beer brand, and every increase in marketing mix factors, results in a 39.8% increase in consumer choice.

Table 4.16: Regression Coefficients for Factors Influencing Consumer Choice

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 (Constant)</td>
<td>-.062</td>
<td>.127</td>
<td>-.483</td>
<td>.629</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal Influencers</td>
<td>.231</td>
<td>.029</td>
<td>.258</td>
<td>7.858</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External Influencers</td>
<td>.473</td>
<td>.026</td>
<td>.591</td>
<td>17.953</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing Mix Factors</td>
<td>.398</td>
<td>.036</td>
<td>.314</td>
<td>10.999</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: Consumer Choice

4.6 Chapter Summary

In this chapter the findings and results of the study have been presented. The first section covered the general information about the respondents regarding gender, salary scale and level of education. The second section covers how the internal influencers affect the beer brand choice namely personal factors, psychological factors. The third section covers how the external influencers affect beer choice namely cultural factors and social factors. The fourth section presented how a marketing mix factor affects beer brand choice. The next chapter presents the summary, discussions, conclusions and recommendations for the study based on the findings and results of the study.
CHAPTER FIVE

5.0 DISCUSSION, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 Introduction
This chapter covers four sections, summary, discussions, conclusion and recommendations in that order. The first section covers the summary of the major elements of the study these includes the study objectives, methodology and findings. The second section covers the discussion of the major areas with respect to the research objectives. The third section presents the conclusions based on the findings and results presented in the previous chapter and the fourth section provides recommendations for further study of the subject.

5.2 Summary
The purpose of this study was to establish the factors that affect choice of beer brands with a focus on EABL beers. The study was guided by the following objectives, to determine how the internal influencers affect choice of beer brand, how the external influencers affect the choice of beer brand and how the market mix factors affect choice of beer brands.

The study targeted beer consumers in Nairobi County. EABL beer consumers comprise of about 150,000, according to beershara.co.ke. This was the population from which a sample size of 399 was selected using the simple random sampling formula. The sampling technique used was clustering and simple random sampling of beer consumers across Nairobi, the sampling frame in this study involved the residents of Nairobi who are consumers of EABL beers. The data collection method used was questionnaires which employed the 5 Linkert scale in rating of various responses. Collected data was coded and analyzed using SPSS version 20 to generate the results. Descriptive and inferential analysis was used the results were presented in tables and figures.

According to the findings of the study most of the respondents feel that internal factors greatly influence the consumer choice. Most of the respondents think that factors such as cost of beer, availability of cheaper alternatives, increase income, lifestyle and personality significantly affect their choice of beer. The findings revealed that income had a negative,
but significant relationship with consumer choice of beer brand, and every increase in income results in a 7.9% decrease in consumer choice due to the inverse relationship. Lifestyle had a positive significant relationship with consumer choice of beer brand, and every increase in lifestyle results in a 22% increase in consumer choice. Personality had a positive significant relationship with consumer choice of beer brand, and every increase in personality results in a 28.5% increase in consumer choice.

The study also revealed that external influencers had a significant effect on consumer choice, factors such as culture, religion, social class and family greatly influence consumer choice. The regression model summary for external influencers of consumer choice for beer brands showed that (culture, social structure, family, and demography) account for 57.7% of the consumer choice which is substantial to influencing brand choice.

According to the findings, culture had a positive significant relationship with consumer choice of beer brand, and every increase in culture results in a 23.9% increase in consumer choice. Social structure had a positive significant relationship with consumer choice of beer brand, and every increase in social structure results in a 12.7% increase in consumer choice. Family had a positive significant relationship with consumer choice of beer brand, and every increase in family results in an 11.1% increase in consumer choice. Demography had a positive significant relationship with consumer choice of beer brand, and every increase in demography results in an 11.5% increase in consumer choice.

Finally the study also revealed a significant relationship between marketing factors and choice of beer brand therefore factors such as price, product features, and promotion and distribution impact heavily in consumer choice of beer brand. The findings revealed the product features had a positive significant relationship with consumer choice of beer brand, and every increase in product results in a 21.6% increase in consumer choice. Price had a positive significant relationship with consumer choice of beer brand, and every increase in price results in a 19.8% increase in consumer choice. Place had a positive significant relationship with consumer choice of beer brand, and every increase in place results in a 13.1% increase in consumer choice.
5.3 Discussions

5.3.1 Effects of Internal Influencers on Consumer Choice

The study looked at the following factors when studying internal influencers: Age, gender, income, education level, lifestyle, personality, and Learning. The study revealed that there was a significant relationship between internal influencers and choice of beer brand and internal factors greatly influenced the choice of beer brand. According to Fernandes and Solimun (2018), internal consumer influencers hold more potency in terms of affecting consumerism behavior and trends; the reason for this prospect is that internal consumer factors resonate more ‘on’ and ‘by’ the consumer as opposed to ‘with’ the consumer or ‘for’ the consumer. As such, it has become widely documented and advanced that internal consumerism influencers are endo-personal and intra-personal. Basically, internal consumer influencers provide significant premises to elaborate and depict consumer behavior (Ide & Kazama, 2017).

When age as a factor was evaluated and examined, most of the respondents between ages 26-35 and 36-45 agreed that it was of significantly high importance when it comes to beer brand choice. For instance, different age groups will prefer different brands and from our findings as elaborated and shown in figure 4.1, we see the beer brand preference by age we also see from the results that age is a highly significant variable in this study. Consumer choice of beer brand and consumption predicates on a dichotomy of some sort; consumers of advanced age (45+ years) exhibit a lower consumer frequency in terms of beer taking while consumers of lower age (35 years and below) show higher consumer frequency. Linehan (2013) appreciates the logic that age is both a retrospective and prospective consumer behavior influencer. Ideally, consumers of lower ages are more easily lured and attracted to prospects of consumerisms opposed to elderly consumers. Kim, Kim, Lee, and Youn (2014) corroborate the position advanced by Linehan (2013) in that product and consumer preferences stem significantly from age as a consumer influencer factor.

When we examined gender, our respondents were 60% Male and 40% female as per random sampling the findings showed that most of the respondents agreed that gender is of the greatest importance in beer brand selection this is to say that males and females will select their beer brands according to their gender, refer to figure 4.1, shows the beer
preference as per gender. We also note from the results that gender is a highly significant variable in this study. According to Haleh Keshavarz and Gholamreza (2017), gender driven consumer trends and behaviors are characteristic in any typical market niche. Validly, the way female view or draw preference for a product is different from that of males. Justifiably, based on the study, it is clear that female patrons had different consumer preferences and behaviors from their male counterparts. Linehan (2013) terms the disparity in consumerism trends and behaviors based on gender as a ‘dichotomized continuum’; where on one extreme end of the continuum lies female oriented consumer preferences and on the other lies male oriented consumer preferences. The difference in nature of gender oriented consumer preferences explains the disparity between female and male consumer beer choices or preferences.

We examined education factors we looked at the level of education of our respondents. Most of our respondents 62% had tertiary education. According to the findings most of the respondents felt that education level was of moderately high importance in beer brand selection however according to our analysis level of education had a low perception level when it comes to beer brand choice. According to Chaudhary and Bisai (2018), consumer preferences and choices rely substantially on the level of education or knowledge present to each consumer. Validly, consumers with higher level of education or knowledge tend to relate to products based on a more elaborate nature; aspects such a brand, quality and distribution among other consumer influencer factors bear more relevance than otherwise. Nonetheless, the level of education does not directly translate to consumer choices and preference of products (Maity, 2010). This explains the low perception level relative to level of education derived from the study; respondents felt that education level was of moderately high importance in beer brand selection but low perception level when it comes to beer brand choice. The denoted logic justifies the position of Rajagopal (2010); education level does not translate and extrapolate consumerism behaviors or choices but influences perception of product qualities and prospects.

We examined income most of our respondents were of the income bracket of between Ksh.10,000 and Ksh.50,000 this variable as found to be highly significant to the study. We examined the following factors, cost of beer, availability of a cheaper alternative, and
increase in income in beer choice. Analysis of cost of beer showed that most of the respondents agree that cost of beer is of importance to choice of beer brand. This is to say that the price of the beer will affect customer choice therefore price is an important attribute to consider. According to Rajagopal (2010), income margins of consumers denotes their financial potential and capabilities. Relevantly, a critical aspect correlating to income of consumers is price (Kim, Lee, & Youn, 2014). Consumerism behaviors exponentially relates with income-price relationships; as the income level of a consumer increase, he/she prefers products of higher price range up to a certain level where income does not relate with consumer choice (Ide & Kazama, 2017).

When we examined availability of cheaper alternative, we found that availability of a cheaper alternative will affect choice of beer brand, therefore availability of cheaper substitute products especially of a competing brand may greatly affect the brand. Kim et al. (2014) confirm that product alternatives or subsidies of a product affect the consumer choice or behavior. When a subsidy or cheaper alternative of a product exists, consumers of lower class, lower income and lower age tend to be persuaded to prefer it to expensive products.

This explains the reason why respondents validated that the availability of a cheaper beer brand would affect their choice of brand (Pantano, 2011). Logically, this explains why most of the respondents felt that income change is of a moderately low importance to beer brand. However, a significant number of respondents also felt that it’s of moderately high importance and greatest importance choice this is to say that an increase in income may influence change of brand and also a good number of customers will maintain their brand.

We examined the lifestyle correlation to beer brand choice, most of the respondents agree that lifestyle has a moderately high importance in beer brand choice, this is to say that people that carry certain lifestyles high or low my prefer certain brands over others. According to Siva Kumar and Gunasekaran (2017), lifestyle trends affects consumer behavior as it avails the prospect of consumer preference of certain products over others. A consumer from a high lifestyle will tend to prefer beer brands that reflect and exhibit their lifestyles; this therefore motivates them to consume beer brands associated to their lifestyle sense and vice versa (Xu, Lin & Shao, 2010).
On matters brand image and product quality perception to beer brand choice, most of the respondents agreed that it’s of moderately high importance. This is to say that quality of the product affects choice. Figure 1-8 examines the quality perception of the various beer brands. According to the findings we see that lifestyle and brand image and product quality are of significance towards choice of beer brands. Markedly, it is well-documented that brand image and product quality are prime consumer behavior drivers (Linehan, 2013; Xu et al, 2010; Rajagopal, 2010).

Products associated with a powerful brand image and high quality tend to attract elite consumers or favor more consumer preferences over products of low quality and weak brand image. As such, beer patrons will value and prefer beers brands that are of good and above quality and bear potent brand images over other brands of beer. Albeit the relevance of brand image and quality prospects, not all consumer groups are affected by these factors. According to Maity (2010), consumers belonging to low income groups or classes are not necessarily swayed by aspects of brand image and quality but rather service provision attained from the product in meeting their needs and wants. Critically, this aspect explains why other respondents did not view brand image and product quality as factors that influence their choice of beer.

As a focus of this study, the personality depiction influence towards beer brand choice was analyzed and evaluated. According to the results, most of the respondents felt that it’s of moderately high importance which is to say that customers select their beer brands based on the perceived brand personality and how it resonates with their personality. According to Maity (2010), consumers associate their preferences and choices to their personality. As explained in the preceding segments of this discussion, perception of product relative to personal prospects affects the choice of consumerism habit and behavior (Pantano, 2011). As such, consumers tend to prefer product brands that they can relate to on a personality basis; a product that answers the questions, what does this product say about me? What does this product portray about me? Affects the consumer choice and preference range (Ide & Kazama, 2017).

We looked at prior drinking experience influence towards beer brand choice. According to the findings, most of the respondents felt that its of moderately high importance which
is to say that customers select their beer brands based on the previous interactions with the product will determine whether they maintain the brand or not. Linehan (2013) elaborates that consumer previous experiences with a product has a direct influence on the preference and choice. As such, if a beer patron had a bad experience with a certain beer brand, he/she will tend to avoid this brand and choice others over it. Suto et al (2005) explains the relationship between consumer past experiences and consumerism behaviors as dependent of each other where the former affects the latter. Evidently, from the findings, it can be understood and appreciated why respondents validated the relevance and significance of past experiences as an influencer of beer brand choice.

The study looked at belief in brand superiority influence towards beer brand choice. The findings justify that brand superiority is of moderately low importance which is to say that most consumers do not consider brand superiority as much when they select their beer brands. Brand superiority is a contextual aspect of quality and brand power; SivaKumar and Gunasekaran (2017) justify that brand superiority is an appeal to competitors within a market niche but not necessarily an appeal to consumers. Validly, this explains the reason why respondents rated brand superiority as a consumer behavior influencer with low importance.

5.3.2 Effects of External Influencers on Consumer Choice

The study revealed that external factors had a bearing in choice of beer brands. The external factors studied in this case included the following religion, role model influence, values and beliefs it was evident that values and beliefs had a moderately high importance towards choice of beer brand, while most of the respondents were in agreement, role model influence had a more importance towards beer brand choice. Most of the respondents were in agreement that religion has a moderately low importance to beer brand choice. Overall, according to the findings under cultural influencers, values and beliefs had the greatest perception level compared to religion and role model influence.

According to Linehan (2013), external factors are a vital consideration of premises affecting consumer behavior. Logically, any brand manufacturer or entrepreneur purposes to advance products that convergent meet the needs, wants and demands of the target market. Pantano (2011) corroborates the rationale posited by Linehan (2013) in that
socio-cultural factors are direct influencers of consumer behavior. Notably, the culture, religion, values and beliefs oriented to a consumer will in turn have an influence on their behavior consumerism actions. Typical in most contemporary societies, external factors of consumer behavior relevance have a close knit tie to the demographics within a population. Extrapolating the results derived from the study it is possible to find a seemingly correlated trend between external factors or influencers and consumer behavior trends (Linehan, 2013; Pantano, 2011; Maity, 2010).

Chaudhary and Bisai (2018) theorize that external factors affecting consumer behavior in a typical market scope predicate on the socio-cultural foundations present. Relevantly, this explains the disparity and differences in consumerism behavior relative to external factor influence. Individuals orient to values, beliefs and cultural prospects differently or converge. Those persons sharing a convergent orientation of values, beliefs and cultural norms tend to exhibit close to similar if not entirely same consumer behavior. Keshavarz and Gholamreza (2017) postulate and confirm the connection between consumer habits and behavior to cultural, religious and principle orientation; the influence of these external factors on consumers is evident in the choices they make. Rationally, some values, beliefs and socio-cultural prospects tend to constrict the freedom and willingness of a consumer to purchase a product or brand (Ide & Kazama, 2017).

Another cultural attribute that was studied is social structure the study revealed that social structure greatly influences beer brand choice the attributes that were studied include social class influence, celebrity/politician influence, peer influence. The study revealed that most of the respondents agree that social class has the greatest influence in beer brand choice. As such, most respondents consider their class level when selecting the brand of beer, the study also analyzed the peer influence in beer brand selection, the study revealed that most of the respondents agreed that peer influence is of moderately high importance towards beer brand selection. According to Kumar and Gunasekaran (2017), social structure segmentation is an aspect that propagates and influences consumer behavior. Consumers who belong to the high social class will tend to favor brands or products that elevate their status or correlates to their status.
Basing on the position of Kumar and Gunasekaran (2017) it is possible to understand and enumerate the consumer behavior trend exhibited by the study population. Rajagopal (2010) reiterates and shares the same position as the former; social class and structure is a market and product driver in any typical target population or market niche. Social class consumerism behaviors correlate to aspects of pricing, quality and brand potency or power. A Product that has the allure of high quality, brand power and integrally meets the needs and wants of the target market will tend to be consumed by persons from the high class society; the opposite of this situation explicitly applies to the lower and middle class levels.

It is therefore justified and warranted to confirm that consumers from high-class societies will favor beer brands that are of high quality and have brand potency regardless of the price tag placed on them. Consumers from lower or middle class levels are restricted to their fiscal potential and do not necessarily explore brands based on quality and brand name as their counterparts from high class levels (Suto, Clare, Holland, & Watson, 2005).

The mean and standard deviation of social influencers reveal that social class influences has the greatest perception level, followed by celebrity influence that had a normal perception level then followed by peers influence that has high influence. Confirmedly, social class as an external factor has a significant influence on consumer behavior. Xu, Lin, and Shao (2010) elaborate that social class stratification depicts the consumerism behavior and trends of a target market.

Family as an attribute of external influencer was studied and the factors that were studied include patrons with family responsibilities in beer brand selection, analysis of married bar patrons in beer brand choice, analysis of respondent family role in beer brand choice. The study revealed that patrons with family responsibilities had a moderately low importance in beer brand selection, this is to say family responsibility doesn’t affect choice of beer significantly, the also study revealed that married bar patrons is of moderately low importance in beer brand selection this is to say that marital status bears little or no significance when it comes to beer brand selection.
On the part of family role in beer brand choice the study revealed that most of the respondents felt that its of moderately low importance this is to say that family roles e.g. bread winner etc does not affect the beer brand choice. According to the findings, all the mentioned family factors have a low significance to beer brand selection.

D’amico, Di vita, Chinnici, Pappalardo, and Pecorino (2014) explains the insignificance of family-personal prospects as a consumerism behavior motivator. Ideally, D’amico et al (2014) appreciates that the family unit is a significant social entity but not a paramount external influencer of consumer behavior. The findings from the study correlate and confirm this position; family responsibility does not affect choice of beer significantly, married bar patrons is of moderately low importance in beer brand selection-this is to say that marital status bears little or no significance when it comes to beer brand selection. Drawing from this justification it is clear that while there are several external factors affecting consumer behavior and choice of consumerism, not all external prospects are of significant influence.

5.3.3 Effects of Marketing Mix Factors on Consumer Choice

During analysis of product features we examined the following features, packaging, quality and alcoholic percentage of the beer. According to the findings most of the respondents agree that packaging aspects influences their choice of beer. Kim, Kim, Lee, and Youn (2014), posit that marketing strategies used and reverted to different product brands has a direct influence on the consumer preference and choice. The marketing mix adopted and applied in the value chain of any product depicts the level of consumer approval and appreciation associated to a brand (Fernandes & Solimun, 2018). Therefore, product attributes like colors, shape of the bottle contribute to beer brand choice. During analysis of quality aspects the findings show that most of the respondents disagree that quality aspects influences their choice of beer. Therefore product quality doesn’t affect choice of beer brand greatly for most of the respondents. According to Fernandes and Solimun (2018), marketing considerations taken into perspective by consumers do not necessarily align with those of the manufacturers. As such, whereas to the manufacturer or brand, aspects like quality and attributes might make more relevance, consumer preferences and behaviors do not predicate on these prospects.
When examining alcoholic percentage the findings show that most of the respondents agree that alcoholic percentage influences their choice of beer. We saw from the respondents that they preferred beers with higher alcoholic content. Maity (2010) acknowledges that consumerism behavior correlates to how a product meets the needs and wants of a consumer. In particular, beer patrons are in search of a product that will meet their alcohol urge; this explains why respondents validated alcohol percentage as a factor that influences tier brand choice (Rajagopal, 2010).

We studied pricing factors we examined the following features, price range, availability of discounts offers and availability of a cheaper product. According to the findings most of the respondents agree that the product price range influences their choice of beer. Therefore product attributes like the price of the product is considered during beer brand choice. During analysis of availability of discounts the findings show that most of the respondents agree that discounts and offers influences their choice of beer. Therefore, discounts can shift preference of brand affect choice of beer brand greatly for most of the respondents (Fernandes & Solimun, 2018).

When examining availability of a cheaper product the findings show that most of the respondents disagree that availability of a cheaper product influences their choice of beer. Therefore a cheaper beer range doesn’t greatly affect beer brand choice. When a subsidy or cheaper alternative of a product exists, consumers of lower class, lower income and lower age tend to be persuaded to prefer it to expensive products. This explains the reason why respondents validated that the availability of a cheaper beer brand would affect their choice of brand (Pantano, 2011). Logically, this explains why most of the respondents felt that income change is of a moderately low importance to beer brand. However, a significant number of respondents also felt that it’s of moderately high importance and greatest importance choice this is to say that an increase in income may influence change of brand and also a good number of customers will maintain their brand.

We studied promotion factors we examined the following features, activations, brand awareness via social media and TV and billboards advertisement. According to the findings most of the respondents agree that the promotion and direct selling influences their choice of beer. Therefore promotional effort and direct selling affects beer brand
choice. During analysis of social media awareness, the findings show that most of the respondents agree that it influences their choice of beer. Therefore constant awareness effort directly or via social media keeps that brand top of mind.

According to Maity (2010), creating brand awareness through promotion prospects as marketing strategies helps lure consumers; consumer choices are therefore dependent on the level of awareness and promotion associated to a brand or product. When examining the findings of the study, based on TV and Billboards advertisements, most of the respondents agree that above the line promotion influences their choice of beer. Therefore, brand awareness affects decisions when it comes to beer brand choice.

We studied distribution factors we examined the following features, accessibility of the brand, availability of dial a delivery service and availability of the beer brand on an online shop. According to the findings most of the respondents strongly agree that availability and accessibility of the beer brand influences their choice of beer. Therefore product accessibility is considered during beer brand choice decision. During analysis of availability of dial and delivery service that most of the respondents agree that it influences their choice of beer. Therefore a delivery service can shift preference of brand affect choice of beer brand greatly for most of the respondents (Fernandes & Solimun, 2018; Maity, 2010).

When examining availability of the beer brand on an online shop, the findings show that most of the respondents agree that it influences their choice of beer. This is to say that online presence is important for brand influence and choice. According to Siva Kumar and Gunasekaran (2017), creation of an online market platform is a way of increasing and diversifying distribution and availability of products. As such, beer brands with an online shop are practicing a marketing strategy that increases availability and distribution of the beer brand; the increase in availability and distribution of a product influences consumer preference and choice.
5.4 Conclusion

5.4.1 Effects of Internal Influencers on Consumer Choice
The study concluded that there is a positive significant relationship between internal factors and beer brand choice factors such as income, age and gender showed a greater significance to beer choice, personality, learning, lifestyle and perception showed a positive significance to influencing beer choice, however a certain element of perception regarding brand superiority that had a low significance to influencing beer brand choice, also country of origin carried a great significance to choice of beer, level of education showed a low significance to beer choice.

5.4.2 Effects of External Influencers on Consumer Choice
The purpose of this study was to assess factors affecting beer brand choice, the following at the conclusions made based on the findings and discussions. The study concluded that there is a positive significance relationship between the external factors and beer brand choice however factors within external influencers such as religion showed that there is little or no significance to beer brand choice, factors such as beliefs and values and role model influence have a greater significance on beer choice. Social factors such as social class, celebrity influence and peer influence, the study has shown to have a significant relationship to beer brand choice. A look at family factors the study shows that there is little or low significance to beer brand choice therefore marital status or family roles have little or no bearing in the choice of beer brand.

5.4.3 Effects of Marketing Mix Factors on Consumer Choice
A look at the product factors the study showed that packaging and alcoholic percentages showed a positive influence towards beer brand choice, however product quality retained a low significance to beer brand choice. A look at the findings of pricing factors products price range and availability of offers and discounts had a significant relationship with choice of beer brand. While availability of a cheaper product did not affect the choice of beer significantly. A look at promotion the elements such as direct selling, social media and above the line promotions show a significant positive relationship to beer brand choice. A closer look at distribution reveals that accessing the product physically bears
the greatest significance to choice of beer. Availability of a dial and delivery service and an online shop also have a bearing on beer choice.

5.5 Recommendations
5.5.1 Recommendations for Improvement
5.5.1.1 Effects of Internal Influencers on Consumer Choice
Cultural Influencers in light of the findings we recommend that EABL should allocate appropriate influencers for their marketing campaigns as this affects greatly the perception of the beer brand and therefore choice. The age, gender and lifestyle factors should be considered while considering the appropriate influencer, these factors also come handy when selecting the product aspects such a color and shape of packaging as well as promotional messaging and platforms.

5.5.1.2 Effects of External Influencers on Consumer Choice
EABL should focus on packaging aspects for its beers for different target markets as it affects beer choice. Alcoholic percentage should be considered while targeting different market segments. As regards brand superiority, it is recommend that EABL highlight the unique attributes of each individual beer brand rather than superiority as in light of the findings brand superiority has little or no effect on choice of beer.

5.5.1.3 Effects of Marketing Mix Factors on Consumer Choice
It is recommended that EABL prices its products appropriately as per its target market as this affects their choice. In light of the findings, they should also watch out for cheaper alternatives within their beer brand collection and also competing brands as this may cannibalize their own products or lose out to competitions products that bear the same attributes but are cheaper in price.
5.5.2 Recommendations for Further Studies

This study was conducted in Nairobi and focused on internal and external influencers as well as the marketing mix factors. The study therefore recommends that for more visibility of promotional activities for the target market that significantly influence choice of beer brand in Kenya be carried out in Nairobi as well as around the country. Notably, the findings from this study form the basis of further study on the same field. It is reasonable to validate and justify the advanced recommendations.
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APPENDICES
APPENDIX I: COVER LETTER

United States International University – Africa,
P. O. Box 14634 – 00800,
Nairobi – Kenya.

Dear Respondent,

REF: REQUEST TO PARTICIPATE IN THE RESEARCH STUDY.

I am a student at the above mentioned institution, and I am pursing a Master’s Degree. As part of my requirement to graduate, I am supposed to carry out a study on the factors influencing consumer choice of beer brand in Kenya. My case study is patrons of East African Breweries.

As observed, you have been selected as a case study and I will appreciate if you divulge the required information that will assist me to complete the study. The attached questionnaire has been created to facilitate my ability to collect data on the same.

The responses that you give will be used for academic purposes only and confidentiality will be assured. Thank you in advance.

Regards,

Dorothy A. Otieno.
APPENDIX II: QUESTIONNAIRE

If any question may not be appropriate to your circumstances do not answer.
(Tick where appropriate)

SECTION A: RESPONDENTS BACKGROUND INFORMATION

1. Gender:
   Male □
   Female □

2. Age bracket
   18 – 25 years □
   26 – 35 years □
   36 – 45 years □
   46 – 60 years □
   60 years and Over □

3. Marital Status
   Married □
   Single □

4. What is your level of Education?
   No Education □
   Primary Level □
   Secondary Level □
   Degree □
   Postgraduate □

5. Do you have any Source of Income
   Yes □
   No □
6. If yes, what is the source?
   Monthly Salary (I am employed) □
   I am self Employed □
   I am a Casual/Freelancer □

7. What is your average Monthly income?
   Less than 10,000 □
   Ksh. 10,001-50,000 □
   Ksh 50001-100,000 □
   Ksh. 100,001 -150,000 □
   Ksh. 150,001-200,000 □
   Ksh 200,001 and Above □

8. Do you consume any of the EABL Beer Brands?
   Yes □
   No □

9. If yes which is your preferred Beer Brand?
   Tusker Lager □
   Guinness □
   Pilsner Lager □
   Baozi Lager □
   Pilsner Ice □
   Alsop’s Lager □
   Tusker Malt □
   White Cap Lager □
   Tusker Lite □
   Senator Keg □
   Tusker Cider □
   White Cap Lite □

10. How Many times in a week do you drink?
    Once □
    Twice □
    Thrice □
    More than Thrice □
SECTION B: Effects of Internal Factors on Consumer Choice of Beer Brands

11. How do these factors influence your decision about a beer brand? Please Rank the following factors on a scale of 1-Least Important – 4-Most Importance in order of importance of choice of Beer.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FACTORS</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Income</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) The cost of beer affects your choice of beer brand</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Availability of a cheaper option affects your choice of beer.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) An increase in income affects your choice of beer.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lifestyle</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) Your choice of beer brand correlates to your lifestyle</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) The brand image and product quality influences your choice of beer</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Personality, Learning, Perception, Age, Beliefs and Attitude</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) The notion that your beer preference depicts your personality influences your choice of beer</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Previous experience in beer drinking influences your choice in beer</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) The belief that a certain brand is superior or inferior to others influences your perception towards brands.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d) Your age influences your choice of beer</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e) Do your personal beliefs and attitude towards beer affect your choice of beer?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SECTION C: Effect of External Influencers on Consumer Choice of Beer Brands

12. How do these factors influence your decision about a beer brand? Please Rank the following factors on a scale of 1-Least Important – 4-Most Importance in order of importance of choice of Beer.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FACTORS</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Culture Influences</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) The element of values and beliefs influences your choice of beer</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Your religion affects the drinking and choice of beer as a bar patron</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) Your choice of beer is influenced by what brand the people you aspire to be like drink.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social Structure</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) Your social class (lower, middle or upper) influences your beer brand preference.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Your choice of beer is influenced by the Celebrities or Politicians in your society.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) Your choice of beer is influenced by what your peers (reference group) takes. Band wagon Effect</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Family</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) Bar patrons with family responsibilities prefer certain brands over others.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Patrons who are married prefer certain brands over others.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) Your Role and status in the family influences your choice of beer</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Demography</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) Gender influences your choice of beer brand</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) The country of origin affects your choice of beer</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) Your level of education affects your choice of beer</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### SECTION C: Effects of Marketing Mix Factors on Consumer Choice

13. How do these factors influence your decision about a beer brand? Please Rank the following factors on a scale of 1-Stringly Disagree– 4-Strongly Agree in order of importance of choice of Beer.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Product</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) The packaging aspect of the beer product e.g. shape of the bottle, influences my choice of beer</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) The quality aspect of beer influences my choice of beer</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) The Alcoholic percentage of the beer brand affects your choice of brand</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pricing</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) Brands with a considerable price range influence my choice of beer</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Availability of discounts affects my choice of beer brands</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) Availability of a cheaper product will affect my choice of beer</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Promotion</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) The promotion activations and direct selling influence my choice of beer</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Brand Awareness via social media affects my choice of beer brand</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) TV and Billboards advertisements affect my choice of beer brand</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Place/Distribution</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) The availability and accessibility of the brand in the bar and shops makes it preferable to me</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Availability of a dial a delivery service will affect my choice of beer brand</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) Availability of the beer brand on an online shop affects my choice of beer brand</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

THE END