```
MULT RESPONSE GROUPS=$BrandValuesSet 'Most Value ins energy drinkMost' (value_taste
    value_affordability value_brandreputation value_healthbenefits value_availability (1)
)
  /FREQUENCIES=$BrandValuesSet.
```

**Multiple Response**

## 1. What factors influence brand loyalty in the energy drink market (Q19)?

### Notes

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Output Created | | 01-MAR-2025 04:16:56 |
| Comments | | |
| Input | Data | E: \WORK\Portfolio\Research \Consumer Preferences and Behavior in the Energy Drink Market\Consumer-Preferences-and-Behavior-in-the-Energy-Drink-Market\1_Data\Analysis. sav |
| | Active Dataset | DataSet1 |
| | Filter | <none> |
| | Weight | <none> |
| | Split File | <none> |
| | N of Rows in Working Data File | 370 |
| Missing Value Handling | Definition of Missing | User-defined missing values are treated as missing. |
| | Cases Used | Statistics for each table are based on all the cases with valid data in the specified range(s) for all variables in each table. |

## Notes

| Syntax | | MULT RESPONSE GROUPS=$BrandValuesSet 'Most Value ins energy drinkMost' (value_taste value_affordability value_brandreputation value_healthbenefits value_availability (1))<br><br>/FREQUENCIES=$BrandValuesSet. |
|---|---|---|
| Resources | Processor Time | 00:00:00.00 |
| | Elapsed Time | 00:00:00.02 |

## Case Summary

| | Cases | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Valid | | Missing | | Total | |
| | N | Percent | N | Percent | N | Percent |
| $BrandValuesSet[a] | 339 | 91.6% | 31 | 8.4% | 370 | 100.0% |

a. Dichotomy group tabulated at value 1.

## $BrandValuesSet Frequencies

| | | Responses | | Percent of Cases |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | N | Percent | |
| Most Value ins energy drinkMost[a] | Q19: Most value in energy drink_Taste | 324 | 27.4% | 95.6% |
| | Q19: Most value in energy drink_Addordabilit | 210 | 17.8% | 61.9% |
| | Q19: Most value in energy drink_Brand Reputarion | 240 | 20.3% | 70.8% |
| | Q19: Most value in energy drink_Health Benifits | 195 | 16.5% | 57.5% |
| | Q19: Most value in energy drink_Availability | 213 | 18.0% | 62.8% |
| Total | | 1182 | 100.0% | 348.7% |

a. Dichotomy group tabulated at value 1.

```
CROSSTABS
 /TABLES=Value_Taste Value_Affordability Value_BrandReputation Value_HealthBenefits
```

```
    Value_Availability BY RedBull Monster PowerHorse Sting Tiger
 /FORMAT=AVALUE TABLES
 /STATISTICS=CHISQ
 /CELLS=COUNT ROW COLUMN
 /COUNT ROUND CELL.
```

**Crosstabs**

**3. Which attributes (Q19) are most important to respondents who are loyal to specific brands ?**

## Notes

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Output Created | | 01-MAR-2025 04:20:33 |
| Comments | | |
| Input | Data | E: \WORK\Portfolio\Research \Consumer Preferences and Behavior in the Energy Drink Market\Consumer-Preferences-and-Behavior-in-the-Energy-Drink-Market\1_Data\Analysis. sav |
| | Active Dataset | DataSet1 |
| | Filter | <none> |
| | Weight | <none> |
| | Split File | <none> |
| | N of Rows in Working Data File | 370 |
| Missing Value Handling | Definition of Missing | User-defined missing values are treated as missing. |
| | Cases Used | Statistics for each table are based on all the cases with valid data in the specified range(s) for all variables in each table. |

## Notes

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Syntax | | CROSSTABS /TABLES=Value_Taste Value_Affordability Value_BrandReputation Value_HealthBenefits Value_Availability BY RedBull Monster PowerHorse Sting Tiger /FORMAT=AVALUE TABLES /STATISTICS=CHISQ /CELLS=COUNT ROW COLUMN /COUNT ROUND CELL. |
| Resources | Processor Time | 00:00:00.06 |
| | Elapsed Time | 00:00:00.06 |
| | Dimensions Requested | 2 |
| | Cells Available | 524245 |

## Case Processing Summary

| | Cases | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Valid | | Missing | | Total | |
| | N | Percent | N | Percent | N | Percent |
| Q19: Most value in energy drink_Taste * Q18: Brand familiarity_Redbull | 369 | 99.7% | 1 | 0.3% | 370 | 100.0% |
| Q19: Most value in energy drink_Taste * Q18: Brand familiarity_Monster | 369 | 99.7% | 1 | 0.3% | 370 | 100.0% |
| Q19: Most value in energy drink_Taste * Q18: Brand familiarity_Power Horse | 369 | 99.7% | 1 | 0.3% | 370 | 100.0% |
| Q19: Most value in energy drink_Taste * Q18: Brand familiarity_Sting | 369 | 99.7% | 1 | 0.3% | 370 | 100.0% |
| Q19: Most value in energy drink_Taste * Q18: Brand familiarity_Tiger | 369 | 99.7% | 1 | 0.3% | 370 | 100.0% |
| Q19: Most value in energy drink_Addordabilit * Q18: Brand familiarity_Redbull | 369 | 99.7% | 1 | 0.3% | 370 | 100.0% |

# Case Processing Summary

| | Cases | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Valid | | Missing | | Total | |
| | N | Percent | N | Percent | N | Percent |
| Q19: Most value in energy drink_Addordabilit * Q18: Brand familiarity_Monster | 369 | 99.7% | 1 | 0.3% | 370 | 100.0% |
| Q19: Most value in energy drink_Addordabilit * Q18: Brand familiarity_Power Horse | 369 | 99.7% | 1 | 0.3% | 370 | 100.0% |
| Q19: Most value in energy drink_Addordabilit * Q18: Brand familiarity_Sting | 369 | 99.7% | 1 | 0.3% | 370 | 100.0% |
| Q19: Most value in energy drink_Addordabilit * Q18: Brand familiarity_Tiger | 369 | 99.7% | 1 | 0.3% | 370 | 100.0% |
| Q19: Most value in energy drink_Brand Reputarion * Q18: Brand familiarity_Redbull | 369 | 99.7% | 1 | 0.3% | 370 | 100.0% |
| Q19: Most value in energy drink_Brand Reputarion * Q18: Brand familiarity_Monster | 369 | 99.7% | 1 | 0.3% | 370 | 100.0% |
| Q19: Most value in energy drink_Brand Reputarion * Q18: Brand familiarity_Power Horse | 369 | 99.7% | 1 | 0.3% | 370 | 100.0% |
| Q19: Most value in energy drink_Brand Reputarion * Q18: Brand familiarity_Sting | 369 | 99.7% | 1 | 0.3% | 370 | 100.0% |
| Q19: Most value in energy drink_Brand Reputarion * Q18: Brand familiarity_Tiger | 369 | 99.7% | 1 | 0.3% | 370 | 100.0% |
| Q19: Most value in energy drink_Health Benifits * Q18: Brand familiarity_Redbull | 369 | 99.7% | 1 | 0.3% | 370 | 100.0% |

## Case Processing Summary

| | Cases | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Valid | | Missing | | Total | |
| | N | Percent | N | Percent | N | Percent |
| Q19: Most value in energy drink_Health Benifits * Q18: Brand familiarity_Monster | 369 | 99.7% | 1 | 0.3% | 370 | 100.0% |
| Q19: Most value in energy drink_Health Benifits * Q18: Brand familiarity_Power Horse | 369 | 99.7% | 1 | 0.3% | 370 | 100.0% |
| Q19: Most value in energy drink_Health Benifits * Q18: Brand familiarity_Sting | 369 | 99.7% | 1 | 0.3% | 370 | 100.0% |
| Q19: Most value in energy drink_Health Benifits * Q18: Brand familiarity_Tiger | 369 | 99.7% | 1 | 0.3% | 370 | 100.0% |
| Q19: Most value in energy drink_Availability * Q18: Brand familiarity_Redbull | 369 | 99.7% | 1 | 0.3% | 370 | 100.0% |
| Q19: Most value in energy drink_Availability * Q18: Brand familiarity_Monster | 369 | 99.7% | 1 | 0.3% | 370 | 100.0% |
| Q19: Most value in energy drink_Availability * Q18: Brand familiarity_Power Horse | 369 | 99.7% | 1 | 0.3% | 370 | 100.0% |
| Q19: Most value in energy drink_Availability * Q18: Brand familiarity_Sting | 369 | 99.7% | 1 | 0.3% | 370 | 100.0% |
| Q19: Most value in energy drink_Availability * Q18: Brand familiarity_Tiger | 369 | 99.7% | 1 | 0.3% | 370 | 100.0% |

**Q19: Most value in energy drink_Taste * Q18: Brand familiarity_Redbull**

## Crosstab

| | | | Q18: Brand familiarity_Redbull | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| | | | No | Yes |
| Q19: Most value in energy drink_Taste | No | Count | 30 | 15 |
| | | % within Q19: Most value in energy drink_Taste | 66.7% | 33.3% |
| | | % within Q18: Brand familiarity_Redbull | 100.0% | 4.4% |
| | Yes | Count | 0 | 324 |
| | | % within Q19: Most value in energy drink_Taste | 0.0% | 100.0% |
| | | % within Q18: Brand familiarity_Redbull | 0.0% | 95.6% |
| Total | | Count | 30 | 339 |
| | | % within Q19: Most value in energy drink_Taste | 8.1% | 91.9% |
| | | % within Q18: Brand familiarity_Redbull | 100.0% | 100.0% |

## Crosstab

| | | | Total |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Q19: Most value in energy drink_Taste | No | Count | 45 |
| | | % within Q19: Most value in energy drink_Taste | 100.0% |
| | | % within Q18: Brand familiarity_Redbull | 12.2% |
| | Yes | Count | 324 |
| | | % within Q19: Most value in energy drink_Taste | 100.0% |
| | | % within Q18: Brand familiarity_Redbull | 87.8% |
| Total | | Count | 369 |
| | | % within Q19: Most value in energy drink_Taste | 100.0% |
| | | % within Q18: Brand familiarity_Redbull | 100.0% |

## Chi-Square Tests

| | Value | df | Asymptotic Significance (2-sided) | Exact Sig. (2-sided) | Exact Sig. (1-sided) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Pearson Chi-Square | 235.115[a] | 1 | .000 | | |
| Continuity Correction[b] | 226.274 | 1 | .000 | | |
| Likelihood Ratio | 150.782 | 1 | .000 | | |
| Fisher's Exact Test | | | | .000 | .000 |
| Linear-by-Linear Association | 234.478 | 1 | .000 | | |
| N of Valid Cases | 369 | | | | |

a. 1 cells (25.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 3.66.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

**Q19: Most value in energy drink_Taste * Q18: Brand familiarity_Monster**

## Crosstab

| | | | Q18: Brand familiarity_Monster | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | No | Yes |
| Q19: Most value in energy drink_Taste | No | Count | 30 | 15 |
| | | % within Q19: Most value in energy drink_Taste | 66.7% | 33.3% |
| | | % within Q18: Brand familiarity_Monster | 18.9% | 7.1% |
| | Yes | Count | 129 | 195 |
| | | % within Q19: Most value in energy drink_Taste | 39.8% | 60.2% |
| | | % within Q18: Brand familiarity_Monster | 81.1% | 92.9% |
| Total | | Count | 159 | 210 |
| | | % within Q19: Most value in energy drink_Taste | 43.1% | 56.9% |
| | | % within Q18: Brand familiarity_Monster | 100.0% | 100.0% |

## Crosstab

|  |  |  | Total |
|---|---|---|---|
| Q19: Most value in energy drink_Taste | No | Count | 45 |
|  |  | % within Q19: Most value in energy drink_Taste | 100.0% |
|  |  | % within Q18: Brand familiarity_Monster | 12.2% |
|  | Yes | Count | 324 |
|  |  | % within Q19: Most value in energy drink_Taste | 100.0% |
|  |  | % within Q18: Brand familiarity_Monster | 87.8% |
| Total |  | Count | 369 |
|  |  | % within Q19: Most value in energy drink_Taste | 100.0% |
|  |  | % within Q18: Brand familiarity_Monster | 100.0% |

## Chi-Square Tests

|  | Value | df | Asymptotic Significance (2-sided) | Exact Sig. (2-sided) | Exact Sig. (1-sided) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Pearson Chi-Square | 11.618[a] | 1 | .001 |  |  |
| Continuity Correction[b] | 10.548 | 1 | .001 |  |  |
| Likelihood Ratio | 11.565 | 1 | .001 |  |  |
| Fisher's Exact Test |  |  |  | .001 | .001 |
| Linear-by-Linear Association | 11.586 | 1 | .001 |  |  |
| N of Valid Cases | 369 |  |  |  |  |

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 19.39.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

**Q19: Most value in energy drink_Taste * Q18: Brand familiarity_Power Horse**

## Crosstab

| | | | Q18: Brand familiarity_Power Horse | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| | | | No | Yes |
| Q19: Most value in energy drink_Taste | No | Count | 45 | 0 |
| | | % within Q19: Most value in energy drink_Taste | 100.0% | 0.0% |
| | | % within Q18: Brand familiarity_Power Horse | 20.0% | 0.0% |
| | Yes | Count | 180 | 144 |
| | | % within Q19: Most value in energy drink_Taste | 55.6% | 44.4% |
| | | % within Q18: Brand familiarity_Power Horse | 80.0% | 100.0% |
| Total | | Count | 225 | 144 |
| | | % within Q19: Most value in energy drink_Taste | 61.0% | 39.0% |
| | | % within Q18: Brand familiarity_Power Horse | 100.0% | 100.0% |

## Crosstab

| | | | Total |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Q19: Most value in energy drink_Taste | No | Count | 45 |
| | | % within Q19: Most value in energy drink_Taste | 100.0% |
| | | % within Q18: Brand familiarity_Power Horse | 12.2% |
| | Yes | Count | 324 |
| | | % within Q19: Most value in energy drink_Taste | 100.0% |
| | | % within Q18: Brand familiarity_Power Horse | 87.8% |
| Total | | Count | 369 |
| | | % within Q19: Most value in energy drink_Taste | 100.0% |
| | | % within Q18: Brand familiarity_Power Horse | 100.0% |

## Chi-Square Tests

| | Value | df | Asymptotic Significance (2-sided) | Exact Sig. (2-sided) | Exact Sig. (1-sided) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Pearson Chi-Square | 32.800[a] | 1 | .000 | | |
| Continuity Correction[b] | 30.959 | 1 | .000 | | |
| Likelihood Ratio | 48.465 | 1 | .000 | | |
| Fisher's Exact Test | | | | .000 | .000 |
| Linear-by-Linear Association | 32.711 | 1 | .000 | | |
| N of Valid Cases | 369 | | | | |

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 17.56.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

**Q19: Most value in energy drink_Taste * Q18: Brand familiarity_Sting**

## Crosstab

| | | | Q18: Brand familiarity_Sting | | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | No | Yes | |
| Q19: Most value in energy drink_Taste | No | Count | 45 | 0 | 45 |
| | | % within Q19: Most value in energy drink_Taste | 100.0% | 0.0% | 100.0% |
| | | % within Q18: Brand familiarity_Sting | 28.3% | 0.0% | 12.2% |
| | Yes | Count | 114 | 210 | 324 |
| | | % within Q19: Most value in energy drink_Taste | 35.2% | 64.8% | 100.0% |
| | | % within Q18: Brand familiarity_Sting | 71.7% | 100.0% | 87.8% |
| Total | | Count | 159 | 210 | 369 |
| | | % within Q19: Most value in energy drink_Taste | 43.1% | 56.9% | 100.0% |
| | | % within Q18: Brand familiarity_Sting | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% |

## Chi-Square Tests

| | Value | df | Asymptotic Significance (2-sided) | Exact Sig. (2-sided) | Exact Sig. (1-sided) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Pearson Chi-Square | 67.689[a] | 1 | .000 | | |
| Continuity Correction[b] | 65.071 | 1 | .000 | | |
| Likelihood Ratio | 84.188 | 1 | .000 | | |
| Fisher's Exact Test | | | | .000 | .000 |
| Linear-by-Linear Association | 67.505 | 1 | .000 | | |
| N of Valid Cases | 369 | | | | |

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 19.39.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

**Q19: Most value in energy drink_Taste * Q18: Brand familiarity_Tiger**

## Crosstab

| | | | Q18: Brand familiarity_Tiger | | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | No | Yes | |
| Q19: Most value in energy drink_Taste | No | Count | 45 | 0 | 45 |
| | | % within Q19: Most value in energy drink_Taste | 100.0% | 0.0% | 100.0% |
| | | % within Q18: Brand familiarity_Tiger | 17.9% | 0.0% | 12.2% |
| | Yes | Count | 207 | 117 | 324 |
| | | % within Q19: Most value in energy drink_Taste | 63.9% | 36.1% | 100.0% |
| | | % within Q18: Brand familiarity_Tiger | 82.1% | 100.0% | 87.8% |
| Total | | Count | 252 | 117 | 369 |
| | | % within Q19: Most value in energy drink_Taste | 68.3% | 31.7% | 100.0% |
| | | % within Q18: Brand familiarity_Tiger | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% |

## Chi-Square Tests

| | Value | df | Asymptotic Significance (2-sided) | Exact Sig. (2-sided) | Exact Sig. (1-sided) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Pearson Chi-Square | 23.795[a] | 1 | .000 | | |
| Continuity Correction[b] | 22.156 | 1 | .000 | | |
| Likelihood Ratio | 37.159 | 1 | .000 | | |
| Fisher's Exact Test | | | | .000 | .000 |
| Linear-by-Linear Association | 23.730 | 1 | .000 | | |
| N of Valid Cases | 369 | | | | |

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 14.27.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

**Q19: Most value in energy drink_Addordabilit * Q18: Brand familiarity_Redbull**

## Crosstab

| | | | Q18: Brand familiarity_Redbull | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | No | Yes |
| Q19: Most value in energy drink_Addordabilit | No | Count | 30 | 129 |
| | | % within Q19: Most value in energy drink_Addordabilit | 18.9% | 81.1% |
| | | % within Q18: Brand familiarity_Redbull | 100.0% | 38.1% |
| | Yes | Count | 0 | 210 |
| | | % within Q19: Most value in energy drink_Addordabilit | 0.0% | 100.0% |
| | | % within Q18: Brand familiarity_Redbull | 0.0% | 61.9% |
| Total | | Count | 30 | 339 |
| | | % within Q19: Most value in energy drink_Addordabilit | 8.1% | 91.9% |
| | | % within Q18: Brand familiarity_Redbull | 100.0% | 100.0% |

## Crosstab

| | | | Total |
|---|---|---|---|
| Q19: Most value in energy drink_Addordabilit | No | Count | 159 |
| | | % within Q19: Most value in energy drink_Addordabilit | 100.0% |
| | | % within Q18: Brand familiarity_Redbull | 43.1% |
| | Yes | Count | 210 |
| | | % within Q19: Most value in energy drink_Addordabilit | 100.0% |
| | | % within Q18: Brand familiarity_Redbull | 56.9% |
| Total | | Count | 369 |
| | | % within Q19: Most value in energy drink_Addordabilit | 100.0% |
| | | % within Q18: Brand familiarity_Redbull | 100.0% |

## Chi-Square Tests

| | Value | df | Asymptotic Significance (2-sided) | Exact Sig. (2-sided) | Exact Sig. (1-sided) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Pearson Chi-Square | 43.129[a] | 1 | .000 | | |
| Continuity Correction[b] | 40.640 | 1 | .000 | | |
| Likelihood Ratio | 54.060 | 1 | .000 | | |
| Fisher's Exact Test | | | | .000 | .000 |
| Linear-by-Linear Association | 43.012 | 1 | .000 | | |
| N of Valid Cases | 369 | | | | |

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 12.93.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

**Q19: Most value in energy drink_Addordabilit * Q18: Brand familiarity_Monster**

## Crosstab

| | | | Q18: Brand familiarity_Monster | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | No | Yes |
| Q19: Most value in energy drink_Addordabilit | No | Count | 54 | 105 |
| | | % within Q19: Most value in energy drink_Addordabilit | 34.0% | 66.0% |
| | | % within Q18: Brand familiarity_Monster | 34.0% | 50.0% |
| | Yes | Count | 105 | 105 |
| | | % within Q19: Most value in energy drink_Addordabilit | 50.0% | 50.0% |
| | | % within Q18: Brand familiarity_Monster | 66.0% | 50.0% |
| Total | | Count | 159 | 210 |
| | | % within Q19: Most value in energy drink_Addordabilit | 43.1% | 56.9% |
| | | % within Q18: Brand familiarity_Monster | 100.0% | 100.0% |

## Crosstab

| | | | Total |
|---|---|---|---|
| Q19: Most value in energy drink_Addordabilit | No | Count | 159 |
| | | % within Q19: Most value in energy drink_Addordabilit | 100.0% |
| | | % within Q18: Brand familiarity_Monster | 43.1% |
| | Yes | Count | 210 |
| | | % within Q19: Most value in energy drink_Addordabilit | 100.0% |
| | | % within Q18: Brand familiarity_Monster | 56.9% |
| Total | | Count | 369 |
| | | % within Q19: Most value in energy drink_Addordabilit | 100.0% |
| | | % within Q18: Brand familiarity_Monster | 100.0% |

## Chi-Square Tests

| | Value | df | Asymptotic Significance (2-sided) | Exact Sig. (2-sided) | Exact Sig. (1-sided) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Pearson Chi-Square | 9.491[a] | 1 | .002 | | |
| Continuity Correction[b] | 8.848 | 1 | .003 | | |
| Likelihood Ratio | 9.580 | 1 | .002 | | |
| Fisher's Exact Test | | | | .002 | .001 |
| Linear-by-Linear Association | 9.465 | 1 | .002 | | |
| N of Valid Cases | 369 | | | | |

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 68.51.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

**Q19: Most value in energy drink_Addordabilit * Q18: Brand familiarity_Power Horse**

## Crosstab

| | | | Q18: Brand familiarity_Power Horse | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | No | Yes |
| Q19: Most value in energy drink_Addordabilit | No | Count | 99 | 60 |
| | | % within Q19: Most value in energy drink_Addordabilit | 62.3% | 37.7% |
| | | % within Q18: Brand familiarity_Power Horse | 44.0% | 41.7% |
| | Yes | Count | 126 | 84 |
| | | % within Q19: Most value in energy drink_Addordabilit | 60.0% | 40.0% |
| | | % within Q18: Brand familiarity_Power Horse | 56.0% | 58.3% |
| Total | | Count | 225 | 144 |
| | | % within Q19: Most value in energy drink_Addordabilit | 61.0% | 39.0% |
| | | % within Q18: Brand familiarity_Power Horse | 100.0% | 100.0% |

## Crosstab

| | | | Total |
|---|---|---|---|
| Q19: Most value in energy drink_Addordabilit | No | Count | 159 |
| | | % within Q19: Most value in energy drink_Addordabilit | 100.0% |
| | | % within Q18: Brand familiarity_Power Horse | 43.1% |
| | Yes | Count | 210 |
| | | % within Q19: Most value in energy drink_Addordabilit | 100.0% |
| | | % within Q18: Brand familiarity_Power Horse | 56.9% |
| Total | | Count | 369 |
| | | % within Q19: Most value in energy drink_Addordabilit | 100.0% |
| | | % within Q18: Brand familiarity_Power Horse | 100.0% |

## Chi-Square Tests

| | Value | df | Asymptotic Significance (2-sided) | Exact Sig. (2-sided) | Exact Sig. (1-sided) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Pearson Chi-Square | .195[a] | 1 | .659 | | |
| Continuity Correction[b] | .111 | 1 | .739 | | |
| Likelihood Ratio | .195 | 1 | .659 | | |
| Fisher's Exact Test | | | | .668 | .370 |
| Linear-by-Linear Association | .194 | 1 | .659 | | |
| N of Valid Cases | 369 | | | | |

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 62.05.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

**Q19: Most value in energy drink_Addordabilit * Q18: Brand familiarity_Sting**

**Crosstab**

| | | | Q18: Brand familiarity_Sting | | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | No | Yes | |
| Q19: Most value in energy drink_Addordabilit | No | Count | 129 | 30 | 159 |
| | | % within Q19: Most value in energy drink_Addordabilit | 81.1% | 18.9% | 100.0% |
| | | % within Q18: Brand familiarity_Sting | 81.1% | 14.3% | 43.1% |
| | Yes | Count | 30 | 180 | 210 |
| | | % within Q19: Most value in energy drink_Addordabilit | 14.3% | 85.7% | 100.0% |
| | | % within Q18: Brand familiarity_Sting | 18.9% | 85.7% | 56.9% |
| Total | | Count | 159 | 210 | 369 |
| | | % within Q19: Most value in energy drink_Addordabilit | 43.1% | 56.9% | 100.0% |
| | | % within Q18: Brand familiarity_Sting | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% |

**Chi-Square Tests**

| | Value | df | Asymptotic Significance (2-sided) | Exact Sig. (2-sided) | Exact Sig. (1-sided) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Pearson Chi-Square | 164.885[a] | 1 | .000 | | |
| Continuity Correction[b] | 162.171 | 1 | .000 | | |
| Likelihood Ratio | 178.214 | 1 | .000 | | |
| Fisher's Exact Test | | | | .000 | .000 |
| Linear-by-Linear Association | 164.438 | 1 | .000 | | |
| N of Valid Cases | 369 | | | | |

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 68.51.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

**Q19: Most value in energy drink_Addordabilit * Q18: Brand familiarity_Tiger**

## Crosstab

| | | | Q18: Brand familiarity_Tiger | | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | No | Yes | |
| Q19: Most value in energy drink_Addordabilit | No | Count | 129 | 30 | 159 |
| | | % within Q19: Most value in energy drink_Addordabilit | 81.1% | 18.9% | 100.0% |
| | | % within Q18: Brand familiarity_Tiger | 51.2% | 25.6% | 43.1% |
| | Yes | Count | 123 | 87 | 210 |
| | | % within Q19: Most value in energy drink_Addordabilit | 58.6% | 41.4% | 100.0% |
| | | % within Q18: Brand familiarity_Tiger | 48.8% | 74.4% | 56.9% |
| Total | | Count | 252 | 117 | 369 |
| | | % within Q19: Most value in energy drink_Addordabilit | 68.3% | 31.7% | 100.0% |
| | | % within Q18: Brand familiarity_Tiger | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% |

## Chi-Square Tests

| | Value | df | Asymptotic Significance (2-sided) | Exact Sig. (2-sided) | Exact Sig. (1-sided) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Pearson Chi-Square | 21.270[a] | 1 | .000 | | |
| Continuity Correction[b] | 20.240 | 1 | .000 | | |
| Likelihood Ratio | 22.059 | 1 | .000 | | |
| Fisher's Exact Test | | | | .000 | .000 |
| Linear-by-Linear Association | 21.212 | 1 | .000 | | |
| N of Valid Cases | 369 | | | | |

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 50.41.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

**Q19: Most value in energy drink_Brand Reputarion * Q18: Brand familiarity_Redbull**

## Crosstab

| | | | Q18: Brand familiarity_Redbull | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | No | Yes |
| Q19: Most value in energy drink_Brand Reputarion | No | Count | 30 | 99 |
| | | % within Q19: Most value in energy drink_Brand Reputarion | 23.3% | 76.7% |
| | | % within Q18: Brand familiarity_Redbull | 100.0% | 29.2% |
| | Yes | Count | 0 | 240 |
| | | % within Q19: Most value in energy drink_Brand Reputarion | 0.0% | 100.0% |
| | | % within Q18: Brand familiarity_Redbull | 0.0% | 70.8% |
| Total | | Count | 30 | 339 |
| | | % within Q19: Most value in energy drink_Brand Reputarion | 8.1% | 91.9% |
| | | % within Q18: Brand familiarity_Redbull | 100.0% | 100.0% |

## Crosstab

| | | | Total |
|---|---|---|---|
| Q19: Most value in energy drink_Brand Reputarion | No | Count | 129 |
| | | % within Q19: Most value in energy drink_Brand Reputarion | 100.0% |
| | | % within Q18: Brand familiarity_Redbull | 35.0% |
| | Yes | Count | 240 |
| | | % within Q19: Most value in energy drink_Brand Reputarion | 100.0% |
| | | % within Q18: Brand familiarity_Redbull | 65.0% |
| Total | | Count | 369 |
| | | % within Q19: Most value in energy drink_Brand Reputarion | 100.0% |
| | | % within Q18: Brand familiarity_Redbull | 100.0% |

## Chi-Square Tests

| | Value | df | Asymptotic Significance (2-sided) | Exact Sig. (2-sided) | Exact Sig. (1-sided) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Pearson Chi-Square | 60.753[a] | 1 | .000 | | |
| Continuity Correction[b] | 57.680 | 1 | .000 | | |
| Likelihood Ratio | 68.142 | 1 | .000 | | |
| Fisher's Exact Test | | | | .000 | .000 |
| Linear-by-Linear Association | 60.589 | 1 | .000 | | |
| N of Valid Cases | 369 | | | | |

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 10.49.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

**Q19: Most value in energy drink_Brand Reputarion * Q18: Brand familiarity_Monster**

## Crosstab

| | | | Q18: Brand familiarity_Monster | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | No | Yes |
| Q19: Most value in energy drink_Brand Reputarion | No | Count | 108 | 21 |
| | | % within Q19: Most value in energy drink_Brand Reputarion | 83.7% | 16.3% |
| | | % within Q18: Brand familiarity_Monster | 67.9% | 10.0% |
| | Yes | Count | 51 | 189 |
| | | % within Q19: Most value in energy drink_Brand Reputarion | 21.3% | 78.8% |
| | | % within Q18: Brand familiarity_Monster | 32.1% | 90.0% |
| Total | | Count | 159 | 210 |
| | | % within Q19: Most value in energy drink_Brand Reputarion | 43.1% | 56.9% |
| | | % within Q18: Brand familiarity_Monster | 100.0% | 100.0% |

## Crosstab

| | | | Total |
|---|---|---|---|
| Q19: Most value in energy drink_Brand Reputarion | No | Count | 129 |
| | | % within Q19: Most value in energy drink_Brand Reputarion | 100.0% |
| | | % within Q18: Brand familiarity_Monster | 35.0% |
| | Yes | Count | 240 |
| | | % within Q19: Most value in energy drink_Brand Reputarion | 100.0% |
| | | % within Q18: Brand familiarity_Monster | 65.0% |
| Total | | Count | 369 |
| | | % within Q19: Most value in energy drink_Brand Reputarion | 100.0% |
| | | % within Q18: Brand familiarity_Monster | 100.0% |

## Chi-Square Tests

| | Value | df | Asymptotic Significance (2-sided) | Exact Sig. (2-sided) | Exact Sig. (1-sided) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Pearson Chi-Square | 133.526[a] | 1 | .000 | | |
| Continuity Correction[b] | 130.991 | 1 | .000 | | |
| Likelihood Ratio | 141.570 | 1 | .000 | | |
| Fisher's Exact Test | | | | .000 | .000 |
| Linear-by-Linear Association | 133.164 | 1 | .000 | | |
| N of Valid Cases | 369 | | | | |

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 55.59.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

**Q19: Most value in energy drink_Brand Reputarion * Q18: Brand familiarity_Power Horse**

**Crosstab**

| | | | Q18: Brand familiarity_Power Horse | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| | | | No | Yes |
| Q19: Most value in energy drink_Brand Reputarion | No | Count | 108 | 21 |
| | | % within Q19: Most value in energy drink_Brand Reputarion | 83.7% | 16.3% |
| | | % within Q18: Brand familiarity_Power Horse | 48.0% | 14.6% |
| | Yes | Count | 117 | 123 |
| | | % within Q19: Most value in energy drink_Brand Reputarion | 48.8% | 51.2% |
| | | % within Q18: Brand familiarity_Power Horse | 52.0% | 85.4% |
| Total | | Count | 225 | 144 |
| | | % within Q19: Most value in energy drink_Brand Reputarion | 61.0% | 39.0% |
| | | % within Q18: Brand familiarity_Power Horse | 100.0% | 100.0% |

## Crosstab

| | | | Total |
|---|---|---|---|
| Q19: Most value in energy drink_Brand Reputarion | No | Count | 129 |
| | | % within Q19: Most value in energy drink_Brand Reputarion | 100.0% |
| | | % within Q18: Brand familiarity_Power Horse | 35.0% |
| | Yes | Count | 240 |
| | | % within Q19: Most value in energy drink_Brand Reputarion | 100.0% |
| | | % within Q18: Brand familiarity_Power Horse | 65.0% |
| Total | | Count | 369 |
| | | % within Q19: Most value in energy drink_Brand Reputarion | 100.0% |
| | | % within Q18: Brand familiarity_Power Horse | 100.0% |

## Chi-Square Tests

| | Value | df | Asymptotic Significance (2-sided) | Exact Sig. (2-sided) | Exact Sig. (1-sided) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Pearson Chi-Square | 43.122[a] | 1 | .000 | | |
| Continuity Correction[b] | 41.665 | 1 | .000 | | |
| Likelihood Ratio | 46.435 | 1 | .000 | | |
| Fisher's Exact Test | | | | .000 | .000 |
| Linear-by-Linear Association | 43.005 | 1 | .000 | | |
| N of Valid Cases | 369 | | | | |

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 50.34.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

**Q19: Most value in energy drink_Brand Reputarion * Q18: Brand familiarity_Sting**

**Crosstab**

| | | | Q18: Brand familiarity_Sting | | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | No | Yes | |
| Q19: Most value in energy drink_Brand Reputarion | No | Count | 69 | 60 | 129 |
| | | % within Q19: Most value in energy drink_Brand Reputarion | 53.5% | 46.5% | 100.0% |
| | | % within Q18: Brand familiarity_Sting | 43.4% | 28.6% | 35.0% |
| | Yes | Count | 90 | 150 | 240 |
| | | % within Q19: Most value in energy drink_Brand Reputarion | 37.5% | 62.5% | 100.0% |
| | | % within Q18: Brand familiarity_Sting | 56.6% | 71.4% | 65.0% |
| Total | | Count | 159 | 210 | 369 |
| | | % within Q19: Most value in energy drink_Brand Reputarion | 43.1% | 56.9% | 100.0% |
| | | % within Q18: Brand familiarity_Sting | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% |

**Chi-Square Tests**

| | Value | df | Asymptotic Significance (2-sided) | Exact Sig. (2-sided) | Exact Sig. (1-sided) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Pearson Chi-Square | 8.746[a] | 1 | .003 | | |
| Continuity Correction[b] | 8.106 | 1 | .004 | | |
| Likelihood Ratio | 8.717 | 1 | .003 | | |
| Fisher's Exact Test | | | | .004 | .002 |
| Linear-by-Linear Association | 8.722 | 1 | .003 | | |
| N of Valid Cases | 369 | | | | |

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 55.59.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

**Q19: Most value in energy drink_Brand Reputarion * Q18: Brand familiarity_Tiger**

**Crosstab**

| | | | Q18: Brand familiarity_Tiger | | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | No | Yes | |
| Q19: Most value in energy drink_Brand Reputarion | No | Count | 99 | 30 | 129 |
| | | % within Q19: Most value in energy drink_Brand Reputarion | 76.7% | 23.3% | 100.0% |
| | | % within Q18: Brand familiarity_Tiger | 39.3% | 25.6% | 35.0% |
| | Yes | Count | 153 | 87 | 240 |
| | | % within Q19: Most value in energy drink_Brand Reputarion | 63.7% | 36.3% | 100.0% |
| | | % within Q18: Brand familiarity_Tiger | 60.7% | 74.4% | 65.0% |
| Total | | Count | 252 | 117 | 369 |
| | | % within Q19: Most value in energy drink_Brand Reputarion | 68.3% | 31.7% | 100.0% |
| | | % within Q18: Brand familiarity_Tiger | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% |

**Chi-Square Tests**

| | Value | df | Asymptotic Significance (2-sided) | Exact Sig. (2-sided) | Exact Sig. (1-sided) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Pearson Chi-Square | 6.542[a] | 1 | .011 | | |
| Continuity Correction[b] | 5.956 | 1 | .015 | | |
| Likelihood Ratio | 6.736 | 1 | .009 | | |
| Fisher's Exact Test | | | | .014 | .007 |
| Linear-by-Linear Association | 6.525 | 1 | .011 | | |
| N of Valid Cases | 369 | | | | |

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 40.90.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

**Q19: Most value in energy drink_Health Benifits * Q18: Brand familiarity_Redbull**

**Crosstab**

| | | | Q18: Brand familiarity_Redbull | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | No | Yes |
| Q19: Most value in energy drink_Health Benifits | No | Count | 30 | 144 |
| | | % within Q19: Most value in energy drink_Health Benifits | 17.2% | 82.8% |
| | | % within Q18: Brand familiarity_Redbull | 100.0% | 42.5% |
| | Yes | Count | 0 | 195 |
| | | % within Q19: Most value in energy drink_Health Benifits | 0.0% | 100.0% |
| | | % within Q18: Brand familiarity_Redbull | 0.0% | 57.5% |
| Total | | Count | 30 | 339 |
| | | % within Q19: Most value in energy drink_Health Benifits | 8.1% | 91.9% |
| | | % within Q18: Brand familiarity_Redbull | 100.0% | 100.0% |

**Crosstab**

| | | | Total |
|---|---|---|---|
| Q19: Most value in energy drink_Health Benifits | No | Count | 174 |
| | | % within Q19: Most value in energy drink_Health Benifits | 100.0% |
| | | % within Q18: Brand familiarity_Redbull | 47.2% |
| | Yes | Count | 195 |
| | | % within Q19: Most value in energy drink_Health Benifits | 100.0% |
| | | % within Q18: Brand familiarity_Redbull | 52.8% |
| Total | | Count | 369 |
| | | % within Q19: Most value in energy drink_Health Benifits | 100.0% |
| | | % within Q18: Brand familiarity_Redbull | 100.0% |

## Chi-Square Tests

| | Value | df | Asymptotic Significance (2-sided) | Exact Sig. (2-sided) | Exact Sig. (1-sided) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Pearson Chi-Square | 36.596[a] | 1 | .000 | | |
| Continuity Correction[b] | 34.324 | 1 | .000 | | |
| Likelihood Ratio | 48.095 | 1 | .000 | | |
| Fisher's Exact Test | | | | .000 | .000 |
| Linear-by-Linear Association | 36.497 | 1 | .000 | | |
| N of Valid Cases | 369 | | | | |

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 14.15.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

**Q19: Most value in energy drink_Health Benifits * Q18: Brand familiarity_Monster**

## Crosstab

| | | | Q18: Brand familiarity_Monster | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | No | Yes |
| Q19: Most value in energy drink_Health Benifits | No | Count | 93 | 81 |
| | | % within Q19: Most value in energy drink_Health Benifits | 53.4% | 46.6% |
| | | % within Q18: Brand familiarity_Monster | 58.5% | 38.6% |
| | Yes | Count | 66 | 129 |
| | | % within Q19: Most value in energy drink_Health Benifits | 33.8% | 66.2% |
| | | % within Q18: Brand familiarity_Monster | 41.5% | 61.4% |
| Total | | Count | 159 | 210 |
| | | % within Q19: Most value in energy drink_Health Benifits | 43.1% | 56.9% |
| | | % within Q18: Brand familiarity_Monster | 100.0% | 100.0% |

# Crosstab

|  |  |  | Total |
|---|---|---|---|
| Q19: Most value in energy drink_Health Benifits | No | Count | 174 |
|  |  | % within Q19: Most value in energy drink_Health Benifits | 100.0% |
|  |  | % within Q18: Brand familiarity_Monster | 47.2% |
|  | Yes | Count | 195 |
|  |  | % within Q19: Most value in energy drink_Health Benifits | 100.0% |
|  |  | % within Q18: Brand familiarity_Monster | 52.8% |
| Total |  | Count | 369 |
|  |  | % within Q19: Most value in energy drink_Health Benifits | 100.0% |
|  |  | % within Q18: Brand familiarity_Monster | 100.0% |

# Chi-Square Tests

|  | Value | df | Asymptotic Significance (2-sided) | Exact Sig. (2-sided) | Exact Sig. (1-sided) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Pearson Chi-Square | 14.408[a] | 1 | .000 |  |  |
| Continuity Correction[b] | 13.620 | 1 | .000 |  |  |
| Likelihood Ratio | 14.480 | 1 | .000 |  |  |
| Fisher's Exact Test |  |  |  | .000 | .000 |
| Linear-by-Linear Association | 14.369 | 1 | .000 |  |  |
| N of Valid Cases | 369 |  |  |  |  |

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 74.98.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

**Q19: Most value in energy drink_Health Benifits * Q18: Brand familiarity_Power Horse**

# Crosstab

| | | | Q18: Brand familiarity_Power Horse | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | No | Yes |
| Q19: Most value in energy drink_Health Benifits | No | Count | 123 | 51 |
| | | % within Q19: Most value in energy drink_Health Benifits | 70.7% | 29.3% |
| | | % within Q18: Brand familiarity_Power Horse | 54.7% | 35.4% |
| | Yes | Count | 102 | 93 |
| | | % within Q19: Most value in energy drink_Health Benifits | 52.3% | 47.7% |
| | | % within Q18: Brand familiarity_Power Horse | 45.3% | 64.6% |
| Total | | Count | 225 | 144 |
| | | % within Q19: Most value in energy drink_Health Benifits | 61.0% | 39.0% |
| | | % within Q18: Brand familiarity_Power Horse | 100.0% | 100.0% |

## Crosstab

| | | | Total |
|---|---|---|---|
| Q19: Most value in energy drink_Health Benifits | No | Count | 174 |
| | | % within Q19: Most value in energy drink_Health Benifits | 100.0% |
| | | % within Q18: Brand familiarity_Power Horse | 47.2% |
| | Yes | Count | 195 |
| | | % within Q19: Most value in energy drink_Health Benifits | 100.0% |
| | | % within Q18: Brand familiarity_Power Horse | 52.8% |
| Total | | Count | 369 |
| | | % within Q19: Most value in energy drink_Health Benifits | 100.0% |
| | | % within Q18: Brand familiarity_Power Horse | 100.0% |

## Chi-Square Tests

| | Value | df | Asymptotic Significance (2-sided) | Exact Sig. (2-sided) | Exact Sig. (1-sided) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Pearson Chi-Square | 13.057[a] | 1 | .000 | | |
| Continuity Correction[b] | 12.296 | 1 | .000 | | |
| Likelihood Ratio | 13.197 | 1 | .000 | | |
| Fisher's Exact Test | | | | .000 | .000 |
| Linear-by-Linear Association | 13.022 | 1 | .000 | | |
| N of Valid Cases | 369 | | | | |

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 67.90.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

**Q19: Most value in energy drink_Health Benifits * Q18: Brand familiarity_Sting**

## Crosstab

| | | | Q18: Brand familiarity_Sting | | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | No | Yes | |
| Q19: Most value in energy drink_Health Benifits | No | Count | 84 | 90 | 174 |
| | | % within Q19: Most value in energy drink_Health Benifits | 48.3% | 51.7% | 100.0% |
| | | % within Q18: Brand familiarity_Sting | 52.8% | 42.9% | 47.2% |
| | Yes | Count | 75 | 120 | 195 |
| | | % within Q19: Most value in energy drink_Health Benifits | 38.5% | 61.5% | 100.0% |
| | | % within Q18: Brand familiarity_Sting | 47.2% | 57.1% | 52.8% |
| Total | | Count | 159 | 210 | 369 |
| | | % within Q19: Most value in energy drink_Health Benifits | 43.1% | 56.9% | 100.0% |
| | | % within Q18: Brand familiarity_Sting | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% |

## Chi-Square Tests

| | Value | df | Asymptotic Significance (2-sided) | Exact Sig. (2-sided) | Exact Sig. (1-sided) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Pearson Chi-Square | 3.612[a] | 1 | .057 | | |
| Continuity Correction[b] | 3.223 | 1 | .073 | | |
| Likelihood Ratio | 3.614 | 1 | .057 | | |
| Fisher's Exact Test | | | | .059 | .036 |
| Linear-by-Linear Association | 3.602 | 1 | .058 | | |
| N of Valid Cases | 369 | | | | |

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 74.98.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

**Q19: Most value in energy drink_Health Benifits * Q18: Brand familiarity_Tiger**

## Crosstab

| | | | Q18: Brand familiarity_Tiger | | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | No | Yes | |
| Q19: Most value in energy drink_Health Benifits | No | Count | 129 | 45 | 174 |
| | | % within Q19: Most value in energy drink_Health Benifits | 74.1% | 25.9% | 100.0% |
| | | % within Q18: Brand familiarity_Tiger | 51.2% | 38.5% | 47.2% |
| | Yes | Count | 123 | 72 | 195 |
| | | % within Q19: Most value in energy drink_Health Benifits | 63.1% | 36.9% | 100.0% |
| | | % within Q18: Brand familiarity_Tiger | 48.8% | 61.5% | 52.8% |
| Total | | Count | 252 | 117 | 369 |
| | | % within Q19: Most value in energy drink_Health Benifits | 68.3% | 31.7% | 100.0% |
| | | % within Q18: Brand familiarity_Tiger | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% |

## Chi-Square Tests

| | Value | df | Asymptotic Significance (2-sided) | Exact Sig. (2-sided) | Exact Sig. (1-sided) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Pearson Chi-Square | 5.195[a] | 1 | .023 | | |
| Continuity Correction[b] | 4.697 | 1 | .030 | | |
| Likelihood Ratio | 5.234 | 1 | .022 | | |
| Fisher's Exact Test | | | | .025 | .015 |
| Linear-by-Linear Association | 5.181 | 1 | .023 | | |
| N of Valid Cases | 369 | | | | |

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 55.17.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

**Q19: Most value in energy drink_Availability * Q18: Brand familiarity_Redbull**

## Crosstab

| | | | Q18: Brand familiarity_Redbull | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | No | Yes |
| Q19: Most value in energy drink_Availability | No | Count | 30 | 126 |
| | | % within Q19: Most value in energy drink_Availability | 19.2% | 80.8% |
| | | % within Q18: Brand familiarity_Redbull | 100.0% | 37.2% |
| | Yes | Count | 0 | 213 |
| | | % within Q19: Most value in energy drink_Availability | 0.0% | 100.0% |
| | | % within Q18: Brand familiarity_Redbull | 0.0% | 62.8% |
| Total | | Count | 30 | 339 |
| | | % within Q19: Most value in energy drink_Availability | 8.1% | 91.9% |
| | | % within Q18: Brand familiarity_Redbull | 100.0% | 100.0% |

## Crosstab

| | | | Total |
|---|---|---|---|
| Q19: Most value in energy drink_Availability | No | Count | 156 |
| | | % within Q19: Most value in energy drink_Availability | 100.0% |
| | | % within Q18: Brand familiarity_Redbull | 42.3% |
| | Yes | Count | 213 |
| | | % within Q19: Most value in energy drink_Availability | 100.0% |
| | | % within Q18: Brand familiarity_Redbull | 57.7% |
| Total | | Count | 369 |
| | | % within Q19: Most value in energy drink_Availability | 100.0% |
| | | % within Q18: Brand familiarity_Redbull | 100.0% |

## Chi-Square Tests

| | Value | df | Asymptotic Significance (2-sided) | Exact Sig. (2-sided) | Exact Sig. (1-sided) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Pearson Chi-Square | 44.586[a] | 1 | .000 | | |
| Continuity Correction[b] | 42.049 | 1 | .000 | | |
| Likelihood Ratio | 55.328 | 1 | .000 | | |
| Fisher's Exact Test | | | | .000 | .000 |
| Linear-by-Linear Association | 44.466 | 1 | .000 | | |
| N of Valid Cases | 369 | | | | |

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 12.68.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

**Q19: Most value in energy drink_Availability * Q18: Brand familiarity_Monster**

## Crosstab

| | | | Q18: Brand familiarity_Monster | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | No | Yes |
| Q19: Most value in energy drink_Availability | No | Count | 111 | 45 |
| | | % within Q19: Most value in energy drink_Availability | 71.2% | 28.8% |
| | | % within Q18: Brand familiarity_Monster | 69.8% | 21.4% |
| | Yes | Count | 48 | 165 |
| | | % within Q19: Most value in energy drink_Availability | 22.5% | 77.5% |
| | | % within Q18: Brand familiarity_Monster | 30.2% | 78.6% |
| Total | | Count | 159 | 210 |
| | | % within Q19: Most value in energy drink_Availability | 43.1% | 56.9% |
| | | % within Q18: Brand familiarity_Monster | 100.0% | 100.0% |

## Crosstab

| | | | Total |
|---|---|---|---|
| Q19: Most value in energy drink_Availability | No | Count | 156 |
| | | % within Q19: Most value in energy drink_Availability | 100.0% |
| | | % within Q18: Brand familiarity_Monster | 42.3% |
| | Yes | Count | 213 |
| | | % within Q19: Most value in energy drink_Availability | 100.0% |
| | | % within Q18: Brand familiarity_Monster | 57.7% |
| Total | | Count | 369 |
| | | % within Q19: Most value in energy drink_Availability | 100.0% |
| | | % within Q18: Brand familiarity_Monster | 100.0% |

## Chi-Square Tests

| | Value | df | Asymptotic Significance (2-sided) | Exact Sig. (2-sided) | Exact Sig. (1-sided) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Pearson Chi-Square | 86.800[a] | 1 | .000 | | |
| Continuity Correction[b] | 84.829 | 1 | .000 | | |
| Likelihood Ratio | 89.718 | 1 | .000 | | |
| Fisher's Exact Test | | | | .000 | .000 |
| Linear-by-Linear Association | 86.565 | 1 | .000 | | |
| N of Valid Cases | 369 | | | | |

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 67.22.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

**Q19: Most value in energy drink_Availability * Q18: Brand familiarity_Power Horse**

**Crosstab**

| | | | Q18: Brand familiarity_Power Horse | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| | | | No | Yes |
| Q19: Most value in energy drink_Availability | No | Count | 132 | 24 |
| | | % within Q19: Most value in energy drink_Availability | 84.6% | 15.4% |
| | | % within Q18: Brand familiarity_Power Horse | 58.7% | 16.7% |
| | Yes | Count | 93 | 120 |
| | | % within Q19: Most value in energy drink_Availability | 43.7% | 56.3% |
| | | % within Q18: Brand familiarity_Power Horse | 41.3% | 83.3% |
| Total | | Count | 225 | 144 |
| | | % within Q19: Most value in energy drink_Availability | 61.0% | 39.0% |
| | | % within Q18: Brand familiarity_Power Horse | 100.0% | 100.0% |

## Crosstab

| | | | Total |
|---|---|---|---|
| Q19: Most value in energy drink_Availability | No | Count | 156 |
| | | % within Q19: Most value in energy drink_Availability | 100.0% |
| | | % within Q18: Brand familiarity_Power Horse | 42.3% |
| | Yes | Count | 213 |
| | | % within Q19: Most value in energy drink_Availability | 100.0% |
| | | % within Q18: Brand familiarity_Power Horse | 57.7% |
| Total | | Count | 369 |
| | | % within Q19: Most value in energy drink_Availability | 100.0% |
| | | % within Q18: Brand familiarity_Power Horse | 100.0% |

## Chi-Square Tests

| | Value | df | Asymptotic Significance (2-sided) | Exact Sig. (2-sided) | Exact Sig. (1-sided) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Pearson Chi-Square | 63.470[a] | 1 | .000 | | |
| Continuity Correction[b] | 61.760 | 1 | .000 | | |
| Likelihood Ratio | 67.819 | 1 | .000 | | |
| Fisher's Exact Test | | | | .000 | .000 |
| Linear-by-Linear Association | 63.298 | 1 | .000 | | |
| N of Valid Cases | 369 | | | | |

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 60.88.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

**Q19: Most value in energy drink_Availability * Q18: Brand familiarity_Sting**

**Crosstab**

| | | | Q18: Brand familiarity_Sting | | |
| | | | No | Yes | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Q19: Most value in energy drink_Availability | No | Count | 99 | 57 | 156 |
| | | % within Q19: Most value in energy drink_Availability | 63.5% | 36.5% | 100.0% |
| | | % within Q18: Brand familiarity_Sting | 62.3% | 27.1% | 42.3% |
| | Yes | Count | 60 | 153 | 213 |
| | | % within Q19: Most value in energy drink_Availability | 28.2% | 71.8% | 100.0% |
| | | % within Q18: Brand familiarity_Sting | 37.7% | 72.9% | 57.7% |
| Total | | Count | 159 | 210 | 369 |
| | | % within Q19: Most value in energy drink_Availability | 43.1% | 56.9% | 100.0% |
| | | % within Q18: Brand familiarity_Sting | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% |

**Chi-Square Tests**

| | Value | df | Asymptotic Significance (2-sided) | Exact Sig. (2-sided) | Exact Sig. (1-sided) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Pearson Chi-Square | 45.738[a] | 1 | .000 | | |
| Continuity Correction[b] | 44.310 | 1 | .000 | | |
| Likelihood Ratio | 46.383 | 1 | .000 | | |
| Fisher's Exact Test | | | | .000 | .000 |
| Linear-by-Linear Association | 45.614 | 1 | .000 | | |
| N of Valid Cases | 369 | | | | |

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 67.22.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

**Q19: Most value in energy drink_Availability * Q18: Brand familiarity_Tiger**

## Crosstab

| | | | Q18: Brand familiarity_Tiger | | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | No | Yes | |
| Q19: Most value in energy drink_Availability | No | Count | 138 | 18 | 156 |
| | | % within Q19: Most value in energy drink_Availability | 88.5% | 11.5% | 100.0% |
| | | % within Q18: Brand familiarity_Tiger | 54.8% | 15.4% | 42.3% |
| | Yes | Count | 114 | 99 | 213 |
| | | % within Q19: Most value in energy drink_Availability | 53.5% | 46.5% | 100.0% |
| | | % within Q18: Brand familiarity_Tiger | 45.2% | 84.6% | 57.7% |
| Total | | Count | 252 | 117 | 369 |
| | | % within Q19: Most value in energy drink_Availability | 68.3% | 31.7% | 100.0% |
| | | % within Q18: Brand familiarity_Tiger | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% |

## Chi-Square Tests

| | Value | df | Asymptotic Significance (2-sided) | Exact Sig. (2-sided) | Exact Sig. (1-sided) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Pearson Chi-Square | 50.769[a] | 1 | .000 | | |
| Continuity Correction[b] | 49.168 | 1 | .000 | | |
| Likelihood Ratio | 55.184 | 1 | .000 | | |
| Fisher's Exact Test | | | | .000 | .000 |
| Linear-by-Linear Association | 50.632 | 1 | .000 | | |
| N of Valid Cases | 369 | | | | |

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 49.46.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

```
CROSSTABS
 /TABLES=RedBull Monster PowerHorse Sting Tiger BY Age_Group Gender City Occupation Inco
me_Range
 /FORMAT=AVALUE TABLES
```

```
/STATISTICS=CHISQ
/CELLS=COUNT ROW COLUMN
/COUNT ROUND CELL.
```

**Crosstabs**

## 4. Is there a significant difference in brand perception between demographics (Q4)?

### Notes

| Output Created | | 01-MAR-2025 04:25:20 |
|---|---|---|
| Comments | | |
| Input | Data | E:\WORK\Portfolio\Research\Consumer Preferences and Behavior in the Energy Drink Market\Consumer-Preferences-and-Behavior-in-the-Energy-Drink-Market\1_Data\Analysis.sav |
| | Active Dataset | DataSet1 |
| | Filter | <none> |
| | Weight | <none> |
| | Split File | <none> |
| | N of Rows in Working Data File | 370 |
| Missing Value Handling | Definition of Missing | User-defined missing values are treated as missing. |
| | Cases Used | Statistics for each table are based on all the cases with valid data in the specified range(s) for all variables in each table. |

## Notes

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Syntax | | CROSSTABS<br> /TABLES=RedBull Monster PowerHorse Sting Tiger BY Age_Group Gender City Occupation Income_Range<br> /FORMAT=AVALUE TABLES<br> /STATISTICS=CHISQ<br> /CELLS=COUNT ROW COLUMN<br> /COUNT ROUND CELL. |
| Resources | Processor Time | 00:00:00.05 |
| | Elapsed Time | 00:00:00.04 |
| | Dimensions Requested | 2 |
| | Cells Available | 524245 |

## Case Processing Summary

| | Cases | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Valid | | Missing | | Total | |
| | N | Percent | N | Percent | N | Percent |
| Q18: Brand familiarity_Redbull * Q1: Age. | 369 | 99.7% | 1 | 0.3% | 370 | 100.0% |
| Q18: Brand familiarity_Redbull * Q2: Gender. | 369 | 99.7% | 1 | 0.3% | 370 | 100.0% |
| Q18: Brand familiarity_Redbull * Q4: City of Residency. | 369 | 99.7% | 1 | 0.3% | 370 | 100.0% |
| Q18: Brand familiarity_Redbull * Q5: Occupation. | 369 | 99.7% | 1 | 0.3% | 370 | 100.0% |
| Q18: Brand familiarity_Redbull * Q6: Monthly income range. | 369 | 99.7% | 1 | 0.3% | 370 | 100.0% |
| Q18: Brand familiarity_Monster * Q1: Age. | 369 | 99.7% | 1 | 0.3% | 370 | 100.0% |
| Q18: Brand familiarity_Monster * Q2: Gender. | 369 | 99.7% | 1 | 0.3% | 370 | 100.0% |

## Case Processing Summary

| | Cases | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Valid | | Missing | | Total | |
| | N | Percent | N | Percent | N | Percent |
| Q18: Brand familiarity_Monster * Q4: City of Residency. | 369 | 99.7% | 1 | 0.3% | 370 | 100.0% |
| Q18: Brand familiarity_Monster * Q5: Occupation. | 369 | 99.7% | 1 | 0.3% | 370 | 100.0% |
| Q18: Brand familiarity_Monster * Q6: Monthly income range. | 369 | 99.7% | 1 | 0.3% | 370 | 100.0% |
| Q18: Brand familiarity_Power Horse * Q1: Age. | 369 | 99.7% | 1 | 0.3% | 370 | 100.0% |
| Q18: Brand familiarity_Power Horse * Q2: Gender. | 369 | 99.7% | 1 | 0.3% | 370 | 100.0% |
| Q18: Brand familiarity_Power Horse * Q4: City of Residency. | 369 | 99.7% | 1 | 0.3% | 370 | 100.0% |
| Q18: Brand familiarity_Power Horse * Q5: Occupation. | 369 | 99.7% | 1 | 0.3% | 370 | 100.0% |
| Q18: Brand familiarity_Power Horse * Q6: Monthly income range. | 369 | 99.7% | 1 | 0.3% | 370 | 100.0% |
| Q18: Brand familiarity_Sting * Q1: Age. | 369 | 99.7% | 1 | 0.3% | 370 | 100.0% |
| Q18: Brand familiarity_Sting * Q2: Gender. | 369 | 99.7% | 1 | 0.3% | 370 | 100.0% |
| Q18: Brand familiarity_Sting * Q4: City of Residency. | 369 | 99.7% | 1 | 0.3% | 370 | 100.0% |
| Q18: Brand familiarity_Sting * Q5: Occupation. | 369 | 99.7% | 1 | 0.3% | 370 | 100.0% |
| Q18: Brand familiarity_Sting * Q6: Monthly income range. | 369 | 99.7% | 1 | 0.3% | 370 | 100.0% |

## Case Processing Summary

| | Cases | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Valid | | Missing | | Total | |
| | N | Percent | N | Percent | N | Percent |
| Q18: Brand familiarity_Tiger * Q1: Age. | 369 | 99.7% | 1 | 0.3% | 370 | 100.0% |
| Q18: Brand familiarity_Tiger * Q2: Gender. | 369 | 99.7% | 1 | 0.3% | 370 | 100.0% |
| Q18: Brand familiarity_Tiger * Q4: City of Residency. | 369 | 99.7% | 1 | 0.3% | 370 | 100.0% |
| Q18: Brand familiarity_Tiger * Q5: Occupation. | 369 | 99.7% | 1 | 0.3% | 370 | 100.0% |
| Q18: Brand familiarity_Tiger * Q6: Monthly income range. | 369 | 99.7% | 1 | 0.3% | 370 | 100.0% |

**Q18: Brand familiarity_Redbull * Q1: Age.**

## Crosstab

| | | | Q1: Age. | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Under 18 | 18–24 | 25–34 |
| Q18: Brand familiarity_Redbull | No | Count | 0 | 15 | 0 |
| | | % within Q18: Brand familiarity_Redbull | 0.0% | 50.0% | 0.0% |
| | | % within Q1: Age. | 0.0% | 7.8% | 0.0% |
| | Yes | Count | 24 | 177 | 117 |
| | | % within Q18: Brand familiarity_Redbull | 7.1% | 52.2% | 34.5% |
| | | % within Q1: Age. | 100.0% | 92.2% | 100.0% |
| Total | | Count | 24 | 192 | 117 |
| | | % within Q18: Brand familiarity_Redbull | 6.5% | 52.0% | 31.7% |
| | | % within Q1: Age. | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% |

**Crosstab**

| | | | Q1: Age. | | |
| | | | 35–44 | 45+ | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Q18: Brand familiarity_Redbull | No | Count | 0 | 15 | 30 |
| | | % within Q18: Brand familiarity_Redbull | 0.0% | 50.0% | 100.0% |
| | | % within Q1: Age. | 0.0% | 100.0% | 8.1% |
| | Yes | Count | 21 | 0 | 339 |
| | | % within Q18: Brand familiarity_Redbull | 6.2% | 0.0% | 100.0% |
| | | % within Q1: Age. | 100.0% | 0.0% | 91.9% |
| Total | | Count | 21 | 15 | 369 |
| | | % within Q18: Brand familiarity_Redbull | 5.7% | 4.1% | 100.0% |
| | | % within Q1: Age. | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% |

**Chi-Square Tests**

| | Value | df | Asymptotic Significance (2-sided) |
|---|---|---|---|
| Pearson Chi-Square | 183.862[a] | 4 | .000 |
| Likelihood Ratio | 102.788 | 4 | .000 |
| Linear-by-Linear Association | 45.232 | 1 | .000 |
| N of Valid Cases | 369 | | |

a. 3 cells (30.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 1.22.

**Q18: Brand familiarity_Redbull * Q2: Gender.**

## Crosstab

| | | | Q2: Gender. | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Male | Female | Prefer not to say |
| Q18: Brand familiarity_Redbull | No | Count | 0 | 30 | 0 |
| | | % within Q18: Brand familiarity_Redbull | 0.0% | 100.0% | 0.0% |
| | | % within Q2: Gender. | 0.0% | 16.7% | 0.0% |
| | Yes | Count | 174 | 150 | 15 |
| | | % within Q18: Brand familiarity_Redbull | 51.3% | 44.2% | 4.4% |
| | | % within Q2: Gender. | 100.0% | 83.3% | 100.0% |
| Total | | Count | 174 | 180 | 15 |
| | | % within Q18: Brand familiarity_Redbull | 47.2% | 48.8% | 4.1% |
| | | % within Q2: Gender. | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% |

## Crosstab

| | | | Total |
|---|---|---|---|
| Q18: Brand familiarity_Redbull | No | Count | 30 |
| | | % within Q18: Brand familiarity_Redbull | 100.0% |
| | | % within Q2: Gender. | 8.1% |
| | Yes | Count | 339 |
| | | % within Q18: Brand familiarity_Redbull | 100.0% |
| | | % within Q2: Gender. | 91.9% |
| Total | | Count | 369 |
| | | % within Q18: Brand familiarity_Redbull | 100.0% |
| | | % within Q2: Gender. | 100.0% |

## Chi-Square Tests

| | Value | df | Asymptotic Significance (2-sided) |
|---|---|---|---|
| Pearson Chi-Square | 34.288[a] | 2 | .000 |
| Likelihood Ratio | 45.866 | 2 | .000 |
| Linear-by-Linear Association | 18.518 | 1 | .000 |
| N of Valid Cases | 369 | | |

a. 1 cells (16.7%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 1.22.

### Q18: Brand familiarity_Redbull * Q4: City of Residency.

## Crosstab

| | | | Q4: City of Residency. | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Cairo | Giza | Alexandria |
| Q18: Brand familiarity_Redbull | No | Count | 30 | 0 | 0 |
| | | % within Q18: Brand familiarity_Redbull | 100.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% |
| | | % within Q4: City of Residency. | 17.2% | 0.0% | 0.0% |
| | Yes | Count | 144 | 36 | 144 |
| | | % within Q18: Brand familiarity_Redbull | 42.5% | 10.6% | 42.5% |
| | | % within Q4: City of Residency. | 82.8% | 100.0% | 100.0% |
| Total | | Count | 174 | 36 | 144 |
| | | % within Q18: Brand familiarity_Redbull | 47.2% | 9.8% | 39.0% |
| | | % within Q4: City of Residency. | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% |

**Crosstab**

| | | | Q4: City of ... Port Said | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Q18: Brand familiarity_Redbull | No | Count | 0 | 30 |
| | | % within Q18: Brand familiarity_Redbull | 0.0% | 100.0% |
| | | % within Q4: City of Residency. | 0.0% | 8.1% |
| | Yes | Count | 15 | 339 |
| | | % within Q18: Brand familiarity_Redbull | 4.4% | 100.0% |
| | | % within Q4: City of Residency. | 100.0% | 91.9% |
| Total | | Count | 15 | 369 |
| | | % within Q18: Brand familiarity_Redbull | 4.1% | 100.0% |
| | | % within Q4: City of Residency. | 100.0% | 100.0% |

**Chi-Square Tests**

| | Value | df | Asymptotic Significance (2-sided) |
|---|---|---|---|
| Pearson Chi-Square | 36.596[a] | 3 | .000 |
| Likelihood Ratio | 48.095 | 3 | .000 |
| Linear-by-Linear Association | 31.791 | 1 | .000 |
| N of Valid Cases | 369 | | |

a. 2 cells (25.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 1.22.

**Q18: Brand familiarity_Redbull * Q5: Occupation.**

**Crosstab**

| | | | Q5: Occupation. | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Student | Working Professional |
| Q18: Brand familiarity_Redbull | No | Count | 0 | 15 |
| | | % within Q18: Brand familiarity_Redbull | 0.0% | 50.0% |
| | | % within Q5: Occupation. | 0.0% | 7.1% |
| | Yes | Count | 117 | 197 |
| | | % within Q18: Brand familiarity_Redbull | 34.5% | 58.1% |
| | | % within Q5: Occupation. | 100.0% | 92.9% |
| Total | | Count | 117 | 212 |
| | | % within Q18: Brand familiarity_Redbull | 31.7% | 57.5% |
| | | % within Q5: Occupation. | 100.0% | 100.0% |

**Crosstab**

| | | | Q5: Occupation. | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Self-employed | Other | Total |
| Q18: Brand familiarity_Redbull | No | Count | 15 | 0 | 30 |
| | | % within Q18: Brand familiarity_Redbull | 50.0% | 0.0% | 100.0% |
| | | % within Q5: Occupation. | 62.5% | 0.0% | 8.1% |
| | Yes | Count | 9 | 16 | 339 |
| | | % within Q18: Brand familiarity_Redbull | 2.7% | 4.7% | 100.0% |
| | | % within Q5: Occupation. | 37.5% | 100.0% | 91.9% |
| Total | | Count | 24 | 16 | 369 |
| | | % within Q18: Brand familiarity_Redbull | 6.5% | 4.3% | 100.0% |
| | | % within Q5: Occupation. | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% |

## Chi-Square Tests

| | Value | df | Asymptotic Significance (2-sided) |
|---|---|---|---|
| Pearson Chi-Square | 107.072[a] | 3 | .000 |
| Likelihood Ratio | 67.944 | 3 | .000 |
| Linear-by-Linear Association | 16.631 | 1 | .000 |
| N of Valid Cases | 369 | | |

a. 2 cells (25.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 1.30.

## Q18: Brand familiarity_Redbull * Q6: Monthly income range.

## Crosstab

| | | | Q6: Monthly income range. | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Less than EGP 5,000 | EGP 5,000–10,000 |
| Q18: Brand familiarity_Redbull | No | Count | 0 | 15 |
| | | % within Q18: Brand familiarity_Redbull | 0.0% | 50.0% |
| | | % within Q6: Monthly income range. | 0.0% | 8.6% |
| | Yes | Count | 87 | 159 |
| | | % within Q18: Brand familiarity_Redbull | 25.7% | 46.9% |
| | | % within Q6: Monthly income range. | 100.0% | 91.4% |
| Total | | Count | 87 | 174 |
| | | % within Q18: Brand familiarity_Redbull | 23.6% | 47.2% |
| | | % within Q6: Monthly income range. | 100.0% | 100.0% |

## Crosstab

| | | | Q6: Monthly income range. | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | EGP 10,001–20,000 | EGP 20,001–30,000 |
| Q18: Brand familiarity_Redbull | No | Count | 0 | 15 |
| | | % within Q18: Brand familiarity_Redbull | 0.0% | 50.0% |
| | | % within Q6: Monthly income range. | 0.0% | 100.0% |
| | Yes | Count | 93 | 0 |
| | | % within Q18: Brand familiarity_Redbull | 27.4% | 0.0% |
| | | % within Q6: Monthly income range. | 100.0% | 0.0% |
| Total | | Count | 93 | 15 |
| | | % within Q18: Brand familiarity_Redbull | 25.2% | 4.1% |
| | | % within Q6: Monthly income range. | 100.0% | 100.0% |

## Crosstab

| | | | Total |
|---|---|---|---|
| Q18: Brand familiarity_Redbull | No | Count | 30 |
| | | % within Q18: Brand familiarity_Redbull | 100.0% |
| | | % within Q6: Monthly income range. | 8.1% |
| | Yes | Count | 339 |
| | | % within Q18: Brand familiarity_Redbull | 100.0% |
| | | % within Q6: Monthly income range. | 91.9% |
| Total | | Count | 369 |
| | | % within Q18: Brand familiarity_Redbull | 100.0% |
| | | % within Q6: Monthly income range. | 100.0% |

## Chi-Square Tests

| | Value | df | Asymptotic Significance (2-sided) |
|---|---|---|---|
| Pearson Chi-Square | 185.485[a] | 3 | .000 |
| Likelihood Ratio | 105.870 | 3 | .000 |
| Linear-by-Linear Association | 41.383 | 1 | .000 |
| N of Valid Cases | 369 | | |

a. 1 cells (12.5%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 1.22.

## Q18: Brand familiarity_Monster * Q1: Age.

### Crosstab

| | | | Q1: Age. | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Under 18 | 18–24 | 25–34 |
| Q18: Brand familiarity_Monster | No | Count | 24 | 81 | 33 |
| | | % within Q18: Brand familiarity_Monster | 15.1% | 50.9% | 20.8% |
| | | % within Q1: Age. | 100.0% | 42.2% | 28.2% |
| | Yes | Count | 0 | 111 | 84 |
| | | % within Q18: Brand familiarity_Monster | 0.0% | 52.9% | 40.0% |
| | | % within Q1: Age. | 0.0% | 57.8% | 71.8% |
| Total | | Count | 24 | 192 | 117 |
| | | % within Q18: Brand familiarity_Monster | 6.5% | 52.0% | 31.7% |
| | | % within Q1: Age. | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% |

**Crosstab**

| | | | Q1: Age. 35–44 | Q1: Age. 45+ | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Q18: Brand familiarity_Monster | No | Count | 6 | 15 | 159 |
| | | % within Q18: Brand familiarity_Monster | 3.8% | 9.4% | 100.0% |
| | | % within Q1: Age. | 28.6% | 100.0% | 43.1% |
| | Yes | Count | 15 | 0 | 210 |
| | | % within Q18: Brand familiarity_Monster | 7.1% | 0.0% | 100.0% |
| | | % within Q1: Age. | 71.4% | 0.0% | 56.9% |
| Total | | Count | 21 | 15 | 369 |
| | | % within Q18: Brand familiarity_Monster | 5.7% | 4.1% | 100.0% |
| | | % within Q1: Age. | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% |

**Chi-Square Tests**

| | Value | df | Asymptotic Significance (2-sided) |
|---|---|---|---|
| Pearson Chi-Square | 63.948[a] | 4 | .000 |
| Likelihood Ratio | 78.680 | 4 | .000 |
| Linear-by-Linear Association | 1.997 | 1 | .158 |
| N of Valid Cases | 369 | | |

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 6.46.

**Q18: Brand familiarity_Monster * Q2: Gender.**

## Crosstab

| | | | Q2: Gender. | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Male | Female | Prefer not to say |
| Q18: Brand familiarity_Monster | No | Count | 39 | 105 | 15 |
| | | % within Q18: Brand familiarity_Monster | 24.5% | 66.0% | 9.4% |
| | | % within Q2: Gender. | 22.4% | 58.3% | 100.0% |
| | Yes | Count | 135 | 75 | 0 |
| | | % within Q18: Brand familiarity_Monster | 64.3% | 35.7% | 0.0% |
| | | % within Q2: Gender. | 77.6% | 41.7% | 0.0% |
| Total | | Count | 174 | 180 | 15 |
| | | % within Q18: Brand familiarity_Monster | 47.2% | 48.8% | 4.1% |
| | | % within Q2: Gender. | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% |

## Crosstab

| | | | Total |
|---|---|---|---|
| Q18: Brand familiarity_Monster | No | Count | 159 |
| | | % within Q18: Brand familiarity_Monster | 100.0% |
| | | % within Q2: Gender. | 43.1% |
| | Yes | Count | 210 |
| | | % within Q18: Brand familiarity_Monster | 100.0% |
| | | % within Q2: Gender. | 56.9% |
| Total | | Count | 369 |
| | | % within Q18: Brand familiarity_Monster | 100.0% |
| | | % within Q2: Gender. | 100.0% |

## Chi-Square Tests

| | Value | df | Asymptotic Significance (2-sided) |
|---|---|---|---|
| Pearson Chi-Square | 67.200[a] | 2 | .000 |
| Likelihood Ratio | 74.792 | 2 | .000 |
| Linear-by-Linear Association | 66.876 | 1 | .000 |
| N of Valid Cases | 369 | | |

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 6.46.

**Q18: Brand familiarity_Monster * Q4: City of Residency.**

## Crosstab

| | | | Q4: City of Residency. | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Cairo | Giza | Alexandria |
| Q18: Brand familiarity_Monster | No | Count | 78 | 27 | 39 |
| | | % within Q18: Brand familiarity_Monster | 49.1% | 17.0% | 24.5% |
| | | % within Q4: City of Residency. | 44.8% | 75.0% | 27.1% |
| | Yes | Count | 96 | 9 | 105 |
| | | % within Q18: Brand familiarity_Monster | 45.7% | 4.3% | 50.0% |
| | | % within Q4: City of Residency. | 55.2% | 25.0% | 72.9% |
| Total | | Count | 174 | 36 | 144 |
| | | % within Q18: Brand familiarity_Monster | 47.2% | 9.8% | 39.0% |
| | | % within Q4: City of Residency. | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% |

# Crosstab

| | | | Q4: City of ... | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| | | | Port Said | Total |
| Q18: Brand familiarity_Monster | No | Count | 15 | 159 |
| | | % within Q18: Brand familiarity_Monster | 9.4% | 100.0% |
| | | % within Q4: City of Residency. | 100.0% | 43.1% |
| | Yes | Count | 0 | 210 |
| | | % within Q18: Brand familiarity_Monster | 0.0% | 100.0% |
| | | % within Q4: City of Residency. | 0.0% | 56.9% |
| Total | | Count | 15 | 369 |
| | | % within Q18: Brand familiarity_Monster | 4.1% | 100.0% |
| | | % within Q4: City of Residency. | 100.0% | 100.0% |

## Chi-Square Tests

| | Value | df | Asymptotic Significance (2-sided) |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Pearson Chi-Square | 50.019[a] | 3 | .000 |
| Likelihood Ratio | 56.417 | 3 | .000 |
| Linear-by-Linear Association | .871 | 1 | .351 |
| N of Valid Cases | 369 | | |

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 6.46.

**Q18: Brand familiarity_Monster * Q5: Occupation.**

# Crosstab

| | | | Q5: Occupation. | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Student | Working Professional |
| Q18: Brand familiarity_Monster | No | Count | 72 | 63 |
| | | % within Q18: Brand familiarity_Monster | 45.3% | 39.6% |
| | | % within Q5: Occupation. | 61.5% | 29.7% |
| | Yes | Count | 45 | 149 |
| | | % within Q18: Brand familiarity_Monster | 21.4% | 71.0% |
| | | % within Q5: Occupation. | 38.5% | 70.3% |
| Total | | Count | 117 | 212 |
| | | % within Q18: Brand familiarity_Monster | 31.7% | 57.5% |
| | | % within Q5: Occupation. | 100.0% | 100.0% |

# Crosstab

| | | | Q5: Occupation. | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Self-employed | Other | Total |
| Q18: Brand familiarity_Monster | No | Count | 24 | 0 | 159 |
| | | % within Q18: Brand familiarity_Monster | 15.1% | 0.0% | 100.0% |
| | | % within Q5: Occupation. | 100.0% | 0.0% | 43.1% |
| | Yes | Count | 0 | 16 | 210 |
| | | % within Q18: Brand familiarity_Monster | 0.0% | 7.6% | 100.0% |
| | | % within Q5: Occupation. | 0.0% | 100.0% | 56.9% |
| Total | | Count | 24 | 16 | 369 |
| | | % within Q18: Brand familiarity_Monster | 6.5% | 4.3% | 100.0% |
| | | % within Q5: Occupation. | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% |

## Chi-Square Tests

| | Value | df | Asymptotic Significance (2-sided) |
|---|---|---|---|
| Pearson Chi-Square | 75.511[a] | 3 | .000 |
| Likelihood Ratio | 90.580 | 3 | .000 |
| Linear-by-Linear Association | 11.909 | 1 | .001 |
| N of Valid Cases | 369 | | |

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 6.89.

**Q18: Brand familiarity_Monster * Q6: Monthly income range.**

## Crosstab

| | | | Q6: Monthly income range. | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Less than EGP 5,000 | EGP 5,000–10,000 |
| Q18: Brand familiarity_Monster | No | Count | 57 | 54 |
| | | % within Q18: Brand familiarity_Monster | 35.8% | 34.0% |
| | | % within Q6: Monthly income range. | 65.5% | 31.0% |
| | Yes | Count | 30 | 120 |
| | | % within Q18: Brand familiarity_Monster | 14.3% | 57.1% |
| | | % within Q6: Monthly income range. | 34.5% | 69.0% |
| Total | | Count | 87 | 174 |
| | | % within Q18: Brand familiarity_Monster | 23.6% | 47.2% |
| | | % within Q6: Monthly income range. | 100.0% | 100.0% |

## Crosstab

| | | | Q6: Monthly income range. | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| | | | EGP 10,001–20,000 | EGP 20,001–30,000 |
| Q18: Brand familiarity_Monster | No | Count | 33 | 15 |
| | | % within Q18: Brand familiarity_Monster | 20.8% | 9.4% |
| | | % within Q6: Monthly income range. | 35.5% | 100.0% |
| | Yes | Count | 60 | 0 |
| | | % within Q18: Brand familiarity_Monster | 28.6% | 0.0% |
| | | % within Q6: Monthly income range. | 64.5% | 0.0% |
| Total | | Count | 93 | 15 |
| | | % within Q18: Brand familiarity_Monster | 25.2% | 4.1% |
| | | % within Q6: Monthly income range. | 100.0% | 100.0% |

## Crosstab

| | | | Total |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Q18: Brand familiarity_Monster | No | Count | 159 |
| | | % within Q18: Brand familiarity_Monster | 100.0% |
| | | % within Q6: Monthly income range. | 43.1% |
| | Yes | Count | 210 |
| | | % within Q18: Brand familiarity_Monster | 100.0% |
| | | % within Q6: Monthly income range. | 56.9% |
| Total | | Count | 369 |
| | | % within Q18: Brand familiarity_Monster | 100.0% |
| | | % within Q6: Monthly income range. | 100.0% |

## Chi-Square Tests

| | Value | df | Asymptotic Significance (2-sided) |
|---|---|---|---|
| Pearson Chi-Square | 50.162[a] | 3 | .000 |
| Likelihood Ratio | 55.867 | 3 | .000 |
| Linear-by-Linear Association | 1.556 | 1 | .212 |
| N of Valid Cases | 369 | | |

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 6.46.

### Q18: Brand familiarity_Power Horse * Q1: Age.

## Crosstab

| | | | Q1: Age. | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Under 18 | 18–24 | 25–34 |
| Q18: Brand familiarity_Power Horse | No | Count | 24 | 132 | 48 |
| | | % within Q18: Brand familiarity_Power Horse | 10.7% | 58.7% | 21.3% |
| | | % within Q1: Age. | 100.0% | 68.8% | 41.0% |
| | Yes | Count | 0 | 60 | 69 |
| | | % within Q18: Brand familiarity_Power Horse | 0.0% | 41.7% | 47.9% |
| | | % within Q1: Age. | 0.0% | 31.3% | 59.0% |
| Total | | Count | 24 | 192 | 117 |
| | | % within Q18: Brand familiarity_Power Horse | 6.5% | 52.0% | 31.7% |
| | | % within Q1: Age. | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% |

## Crosstab

| | | | Q1: Age. | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| | | | 35–44 | 45+ | Total |
| Q18: Brand familiarity_Power Horse | No | Count | 6 | 15 | 225 |
| | | % within Q18: Brand familiarity_Power Horse | 2.7% | 6.7% | 100.0% |
| | | % within Q1: Age. | 28.6% | 100.0% | 61.0% |
| | Yes | Count | 15 | 0 | 144 |
| | | % within Q18: Brand familiarity_Power Horse | 10.4% | 0.0% | 100.0% |
| | | % within Q1: Age. | 71.4% | 0.0% | 39.0% |
| Total | | Count | 21 | 15 | 369 |
| | | % within Q18: Brand familiarity_Power Horse | 5.7% | 4.1% | 100.0% |
| | | % within Q1: Age. | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% |

## Chi-Square Tests

| | Value | df | Asymptotic Significance (2-sided) |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Pearson Chi-Square | 58.673[a] | 4 | .000 |
| Likelihood Ratio | 71.585 | 4 | .000 |
| Linear-by-Linear Association | 12.732 | 1 | .000 |
| N of Valid Cases | 369 | | |

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 5.85.

**Q18: Brand familiarity_Power Horse * Q2: Gender.**

# Crosstab

|  |  |  | Q2: Gender. | | Prefer not to say |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
|  |  |  | Male | Female | |
| Q18: Brand familiarity_Power Horse | No | Count | 84 | 126 | 15 |
|  |  | % within Q18: Brand familiarity_Power Horse | 37.3% | 56.0% | 6.7% |
|  |  | % within Q2: Gender. | 48.3% | 70.0% | 100.0% |
|  | Yes | Count | 90 | 54 | 0 |
|  |  | % within Q18: Brand familiarity_Power Horse | 62.5% | 37.5% | 0.0% |
|  |  | % within Q2: Gender. | 51.7% | 30.0% | 0.0% |
| Total |  | Count | 174 | 180 | 15 |
|  |  | % within Q18: Brand familiarity_Power Horse | 47.2% | 48.8% | 4.1% |
|  |  | % within Q2: Gender. | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% |

# Crosstab

|  |  |  | Total |
|---|---|---|---|
| Q18: Brand familiarity_Power Horse | No | Count | 225 |
|  |  | % within Q18: Brand familiarity_Power Horse | 100.0% |
|  |  | % within Q2: Gender. | 61.0% |
|  | Yes | Count | 144 |
|  |  | % within Q18: Brand familiarity_Power Horse | 100.0% |
|  |  | % within Q2: Gender. | 39.0% |
| Total |  | Count | 369 |
|  |  | % within Q18: Brand familiarity_Power Horse | 100.0% |
|  |  | % within Q2: Gender. | 100.0% |

## Chi-Square Tests

| | Value | df | Asymptotic Significance (2-sided) |
|---|---|---|---|
| Pearson Chi-Square | 27.554[a] | 2 | .000 |
| Likelihood Ratio | 32.697 | 2 | .000 |
| Linear-by-Linear Association | 27.176 | 1 | .000 |
| N of Valid Cases | 369 | | |

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 5.85.

**Q18: Brand familiarity_Power Horse * Q4: City of Residency.**

## Crosstab

| | | | Q4: City of Residency. | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Cairo | Giza | Alexandria |
| Q18: Brand familiarity_Power Horse | No | Count | 84 | 27 | 99 |
| | | % within Q18: Brand familiarity_Power Horse | 37.3% | 12.0% | 44.0% |
| | | % within Q4: City of Residency. | 48.3% | 75.0% | 68.8% |
| | Yes | Count | 90 | 9 | 45 |
| | | % within Q18: Brand familiarity_Power Horse | 62.5% | 6.3% | 31.3% |
| | | % within Q4: City of Residency. | 51.7% | 25.0% | 31.3% |
| Total | | Count | 174 | 36 | 144 |
| | | % within Q18: Brand familiarity_Power Horse | 47.2% | 9.8% | 39.0% |
| | | % within Q4: City of Residency. | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% |

**Crosstab**

| | | | Q4: City of ... | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| | | | Port Said | Total |
| Q18: Brand familiarity_Power Horse | No | Count | 15 | 225 |
| | | % within Q18: Brand familiarity_Power Horse | 6.7% | 100.0% |
| | | % within Q4: City of Residency. | 100.0% | 61.0% |
| | Yes | Count | 0 | 144 |
| | | % within Q18: Brand familiarity_Power Horse | 0.0% | 100.0% |
| | | % within Q4: City of Residency. | 0.0% | 39.0% |
| Total | | Count | 15 | 369 |
| | | % within Q18: Brand familiarity_Power Horse | 4.1% | 100.0% |
| | | % within Q4: City of Residency. | 100.0% | 100.0% |

**Chi-Square Tests**

| | Value | df | Asymptotic Significance (2-sided) |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Pearson Chi-Square | 28.027[a] | 3 | .000 |
| Likelihood Ratio | 33.247 | 3 | .000 |
| Linear-by-Linear Association | 22.452 | 1 | .000 |
| N of Valid Cases | 369 | | |

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 5.85.

**Q18: Brand familiarity_Power Horse * Q5: Occupation.**

**Crosstab**

| | | | Q5: Occupation. | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Student | Working Professional |
| Q18: Brand familiarity_Power Horse | No | Count | 87 | 98 |
| | | % within Q18: Brand familiarity_Power Horse | 38.7% | 43.6% |
| | | % within Q5: Occupation. | 74.4% | 46.2% |
| | Yes | Count | 30 | 114 |
| | | % within Q18: Brand familiarity_Power Horse | 20.8% | 79.2% |
| | | % within Q5: Occupation. | 25.6% | 53.8% |
| Total | | Count | 117 | 212 |
| | | % within Q18: Brand familiarity_Power Horse | 31.7% | 57.5% |
| | | % within Q5: Occupation. | 100.0% | 100.0% |

**Crosstab**

| | | | Q5: Occupation. | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Self-employed | Other | Total |
| Q18: Brand familiarity_Power Horse | No | Count | 24 | 16 | 225 |
| | | % within Q18: Brand familiarity_Power Horse | 10.7% | 7.1% | 100.0% |
| | | % within Q5: Occupation. | 100.0% | 100.0% | 61.0% |
| | Yes | Count | 0 | 0 | 144 |
| | | % within Q18: Brand familiarity_Power Horse | 0.0% | 0.0% | 100.0% |
| | | % within Q5: Occupation. | 0.0% | 0.0% | 39.0% |
| Total | | Count | 24 | 16 | 369 |
| | | % within Q18: Brand familiarity_Power Horse | 6.5% | 4.3% | 100.0% |
| | | % within Q5: Occupation. | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% |

### Chi-Square Tests

| | Value | df | Asymptotic Significance (2-sided) |
|---|---|---|---|
| Pearson Chi-Square | 53.788[a] | 3 | .000 |
| Likelihood Ratio | 67.722 | 3 | .000 |
| Linear-by-Linear Association | 2.320 | 1 | .128 |
| N of Valid Cases | 369 | | |

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 6.24.

**Q18: Brand familiarity_Power Horse * Q6: Monthly income range.**

### Crosstab

| | | | Q6: Monthly income range. | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Less than EGP 5,000 | EGP 5,000–10,000 |
| Q18: Brand familiarity_Power Horse | No | Count | 72 | 60 |
| | | % within Q18: Brand familiarity_Power Horse | 32.0% | 26.7% |
| | | % within Q6: Monthly income range. | 82.8% | 34.5% |
| | Yes | Count | 15 | 114 |
| | | % within Q18: Brand familiarity_Power Horse | 10.4% | 79.2% |
| | | % within Q6: Monthly income range. | 17.2% | 65.5% |
| Total | | Count | 87 | 174 |
| | | % within Q18: Brand familiarity_Power Horse | 23.6% | 47.2% |
| | | % within Q6: Monthly income range. | 100.0% | 100.0% |

**Crosstab**

| | | | Q6: Monthly income range. | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| | | | EGP 10,001–20,000 | EGP 20,001–30,000 |
| Q18: Brand familiarity_Power Horse | No | Count | 78 | 15 |
| | | % within Q18: Brand familiarity_Power Horse | 34.7% | 6.7% |
| | | % within Q6: Monthly income range. | 83.9% | 100.0% |
| | Yes | Count | 15 | 0 |
| | | % within Q18: Brand familiarity_Power Horse | 10.4% | 0.0% |
| | | % within Q6: Monthly income range. | 16.1% | 0.0% |
| Total | | Count | 93 | 15 |
| | | % within Q18: Brand familiarity_Power Horse | 25.2% | 4.1% |
| | | % within Q6: Monthly income range. | 100.0% | 100.0% |

**Crosstab**

| | | | Total |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Q18: Brand familiarity_Power Horse | No | Count | 225 |
| | | % within Q18: Brand familiarity_Power Horse | 100.0% |
| | | % within Q6: Monthly income range. | 61.0% |
| | Yes | Count | 144 |
| | | % within Q18: Brand familiarity_Power Horse | 100.0% |
| | | % within Q6: Monthly income range. | 39.0% |
| Total | | Count | 369 |
| | | % within Q18: Brand familiarity_Power Horse | 100.0% |
| | | % within Q6: Monthly income range. | 100.0% |

## Chi-Square Tests

| | Value | df | Asymptotic Significance (2-sided) |
|---|---|---|---|
| Pearson Chi-Square | 98.759[a] | 3 | .000 |
| Likelihood Ratio | 107.278 | 3 | .000 |
| Linear-by-Linear Association | 3.498 | 1 | .061 |
| N of Valid Cases | 369 | | |

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 5.85.

### Q18: Brand familiarity_Sting * Q1: Age.

## Crosstab

| | | | Q1: Age. | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Under 18 | 18–24 | 25–34 |
| Q18: Brand familiarity_Sting | No | Count | 0 | 84 | 54 |
| | | % within Q18: Brand familiarity_Sting | 0.0% | 52.8% | 34.0% |
| | | % within Q1: Age. | 0.0% | 43.8% | 46.2% |
| | Yes | Count | 24 | 108 | 63 |
| | | % within Q18: Brand familiarity_Sting | 11.4% | 51.4% | 30.0% |
| | | % within Q1: Age. | 100.0% | 56.3% | 53.8% |
| Total | | Count | 24 | 192 | 117 |
| | | % within Q18: Brand familiarity_Sting | 6.5% | 52.0% | 31.7% |
| | | % within Q1: Age. | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% |

**Crosstab**

| | | | Q1: Age. | | |
| | | | 35–44 | 45+ | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Q18: Brand familiarity_Sting | No | Count | 6 | 15 | 159 |
| | | % within Q18: Brand familiarity_Sting | 3.8% | 9.4% | 100.0% |
| | | % within Q1: Age. | 28.6% | 100.0% | 43.1% |
| | Yes | Count | 15 | 0 | 210 |
| | | % within Q18: Brand familiarity_Sting | 7.1% | 0.0% | 100.0% |
| | | % within Q1: Age. | 71.4% | 0.0% | 56.9% |
| Total | | Count | 21 | 15 | 369 |
| | | % within Q18: Brand familiarity_Sting | 5.7% | 4.1% | 100.0% |
| | | % within Q1: Age. | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% |

**Chi-Square Tests**

| | Value | df | Asymptotic Significance (2-sided) |
|---|---|---|---|
| Pearson Chi-Square | 40.270[a] | 4 | .000 |
| Likelihood Ratio | 54.680 | 4 | .000 |
| Linear-by-Linear Association | 16.706 | 1 | .000 |
| N of Valid Cases | 369 | | |

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 6.46.

**Q18: Brand familiarity_Sting * Q2: Gender.**

**Crosstab**

| | | | Q2: Gender. | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Male | Female | Prefer not to say |
| Q18: Brand familiarity_Sting | No | Count | 84 | 75 | 0 |
| | | % within Q18: Brand familiarity_Sting | 52.8% | 47.2% | 0.0% |
| | | % within Q2: Gender. | 48.3% | 41.7% | 0.0% |
| | Yes | Count | 90 | 105 | 15 |
| | | % within Q18: Brand familiarity_Sting | 42.9% | 50.0% | 7.1% |
| | | % within Q2: Gender. | 51.7% | 58.3% | 100.0% |
| Total | | Count | 174 | 180 | 15 |
| | | % within Q18: Brand familiarity_Sting | 47.2% | 48.8% | 4.1% |
| | | % within Q2: Gender. | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% |

**Crosstab**

| | | | Total |
|---|---|---|---|
| Q18: Brand familiarity_Sting | No | Count | 159 |
| | | % within Q18: Brand familiarity_Sting | 100.0% |
| | | % within Q2: Gender. | 43.1% |
| | Yes | Count | 210 |
| | | % within Q18: Brand familiarity_Sting | 100.0% |
| | | % within Q2: Gender. | 56.9% |
| Total | | Count | 369 |
| | | % within Q18: Brand familiarity_Sting | 100.0% |
| | | % within Q2: Gender. | 100.0% |

## Chi-Square Tests

|  | Value | df | Asymptotic Significance (2-sided) |
|---|---|---|---|
| Pearson Chi-Square | 13.414[a] | 2 | .001 |
| Likelihood Ratio | 18.953 | 2 | .000 |
| Linear-by-Linear Association | 8.096 | 1 | .004 |
| N of Valid Cases | 369 |  |  |

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 6.46.

**Q18: Brand familiarity_Sting * Q4: City of Residency.**

## Crosstab

|  |  |  | Q4: City of Residency. | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
|  |  |  | Cairo | Giza | Alexandria |
| Q18: Brand familiarity_Sting | No | Count | 96 | 9 | 54 |
|  |  | % within Q18: Brand familiarity_Sting | 60.4% | 5.7% | 34.0% |
|  |  | % within Q4: City of Residency. | 55.2% | 25.0% | 37.5% |
|  | Yes | Count | 78 | 27 | 90 |
|  |  | % within Q18: Brand familiarity_Sting | 37.1% | 12.9% | 42.9% |
|  |  | % within Q4: City of Residency. | 44.8% | 75.0% | 62.5% |
| Total |  | Count | 174 | 36 | 144 |
|  |  | % within Q18: Brand familiarity_Sting | 47.2% | 9.8% | 39.0% |
|  |  | % within Q4: City of Residency. | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% |

## Crosstab

| | | | Q4: City of ... | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| | | | Port Said | Total |
| Q18: Brand familiarity_Sting | No | Count | 0 | 159 |
| | | % within Q18: Brand familiarity_Sting | 0.0% | 100.0% |
| | | % within Q4: City of Residency. | 0.0% | 43.1% |
| | Yes | Count | 15 | 210 |
| | | % within Q18: Brand familiarity_Sting | 7.1% | 100.0% |
| | | % within Q4: City of Residency. | 100.0% | 56.9% |
| Total | | Count | 15 | 369 |
| | | % within Q18: Brand familiarity_Sting | 4.1% | 100.0% |
| | | % within Q4: City of Residency. | 100.0% | 100.0% |

## Chi-Square Tests

| | Value | df | Asymptotic Significance (2-sided) |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Pearson Chi-Square | 28.355[a] | 3 | .000 |
| Likelihood Ratio | 34.103 | 3 | .000 |
| Linear-by-Linear Association | 18.979 | 1 | .000 |
| N of Valid Cases | 369 | | |

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 6.46.

**Q18: Brand familiarity_Sting * Q5: Occupation.**

**Crosstab**

| | | | Q5: Occupation. | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Student | Working Professional |
| Q18: Brand familiarity_Sting | No | Count | 15 | 104 |
| | | % within Q18: Brand familiarity_Sting | 9.4% | 65.4% |
| | | % within Q5: Occupation. | 12.8% | 49.1% |
| | Yes | Count | 102 | 108 |
| | | % within Q18: Brand familiarity_Sting | 48.6% | 51.4% |
| | | % within Q5: Occupation. | 87.2% | 50.9% |
| Total | | Count | 117 | 212 |
| | | % within Q18: Brand familiarity_Sting | 31.7% | 57.5% |
| | | % within Q5: Occupation. | 100.0% | 100.0% |

**Crosstab**

| | | | Q5: Occupation. | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Self-employed | Other | Total |
| Q18: Brand familiarity_Sting | No | Count | 24 | 16 | 159 |
| | | % within Q18: Brand familiarity_Sting | 15.1% | 10.1% | 100.0% |
| | | % within Q5: Occupation. | 100.0% | 100.0% | 43.1% |
| | Yes | Count | 0 | 0 | 210 |
| | | % within Q18: Brand familiarity_Sting | 0.0% | 0.0% | 100.0% |
| | | % within Q5: Occupation. | 0.0% | 0.0% | 56.9% |
| Total | | Count | 24 | 16 | 369 |
| | | % within Q18: Brand familiarity_Sting | 6.5% | 4.3% | 100.0% |
| | | % within Q5: Occupation. | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% |

## Chi-Square Tests

| | Value | df | Asymptotic Significance (2-sided) |
|---|---|---|---|
| Pearson Chi-Square | 99.622[a] | 3 | .000 |
| Likelihood Ratio | 121.040 | 3 | .000 |
| Linear-by-Linear Association | 84.905 | 1 | .000 |
| N of Valid Cases | 369 | | |

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 6.89.

**Q18: Brand familiarity_Sting * Q6: Monthly income range.**

## Crosstab

| | | | | Q6: Monthly income range. | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | Less than EGP 5,000 | EGP 5,000–10,000 |
| Q18: Brand familiarity_Sting | No | Count | | 0 | 75 |
| | | % within Q18: Brand familiarity_Sting | | 0.0% | 47.2% |
| | | % within Q6: Monthly income range. | | 0.0% | 43.1% |
| | Yes | Count | | 87 | 99 |
| | | % within Q18: Brand familiarity_Sting | | 41.4% | 47.1% |
| | | % within Q6: Monthly income range. | | 100.0% | 56.9% |
| Total | | Count | | 87 | 174 |
| | | % within Q18: Brand familiarity_Sting | | 23.6% | 47.2% |
| | | % within Q6: Monthly income range. | | 100.0% | 100.0% |

**Crosstab**

| | | | Q6: Monthly income range. | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| | | | EGP 10,001–20,000 | EGP 20,001–30,000 |
| Q18: Brand familiarity_Sting | No | Count | 69 | 15 |
| | | % within Q18: Brand familiarity_Sting | 43.4% | 9.4% |
| | | % within Q6: Monthly income range. | 74.2% | 100.0% |
| | Yes | Count | 24 | 0 |
| | | % within Q18: Brand familiarity_Sting | 11.4% | 0.0% |
| | | % within Q6: Monthly income range. | 25.8% | 0.0% |
| Total | | Count | 93 | 15 |
| | | % within Q18: Brand familiarity_Sting | 25.2% | 4.1% |
| | | % within Q6: Monthly income range. | 100.0% | 100.0% |

**Crosstab**

| | | | Total |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Q18: Brand familiarity_Sting | No | Count | 159 |
| | | % within Q18: Brand familiarity_Sting | 100.0% |
| | | % within Q6: Monthly income range. | 43.1% |
| | Yes | Count | 210 |
| | | % within Q18: Brand familiarity_Sting | 100.0% |
| | | % within Q6: Monthly income range. | 56.9% |
| Total | | Count | 369 |
| | | % within Q18: Brand familiarity_Sting | 100.0% |
| | | % within Q6: Monthly income range. | 100.0% |

## Chi-Square Tests

| | Value | df | Asymptotic Significance (2-sided) |
|---|---|---|---|
| Pearson Chi-Square | 122.373[a] | 3 | .000 |
| Likelihood Ratio | 160.367 | 3 | .000 |
| Linear-by-Linear Association | 119.866 | 1 | .000 |
| N of Valid Cases | 369 | | |

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 6.46.

### Q18: Brand familiarity_Tiger * Q1: Age.

## Crosstab

| | | | Q1: Age. | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Under 18 | 18–24 | 25–34 |
| Q18: Brand familiarity_Tiger | No | Count | 0 | 144 | 72 |
| | | % within Q18: Brand familiarity_Tiger | 0.0% | 57.1% | 28.6% |
| | | % within Q1: Age. | 0.0% | 75.0% | 61.5% |
| | Yes | Count | 24 | 48 | 45 |
| | | % within Q18: Brand familiarity_Tiger | 20.5% | 41.0% | 38.5% |
| | | % within Q1: Age. | 100.0% | 25.0% | 38.5% |
| Total | | Count | 24 | 192 | 117 |
| | | % within Q18: Brand familiarity_Tiger | 6.5% | 52.0% | 31.7% |
| | | % within Q1: Age. | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% |

**Crosstab**

| | | | Q1: Age. | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| | | | 35–44 | 45+ | Total |
| Q18: Brand familiarity_Tiger | No | Count | 21 | 15 | 252 |
| | | % within Q18: Brand familiarity_Tiger | 8.3% | 6.0% | 100.0% |
| | | % within Q1: Age. | 100.0% | 100.0% | 68.3% |
| | Yes | Count | 0 | 0 | 117 |
| | | % within Q18: Brand familiarity_Tiger | 0.0% | 0.0% | 100.0% |
| | | % within Q1: Age. | 0.0% | 0.0% | 31.7% |
| Total | | Count | 21 | 15 | 369 |
| | | % within Q18: Brand familiarity_Tiger | 5.7% | 4.1% | 100.0% |
| | | % within Q1: Age. | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% |

**Chi-Square Tests**

| | Value | df | Asymptotic Significance (2-sided) |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Pearson Chi-Square | 74.861[a] | 4 | .000 |
| Likelihood Ratio | 89.141 | 4 | .000 |
| Linear-by-Linear Association | 22.018 | 1 | .000 |
| N of Valid Cases | 369 | | |

a. 1 cells (10.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 4.76.

**Q18: Brand familiarity_Tiger * Q2: Gender.**

**Crosstab**

| | | | Q2: Gender. | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Male | Female | Prefer not to say |
| Q18: Brand familiarity_Tiger | No | Count | 138 | 114 | 0 |
| | | % within Q18: Brand familiarity_Tiger | 54.8% | 45.2% | 0.0% |
| | | % within Q2: Gender. | 79.3% | 63.3% | 0.0% |
| | Yes | Count | 36 | 66 | 15 |
| | | % within Q18: Brand familiarity_Tiger | 30.8% | 56.4% | 12.8% |
| | | % within Q2: Gender. | 20.7% | 36.7% | 100.0% |
| Total | | Count | 174 | 180 | 15 |
| | | % within Q18: Brand familiarity_Tiger | 47.2% | 48.8% | 4.1% |
| | | % within Q2: Gender. | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% |

**Crosstab**

| | | | Total |
|---|---|---|---|
| Q18: Brand familiarity_Tiger | No | Count | 252 |
| | | % within Q18: Brand familiarity_Tiger | 100.0% |
| | | % within Q2: Gender. | 68.3% |
| | Yes | Count | 117 |
| | | % within Q18: Brand familiarity_Tiger | 100.0% |
| | | % within Q2: Gender. | 31.7% |
| Total | | Count | 369 |
| | | % within Q18: Brand familiarity_Tiger | 100.0% |
| | | % within Q2: Gender. | 100.0% |

## Chi-Square Tests

| | Value | df | Asymptotic Significance (2-sided) |
|---|---|---|---|
| Pearson Chi-Square | 44.106[a] | 2 | .000 |
| Likelihood Ratio | 46.994 | 2 | .000 |
| Linear-by-Linear Association | 33.073 | 1 | .000 |
| N of Valid Cases | 369 | | |

a. 1 cells (16.7%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 4.76.

### Q18: Brand familiarity_Tiger * Q4: City of Residency.

## Crosstab

| | | | Q4: City of Residency. | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Cairo | Giza | Alexandria |
| Q18: Brand familiarity_Tiger | No | Count | 126 | 27 | 84 |
| | | % within Q18: Brand familiarity_Tiger | 50.0% | 10.7% | 33.3% |
| | | % within Q4: City of Residency. | 72.4% | 75.0% | 58.3% |
| | Yes | Count | 48 | 9 | 60 |
| | | % within Q18: Brand familiarity_Tiger | 41.0% | 7.7% | 51.3% |
| | | % within Q4: City of Residency. | 27.6% | 25.0% | 41.7% |
| Total | | Count | 174 | 36 | 144 |
| | | % within Q18: Brand familiarity_Tiger | 47.2% | 9.8% | 39.0% |
| | | % within Q4: City of Residency. | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% |

## Crosstab

| | | | Q4: City of ... | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| | | | Port Said | Total |
| Q18: Brand familiarity_Tiger | No | Count | 15 | 252 |
| | | % within Q18: Brand familiarity_Tiger | 6.0% | 100.0% |
| | | % within Q4: City of Residency. | 100.0% | 68.3% |
| | Yes | Count | 0 | 117 |
| | | % within Q18: Brand familiarity_Tiger | 0.0% | 100.0% |
| | | % within Q4: City of Residency. | 0.0% | 31.7% |
| Total | | Count | 15 | 369 |
| | | % within Q18: Brand familiarity_Tiger | 4.1% | 100.0% |
| | | % within Q4: City of Residency. | 100.0% | 100.0% |

## Chi-Square Tests

| | Value | df | Asymptotic Significance (2-sided) |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Pearson Chi-Square | 15.673[a] | 3 | .001 |
| Likelihood Ratio | 19.918 | 3 | .000 |
| Linear-by-Linear Association | 1.755 | 1 | .185 |
| N of Valid Cases | 369 | | |

a. 1 cells (12.5%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 4.76.

**Q18: Brand familiarity_Tiger * Q5: Occupation.**

**Crosstab**

| | | | Q5: Occupation. | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Student | Working Professional |
| Q18: Brand familiarity_Tiger | No | Count | 60 | 152 |
| | | % within Q18: Brand familiarity_Tiger | 23.8% | 60.3% |
| | | % within Q5: Occupation. | 51.3% | 71.7% |
| | Yes | Count | 57 | 60 |
| | | % within Q18: Brand familiarity_Tiger | 48.7% | 51.3% |
| | | % within Q5: Occupation. | 48.7% | 28.3% |
| Total | | Count | 117 | 212 |
| | | % within Q18: Brand familiarity_Tiger | 31.7% | 57.5% |
| | | % within Q5: Occupation. | 100.0% | 100.0% |

**Crosstab**

| | | | Q5: Occupation. | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Self-employed | Other | Total |
| Q18: Brand familiarity_Tiger | No | Count | 24 | 16 | 252 |
| | | % within Q18: Brand familiarity_Tiger | 9.5% | 6.3% | 100.0% |
| | | % within Q5: Occupation. | 100.0% | 100.0% | 68.3% |
| | Yes | Count | 0 | 0 | 117 |
| | | % within Q18: Brand familiarity_Tiger | 0.0% | 0.0% | 100.0% |
| | | % within Q5: Occupation. | 0.0% | 0.0% | 31.7% |
| Total | | Count | 24 | 16 | 369 |
| | | % within Q18: Brand familiarity_Tiger | 6.5% | 4.3% | 100.0% |
| | | % within Q5: Occupation. | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% |

## Chi-Square Tests

| | Value | df | Asymptotic Significance (2-sided) |
|---|---|---|---|
| Pearson Chi-Square | 35.342[a] | 3 | .000 |
| Likelihood Ratio | 46.256 | 3 | .000 |
| Linear-by-Linear Association | 30.088 | 1 | .000 |
| N of Valid Cases | 369 | | |

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 5.07.

**Q18: Brand familiarity_Tiger * Q6: Monthly income range.**

## Crosstab

| | | | Q6: Monthly income range. | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Less than EGP 5,000 | EGP 5,000–10,000 |
| Q18: Brand familiarity_Tiger | No | Count | 30 | 129 |
| | | % within Q18: Brand familiarity_Tiger | 11.9% | 51.2% |
| | | % within Q6: Monthly income range. | 34.5% | 74.1% |
| | Yes | Count | 57 | 45 |
| | | % within Q18: Brand familiarity_Tiger | 48.7% | 38.5% |
| | | % within Q6: Monthly income range. | 65.5% | 25.9% |
| Total | | Count | 87 | 174 |
| | | % within Q18: Brand familiarity_Tiger | 23.6% | 47.2% |
| | | % within Q6: Monthly income range. | 100.0% | 100.0% |

**Crosstab**

| | | | Q6: Monthly income range. | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| | | | EGP 10,001–20,000 | EGP 20,001–30,000 |
| Q18: Brand familiarity_Tiger | No | Count | 78 | 15 |
| | | % within Q18: Brand familiarity_Tiger | 31.0% | 6.0% |
| | | % within Q6: Monthly income range. | 83.9% | 100.0% |
| | Yes | Count | 15 | 0 |
| | | % within Q18: Brand familiarity_Tiger | 12.8% | 0.0% |
| | | % within Q6: Monthly income range. | 16.1% | 0.0% |
| Total | | Count | 93 | 15 |
| | | % within Q18: Brand familiarity_Tiger | 25.2% | 4.1% |
| | | % within Q6: Monthly income range. | 100.0% | 100.0% |

**Crosstab**

| | | | Total |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Q18: Brand familiarity_Tiger | No | Count | 252 |
| | | % within Q18: Brand familiarity_Tiger | 100.0% |
| | | % within Q6: Monthly income range. | 68.3% |
| | Yes | Count | 117 |
| | | % within Q18: Brand familiarity_Tiger | 100.0% |
| | | % within Q6: Monthly income range. | 31.7% |
| Total | | Count | 369 |
| | | % within Q18: Brand familiarity_Tiger | 100.0% |
| | | % within Q6: Monthly income range. | 100.0% |

## Chi-Square Tests

| | Value | df | Asymptotic Significance (2-sided) |
|---|---|---|---|
| Pearson Chi-Square | 66.060[a] | 3 | .000 |
| Likelihood Ratio | 67.803 | 3 | .000 |
| Linear-by-Linear Association | 55.565 | 1 | .000 |
| N of Valid Cases | 369 | | |

a. 1 cells (12.5%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 4.76.