# Brand Familiarity freq

**Frequencies**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Notes** | | |
| Output Created | | 28-FEB-2025 22:43:44 |
| 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 are based on all cases with valid data. |
| Syntax | | FREQUENCIES VARIABLES=RedBull Monster PowerHorse Sting Tiger  /ORDER=ANALYSIS. |
| Resources | Processor Time | 00:00:00.00 |
| Elapsed Time | 00:00:00.01 |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Statistics** | | | | | | |
|  | | Q18: Brand familiarity\_Redbull | Q18: Brand familiarity\_Monster | Q18: Brand familiarity\_Power Horse | Q18: Brand familiarity\_Sting | Q18: Brand familiarity\_Tiger |
| N | Valid | 369 | 369 | 369 | 369 | 369 |
| Missing | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |

**Frequency Table**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Q18: Brand familiarity\_Redbull** | | | | | |
|  | | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
| Valid | No | 30 | 8.1 | 8.1 | 8.1 |
| Yes | 339 | 91.6 | 91.9 | 100.0 |
| Total | 369 | 99.7 | 100.0 |  |
| Missing | System | 1 | .3 |  |  |
| Total | | 370 | 100.0 |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Q18: Brand familiarity\_Monster** | | | | | |
|  | | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
| Valid | No | 159 | 43.0 | 43.1 | 43.1 |
| Yes | 210 | 56.8 | 56.9 | 100.0 |
| Total | 369 | 99.7 | 100.0 |  |
| Missing | System | 1 | .3 |  |  |
| Total | | 370 | 100.0 |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Q18: Brand familiarity\_Power Horse** | | | | | |
|  | | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
| Valid | No | 225 | 60.8 | 61.0 | 61.0 |
| Yes | 144 | 38.9 | 39.0 | 100.0 |
| Total | 369 | 99.7 | 100.0 |  |
| Missing | System | 1 | .3 |  |  |
| Total | | 370 | 100.0 |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Q18: Brand familiarity\_Sting** | | | | | |
|  | | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
| Valid | No | 159 | 43.0 | 43.1 | 43.1 |
| Yes | 210 | 56.8 | 56.9 | 100.0 |
| Total | 369 | 99.7 | 100.0 |  |
| Missing | System | 1 | .3 |  |  |
| Total | | 370 | 100.0 |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Q18: Brand familiarity\_Tiger** | | | | | |
|  | | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
| Valid | No | 252 | 68.1 | 68.3 | 68.3 |
| Yes | 117 | 31.6 | 31.7 | 100.0 |
| Total | 369 | 99.7 | 100.0 |  |
| Missing | System | 1 | .3 |  |  |
| Total | | 370 | 100.0 |  |  |

Below is the interpretation and summary of the SPSS Frequencies output for the familiarity of various energy drink brands (Red Bull, Monster, Power Horse, Sting, and Tiger). This analysis provides insights into how familiar consumers are with each brand.

---

### \*\*Summary Table: Familiarity with Energy Drink Brands\*\*

| \*\*Brand\*\* | \*\*Response\*\* | \*\*Frequency (N)\*\* | \*\*Percent of Total Cases\*\* | \*\*Valid Percent\*\* | \*\*Cumulative Percent\*\* |

|--------------------|--------------|-------------------|----------------------------|-------------------|-------------------------|

| \*\*Red Bull\*\* | No | 30 | 8.1% | 8.1% | 8.1% |

| | Yes | 339 | 91.6% | 91.9% | 100.0% |

| | \*\*Total Valid Responses\*\* | \*\*369\*\* | \*\*99.7%\*\* | \*\*100.0%\*\* | |

| | Missing (System) | 1 | 0.3% | | |

| | \*\*Total Cases\*\* | \*\*370\*\* | \*\*100.0%\*\* | | |

| \*\*Monster\*\* | No | 159 | 43.0% | 43.1% | 43.1% |

| | Yes | 210 | 56.8% | 56.9% | 100.0% |

| | \*\*Total Valid Responses\*\* | \*\*369\*\* | \*\*99.7%\*\* | \*\*100.0%\*\* | |

| | Missing (System) | 1 | 0.3% | | |

| | \*\*Total Cases\*\* | \*\*370\*\* | \*\*100.0%\*\* | | |

| \*\*Power Horse\*\* | No | 225 | 60.8% | 61.0% | 61.0% |

| | Yes | 144 | 38.9% | 39.0% | 100.0% |

| | \*\*Total Valid Responses\*\* | \*\*369\*\* | \*\*99.7%\*\* | \*\*100.0%\*\* | |

| | Missing (System) | 1 | 0.3% | | |

| | \*\*Total Cases\*\* | \*\*370\*\* | \*\*100.0%\*\* | | |

| \*\*Sting\*\* | No | 159 | 43.0% | 43.1% | 43.1% |

| | Yes | 210 | 56.8% | 56.9% | 100.0% |

| | \*\*Total Valid Responses\*\* | \*\*369\*\* | \*\*99.7%\*\* | \*\*100.0%\*\* | |

| | Missing (System) | 1 | 0.3% | | |

| | \*\*Total Cases\*\* | \*\*370\*\* | \*\*100.0%\*\* | | |

| \*\*Tiger\*\* | No | 252 | 68.1% | 68.3% | 68.3% |

| | Yes | 117 | 31.6% | 31.7% | 100.0% |

| | \*\*Total Valid Responses\*\* | \*\*369\*\* | \*\*99.7%\*\* | \*\*100.0%\*\* | |

| | Missing (System) | 1 | 0.3% | | |

| | \*\*Total Cases\*\* | \*\*370\*\* | \*\*100.0%\*\* | | |

---

### \*\*Key Findings\*\*

1. \*\*Red Bull\*\*:

- \*\*High Familiarity\*\*: The vast majority (91.9%) of respondents are familiar with Red Bull.

- \*\*Low Unfamiliarity\*\*: Only 8.1% of respondents are not familiar with Red Bull.

2. \*\*Monster\*\*:

- \*\*Moderate Familiarity\*\*: About 56.9% of respondents are familiar with Monster.

- \*\*Significant Unfamiliarity\*\*: 43.1% of respondents are not familiar with Monster.

3. \*\*Power Horse\*\*:

- \*\*Low Familiarity\*\*: Only 39.0% of respondents are familiar with Power Horse.

- \*\*High Unfamiliarity\*\*: A significant 61.0% of respondents are not familiar with Power Horse.

4. \*\*Sting\*\*:

- \*\*Moderate Familiarity\*\*: Similar to Monster, 56.9% of respondents are familiar with Sting.

- \*\*Significant Unfamiliarity\*\*: 43.1% of respondents are not familiar with Sting.

5. \*\*Tiger\*\*:

- \*\*Very Low Familiarity\*\*: Only 31.7% of respondents are familiar with Tiger.

- \*\*Very High Unfamiliarity\*\*: A large majority (68.3%) of respondents are not familiar with Tiger.

---

### \*\*Conclusion\*\*

The results indicate varying levels of brand familiarity among consumers for different energy drink brands. Key insights include:

- \*\*Red Bull\*\*: By far the most recognized brand, with nearly universal familiarity (91.9%).

- \*\*Monster and Sting\*\*: Both have moderate levels of familiarity (56.9%), indicating they are well-known but not as dominant as Red Bull.

- \*\*Power Horse\*\*: Less familiar than Monster and Sting, with only 39.0% of respondents recognizing the brand.

- \*\*Tiger\*\*: The least familiar brand, with only 31.7% of respondents recognizing it.

Energy drink companies can use these findings to inform their marketing strategies. For example:

- \*\*Red Bull\*\*: Focus on maintaining its strong brand presence and expanding its market leadership.

- \*\*Monster and Sting\*\*: Enhance brand awareness campaigns to close the gap with Red Bull.

- \*\*Power Horse and Tiger\*\*: Invest in promotional activities and advertising to increase brand recognition and appeal to a broader audience.