International Journal of Engineering & Technology, 7 (2.11) (2018) 41-47

International Journal of Engineering & Technology

Website: www.sciencepubco.com/index.php/IJET

Research Paper

An Empirical Study on the Perception of Consumers about Green Products in Delhi

Prachi Trivedi[1*], Meghna Shrama[2]

[1,2]Amity International Business School, Amity University, Noida, India
**Corresponding author E-mail: prachitrivedi86@gmail.com*

Abstract

Green is the talk of the town. Every other day new strategies and technologies are being invented to fight the deadliest consequences of environmental degradation. The pace at which our Planet is being exploited and environmental problems are increasing, Green Marketing and Green Products have become a necessity. But this 'green concept' will only be successful when the awareness level will be high and perception is positive. In this paper perception of consumers about green products in Delhi is being studied. Is the overall perception negative, positive or neutral? Do they appreciate the packaging of green products? Or is there any correlation between perception and various demographic variables of consumers? All these questions are answered in this paper with detailed analysis. Structured and undisguised form of questionnaire was prepared which was distributed to 120 respondents out of which 106 were found to be usable. Any sample above 30 is considered large. Statistical tools like mode, median, frequency distribution, Kruskal-Wallis and One way ANOVA are used to test the hypotheses. This paper will be beneficial to other researchers to get the insight of consumers' perception about green products, to companies in making the right strategies and policies according to consumer perception and to other organization and institutes who are interested in studying the consumer behaviour regarding Green Products.

Keywords: *Green Marketing; Green Products; perception; environmental problems; eco-friendly marketing; eco friendly products.*

1. Introduction

Consumer is the king. All the marketing efforts of the company are centred on consumers. Without luring the consumers towards the product no company can gain competitive advantage in the market. To grab the biggest piece of cake, it is important to make the first move. In the same way, if a company wants to capture the largest market share it needs to make a first move and thereby getting the first mover advantage. But in order to make the first move, company should know their consumers. They should understand their perception, attitude and awareness level so that policies should be framed accordingly.

Green Marketing is relatively a new term as compared to traditional marketing. So the companies adopting green marketing strategies at the earliest are at better position than those who are not. Today, almost every consumer understand what 'green' is. What are the benefits if a company is green and what are the threats if a company is not? So, a company should always keep up with the changing times or will face the lash of consumers.

To frame policies and new marketing strategies, the company should understand the perception of consumers towards that particular product. Whether they like the product or not? What all they like in a product? What all they dislike in a product? What makes them buy the product? What is their opinion about the product? Any company should know the answer to these questions before moving ahead with any action plan. This paper talks about the perception of consumers towards Green Products and Green Packaging.

2. Literature Review

Green Product often termed as those products or services that permits the development of economy while protecting resources for our future generations (Speer, 2011). No product is 100 percent green. It means that at one point or the other of PLC green product do have an impact on the environment and surroundings. But this impact is much less as compared to other traditional products. To further understand the concept of Green Products, one must understand what are the features or characteristics of Green Products. According to Bhatia and Jain (2013) and Chauhan (2011), green products are-

"biodegradable, water efficient, energy efficient, low emitting, reusable or reused product, safe and healthy, durable, renewable, locally grown, certified from third party, contents under approved chemicals, not tested on animals and eco-friendly packaging." (as cited in Sharma & Trivedi, 2016).

In a study by Mahesh and Ganapathi (2016), the factors affecting consumers' perception are attractiveness, quality, familiarity and environmental anxiety. And these factors have positive influence on the purchasing decision of the consumers for the green products. So, marketers should offer products that are tasty and have good appearance at affordable prices. Another study done in Sylhet found that there is not enough knowledge among people regarding green products and the consumption is low. Consumers are more concerned about the end-value of the product. Most of the consumers are more satisfied with green companies and activities they are involved in. Quality is their main concern when it comes to buying product at higher prices (Rumi et al., 2014).

Another study also says that price and product quality are the most important factors when it comes to brand loyalty and willingness to pay more for green products. This study found that female consumers and older age consumers are more likely to recycle than males and consumers between 25-31 years of age. Consumers in higher income group are willing to pay more for green products (Issacs, 2015). According to Green Trade and development (2008) consumers are bending towards eco-friendly products and their attitude and perception is also changing which in fact shows that they are conscious about their environment (as cited in Yusuf & Fatima, 2015). In their own study Yusuf and Fatima (2015), asserted that large population is of the view that green products are healthy for them and safe for the environment as well. They also think that green products are superior to conventional products. Also, green products give a good packaging design.

In another paper it was stressed that message content for green products should be attractive so that young generation will buy them. Labelling should be done in such a way that it is easier to differentiate between green and non-green products. This paper also asserts that prices of Green products should be made affordable so that the consumers can easily buy those (Ranganathan & Ramya, 2016).

A study by Renzai et al (2013) states that there is positive perception of consumers towards green. 85.7% think that the concept of Green can save the planet and most of the respondents feel that green can improve health and 79.3% feel good to go green.

3. Research Work

3.1. Objectives

1. To study the perception of consumers about Green Products in Delhi.
2. To study the perception of consumers about the packaging of Green Products in Delhi.
3. To study the relationship between perception and demographic variables like age, education and income.

3.2. Hypotheses

H1) Perception of consumers regarding Green Products is positive in Delhi.
H2) Consumers appreciate the packaging of Green Products.
H3) Consumers understand and believe in the information given on the packaging of Green Products.
H4) There is a significant difference in perception among consumers regarding Green Products based on their education.
H5) There is no significant difference in perception among consumers regarding green products based on their age and income.

3.3. Research Methodology

Data collection: A structured non-disguised form of questionnaire was constructed which was distributed to 120 consumers from Delhi. 106 responses out of this were found to be complete and usable for the study. Questionnaire consists of sixty items and is divided into five parts: Demographics, Awareness level about green products, Consumption pattern, Perception and Purchase Intention. This paper deals with perception of consumers about green products. The questions were categorical, ordinal, interval and continuous in nature. Some of the constructs were measured on a five point Likert scale. All the questions were closed ended. Secondary data was also collected through different websites and online journals and articles to form a strong review of literature. Various newspaper articles and books were also referred.

Sampling Procedure: Random sampling is used to collect the data. The data is collected through self administered questionnaire by the researchers themselves. Sample was drawn from Delhi only. Different areas were selected and respondents were targeted on a pure random basis.

Data analysis procedure: Various statistical techniques are used to analyse the data with the help of a SPSS. Frequency distribution, Mode, Median, Kruskal-Wallis and one-way ANOVA is done to test the hypotheses and finding out the results.

4. Findings and Discussion

Demographic Profile of the respondents: The tables from 1 to 6 show the demographic profile of the respondents in terms like gender, age, income level, education, marital status and occupation. (See Appendix) The data shows that 52% of the respondents were males and rest 48% were female. 54% of the respondents fall under the age of 15-24, 35% in 25-34 and rest were above 35 years of age. 57% of the respondents have graduate degree, 36% are postgraduates and 2% are doctorate. This shows that more than 90% of the respondents have 15 or more years of education. Most of the respondents are unmarried. 20% of respondents fall in low income group, 57% in middle income group and 24% belong to higher income group. This shows that nearly 80% of the respondents can afford to buy green products. Nearly half of the respondents were students (54.7%), 41% were either self employed or doing job and rest were unemployed.

Reliability and Validity of the data: For the reliability of the questionnaire Cronbach's Alpha was carried out. The value was .976 which means the questionnaire was reliable. Table 7 shows the Reliability Statistics.

Table 7: Reliability Statistics

Cronbach's Alpha	Cronbach's Alpha Based on Standardized Items	N of Items
.976	.976	60

For the adequacy of the sample KMO Measure of Sampling Adequacy was carried out and table 8 shows the result:

Table 8: KMO and Bartlett's Test

Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy.		.924
Bartlett's Test of Sphericity	Approx. Chi-Square	618.259
	df	21
	Sig.	.000

The value is .924 which means that the sample was adequate.

Perception of Consumers about Green Products: For finding out the perception of consumers about green products they were asked to tick the choice on a Likert Scale which ranges from 'Strongly Disagree' to 'Strongly Agree'. 1 stands for 'Strongly Disagree', 2 for 'Disagree', 3 for 'Neutral', 4 for 'Agree' and 5 for 'Strongly Agree'. **To test the H1**: (Perception of consumers regarding Green Products is positive in Delhi); the following test was carried out. 82 respondents who were aware of green products were considered. The table 9 shows the mode and median values of the statements related to perception:

Table 9: Statistics for perception

		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
		GP are fashionable	Healthy	Safe for environment	have good taste and appearance	not required	Cheaper	Of the same price	Costlier	I recommend to others
N	Valid	82	82	82	82	82	82	82	82	82
	Missing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Median		3.00	5.00	5.00	3.00	1.00	2.00	3.00	3.00	4.00
Mode		3	5	5	3	1	2	3	4	5

Above statistics show that consumers 'Strongly Agree' with the statements 2, 3 and 9 as their modal value is 5 and their median is also 5. Consumers strongly perceive Green Products as 'Healthy' and 'Safe for Environment' and they 'strongly recommend' green products to others. 97% believe that green products are safe for environment and 91% perceive them as healthy product. Somehow, they are 'Neutral' about the statements 1, 4 and 7. They are not very sure whether Green Products are fashionable or have good taste and appearance. 73% are either undecided or disagree that green products are fashionable. 43% are not sure about the taste and appearance of the green products. 37% of the respondents are not sure whether green products are of the same price or not while 32 % disagree with the statement. Moreover, they 'Agree' with the statement that green products are costlier as it has the modal value of 4 as 47% either agree or strongly agree with it. This statement is backed by the fact that statement 'Green Products are cheaper' has a modal value of 2 which means that most of the respondents 'Disagree' with the statement. 53.7% disagree or strongly disagree with the statement that they are cheaper.

Above findings show that consumers have strong perception towards green products. They strongly believe that green products are healthy, safe for environment and they also recommend green products to others. They think that green products are costly which again a fact is. Not all green products are fashionable and consumers also think the same. They are undecided only for a statement for taste and appearance. They are dicey to perceive something about it. This shows that consumers hold a strong and positive perception about green products and therefore H1 is accepted. See Appendix frequency table for percentages.

Perception of consumers about the packaging of green products: Packaging of any product matters a lot. Packaging is important for the product to save it from the damages. It is easier to transport when packed. For some products it is necessary to pack them in layers in order to maintain their shelf life and the contents. Packaging creates tons of trash every year which goes to the landfills and incinerators. Green Packaging is the packaging of products in recycled materials or minimal packaging that effects the environment least. It should not create unnecessary waste that pollutes the environment. Consumers should buy products that are minimally packed or is packed in recycled or biodegradable packaging. Consumers' perception about green packaging is important in order to make the producers persuade to go for green packaging.

To test the second hypothesis consumers were asked whether they appreciate the packaging of green products or not on a five point Likert Scale. Table 10 and 11 show the following results:

Table 10: Statistics

Appreciate the package		
N	Valid	82
	Missing	0
Median		4.00
Mode		4

Table 11: Appreciate the package

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Disagree	5	6.1	6.1	6.1
	Disagree	9	11.0	11.0	17.1
	Undecided	13	15.9	15.9	32.9
	Agree	38	46.3	46.3	79.3
	Strongly Agree	17	20.7	20.7	100.0
	Total	82	100.0	100.0	

It can be seen that modal value and median is 4 which mean that most respondents agree with the statement. Table 11 shows that 46.3% respondents agree that they 'appreciate the package' and 20.7% strongly agree with this statement. 67% appreciate the efforts of producers of green products to make the packaging green. 67% is a good number to accept the second hypothesis. Therefore, H2: consumers appreciate the packaging of green products is accepted. Furthermore, producers should increase the awareness about the pros of green packaging so that more and more consumers appreciate and buy the products with green packaging.

Understanding and Belief in the information given on the Packaging: It is not just the appreciation by the consumers that is sufficient but also the understanding and belief in the information that is given on the packaging of green products. Until and unless they understand and believe in the information they are not going to buy the product. So**, to test the H3**, consumers were asked to tick some statements on five point likert scale and following are the results:

Table 12: Statistics

		Enough info on package	Understand the info	Believe that info
N	Valid	82	82	82
	Missing	0	0	0
Median		4.00	4.00	4.00
Mode		4	4	4

Table 13: Enough info on package

		Frequency	**Percent**	**Valid Percent**	**Cumulative Percent**
Valid	Strongly Disagree	3	3.7	3.7	3.7
	Disagree	11	13.4	13.4	17.1
	Undecided	18	22.0	22.0	39.0
	Agree	32	39.0	39.0	78.0
	Strongly Agree	18	22.0	22.0	100.0
	Total	82	100.0	100.0	

Table 14: Understand the info

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Disagree	2	2.4	2.4	2.4
	Disagree	9	11.0	11.0	13.4
	Undecided	14	17.1	17.1	30.5
	Agree	38	46.3	46.3	76.8
	Strongly Agree	19	23.2	23.2	100.0
	Total	82	100.0	100.0	

Table 15: Believe that info

		Frequency	**Percent**	**Valid Percent**	**Cumulative Percent**
Valid	Strongly Disagree	4	4.9	4.9	4.9
	Disagree	7	8.5	8.5	13.4
	Undecided	23	28.0	28.0	41.5
	Agree	26	31.7	31.7	73.2
	Strongly Agree	22	26.8	26.8	100.0
	Total	82	100.0	100.0	

Table 12 shows the median and modal values of the statements; 'enough information on the packaging', 'understands the information' and 'believes in the information'. The median and modal value for all the three statements is 4 which mean that most of the respondents agree with the statements. Table 13 reveals that 39% of the respondents 'agree' and 22% 'strongly agree' that there is enough information on the packaging about the green features or the greenness of the product. That means that they can make out from the package itself whether the product is green or not. With the minimal packaging, it is challenge for the producers to put all the information on the package but 61% believing that there is enough information is a good start to the makers.

Table 14 shows that 46.3% 'agree' and 23.2% 'strongly agree' that they understand the information given on the packaging. 69.5% understand the logos and signs for eco-friendly products that are printed on the packaging. But only half of the respondents actually believe in the information given. Only 58% believe that the information given on the packaging is true. 28% are unsure

about the reliability of the information whereas 13% think that information on the packaging is false and they don't judge a product to be green based on the information given on the packaging. Based on the data above, it can be concluded that consumers understand and believe in the information given on the packaging of a green product. This number can increase if producers get certifications of green and advertise it. Producers should try to find out the reasons that why consumers are sceptical about the truthfulness of the claim and then act accordingly. Their belief in the product is important to make them buy it. In a study by Sharma and Trivedi (2016) it was found that the consumption of green products is low. And this might be one of the reasons that consumers don't buy it. But 58% is safe to say that majority believe in the information on packaging and therefore H3 is accepted.

Relationship between perception and demographic variables like education, income and age: Besides knowing the perception of the consumers about the green products it is also important to know whether demographic variables like education, income and age have any effect on the perception. Do these variables play any role in formation of perception of consumers regarding green products? This question is very crucial to the producers as they need to frame policies and strategies accordingly. They should know the basis of their market segmentation or is there any need for market segmentation based on these variables.

To test the H4, Kruskal-Wallis is used. It is used when the dependent variable is ordinal or interval with one independent variable with two or more levels (independent groups). This condition fulfils here. Moreover, one can control the range of independent groups that are included for the test. For this test, the last group 'Doctorate' is excluded as it represents a very small percentage i.e. 2%. Table 16 and 17 show the results of the test.

Table 16: Ranks

	Education	N	Mean Rank
GP are fashionable	Intermediate	4	52.25
	Undergraduate	47	41.10
	Postgraduate	30	39.35
	Total	81	
Healthy	Intermediate	4	36.13
	Undergraduate	47	39.70
	Postgraduate	30	43.68
	Total	81	
Safe for environment	Intermediate	4	19.25
	Undergraduate	47	42.87
	Postgraduate	30	40.97
	Total	81	
have good taste and appearance	Intermediate	4	59.50
	Undergraduate	47	40.21
	Postgraduate	30	39.77
	Total	81	
not required	Intermediate	4	51.63
	Undergraduate	47	41.77
	Postgraduate	30	38.38
	Total	81	
Cheaper	Intermediate	4	49.25
	Undergraduate	47	41.57
	Postgraduate	30	39.00
	Total	81	
Of the same price	Intermediate	4	48.25
	Undergraduate	47	44.14
	Postgraduate	30	35.12
	Total	81	
Costlier	Intermediate	4	24.00
	Undergraduate	47	39.29
	Postgraduate	30	45.95
	Total	81	
I recommend to others	Intermediate	4	32.50
	Undergraduate	47	40.89
	Postgraduate	30	42.30
	Total	81	

Table 17: Test Statistics[a,b]

	GP are fashionable	Healthy	Safe for environment	have good taste and appearance	not required	Cheaper	Of the same price	Costlier	I recommend to others
Chi-Square	1.137	.901	6.400	2.910	1.818	.800	3.378	3.936	.723
df	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
Asymp. Sig.	.566	.637	.041	.233	.403	.670	.185	.140	.697
a. Kruskal Wallis Test									
b. Grouping Variable: Education									

The above test results reveal that there is no significant difference in the mean ranks except for 'safe for environment'. It also backed up the value of Kruskal Wallis test for 'safe for environment' i.e. 0.041 which is less than 0.05. For this test, if the p value is greater than 0.05, Null Hypothesis is rejected. So, H4 is rejected except for statement 'safe for environment'. Hence, it is concluded that there is no significant difference in perception among consumers based on their education.

To test H5, One Way ANOVA is used. It is used when the dependent variable is interval and normal with one independent variable with two or more levels. The condition satisfies here. The following table 18 shows the result for demographic variable income and perception:

Table 18: ANOVA

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
GP are fashionable	Between Groups	4.088	3	1.363	.933	.429
	Within Groups	113.924	78	1.461		
	Total	118.012	81			
Healthy	Between Groups	2.282	3	.761	1.412	.246
	Within Groups	42.023	78	.539		
	Total	44.305	81			
Safe for environment	Between Groups	.727	3	.242	.953	.419
	Within Groups	19.822	78	.254		
	Total	20.549	81			
have good taste and appearance	Between Groups	6.201	3	2.067	2.092	.108
	Within Groups	77.080	78	.988		
	Total	83.280	81			
not required	Between Groups	6.130	3	2.043	1.553	.207
	Within Groups	102.614	78	1.316		
	Total	108.744	81			
Cheaper	Between Groups	9.062	3	3.021	2.713	.051
	Within Groups	86.841	78	1.113		
	Total	95.902	81			
Of the same price	Between Groups	3.269	3	1.090	.962	.415
	Within Groups	88.341	78	1.133		
	Total	91.610	81			
Costlier	Between Groups	3.101	3	1.034	.717	.545
	Within Groups	112.375	78	1.441		

	Total	115.476	81			
I recommend to others	Between Groups	4.801	3	1.600	1.427	.241
	Within Groups	87.443	78	1.121		
	Total	92.244	81			

For this test, if 'p value' is less than 0.05, Null Hypothesis is rejected. But the above table 18 shows that all the statements bear a 'p value' which is greater than 0.05 and therefore H5 for income is accepted. It is for the statement 'green products are cheaper' the 'p value' is 0.051 which is at the edge of being rejected. That means when it comes to green products being cheaper there is a difference in perception based on income level but not the significant one. So, it can be said that there is no significant difference in perception among consumers based on their income level.

Now for age, again one-way ANOVA is used and the table 19 shows the following results:

Table 19: ANOVA

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
GP are fashionable	Between Groups	2.901	3	.967	.655	.582
	Within Groups	115.111	78	1.476		
	Total	118.012	81			
Healthy	Between Groups	1.327	3	.442	.803	.496
	Within Groups	42.978	78	.551		
	Total	44.305	81			
Safe for environment	Between Groups	.204	3	.068	.261	.853
	Within Groups	20.344	78	.261		
	Total	20.549	81			
have good taste and appearance	Between Groups	2.614	3	.871	.842	.475
	Within Groups	80.667	78	1.034		
	Total	83.280	81			
not required	Between Groups	8.077	3	2.692	2.086	.109
	Within Groups	100.667	78	1.291		
	Total	108.744	81			
Cheaper	Between Groups	3.425	3	1.142	.963	.415
	Within Groups	92.478	78	1.186		
	Total	95.902	81			
Of the same price	Between Groups	5.643	3	1.881	1.707	.172
	Within Groups	85.967	78	1.102		
	Total	91.610	81			
Costlier	Between Groups	9.064	3	3.021	2.215	.093
	Within Groups	106.411	78	1.364		
	Total	115.476	81			
I recommend to others	Between Groups	3.099	3	1.033	.904	.443
	Within Groups	89.144	78	1.143		
	Total	92.244	81			

The table 19 reveals that all the statements bears a 'p value' of greater than 0.05 which means H5 for age is accepted. This means that consumers do not significantly differ in their perception based on their age. Post hoc t-test is not required because the hypothesis is accepted both for income and age. Post hoc is required when the Null Hypothesis is rejected.

5. Conclusion

Perception makes all the difference. Consumers hold strong perception about green products but producers really needs to make green products tasty and good in appearance. If consumers are made to believe that green products are tasty, the consumption of it might go up. Green products are needed to be made fashionable.

References

[1] Bhatia, M., & Jain, A. (2013). Green marketing: A study of consumer perception and preferences in India. *Electronic Green Journal* 1.

[2] Chauhan, Vinayak. (2011). Green Marketing. Philip Kotlar 2011-2013. Retrieved from http://philipkotler2013.blogspot.in/2011/11/green-marketing.html

[3] Issacs, S.M. (2015). Consumers Perception of Eco-Friendly Products. (Doctoral Thesis, Walden University, Minneapolis, Minnesota).

[4] Mahesh, N. and Ganapathi, R. (2016). A Study on Impact of Factors Affecting Consumers Perception On Purchase Behaviour towards Green Products. *International Journal of Advancement in Engineering Technology, Management & Appled Science* 3, 27-33.

[5] Ranganathan, V. and Ramya, S. (2016). A study on Consumers' Perception Towards Green Products with reference to Coimbatore city. *Imperial Journal Interdisciplinary Research* 2, 145-150.

[6] Rezai, G., Teng, PK., Mohamed, Z. and Shamsudin, MN. (2013). Is it Easy to go Green? Consumer Perception and Green Concept. *American Journal of Applied Science* 10, 793-800.

[7] Rumi, N.J., Sayem, S., Morshed, A.A., Hasan, M., Somadder, D.K. and Ahmed, S. (2014). Consumer Purchasing Behaviour towards Green Products. Paper presented at Shahjalal University of Science and Technology, Sylhet, Bangladesh.

[8] Sharma, M. and Trivedi, P. (2016). Various Green Marketing Variables and their Effects on Consumers' Buying Behaviour for Green Products. *International Journal of Latest Technology in Engineering, Management & Applied Science* 5, 1-8.

[9] Sharma, M. and Trivedi, P. (2016). An Empirical Study on Consumers' Awareness Level and Consumption regarding Green Products in Delhi. *International Journal of Research in Finance and Marketing* 6, 15-34.

[10] Yusuf, S. and Fatima, Z. (2015). Consumer Attitude and Perception towards Green Products. *The International Journal of Indian Psychology* 2, 2349-3429.

Appendix:

Table 1: Gender

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Male	55	51.9	51.9	51.9
	Female	51	48.1	48.1	100.0
	Total	106	100.0	100.0	

Table 2: Age

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	15-24	58	54.7	54.7	54.7
	25-34	37	34.9	34.9	89.6
	35-44	6	5.7	5.7	95.3
	45-54	3	2.8	2.8	98.1
	>55	2	1.9	1.9	100.0
	Total	106	100.0	100.0	

Table 3: Education

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Intermediate	5	4.7	4.7	4.7
	Undergraduate	61	57.5	57.5	62.3
	Postgraduate	38	35.8	35.8	98.1
	Doctorate	2	1.9	1.9	100.0
	Total	106	100.0	100.0	

Table 4: Marital Status

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Married	20	18.9	18.9	18.9
	Unmarried	86	81.1	81.1	100.0
	Total	106	100.0	100.0	

Table 5: Family Monthly Income

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	<30,000	21	19.8	19.8	19.8
	30,001-60,000	27	25.5	25.5	45.3
	60,001-90,000	33	31.1	31.1	76.4
	>90,001	25	23.6	23.6	100.0
	Total	106	100.0	100.0	

Table 6: Occupation

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Job	31	29.2	29.2	29.2
	Self-employed	13	12.3	12.3	41.5
	Unemployed	3	2.8	2.8	44.3
	Student	58	54.7	54.7	99.1
	Housewife	1	.9	.9	100.0
	Total	106	100.0	100.0	

Frequency Table 1:

GP are fashionable

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Disagree	9	11.0	11.0	11.0
	Disagree	25	30.5	30.5	41.5
	Undecided	26	31.7	31.7	73.2
	Agree	10	12.2	12.2	85.4
	Strongly Agree	12	14.6	14.6	100.0
	Total	82	100.0	100.0	

Healthy

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Disagree	1	1.2	1.2	1.2
	Undecided	6	7.3	7.3	8.5
	Agree	29	35.4	35.4	43.9
	Strongly Agree	46	56.1	56.1	100.0
	Total	82	100.0	100.0	

Safe for environment

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Undecided	2	2.4	2.4	2.4
	Agree	19	23.2	23.2	25.6
	Strongly Agree	61	74.4	74.4	100.0
	Total	82	100.0	100.0	

have good taste and appearance

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Disagree	3	3.7	3.7	3.7
	Disagree	10	12.2	12.2	15.9
	Undecided	35	42.7	42.7	58.5
	Agree	21	25.6	25.6	84.1
	Strongly Agree	13	15.9	15.9	100.0
	Total	82	100.0	100.0	

not required

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Disagree	55	67.1	67.1	67.1
	Disagree	15	18.3	18.3	85.4
	Undecided	3	3.7	3.7	89.0
	Agree	4	4.9	4.9	93.9
	Strongly Agree	5	6.1	6.1	100.0
	Total	82	100.0	100.0	

Cheaper

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Disagree	12	14.6	14.6	14.6
	Disagree	32	39.0	39.0	53.7
	Undecided	20	24.4	24.4	78.0
	Agree	14	17.1	17.1	95.1
	Strongly Agree	4	4.9	4.9	100.0
	Total	82	100.0	100.0	

Of the same price

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Disagree	7	8.5	8.5	8.5
	Disagree	26	31.7	31.7	40.2
	Undecided	30	36.6	36.6	76.8
	Agree	12	14.6	14.6	91.5
	Strongly Agree	7	8.5	8.5	100.0
	Total	82	100.0	100.0	

Costlier

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Disagree	9	11.0	11.0	11.0
	Disagree	14	17.1	17.1	28.0
	Undecided	20	24.4	24.4	52.4
	Agree	29	35.4	35.4	87.8
	Strongly Agree	10	12.2	12.2	100.0
	Total	82	100.0	100.0	

I recommend to others

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Disagree	4	4.9	4.9	4.9
	Disagree	3	3.7	3.7	8.5
	Undecided	8	9.8	9.8	18.3
	Agree	29	35.4	35.4	53.7
	Strongly Agree	38	46.3	46.3	100.0
	Total	82	100.0	100.0	