

https://dspace.org/

Drivers of Consumer Behaviour in the Purchase of Chocolates as Gifts in South Africa

Mokholo, Duduzile Precious

2014-01-08
http://hdl.handle.net10539/13371

Downloaded from a DSpace repository. https://dspace.org/

Drivers of Consumer Behaviour in the Purchase of Chocolates asGifts in South Africa

Duduzile Precious Mokholo

A research report submitted to the Faculty of Commerce, Law and Management, University of the Witwatersrand, in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Business Administration

Johannesburg, 2012

(Version March 2012)

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this research is to provide some insights on the key drivers of the purchasing of chocolate as a gift for different gifting occasions in South Africa, as well as for consumer segments within the chocolate gifting market to enable proper targeting of marketing efforts. The researchaims to enable both manufactures and retailers of chocolate in South Africa to target their marketing and selling efforts to meet specific consumer needs.

The selected sample consisted of both males and females of all races betweenthe ages of 18 and 45, with an income of R3,000 and above. Respondents were randomly selected from an existing profiled database,(a list of consumers who have previously agreed to receive promotional and research information from suppliers) of chocolate consumers.Data was gathered through a web based questionnaire.

Key findings were that the overall key purchase drivers were identified (in order of importance) as: 1) Quality; 2) Likeability; 3) Enjoyment; 4) Taste; 5) Indulgence; 6) Appropriateness for the occasion; 7) Packaging Style and Design; 8) Prettiness; 9) Lovingness and; 10) Brand name. The order of importance was established to be different for different consumer segments.

Chocolate was identified as playing a key role in occasions like Easter, Valentine's Day, as a "Thank You" gesture, for Secretary's Day as well as a gesture to say, "I'm Sorry". Chocolate was identified as a least likely gift for key or major occasions, such as Christmas. Chocolates, together with flowers were established as less formal gesture gifts, given as a sign of appreciation or nurturing.

Four clusters were identified, named and profiled by demographic characteristics, chocolate gifting occasions, as well as their frequency of purchase. These clusters all showed real difference in the order of importance of the 24 attributes.

DECLARATION

I, Duduzile Precious Mokholo, declare that this research report is my own work except as indicated in the references and acknowledgements. It is submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Business Administration at the University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg. It has not been submitted before for any degree or examination at this or any other university.

Duduzile Precious Mokholo

Signed at ……

On the …….. day of …… 2012

DEDICATION

This research report is dedicated to my husband, Sobi Mokholo,and my two little girls, Kamohelo and Enhle-Imbali Mokholo.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to acknowledge and thank the following people:

- My husband Sobi Mokholo, for being my support structure throughout my MBA studies and for driving me hard to the finish line.
- My two little girls Kamohelo and Enhle-Imbali, for their unconditional patience and understanding.
- Yvonne Saini, my supervisor for her guidance in completing this research.
- Merle Werbeloff,Professor Anthony Stacey and HonoreGasafor assistingwiththe Methodology Chapterand guiding all the quantitativedecisions I had to make. I truly appreciate your guidance, time and patience.Your insightswere extremely invaluable.
- All my family, friends and colleagues who made themselves available whenever input was required.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT ..... **II**

DECLARATION ..... **III**

DEDICATION ..... **IV**

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS ..... **V**

TABLE OF CONTENTS ..... **VI**

LIST OF TABLES ..... **VIII**

LIST OF FIGURES ..... **VIII**

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION **1**

1.1 PURPOSE OF THE STUDY 1
1.2 CONTEXT OF THE STUDY 1
1.3 PROBLEM STATEMENT 3
1.3.1 MAIN PROBLEM 3
1.3.2 SUB-PROBLEMS 3
1.4 SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY 3
1.5 DELIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY 4
1.6 DEFINITION OF TERMS 4
1.7 ASSUMPTIONS 5

CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW **6**

2.1. INTRODUCTION 6
2.2. BACKGROUND DISCUSSION 7
2.3. GIFTS AND GIFT GIVING 7
2.3.1 THE RECEIVER: WHO IN GIVING AND RECEIVING 8
2.3.2 REASON FOR PURCHASING THE GIFT 8
2.3.3 THE GIFT ITSELF 9
2.4. A REVIEW OF GIFTING OCCASIONS AND THE ROLE OF CHOCOLATE AS GIFT FOR OCCASIONS 11
2.4.1 SPECIAL OCCASIONS 13
2.4.2 NON-COMMERCIAL OCCASIONS AND CHOCOLATE 15
2.5. CONCLUSION OF LITERATURE REVIEW 15
2.6. RESEARCH QUESTIONS 16
2.6.1. RESEARCH QUESTION 1: 16

2.6.2. Research Question 2:.....17

CHAPTER 3: RESEARCH METHODOLOGY.....18

3.1 Research methodology /paradigm..... 18
3.2 Research Design..... 18
3.3 Population and sample..... 20
3.3.1 Population.....20
3.3.2 Sample and sampling method.....20
3.4 The research instrument..... 21
3.5 Procedure for data collection..... 22
3.6 Data analysis and interpretation..... 22
3.7 Limitations of the study..... 24
3.8 Validity and reliability..... 25
3.8.1 External validity.....25
3.8.2 Internal validity.....26
3.8.3 Content validity.....26
3.8.4 Reliability.....27
3.1.1 Statistical techniques section.....28

CHAPTER 4: PRESENTATION OF RESULTS.....29

4.1 Demographic profile of respondents..... 29
4.2 Results pertaining to Research Question 1: The Key Drivers of Chocolate as a Gift for Different Gifting Occasions..... 30
4.2.1 What is the role of chocolate in gifting in the context of other gifts and occasions?.....30
4.2.2 How often are Gifts Purchased?.....36
4.2.3 Research Question 1.1: What are the key drivers of the purchasing of chocolate as a gift?.....37
4.3 Results pertaining to Research Question 2: The Key Drivers of the Purchase of Chocolate as a Gift Identified by Subgroup..... 38
4.3.1 What are the underlying subgroups/segments in the market of chocolate gift purchasing in terms of the key drivers?.....38
4.3.2 How does the identified segmentation of chocolate gift purchasing in terms of attributes, relate to demographic characteristics of purchasers?.....42
4.3.3 How does the identified segmentation of chocolate gift purchasing, in terms of attributes, relate to the occasion of chocolate gifting?.....44
4.3.4 How does the identified segmentation of chocolate gift purchasing in terms of attributes, relate to the frequency of purchase of chocolate in gifting?.....45
4.4 Summary of the results..... 47

CHAPTER 5: DISCUSSION OF THE RESULTS.....48

5.1 Demographic Profile of Respondents..... 49
5.2 Discussion pertaining to Research Question 1: The Key Drivers of Chocolate as a Gift for Different Gifting Occasions..... 50

5.3 DISCUSSION PERTAINING TO RESEARCH QUESTION 2: THE KEY DRIVERS OF THE PURCHASE OF CHOCOLATE AS A GIFT IDENTIFIED BY SUBGROUP 54
5.4 CONCLUSION 57

CHAPTER 6: CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS 58

6.1 INTRODUCTION 58
6.2 CONCLUSIONS OF THE STUDY 58
6.3 RECOMMENDATIONS 59
6.4 SUGGESTIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH 60

REFERENCES 62

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1: A Gift Relationship Continuum (Joy, 2001) 12

Table 2: Summary of the internal consistency reliability results for the scale 27

Table 3: Eigenvalues and percentages of inertia 30

Table 4: One-Way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) 39

Table 5: Profile of Clusters 43

Table 6: Median 46

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1: Seasonal Chocolate Sales by Occasion (Bainbridge, 2008) 13

Figure 2: Profile of Respondents 29

Figure 3: Symmetric Column Plot 31

Figure 4: Symmetric Row Plot 32

Figure 5: Correspondence Matrix 33

Figure 6: Segmented Correspondence Matrix 34

Figure 7: Profile of Gifts Bought for any occasion 35

Figure 8: Profile of Occasions (ranked by Chocolate occasions) 36

Figure 9: Frequency of Purchase – All Gifts 37

Figure 10: Frequency of Purchase - Chocolate Gifts 37

Figure 11: Overall Mean Ranking of attributes 37

Figure 12: Attributes by Cluster – Comparison of the Cluster Means 40

Figure 13: Key Attribute Ranking – Cluster 1 40

Figure 14: Key Attribute Ranking – Cluster 2 41

Figure 15: Key Attribute Ranking – Cluster 3 41

Figure 16: Key Attribute Ranking – Cluster 4 42

Figure 17: Profile of Chocolate Occasions by Cluster 44

Figure 18: Frequency of Purchase 46

Figure 19: Gender Profile 49

Figure 20: Marital Status Profile 49

Figure 21: Age Profile 49

Figure 22: Overall Mean Ranking of attributes 50

Figure 23: Segmented Correspondence Matrix 51

Figure 24: Profile of Occasions (ranked by Chocolate occasions) 52

Figure 25: Profile of Clusters 54

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

1.1 Purpose of the study

The main objective of this research is to identify the key drivers of the purchasing of chocolate as a gift for different gifting occasions in South Africa

Gift purchasing and gift giving have over the years developed into sizeable businesses, yielding good profits globally (Research and Market Trends, 2006). The gifting market presents a unique opportunity for businesses to achieve exponential growth,as through different gifting occasions,marketing efforts can be targeted to reach different segments of the market, thereby growing consumption (Research and Market Trends, 2006).

The chocolate gifting market in South Africa is at infancy, with limited conclusive research on what drives the consumer purchase decision. Manufacturers and Retailers alike currently sell seasonal or gifting chocolate with limited insight, which could be limiting category growth.

The purpose of this study is therefore to provide some insights on the key drivers of the purchasing of chocolate as a gift for different gifting occasions in South Africa, as well as for consumer segments within the chocolate gifting market to enable proper targeting of marketing efforts.

1.2 Context of the study

The giving of gifts occurs in most societies and is generally linked to special occasions, from Christmas to Easter, Valentine's Days, Birthdays, Mother's Days and Father's Days(The Ultimate Chocolate Shoppe, 2010). Giving gifts within the different occasions has become an art;(Tan, 2009). Belk (1996) describes gifting as a talent, which involves knowing what a person wants, knowing when and how to get it to them and giving it lovingly and well. Gib(2010) expresses it as a stressful situation, as it can sometimes be difficult to tell what gifts are appropriate to give and when. Both Belk (1996) and Gib(2010) therefore agree that many questions are still unanswered as to the meaning of gifts and the

actual gift giving rituals that surround them. Belk (1996) also states there are meaningful differences in the motivation of gifts, their selections, and presentation rituals. Gift giving is the cement of social relationships (Komter and Vollebergh, 1997). A range of feelings may be involved in gift giving. A gift may be inspired by sympathetic feelings or feelings of being involved in someone's life. In other cases, feelings of being morally obliged to another person may play a role. One may feel indebted towards aparticular person because they have rendered a service or given a gift (Komter and Vollebergh, 1997).

It is also important to know which occasions are considered appropriate for giving certain gifts (e.g. Chocolate). Chocolate gifts are a popular choice for many occasions and can generally be considered for most gifting opportunities (Gib, 2010; The Ultimate Chocolate Shoppe, 2010). Chocolate gifts have also been used to express feelings and as a replacement (and sometimes as an accompaniment), of fresh flowers (The Ultimate Chocolate Shoppe, 2010).

Chocolate can be given 365 days of the year as a gift for most occasions.. From birthdays to Valentine's Day, to Mother's Day, to simply saying "Thank you", "Get well soon"or "I'm Thinking of You". It has become the solution to many choosing-the-perfect-gift-woes, as people find it easier to simply give a slab or a box of chocolates (The Ultimate Chocolate Shoppe, 2010). It is also important to ensure that the arrangement that holds the chocolate is decorated around the theme of the occasion for which it is intended, especially for the more commercialised occasions.

Gift giving is therefore developing as an important pillar of a consumer economy (Tan, 2009). There is little doubt that gifts as a purchase category, form an important part of total consumer product sales (DeVere, Scott and Shulby, 1983).

This study sought to establish where chocolate (as well as chocolate gifting occasions), is positioned amongst other gifts (and gifting occasions), for the general market. Moreover, the study also focused on the chocolate gifting market in terms of segmentation and purchase behaviour within the different segments identified.Once these segments were established, there was also a need to identify the demographic profiles of these segments in order to be relevant for targeted marketing efforts.

1.3 Problem statement

1.3.1 *Main problem*

To identify the key drivers of the purchasing of chocolate as a gift for different gifting occasions and consumer segments in South Africa.

This study will benefit both manufactures and retailers of chocolate in South Africa, enabling them to target their marketing and selling efforts to meet specific consumer needs.The research will also add to the body of knowledge, as there is currently limited formal research into the South African chocolate market.

1.3.2 *Sub-problems*

Sub – problem 1:To establish the role of chocolate in gifting in the context of other gifts and occasions, with the aim of establishing the key driver thereof.

Sub – problem 2:To identify the consumer segmentation of chocolate gift purchasing,relatingto demographic characteristics of purchasers, gifting occasions and frequency of gift purchasing.

1.4 Significance of the study

The study fills a gap as there is currently littlescientific researchthataddresses purchase drivers and the giving of chocolate as a gift. Research studies that exist under the gifting topic, mainly address the buying or purchasing and giving of gifts in general (DeVere et al., 1983; Godelier, 1999; Durgee and Sego, 2001; Parsons, 2002; Giesler, 2006; Homick, 2007; Davies, Whelan, Foley and Walsh, 2009), as well as the anxiety that surrounds choosing the appropriate gift. As such, this research will add to the body of knowledge.

The study will provide guidance to the understanding of the key drivers of the chocolate gifting market and provide chocolate manufacturers with strategic insights into satisfying consumer needs in this market. The research will also provide retailers with insights into key purchase triggers in the chocolate market, enabling them to better layout their stores for an optimal shopping experience.

1.5 Delimitations of the study

This study is limited to current consumers of chocolate products in the Republic of South Africa (mainly in Gauteng). The study also focused on seasonal chocolates, thereby excluding some chocolate formats such as Countlines or Barlines. Children were also not considered for this research.

1.6 Definition of terms

Special Occasions: these include the more commercialised occasionssuch as Easter, Christmas, New Year's Day, Valentine's Day, Mother's Day, Father's Day, and Women's Day.

Non-commercialisedOccasions: These include occasions for thank you, get well soon, birthdays, anniversaries and weddings.

Seasonal Chocolates: Comprised of a number of different sweets which may be miniature versions of slabs, counter lines or regular Easter and Christmas offerings (Mackenzie, 2010). This category includes all chocolates made by small, specialist manufacturers to cater for certain sectors of the industry, as well as all types of chocolates that contain limited or no sucrose. The category has been subdivided into three sectors namely Chocolate boxes, Chocolate Packets, and Novelties or Other chocolates (Mackenzie, 2010).

Chocolate Slabs: Moulded slabs manufactured from milk, plain, dark or white chocolate. These may contain roasted nuts, unroasted nuts and fruit, fondant cream/praline, layered wafer biscuits and cereal.

Speciality Chocolates: Comprised of a number of different sweets which may be miniature versions of slabs and count lines. This category also includes *seasonal chocolate* offerings, as well as all chocolates made by small, specialist manufacturers to cater for certain sectors of the industry.This category can be subdivided into the three sectors; Chocolate boxes, Chocolate Packets, Novelty/ other chocolates.

Count Lines:smaller chocolate bars which may contain wafer layered with fondant cream or praline, cereal, biscuit, fruit and/or nuts, caramel, butterscotch, cracknel, nougat, peanut butter and/or any combination of any of the above

WAP: Wireless Application Protocol

Smart Phone: WAP enabled cell phone

Mobisites: a website customised for WAP (Wireless Application Protocol)enabled cellphones

Buppies: A young Black city or suburban resident with a well-paid professional job and an affluent lifestyle. an affluent young Black person [derived from B(lack) + (y)uppie](The Free Discionary by Farlex, 2011)

1.7 Assumptions

The following assumptions have been made regarding the research:

- The respondents of this research will represent a sample of consumers (and/or shoppers) and have relevant knowledge ofthe subject. Lack of knowledge ofthe subject will affect the results negatively.
- The sample will be able to share information oftheir knowledge of the gifting category and the buying decision process thereof. Lack of knowledge of strategy will negatively affect the credibility of study.
- Information conveyed by respondents will be assumed to be honest and representative of true perceptions. False data will be misleading to the research analysis and results.
- The total number of respondents will be sufficient to gain adequate data.

CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1. Introduction

The body of knowledge states overall consumer behaviour is driven by an underlying set of four factors, namely culture(shared value systems based on common life experiences and situations); personal (lifestyle, economic situation, occupation, age, personality and self-concept); socio-economic (family, friends, neighbours, reference groups, co-workers, and economic situation) and psychological factors (perception, motivation, learning, beliefs and attitudes) (Belk, 1975; Folkes, 1988).

In consumer markets, several researchers (Summers, Lorterapong and Morgan, 2006; Bhardwaj and Palaparthy, 2008; Wolf, Butler, Martin and Foltz, 2009; Lahiri and Samanta, 2010), have also identified the importance of perceived quality, price-consciousness, taste, style, variety, good value for money as well as reasonable pricing, brand name, positioning, advertisement and group referral in influencing consumers' buying behaviour.

Lahiri and Samanta(2010) also conclude that in apparel, factors can be ranked according to importance (in a descending order as: style, quality, price, variety, appeal, brand name, referral group). It implies that people go for retail apparel brands mainly to keep themselves fashionable with the latestavailable designs. They are more quality conscious and comparatively less price sensitive. From a food perspective, factors like fresh tasting, safe, healthy, high in nutrition and flavourful (Wolf et al., 2009), also come to the fore in the ladder of importance.

In this section, a review of literature will be conducted on the key themes of the topic. The first theme will identify the key attributes that influence the purchase and giving of gifts in general. The second part will review gifting occasions and the role of chocolate as gifts for occasions.

2.2. Background Discussion

Research and Market Trends (2006) reported consumer spend on buying gifts for family and friends, to be roughly estimated at about 10% of total consumer spend in the U.S.A in 2005. For marketers, gifting has all the advantages and the promotional marketing power of sampling and word-of-mouth, yet it magnifies and intensifies that power through an emotional connection between the giver and the recipient (Unknown, 2008).

"Gifting is about emotionally connecting gift givers and gift recipients in order to achieve a special feeling, enhance an experience or to deepen an emotional reaction and strengthen the emotional connection between individuals"
(Research and Market Trends, 2006 p. 8)

Gift purchasing and gift giving have over the years developed into sizeable businesses, yielding good profits (Research and Market Trends, 2006). The gifting market presents a unique opportunity for businesses to achieve exponential growth, as marketing efforts can reach two target markets personally and directly; the buyer and the receiver (Research and Market Trends, 2006).

2.3. Gifts and Gift Giving

Gifts serve as a tool of communication, which is highly symbolic, emotional and interpersonal (Belk, 1996; Wooten, 2000). They are a medium which helps people convey messages, which may be found difficult or even impossible to express in words (Belk, 1996).

Gift giving is also considered to be a good indicator of emotional involvement in family and friends, because it is tangible and concrete; therefore it is a measurable expression of feeling towards others (Komter and Vollebergh, 1997). Intimate gifts may be given to signify the intention to further develop a relationship (Davies et al., 2009).

According to Tan (2009), giving gifts for different occasions has become an art and a talent, which involves knowing who the gift is intended for (the receiver), what a person wants (the gift itself), knowing when (the occasion) and how (the packaging or wrapping) to get it to them and giving it lovingly and well (Belk,

1996). Pressures to meet high expectations often accompany efforts in the preparation of the gift, as it can also create an impression about the giver to the receiver (Sherry, 1983).

2.3.1 The Receiver: Who in Giving and receiving

In their findings Hollenbeck, Peters and Zinkhan, (2006) found that gifts tend to be given and received in a communal network of relationships, such as family members, friends, neighbours or co-workers. Gifts are shared among network members, and the relationships play an important role in shaping givers' individual purchase behaviour (Hollenbeck et al., 2006). Joy (2001) identifies a relationship continuum, which consists of four major role players in gift-giving, namely, The Romantic Other (especially at the beginning stages of a romantic relationship); Close Friends, Just Friends and Hi-Bye Friends. In this continuum, a Romantic partner, close friends will just buy an expressive gift driven by high emotional expectations from the receiver (or significant other), as well as the need to win their heart or show that they care. In this relationship,often at the early stages, a romantic partner will give spontaneous inexpensive gifts and gradually upgrade to infrequent, more expensive ones as the relationship strengthens. Gifts in these relationships will generally be given for special occasions such as Birthdays, Valentines' days, and non-commercialised occasions such as spontaneous "Thank yous", "I love yous", and "I'm thinking of yous" (Joy, 2001).

Gib(2010) expresses gift-giving as a stressful situation, as it can sometimes be difficult to tell what gifts are appropriate to give and when. Both Belk (1996) and Gib(2010) therefore agree in that many questions are still unanswered as to the meaning of gifts and the actual gift giving rituals that surround them (Belk, 1996; Gib, 2010). Belk (1996) also states there are meaningful differences in the motivation of gifts, their selections, presentation rituals.

2.3.2 Reason for Purchasing the Gift

Numerous reasons exist for giving gifts, all founded upon a relationship beginning, progressing or ending, with gifts described as a sign of the nature of

the bond one has with other people (Komter and Vollebergh, 1997). Gift giving is the cement of social relationships. A range of feelings may be involved in gift giving. A gift may be inspired by sympathetic feelings or feelings of being involved in someone's life. In other cases, feelings of being morally obliged to another person may play a role. One may feel indebted towards this particular person because they have rendered a service or given a gift (Komter and Vollebergh, 1997).

Hollenbeck, Peters and Zinkhan(2006), building on prior works done by Belk (1976), Mauss(1954) and Schwartz (1967) identify three distinct paradigms in gift giving, the economic-exchange paradigm (based on budgetary expenditures); the relational partnership paradigm (based on relational intimacy) and the communal-commitment paradigm (based on interconnectedness within a community of givers). The three paradigms provide a holistic description of gift-giving behaviours in terms of the meaning of gifts, their selection, value, perception, and self-image (Hollenbeck et al., 2006)

2.3.3 The Gift Itself

A Gift is something used to express a thought or feeling to a recipient. It should be something memorable and generally what a receiver wishes for (Tan, 2009). Gift givers will invest considerable emotional effort in electing a suitable gift, particularly for recipients who have influence over them, whether personal (family or friends) or otherwise (recipient plays a role in career or wider social network) (Davies et al., 2009).

Gender is often a significant factor in consumer behaviour and more so in gifting (Bodur and Grohmann, 2005). Gender has wider implications in the study of gift purchasing and giving, as women appear to be more involved in gifting, and the sexes differ in the meaning they ascribe to giving and receiving gifts (Areni, Kiecker and Palan, 1998). Males are more likely to rely on salesperson advice, and females seek more information when deciding on a gift (Cleveland, Babin, Laroche, Ward and Bergeron, 2003). Women do appear to generally give more gifts than men do, while men tend to spend more per gift. Gender differences also play a significant role in determining the meaning of memorable gifts.

Women tend to remember more gift receiving experiences than gift-giving experiences (Areni et al., 1998).

In an earlier quantitative study conducted in 1983, DeVere et al., found the following to be some of the attributes gift purchasers consider in buying a gift: low frequency of use; presence of government; sponsored consumer tests; money-back guarantee; reflection of receiver's personality; tangibility; spontaneity; desirability; handmade; novelty; liked by friends and family; thoughtfulness in selection; tastefulness; allows receiver to be creative; uniqueness; edibility; imaginativeness; ability to try product before purchase; compatibility with other products owned by receiver; prettiness; low quality; presence of warranty; size; expensiveness; appropriateness for occasion; luxuriousness;enjoy-ability; presence of endorsement; memorability; style; traditional-ness; brand status; brand mostly purchased; lovingness; social acceptability; prestigious-ness; durability; functionality; high performance; usefulness; innovativeness; convenience; reliabilityand receiver's need for product.

DeVere et al.,(1983) also found that of the two occasions researched (Birthdays and Weddings), at least ten variables were identified as key purchase drivers, while another ten impacted negatively; therefore 20 variables in total influence the purchase decision of gifts for those occasions.

Based on their relevance to the chocolate category, identified variables were narrowed down for the purpose of this research. For example, functionality, high performance and useability are not relevant to chocolateas these apply more to durable goods,these were therefore eliminated. Similarly, Edibility and Tangibility can be assumed for the products since chocolate is a food item (therefore edible), and is physical (therefore tangible). Twenty four (24) attributes were finally selected to be included in a questionnaire for consumers to rate. These included: tastefulness; uniqueness; novelty; appropriateness for occasion; prettiness; handmade; size; imaginativeness; expensiveness (price); luxuriousness & prestigious-ness; enjoy-ability; style; brand; innovativeness; presence of endorsement; memorability; desirability; lovingness; spontaneity; liked by friends and family;quality; indulgence;reflection of receiver's personalityand thoughtfulness in selection.

DeVere et al.,(1983) established that particular gift attributes were sought or avoided for all gift-giving occasions, but that the degree of importance was dependent upon the nature of the gift-giving occasion (DeVere et al., 1983). Wolfinbarger(1990) also confirms some of these attributes. DeVere et al.,(1983)Wolfinbarger(1990) and Hollenbeck et al.,(2006)all found quality to be an important factor in the consumer's decision to purchase gifts for family and friends (DeVere et al., 1983; Wolfinbarger, 1990; Hollenbeck et al., 2006). The importance of product quality stems from a desire to please a recipient or reinforce a relationship by giving a desirable item. Gift purchasers and receivers create their own sense of style; a style that must be reflected in the design of the product chosen for gift purchase. Some consumers also believe that particular brands are more reliable than others and deliver better-quality gifts (Hollenbeck et al., 2006). Many gift-givers won't look beyond familiar names (e.g. Godiva or Russell Stover)(Anon, 2005). Parsons (2002) also agrees that Brands Choice; Product Quality;Appropriateness; Price (maybe indicator of value);Packaging and General Perceptions of the product to be key attributes sought after by both gift purchaser and receivers.

Lastly, a gift may be given in the expectation of a return; of either a reciprocal gift or a benefit from giving. The giver will be rewarded emotionally if the gift is well received. The gift has great symbolic associations and has been described as an invitation to a partner and as an expression of a social relationship (Sherry 1983).

2.4. A review of gifting occasions and the role of chocolate as gift for occasions

This section will review the different occasions where giving gifts would be relevant. These include both special and everyday occasions. Special occasions include (and are not limited to), commercialised occasions, such as Easter, Christmas, New year's day, Valentine's day, Mother's day, Father's day, and Women's day. Non-commercialised occasions are occasions that are event driven e.g. thank you, get well soon, birthdays, anniversaries, weddings, and congratulations. The review will also touch on the appropriateness of chocolate as a gift within the different occasions.

Joy (2001) proposes a gift continuum that focuses on friendships (close friends; good friends; just friends; Hi-Bye friends; and the romantic other), and the levels of intimacy thereof. The continuum attempts to determine and guide gift exchanges and proposes a gift selection criteria based on these levels of intimacy (see Table 1 below) (Joy, 2001).

Table 1: A Gift Relationship Continuum(Joy, 2001)

Who	Romantic Other	Close Friends	Just Friends	Hi/Bye Friends
When (examples)	(1) Birthday Gift (2) Special Occasions [e.g. Valentines Day] (3) Spontaneous [e.g. Small gifts] (4) Formal/Ceremonial [e.g. Mid-Autum Festival]	(1) Birthday Gift (2) Special Occasions [e.g. Leaving on a trip] (3) Spontaneous [e.g. Special awards] (4) Formal/Ceremonial [e.g. New Year]	(1) Birthday Gift (2)Maintainance Gift [e.g. Souvenir from a trip]	(1) Birthday Gift
Type of Gift	Expressive	Expressive	Expressive/ Instrumental	Instrumental
Emotional Expectations	High	High	Medium	Low
Selection Criteria	Inexpensive (early) Expensive (later) No Gift (family)	Mostly Expensive	Somewhat Expensive	Inexpensive
Effort in Selection	Match Needs [e.g. Jewelry]	Match Needs [e.g. Desired clothing]	Typical Gift [e.g. having meal]	Typical [e.g. Birthday card]
Token Gift (interim)	Often	Often	Occasionally	Occasionally
Why	Win Hearts	Care	Care/ Build Network	Build Network
Face	Social (early) Moral (later)	Moral	Mostly Social	Social
Risks	Guilt/ Shame	Guilt/ Shame	Loss of Face	Loss of Face

Source:(Joy, 2001)

The model suggests a link between the level of intimacy and number of occasions observed for gifting. Therefore, a Romantic other will engage with more occasions (special and everyday) in order to win a loved one's heart, while Hi-Bye friends will only observe one occasion deemed special in order to build networks. Some similarities can also be observed between the model and attributes identifiedearlier. Joy (2001) suggests that the level of effort invested in selecting a gift is dependent on the intimacy of a relationship. The level of effort could also be seen as thoughtfulness in selection, coupled with reflection of the receiver's personality, which are attributes suggested by DeVere et al.,(1983). The selection criteria (Joy, 2001) can be linked with appropriateness for occasion

(DeVere et al., 1983); while the emotional expectations (Source: Joy, 2001) can be linked to lovingness, and memorability (DeVere et al., 1983). However,one of the limitations of the model, is that it does not take into account family members in the equation. The model assumes that gifting does not take place for family members (spouse and children).

2.4.1 Special Occasions

Special Occasionsinclude commercialised occasions such as Easter, Christmas, New year's day, Valentine's day, Mother's day, Father's day, and Women's day. Christmas and Birthdays are the primary gifting occasion throughout the year, with gifting budgets nearly evenly divided between special occasions, gifts and gifts for specific non-commercialised everyday occasions (Unknown, 2008). While when it comes to the gifting market,special occasions receive the lion's share of marketers and retailers attention, the reality is that gifting represents a significant marketing opportunity throughout the whole year in the form of everyday occasions. As stated by the Research and Market Trends report, most retailers generally report that 25%-40% of annual sales are typically generated from the last two months of the year (Research and Market Trends, 2006). However, according to a Mintel Report cited by Bainbridge (2008), Eater contributed 54% to the sales of Seasonal Chocolate Sales in the United Kingdom (UK), with Christmas contributing 34%.




Figure 1: Seasonal Chocolate Sales by Occasion (Bainbridge, 2008)

Christmas is a universally popular celebration (Tuckfelt, 2008). According to the Research and Market Trends report (2006), Christmas accounts for about 40% of atypical gifter's annual gifting budget. A major finding in the gifting study is that the gifting market is an important shopping opportunity throughout the year, not just during the traditional Christmas season (Research and Market Trends, 2006; Unknown, 2008). Christmas gifts mainly communicate a message of love, affection, and esteem for the recipient. Gift shopping may involve extreme efforts to obtain gifts reflective of the nature of the relationship between the giver and the receiver (Wolfinbarger, 1990). Shoppers also view Christmas shopping as an indulgent, playful, and relatively trivial pursuit (Fischer and Arnold, 1990). Gift-purchasing strategies fluctuate in line with the relationship between the giver and the receiver (Sherry, 1983). Christmas gifts serve a diverse social, economic, and personal purpose and are predominantly value expressive (Belk, 1979; Sherry, 1983), therefore chocolate is less of a gift selection for the occasion. Based on Joy's (2001) gift continuum, chocolate will therefore only be appropriate as a Christmas gift to the last two categories,(just friends and Hi-Bye friends), with mainly the lowest levels of intimacy, as these would be viewed as network building gifts.

Easter is one of the most important Christian holidays and many believe that Easter is the most important or holy of Christian holidays(Basil, 2009). Easter is often a family-based feast, where families gather to watch children hunt for Easter eggs and then sit down to a large meal breaking the food fasts of Lent (historically 40 days from Ash Wednesday, now more frequently just the 3 days from Good Friday to Easter Sunday) (Basil, 2009). Easter gift-giving is relatively recent and by no means on the same scale as Christmas gift-giving(Caplow and Holmes Williamson, 1980). Easter gifts, although increasingly important, are much less emphasized and the gifts themselves are less varied; real and chocolate eggs, chocolate rabbits, candy of all kinds, small pet animals, and clothing(Caplow and Holmes Williamson, 1980; Basil, 2009). Gifts over this period are mainly symbolic of Easter Bunnies and Easter Eggs, which are predominantly made of chocolate. Referring back to Joy's (2001) gift continuum, chocolate as an Easter gift is suitable for all categories of the continuum.

Nearly all other Special Occasions, (Valentine's Day: February, Easter: March/April, Mother's Day: May, Father's Day: June, Christmas Day: December, New Year's Day: January), lend themselves to Chocolate gifts (Gib, 2010). The link to the continuum comes with the type or format of the gifting chocolate (premium boxed or speciality).

2.4.2 Non-Commercial Occasions and Chocolate

Many people are making it a habit of giving chocolate as a gift for most occasions, 365 days of the year (The Ultimate Chocolate Shoppe, 2010). Everyday occasions, like simply saying "Thank You", "I'm Thinking of You", "Get well soon" and "Congratulations", lend themselves to the chocolate gifting environment (Gib, 2010; The Ultimate Chocolate Shoppe, 2010). Many have resolved their choosing-the-perfect-gift-woes by giving a simple chocolate bar or box full of chocolates. Chocolates have become an instant hit as a gift for many everyday occasions including Secretaries' Day, Bosses' Day, and Women's Day. Giving chocolates as a gift oneveryday occasions may indicate that one considers the receiver as special, and acknowledges the relationship between them.

The Innova Market Insights (Innova Market Insights, 2009), report suggests that the positioning and packaging of the product will influence the category it is purchased for. According to the report, 52% of products launched in 2009 were positioned as indulgent and premium (suitable for all Special occasions, mainly top 3 categories of the relationship continuum); while 13% of products launched were Seasonal (directly linked to Christmas or Easter)(Innova Market Insights, 2009). Boxed chocolates have undergone some transformation in recent times with various flavours and packaging trends. Annually, new concepts of boxed chocolate are launched to entice consumers to indulge without guilt and to create a lot of excitement in the gifting arena (Innova Market Insights, 2009).

2.5. Conclusion of Literature Review

In conclusion, a number of attributes have been identified as key to driving the selection and purchase of gifts. The attributes range from product attributes, to

branding attributes and positioning attributes. Through the literature review, it has also been established that the intensity and intimacy of the relationship between the giver and the receiver may influence the type of gift exchanged. The two hypotheses listed below aretherefore tested through the Quantitative Research methods.

2.6. Research Questions

The purpose of this research was to identify the key drivers of the purchasing of chocolate as a gift for different gifting occasions in South Africa. This was investigated by surveying the perceptions of consumers of general gifts and gifting occasions, as well as quantifying the relative importance of 24 attributes (as identified in the literature review), in their decision to purchase chocolate as a gift.

Thus, the research questions of this study are as follows:

2.6.1. Research Question 1:

What are the key drivers of the purchasing of chocolate as gifts for different gifting occasions in South Africa?

2.6.1.1. Research Question 1.1:

What is the role of chocolate in gifting in the context of other gifts and occasions?

- *2.6.1.1.1. What is the role of chocolate in gifting occasions?*
- *2.6.1.1.2. Which occasions are chocolate driven?*

2.6.1.2. Research Question 1.2:

How often are gifts purchased?

2.6.1.3. Research Question 1.3:

What are the key drivers of the purchasing of chocolate as a gift?

2.6.2. Research Question 2:

Are the key drivers of the purchasing of chocolate as gifts for different gifting occasions as identified for the South Africa market, different for different market segments?

2.6.2.1. Research Question 2.1:

What are the underlying subgroups/segments in the market of chocolate gift purchasing in terms of the key drivers?

2.6.2.2. Research Question 2.2:

How does the identified segmentation of chocolate gift purchasing, in terms of attributes, relate to demographic characteristics of purchasers?

2.6.2.3. Research Question 2.3:

How does the identified segmentation of chocolate gift purchasing, in terms of attributes, relate to the occasion of chocolate gifting?

2.6.2.4. Research Question 2.4:

How does the identified segmentation of chocolate gift purchasing, in terms of attributes, relate to the frequency of purchase of chocolate in gifting?

CHAPTER 3: RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.1 Research methodology /paradigm

The aim of this research was to identify the key purchase drivers of chocolate gifts for special occasions in South Africa and establish their relative importance. A quantitative study was conducted to address the topic. According to Creswell (2009), the quantitative approach is appropriate, if the problem calls for the identification of attributes that influence an outcome; the utility of an intervention or understanding the best of outcomes. In quantitative research, through the employment of statistics,the researcher is typically looking for the distribution of variables and explanations from distributions in terms of logical structure or conditions, relevant to a certain degree of probability of the occurrence, given these conditions (Smeyers, 2008).

3.2 Research Design

Quantitative research uses an array of statistical procedures and generalisations to determine what data means (Onwuegbuzie and Leech, 2005). It employs strategies of inquiry (e.g. surveys) to collect data on set instruments that result in statistical data (Creswell, 2003). Quantitative research uses cause and effect thinking and the reduction of specific variables (data reduction), hypotheses and questions to develop knowledge (Creswell, 2003; Onwuegbuzie and Leech, 2005).

Quantitative research was deemed appropriate for this study as it involvedthe answering of research questions that arose from existing theory. A study is confirmatory if the aim of the investigation is to use the underlying data collected to test hypotheses of interest (Onwuegbuzie and Leech, 2005).

An Electronic Survey Questionnaire was used to gather the necessary data.

Some disadvantages of questionnaires include the fact that questionnaires are closed-endedand therefore do not allow for the explanation of any points in the questions respondents may misinterpret (Wilson and McClean, 1994). To

address this concern, the questionnaire was piloted with ten respondents, and changes were implemented to make sure it was clear and easy to understand.

Open-ended questions can generate large amounts of data that can take a long time to process and analyse. Respondents may answer superficially, especially if the questionnaire takes a long time to complete (Jenkins and Dillman, 1997).Although open-ended questions were included, they were not analysed as, over and above the attributes and occasions already identified,they did not yield any other relevant information.

An advantage to using this closed-endedinstrument of measure,is that the analysis of the data is an objective look at the outcome in numerical terms, therefore the results of the data collection offers a precise measurement (Jenkins and Dillman, 1997; Atieno, 2009). It is therefore relatively quick to collect information using a questionnaire; however, they can take longer to design. Information can potentially be collected from a large sample group; however, this could be limited by a low response rate. This could be mitigated through administering the questionnaire to a captive target audience (Wilson and McClean, 1994; Jenkins and Dillman, 1997).

Other issues included the unwillingness of respondents to answer certain questions (Respondent Error);which led to a number of incomplete questionnaires.

Regardless of the method used, to ensure credibility of research, all researchers must ask questions about selection and interpretation of data or a host of practical, interpretive and ethical questions in relation to their authority and responsibility to participants (Marecek, Fine and Kidder, 1997).

Choosing this research design offered simplicity in data summarisation and analysis, and because data collection was in numerical terms, results could be easily quantified (Atieno, 2009)

3.3 Population and sample

3.3.1 Population

The population for this study consisted of all consumers and shoppers aged 15 and above in the urban areas of South Africa, who had previously purchased a gift.

3.3.2 Sample and sampling method

The sample selected consisted of both males and females of all races between the ages of 18 and 45, with an income of R3,000 per month and above. An existing profiled databaseof chocolate consumers was obtained and used. The profiled database used, is a list of consumers who have previously agreed to receive promotional and research information from suppliers. Respondents were randomly selected from this list, as each person or unit had an equal probability of being selected into the sample. An e-mail was sent out to each person selected from the list, introducing the study and requesting them to click on a link which took them to a web-based questionnaire. The link was also posted on a social media platform (Facebook), however responses from this platform were poor. Although the questionnaire was web based, respondents could also use a WAP enabled cell phone to access it.

The sampling method used was the **Nonprobability Convenience Sampling**method. This is a non-probability or non-random sampling technique which selects readily available and accessible sample members (Marshall, 1996; Kalof, Dan and Dietz, 2008).

One of the **advantages** of using the convenience sampling method is that the researcher can obtain basic data and trends without the complications of a randomised sample (Castillo, 2009). This sampling method is also useful in detecting relationships between different incidents (Castillo, 2009). The technique is preferred by many researchers as it is fast, low cost (in terms of time effort and money), and accessible (Marshall, 1996; Castillo, 2009).

However, the **disadvantage** linked to this sampling method, is that the sample may not be representative of the entire population due to sampling bias (Castillo, 2009). This may compromise the credibility of the result, as it may lead to skewed outcomes due to the results of the sample being significantly different to those of an entire population. This may limit the research in terms of generalise-ability and the making of inferences about the entire population, thus leading to low external validity (Castillo, 2009).

3.4 The research instrument

The research instrument used was a structured online survey questionnaire, also known as web-based questionnaire(seeAppendix A: Research Instrument).

The questionnaire was piloted on ten respondents before the data was collected. The questionnaire, based on the responses of the pilot sample,was then further refined.

Respondents received an e-mail in which they were requested to click on a linked address. The link took them to a secure web-site to fill in the questionnaire.

Some advantages of this method include: the ability to interview large numbers of respondents quickly, geographical location not being a barrier, on average higher response rates, (although response rates have faded especially in the face of spam and over-surveying) (Synnovate, 2009). Some disadvantages of this method include: the exclusion of people who do not have a computer or are unable to access a computer.

The content of the questionnaire was based on the literature review on gifting and gifting occasions, in which forty four (44) attributes were identified as key drivers for purchasing gifts for special occasions. These variables were refined based on their relevance to the chocolate category. For example, functionality, high performance and useability are not relevant to chocolate, therefore these were eliminated. Similarly, edibility and tangibility is relevant for the products, since chocolate is a food item and is physical (therefore tangible). Twenty four (24) attributes were finally selected to be included in a questionnaire for consumers to rate. These were: tastefulness; uniqueness;

novelty;appropriateness for occasion; prettiness; handmade; size; imaginativeness; expensiveness (price); luxuriousness &prestigiousness; enjoy-ability; style; brand; innovativeness; presence of endorsements; memorability;desireability; lovingness; spontaneity; liked by friends and family;quality; indulgence;reflection of receiver's personality and thoughtfulness.

The first section of the questionnaire gathered demographic information. In addition to the customary demographic questions of gender, race and income, respondents were asked questions regarding their level of interaction with the gifting category, their engagement with the chocolate gifting category as well as the occasions they buy for or expect to receive gifts for. Perceptions of respondents about the purchase of gifts in general, as well as chocolate gifts in particular, were measured in the second and third part of the questionnaire through a seven-point Likert scale with one (1) as strongly disagree, (4) neither, and seven (7) strongly agree.An open-ended question was also included to capture any additional attributes and occasions, which could be relevant, however, this data was not included in the analysis.

3.5 Procedure for data collection

Data was gathered through a web based questionnaire on FluidSurveys. FluidSurveys is an online survey tool which allows researchers to create their surveys, collect data from respondents and analyse results. The Data was collected over a two month period. An e-mail was sent out to each person selected from the database, introducing the study and requesting them to click on a link which took them to a web-based questionnaire.

3.6 Data analysis and interpretation

Factor Analysis is primarily used for data reduction and summation, through establishing relationships among sets of many interrelated variables and creating groupings that might exist among factors to determine how underlying constructs influence the responses on a number of measured variables(DeCoster, 1998).

Factor analysis, through a number of levels such as the generation of the correlation matrix, extraction of initial factors, rotation and interpretation, and construction of scales or factor scores for further analyses,can also be used to determine the relative importance amongst variables.

Factor Analysis was however not pursued for data analysis as the factor structure was shown to be weak, with less than half of the variance explained by the extracted factors (Appendix E).

Correspondence analysis is a statistical method,which is primarily used to depict associations visually between two or more categorical variables, with the objective of having a global view of the data useful for interpretation(Garson, 2001). This technique was used in the present research tovisually identify associations betweengifting occasions and types of gifts.Specifically, correspondence analysis was performed to establish whether the type of gift purchased was influenced by the nature of the occasion, and or the relationship between the giver and the receiver.

The technique is often used where a tabular approach is less effective due to large tables with many rows and/or columns. Correspondence analysis is very useful when examining similarities and associations between two or more multi-level categorical variables, such as attributesand brand (Garson, 2001; Beldona and Morrison, 2005). This analysis technique can also be used in marketingto display variables such as customer colour preference, size preference, and taste preference in relation to preferences for different brands (Garson, 2001). In other words,correspondence analysis is a sophisticated technique which gives a visual representation of associations between variables, by giving a comprehensive view of data for effective interpretation.

Correspondence analysis has, however, been noted as a purely exploratory technique, where statistical significance of relationships should not be assumed (Hair, Black, Babin and Anderson, 2010). It is a tool for finding things, not establishing their significance or discerning their relevance. It therefore offers little assurance; patterns found are anything more than a chance result, specific to the sample under observation(Glynn, 2011).

Inertia is one of the key concepts in Correspondence Analysiswhich can be defined as the relative measure of the Chi-square, calculated as the total Chi-square divided by total frequency count(Hair et al., 2010)

Cluster Analysis isa technique for developing meaningful subgroups of individuals or objects, with the objective of classifying a sample of respondents into asmall number of mutually exclusive groups, based on the similarities among them (Punj and Stewart, 1983; Baker and Burnham, 2001; Hair et al., 2010). Cluster analysis is frequently employed as a classification tool (Punj and Stewart, 1983) in developing a taxonomy that segments respondents into groups with similar perceptions and or demographics (Hair et al., 2010).

Cluster analysis was used in the present research to cluster the respondents, based on their responses, to the twenty four attributes. One-way analysis of variance was used to compare the clusters on the means of the clustering variables, to check for significant differences among them. Furthermore, the clusters were cross tabulated against the categorical demographic variables in order to describe their demographic characteristics.

The rationale for the clustering was that subgroups could be identified and defined in terms of their demographic characteristics for marketing purposes, based on their ratings of the twenty four attributes in the context of chocolate gifting and gifting occasions. The researcher considered it naïve to expect that the pattern or hierarchy of importance of the attributes, would be similar for all respondents, and thus a segmentation of respondents was carried out.

3.7 Limitations of the study

The data was collected through an online survey and will therefore be limited to respondents who have access to computers and the internet. The study will also have low generalise-ability as the sample,due to low internet penetration in South Africa, eliminates a large portion of the population, which is reported at 10% (Anand, 2010). This could possibly be mitigated by customising the online questionnaire to be accessed through a Mobisite, a website customised for WAP (Wireless Application Protocol)enabled cell phones. Cellphone penetration in the

country is currently estimated at 98% (it news Africa, 2009), with an increase in the number of WAP enabled cellphones.

This limitation was partially addressed by making the questionnaire mobile friendly, expanding the reach of the survey to people with mobile phones.

3.8 Validity and reliability

Validity and reliability form the foundation of any measurable construct, and reliability should be acceptably high depending on the subject of research (Bodie and Worthington, 2010), to build credibility of the data.As threats to both reliability and validity create questions to the credibilityof the sample, and research (Wolverton, 2009). Validity is used to determine whether the research has measured what it intended to measure, to estimate the truthfulness of the results and whether the details and the conclusions of the research are a match (Kalof et al., 2008).

3.8.1 External validity

External validity is the extent to which findings apply to situations such that conclusions can be made (Leedy and Ormrod, 2005). External validation is imperative when findings and conclusions are to be generalised from research findings. It is typical when characteristics of a random sample can be matched with the target population, subject to the notion of sampling error, which is always present (Wolverton, 2009). In quantitative research, testing for validity and reliability is almost a given due to the statistical nature of the method. In quantitative research, this can be done by ensuring that the sampling methods are properly applied.

The sampling method used in this research (Non-probability Convenience Sampling method), has been noted to potentially limit research in terms of generalise-ability and the making of inferences about the entire population, thus leading to low external validity (Castillo, 2009).

3.8.2 Internal validity

Internal Validity refers to the veracity of the study, how well it was constructed and run, accuracy of definitions and theories employed, accurate measurement of variables, and the researcher's degree of confidence the change in the dependent variable, was effected by the independent variable (Lowhorn, 2005).

To ensure content validity, all applicable attributes identified in the theoretical literature were included.

A seven point Likert scale was considered appropriate for measurement in the present study. The researcher aimed to use a scale that was easy for respondents and unambiguous, so that unnecessary error in responseswould be avoided. The Likert scale (Garland, 1991)is a rating scale that "is useful when a behaviour, attitude or other phenomena of interest needs to be evaluated" (Leedy and Ormrod, 2005:185). In this study the attributes were evaluated on a continuum of "strongly disagree" to "strongly agree".

3.8.3 Content validity

To ensure content validity was achieved, all applicable attributes identified in the theoretical literature were included. These include: tastefulness; uniqueness; novelty; appropriateness for occasion; prettiness; handmade; size; imaginativeness; expensiveness (price); luxuriousness &prestigiousness; enjoy-ability; style; brand; innovativeness; presence of endorsements; memorability; desirability; lovingness; spontaneity; liked by friends and family; reflection of receiver's personality; thoughtfulness in selection.

As previously justified, these were selected from an original list of 44, based on their relevance to the chocolate category. For example, functionality, high performance and useability are not relevant to chocolate, therefore these were eliminated. Similarly, edibility and tangibility can be assumed for the products since chocolate is a food item and is physical (therefore tangible). Twenty four (24) attributes were finally selected from the forty four(44)originally identified as key drivers for purchasing gifts for special occasions.

3.8.4 Reliability

The consistency in measurement of a research instrument, influences the extent of random error in the data collected. A piloted instrument may contribute to higher reliability,as ambiguity and other apparent errors in the research are resolved before the main research is conducted. The internal consistency or reliability of the measurement scale is measured through the reliability coefficient, and the statistic most used to describe the reliability of scales is Cronbach's Coefficient Alpha. The higher the score, the more reliable the generated scale, with a reliability value of 0.8 considered as satisfactorily high(Reynaldo and Santos, 1999). However, in the present study, there was high internal consistency in the response to the 24 attributes, as these attributes do not reflect a single underlying construct. For example, why should responses to the attributes of luxury &prestige, prettiness, and innovativeness, be highly correlated?

Therefore, although Cronbach's Alpha was found to be high at 0.90 (see Table 2 summary of scale), this value is not reflective of high internal consistency, as it is based on a scale of 24 items and thus deceptively high; as Cronbach's Alpha is positively correlated to the number of items in the scale(Hair et al., 2010:p125). A truer reflection of the internal consistency of the scale is the value of the average inter-item correlation,as this measure does not depend on the length of the scale.

Table 2: Summary of the internal consistency reliability results for the scale

Summary for scale:	
Mean	129.991
Std.Dv.	17.289
Valid N: (Only Chocolate Gifting (Responses) interval.sta)	117
Cronbach alpha:	0.899
Standardized alpha:	0.904
Average inter-item corr.:	0.289

According to Hair (2010), values of 0.30 and above are indicative of adequate internal consistency. In the present study the average inter-item correlation was computed at 0.29. However, as the researcher considered the presence of high internal consistency in the responses to be inappropriate, no further investigation of the scale's internal consistency was pursued. For completeness, the internal consistency reliability results for the scale may be found in Appendix D.

3.1.1 Statistical techniques section

The analysis was done using Statistica v9.0 data analysis software system (StatsoftInc, 2009)and XLSTAT Version 2011.1.05, data analysis and statistical software package for Microsoft Excel.

CHAPTER 4: PRESENTATION OF RESULTS

The purpose of this chapter is to present the results of the data collected from the survey questionnaires. The results are presented in three sections: section 4.1the demographic profiles of the respondents; section 4.2 - 4.3present the results of the survey by answering the research questions of the study, using statistical techniques computed by Statistica v9.0 data analysis software system (StatsoftInc, 2009) as well as XLSTAT Version 2011.

4.1 Demographic profile of respondents

In total,the researcher attempted to receive 200 responses,as a large sample was required owing to the quantitative natureof the research.The targeted sample consisted of males and females of all races between the ages of 18 and 45, with an income of R3,000 per month and above.

The age, race, marital status, household income, gender and regional distributions are presented graphically in the form of bar charts in Figure 2.




Figure 2: Profile of Respondents

One hundred and eighty-eight (188) responses were received, with only 62% complete (117 complete responses in total). Figure 2 shows the distribution of the basic demographic characteristics of the respondents who completed the survey. Of 117 respondents who completed the electronic questionnaire, 78% were females and 22% males, mostly living in the Gauteng region (86%). The majority of these respondents (94%) were 25 years and older in age, with a monthly household income of R14,000 and above (83%). Most were either married (47%) or single (44%) and spread across three main racial groups namely White (45%), African (32%) and Indian (15%).

4.2 Results pertaining to Research Question 1:The Key Drivers of Chocolate as a Gift for Different Gifting Occasions

What are the key drivers of the purchasing of chocolate as gifts for different gifting occasions in South Africa?

4.2.1 What is the role of chocolate in gifting in the context of other gifts and occasions?


What is the role of chocolate in gifting occasions?

Initially **Factor Analysis** was conducted to identify the factor structure of the 24 attributes. However, the factor structure was shown to be weak, with less than half of the variance explained by the extracted factors (see Appendix E: Factor Analysis). Thus this technique was not pursued further in the analysis of the data.

A **Correspondence Analysis (CA)** was performed to establish whether the type of gift purchased was influenced by the nature of the occasion and or the relationship between the giver and the receiver. This analysis was performed to position chocolate gifting, relative to other gifts and occasions incorporating various relationships between the giver and the receiver. The analysis was done using XLSTAT Version 2011.1.05, data analysis and statistical software package for Microsoft Excel.

Table 3: Eigenvalues and percentages of inertia

	F1	F2	F3	F4	F5	F6	F7	F8
Eigenvalue	0.2	0.1	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Inertia (%)	55.7	17.3	11.9	8.2	4.0	1.5	0.9	0.4
Cumulative %	55.7	73.0	84.9	93.1	97.1	98.7	99.6	100.0



Based on this analysis, three factors had an Eigenvalue of 0.1 and above; with a cumulative Inertia of 84.9% (Table 3 refers). The first two factors (F) however, covered 73% of the information (F1 – 55.7% and F2 17.3%), therefore these were the two factor used to generate a Correspondence Matrix.

Looking at the symmetric plot of columns (type of gift) in Figure 3, two clear segments emerge, with the left of the matrix consisting of substantial types of gifts, which seem relatively higher in value and the right of the matrix, consisting of a relatively smaller, less personalised types of gifts, which are seemingly of a lower value.




Figure 3: Symmetric Column Plot

Figure 4 represents the symmetric plot of rows (gifting occasions). Taking occasions into account, again a pattern emerges with the top part of the matrix characterised by “intimate” type of occasions. The bottom half characterised by “formal” type of occasions, occasions where one would need to impress the recipient.




Figure 4: Symmetric Row Plot

A plot of these two axes is shown in Figure 5. Both the occasions (Rows), and the types of gifts given (Columns),are plotted on the matrix based on their contribution to the axes. The strongest contributors (contributing 0.1 and above) to the horizontal axis, were identified as *Christmas, Birthdays, Father’s Day, Electronics, Clothing, Chocolate, Flowers and Get-well-soon* (full data tables attached in the Data table section in Appendix C). On the vertical axis, *Get-well Soon, Flowers, Wines and “Take to Dinner Party”* were the key contributors.




Figure 5: Correspondence Matrix

Based on this insight, the two main dimensions were labelled. The first, being the horizontal axis (contributing 55.7%), was labelled “type of gift”, with a high end of the axis labelled Obligatory or Substantial gifts, and a low of voluntary gifts or gestures.

The second, being the vertical axis (contributing 17.3%), showed a level of Closeness. The high end was labelled “Intimate” and the low end “Distant or Formal”.

The four Quadrents (Q1 - Q4) are thus labelled:

Q1 = Intimate – Substantial, Q2 = Intimate – Voluntary, Q3 = Formal/Distant – Voluntary, Q4 = Substantial – Formal/Distant.

Based on the results of the correspondence analysis, a context can be established for chocolate gifting within the context of other gifts and gifting occasions. There are three categories of gifting occasions, and in the context of these categories, chocolate gifting is positioned in the category of **“Warm**

Gestures", identified by occasions where one would tend to buy warm, less formal gesture gifts, such as chocolate and flowers as a sign of appreciation or nurturing. Furthermore, chocolate gifting is seen to be less intimate or personalised than gifts such as jewellery, and clothing and gifting occasions that are to an extent intimate, such as Valentine's Day and "Thank You" gestures, rather than more formal occasions such as Boss's day or Dinner Parties. By contrast, gifts in the other two categories are either more **Substantial Gifts and Occasions or** "Gifts/Occasions to Impress".

Substantial gifts and occasions, mainly involving family members or significant people in one's life (such as parents, wife or husband). The types of gifts in this category(labelled B in Figure 6) are also seemingly of a substantial or personalised nature (such as Jewellery, Electronics, Appliances, jewellery or clothing). **Gifts/Occasions to Impress**(labelled C in Figure 6) are identified inmore formal occasions, where giftswould be bought to impress the receiver. These are occasion of which one would also not be obliged to buy a gift, but rather to impress the receiver (e.g. an expensive bottle of wine) whether it is the Boss or dinner host.




Figure 6: Segmented Correspondence Matrix

Which Occasions are Chocolate Driven?

To address this topic, respondents were asked to indicate *"which types of gifts they generally buy?"* as well as *"Which Occasions they bought gifts for?"*




Figure 7: Profile of Gifts Bought for any occasion

Chocolate (26%) and Flowers (23%) are the most likely gifts to be bought for any occasion, followed by Wine, Gift Vouchers and Books (cumulative of83% contribution of all gifts bought). These results indicate that both Chocolate and Flowers are the most versatile of all gifts, as they appeal to a wider range of occasions.




Figure 8: Profile of Occasions (ranked by Chocolate occasions)

In general, gifts are predominantly bought for Christmas, Birthdays, Father's Day, Mother's Day and Anniversaries. Gifts are least likely to be bought for Easter, Secretary's Day, Get Well Soon and "I'm sorry" gestures.

Chocolate, however is most likely to be bought as a gift for Easter, Valentine Day, as a "Thank You" gesture, for Secretary's Day as well as a gesture to say "I'm Sorry". Chocolate is therefore less likely to be bought as a gift for the key gifting occasions.

4.2.2 How often are Gifts Purchased?

Consumers were asked how often they bought gifts in general, as well as how often they bought chocolate gifts specifically.

Gifts are mostly purchased on Special occasion (35%). Approximately a quarter (26%) of the respondents also buy gifts every month; 20% more than once a month with 16% buying them every 3 months (Figure 9). Similarly for Chocolate gifts, 29% of the respondents buy them for specially occasions. Chocolate gifts are however, bought less frequently that other gifts, with 23% being bought every 3 months and only 19% bought once a month. Chocolate gifts also have a high probability of being bought once every 6 months (Figure 10).




Figure 9: Frequency of Purchase – All Gifts




Figure 10: Frequency of Purchase - Chocolate Gifts

4.2.3 Research Question 1.1: What are the key drivers of the purchasing of chocolate as a gift?

The 24 attributes identified in the theoretical literature were ranked based on the mean respondent ratings. The overall top ten scoring attributes were identified (in order of importance) as; Quality, Likeability, Enjoyment, Taste, Indulgence, Appropriateness for the occasion, Packaging Style and Design, Prettiness, Lovingness and Brand name. These were thus identified as the key purchase drivers of purchasing chocolate as a gift (Figure 11).




Figure 11: Overall Mean Ranking of attributes

4.3 Results pertaining to Research Question 2: The Key Drivers of the Purchase of Chocolate as a Gift Identified by Subgroup

Are the key drivers of the purchasing of chocolate as gifts for different gifting occasions as identified for the South Africa market, different for different market segments?

This research question comprises the following sub-questions:

4.3.1 What are the underlying subgroups/segments in the market of chocolate gift purchasing in terms of the key drivers?

A Cluster analysis was conducted using K-Means clustering of the respondents; based on their responses to the twenty four attributes and based on the results, four clusters were identified.

The four clusters differed significantly on all of the 24 attributes, as shown in the one-way Analysis of Variance results (Table 4). Thus the differences between the clusters in terms of the attributes are considered real (that is, there are substantial differences between the clusters).

Table 4: One-Way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA)

		Between	df	Within	df3	F	signif.
Tastefulness	how tasty it is	20.895	3	104.028	113	7.566	0.000117
Uniqueness	how unique it is	117.365	3	131.712	113	33.564	0.000000
Appropriateness	how appropriate it is for the occasion	33.087	3	97.836	113	12.738	0.000000
Prettiness	how pretty it look	40.976	3	129.811	113	11.890	0.000001
Likability	whether it will be liked by the receiver	27.752	3	53.445	113	19.559	0.000000
Novelty	how new and different (novel) it is	71.777	3	172.530	113	15.670	0.000000
Handmade	whether the chocolate is handmade	112.633	3	181.589	113	23.363	0.000000
Size Impression	the size impression	74.537	3	198.540	113	14.141	0.000000
Imaginative	how imaginative it is	103.484	3	119.508	113	32.616	0.000000
Packaging Style & Design	the style and design of the packaging	52.899	3	102.332	113	19.471	0.000000
Brand Name	the brand name	58.774	3	193.140	113	11.462	0.000001
Quality	the quality of chocolate	16.188	3	51.009	113	11.953	0.000001
Spontaneity	whether I'm buying a gift on the spare of the moment (spontaneity)	58.620	3	175.910	113	12.552	0.000000
Enjoyment	how much the receiver will enjoy it	27.622	3	56.703	113	18.349	0.000000
Memorability	how memorable it will be	88.958	3	115.043	113	29.126	0.000000
Desirability	how desirable it is to me (something I would like to receive as a gift)	50.311	3	204.766	113	9.255	0.000016
Lovingness	whether it shows my affection for the receiver (lovingness)	62.078	3	129.614	113	18.040	0.000000
Innovativeness	how innovative it is	109.549	3	145.238	113	28.411	0.000000
Thoughtfulness	how thoughtful it requires me to be in selecting it	63.164	3	146.495	113	16.241	0.000000
Luxurious & Prestigious	how luxurious & prestigious it is	97.151	3	131.157	113	27.901	0.000000
Indulgence	how indulgent it is	63.354	3	82.612	113	28.886	0.000000
Expensiveness (price)	how expensive it is	92.606	3	164.318	113	21.228	0.000000
Presence of Endorsements	whether it is recommended by people I trust (endorsements)	22.986	3	197.322	113	4.388	0.005837
Reflection of Receiver's Personality	whether it will be a reflection of the receiver's personality	81.127	3	152.104	113	20.090	0.000000

Within the clusters, the order of the importance of attributes differs.The clusters are described in terms of their top 10 attributes,based on the means of the clustering variables.




Figure 12: Attributes by Cluster – Comparison of the Cluster Means

Cluster 1




Figure 13: Key Attribute Ranking – Cluster 1

Cluster 1, scored below the overall mean across all the attributes. For this group, quality was also the highest scoring attribute. **Taste** and **brand name** however, ranked relatively above average (overall mean), whilst **likeability** and **indulgence** were relatively less important.

This subgroup is indifferent about why they purchase chocolate as a gift. They seem to buy chocolate gifts because they have to.

Cluster 2

Overall, Cluster 2 scored above average on six of the top ten attributes, (Quality, Likability, Enjoyment, Taste, Indulgence, and Appropriateness for the occasion). To this subgroup, **likeability** and **taste** are more important than **quality** as key purchase drivers. **Luxurious and prestigious**, **desirability**, **brandname** as well as **expensiveness(price)** scored higher than average, while prettiness and lovingness were less important and excluded in the group's top ten drivers.




Figure 14: Key Attribute Ranking – Cluster 2

To this subgroup, **Indulgence**, **luxury and prestige** as well as **expensiveness (price)** were significantly more important than most of the other subgroups.

Cluster 3




Figure 15: Key Attribute Ranking – Cluster 3

Cluster 3 are characterised by the more emotional attributes with **likeability**, **enjoyment**, **memorability**, appropriateness, **lovingness** and **reflection of the receivers personality** scoring higher than average, as well as higher than all the other subgroups.

To this subgroup, brand name, luxurious and prestigious and expensiveness (price) are

considerably less important, with these attributes scoring extremely lower than average, as well with other subgroups.

Cluster 4

Cluster 4 scored above average on all the attributes. They agreed with the Cluster 2 on the first five of the top ten attributes (Quality, Likeability, Enjoyment, Taste, and Indulgence) as the most important attributes. The Buppies, however, scored packaging style & design and prettiness above average, and above all other subgroups. The subgroup also scored uniqueness, thoughtfulness and imaginativeness well above average and other groups.




Figure 16: Key Attribute Ranking – Cluster 4

This subgroup is more concerned about the aesthetics of the gift, the quality, packaging style & design, how pretty it looks, if it is unique and so on.

4.3.2 How does the identified segmentation of chocolate gift purchasing in terms of attributes, relate to demographic characteristics of purchasers?

Cross tabulations of the identified clusters with the demographic variables of age, gender, marital status, race and monthly household income were used to characterise the clusters as shown in

Table 5. Based on both these demographic variables, as well as the clustering attribute variables, the clusters were described in more detail and names attached.

Table 5: Profile of Clusters

		Cluster 1	Cluster 2	Cluster 3	Cluster 4	Total
		Detached	Affluents	Ingratiaters	Buppies	
Age:	above 45 years	18.8%	5.3%	21.4%	13.5%	14.5%
	35 to 44 years	40.6%	47.4%	35.7%	26.9%	35.0%
	25 to 34 years	37.5%	47.4%	35.7%	53.8%	46.2%
	18 to 24 years	3.1%	0.0%	7.1%	5.8%	4.3%
	Total	**27.4%**	**16.2%**	**12.0%**	**44.4%**	**100.0%**
Gender:	Male	34.4%	31.6%	14.3%	25.0%	27.4%
	Female	65.6%	68.4%	85.7%	75.0%	72.6%
	Total	**27.4%**	**16.2%**	**12.0%**	**44.4%**	**100.0%**
Marital Status:	Married	50.0%	63.2%	42.9%	34.6%	44.4%
	Widowed	3.1%	0.0%	0.0%	5.8%	3.4%
	Single	46.9%	31.6%	35.7%	59.6%	48.7%
	Divorced	0.0%	5.3%	21.4%	0.0%	3.4%
	Total	**27.4%**	**16.2%**	**12.0%**	**44.4%**	**100.0%**
Race:	African/Black	28.1%	26.3%	35.7%	48.1%	37.6%
	White	50.0%	42.1%	42.9%	36.5%	41.9%
	Indian	15.6%	15.8%	14.3%	13.5%	14.5%
	Coloured	6.3%	15.8%	7.1%	1.9%	6.0%
	Total	**27.4%**	**16.2%**	**12.0%**	**44.4%**	**100.0%**
Household Monthly Income (R):	Above 20,000	71.9%	94.7%	64.3%	51.9%	65.8%
	14,000 to 19,999	15.6%	0.0%	7.1%	21.2%	14.5%
	8,000 to 13,999	12.5%	5.3%	21.4%	17.3%	14.5%
	3,000 to 7,999	0.0%	0.0%	7.1%	7.7%	4.3%
	Below 2,999	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.9%	0.9%
	Total	**27.4%**	**16.2%**	**12.0%**	**44.4%**	**100.0%**

Cluster 1: the Detached (27.4%), is mostly older than all the other clusters (59% older than 35 years), has the highest proportion of males (34.4%), white people (50%) and high income earners (71% Above R20, 000).

Cluster 2: the Affluents (16.2%), is slightly younger consisting mainly of peoples between the ages of 25 and 44 years. This cluster is more female, but also has an above average male representation. It also consists of high income earners, the lowest representation of Africans/Blacks, and an above average number of people in this cluster are married.

Cluster 3: the Ingratiaters (12%) consist of people aged 25+, but tend to be generally older than other clusters, with an above average number of people older than 45 years of age. It also has a high percentage of females; spread across all races with the highest percentage of divorced people.

Cluster 4: the "Buppies" (44%) is the youngest of the clusters, with an above average number of people between the ages of 18 – 34 years earning between R14,000 – R19,999 per month. The cluster consists mainly of African/Black

people having the lowest proportion of white people. The cluster also scores lower than all the other clusters on married people, with mostly singlepeople.

4.3.3 How does the identified segmentation of chocolate gift purchasing, in terms of attributes, relate to the occasion of chocolate gifting?

For each respondent, the probability of giving chocolate as a gift for occasions, for example Christmas, Easter and Mother's Day, was calculated. For each occasion, this value was based on whether the respondents indicated that they would purchase chocolate, relative to the total number of occasions the respondents indicated they would give chocolate.

Figure 17 shows the profile of the probability of chocolate giving byoccasions for each cluster. For all the clusters, Easter features as the most prominent occasion for chocolate gifting, whereas chocolate is seldom bought for Christmas and Birthdays.




Figure 17: Profile of Chocolate Occasions by Cluster

Further details in the patterns of chocolate gifting by occasion, per cluster, are illustrated as follows:

The Detached (Cluster 1), are most likely to buy chocolate gifts for Easter, Valentine's Day, Bosses' Day, Farewells, and as a gesture to say I'm sorry. They are also likely to buy them for Secretary's Day, (although less likely than the Ingratiaters). Compared with the other clusters, this cluster is least likely to buy chocolate gifts to take to Dinner Parties and as a gesture to say, "Thank You".

The Ingratiaters (Cluster 3), will buy chocolate gifts for most occasions and are most likely to buy chocolate as a gifts for Easter (90%), as a "Thank You" gesture (75%) and for Women's Day (67%). They are also more likely than other clusters to buy chocolate for Secretary's Day (57%) and as an Anniversary (40%) gift. Compared with other clusters, the Ingratiaters are less likely than the Detached and the Affluents to buy chocolate gifts for Easter, and will hardly ever buy it as a Birthday Gift.

Although **"Buppies"** (Cluster 4), may buy chocolate as gift for Easter (90%), they are least likely (scoring the lowest for this occasion), than other clusters. They may also buy chocolate gifts as a gesture to say "I'm sorry" (44%), "Thank You" (43%) and for Valentine's Day (40%). This cluster will also buy chocolate gifts for Christmas and Birthdays; however this is less rarely than other clusters. Compared with the others, Buppies are also least likely to buy chocolate for Farewells and Get-Well-Soon.

The Affluents (Cluster 2), are least likely to buy chocolate as a gift for any occasion. They may however consider it for Easter (93%, more so than the Ingratiaters and the Buppies), Get-Well-Soon (41%), as a gesture to say "I'm Sorry" (40%), Thank You (25%), Secretary's Day (33%) and Valentine's Day (31%).

4.3.4 How does the identified segmentation of chocolate gift purchasing in terms of attributes, relate to the frequency of purchase of chocolate in gifting?

The frequency of positive response to the question of,*"how often do you buy chocolate gifts?"* was used to compare the clusters. Table 6 indicates that the Ingratiaters (Cluster 3) are the most likely cluster to buy chocolate as gifts.

Table 6: Median

	Detached	Affluents	Ingratiaters	Buppies
Median	33%	15%	40%	26%

More detailed analysis of the frequency of chocolate gift purchasing is illustrated in Figure 18, in which the frequencies of purchasing all gifts versus chocolate gifts are specifically compared.




Figure 18: Frequency of Purchase

In summary, Ingratiaters (Cluster 3) are most like to buy gifts on special occasions and there is a high probability of them buying chocolate as a gift for special occasions. This is the cluster that will buy gifts most frequently (once every month), however; they are least likely to buy chocolate gifts as frequently.

Buppies will most like buy gifts once every three months, however will buy chocolate gifts mostly on Special Occasions. The Detached are also most like to buy gifts on special occasions, however, will buy chocolate more frequently (once a month). The Affluents buy gifts less frequently than most clusters, as they will mostly buy them on special occasions, once every three months, six months and once a year. They are also least like to buy chocolate in those occasions.

4.4 Summary of the results

The results presented in this chapter, represent results from the surveyconducted over a period of two months, among chocolate consumers in South Africa. The questions asked in the questionnaire survey were designed to gather information relating to the demographic profile of the respondents, as well as their Perceptions about the purchase of gifts in general, as well as chocolate gifts specifically based on attributes extracted from the literature

Correspondence and cluster analyses were run and the researcher presented the results in this chapter. The results of this study are discussed in the next chapter.

CHAPTER 5: DISCUSSION OF THE RESULTS

The purpose of this research was to identify the key drivers of the purchasing of chocolate as a gift for different gifting occasions in South Africa. This was investigated by surveying the perceptions of consumers of general gifts and gifting occasions, as well as quantifying the relative importance of 24 attributes (as identified in the literature review), in their decision to purchase chocolate as a gift.

This study sought to establish where chocolate (as well as chocolate gifting occasions), is positioned amongst other gifts (and gifting occasions),inthe general market. Moreover, the study also focused on the chocolate gifting market, in terms of segmentation and purchasing behaviour within the different segments identified. Once these segments were established, in order to be relevant for targeted marketing efforts,there was also a need to identify the demographic profiles of these segments,

In this chapter, the results are discussed in three sections: section 5.1will discuss the demographic profiles of the respondents; while sections5.2 - 5.3discuss the results of the survey pertaining to the research questions of the study.

5.1 Demographic Profile of Respondents

The respondents in this survey were existing consumers in South Africa, who had previously interacted with the chocolate category.




Figure 19: Gender Profile

From a gender perspective, although the researcher targeted both male and female, the respondents who completed the survey had a strong female bias.Bodur and Grohmann (2005) explain that gender is often a significant factor in consumer behaviour and more so in gifting, as women appear to be more involved in gifting. Areni et al(1998) also confirmed that women generally appear to give more gifts than men do.

Most respondents were bothmarried or single. Joy (2001) suggests a link between the level of intimacy and gifting, where people invoved romantically will engage in gifting andonmore occasions (special and everyday) in order to win a loved one's heartor show they care.In these relationships, a romantic partner will oftengive spontaneous inexpensive gifts [such as chocolate](Joy, 2001). This could therefore explain the low involvement of those divorced or widowed respondents in this particular study.




Figure 20: Marital Status Profile




Figure 21: Age Profile

Respondents also tended to be relatively older. Although the sample consisted of those between the ages of 18 and 45 years of age, most respondents were 25 years and older, with almost a fifth being over the age of 45 years.

5.2 Discussion pertaining to Research Question 1: The Key Drivers of Chocolate as a Gift for Different Gifting Occasions

What are the key drivers of the purchasing of chocolate as gifts for different gifting occasions in South Africa?

The overall top ten scoring attributes were identified (in order of importance) as; Quality, Likeability, Enjoyment, Taste, Indulgence, Appropriateness for the occasion, Packaging Style and Design, Prettiness, Lovingness and Brand name. These were therefore identified as the key purchase drivers of chocolate as a gift.




Figure 22: Overall Mean Ranking of attributes

A number of researchers also found Quality to be an important attribute in adecision to purchase gifts (DeVere et al., 1983; Wolfinbarger, 1990; Hollenbeck et al., 2006), stemming from a desire to please a recipient or reinforce a relationship by giving a desirable item. Hollenbeck et al.(2006) explained that some consumers also believe particular brands are more reliable than others, and deliver better-quality gifts, thereby linking brand name to product quality. Parsons (2002) also agreed that Brands Choice, Product Quality, Appropriateness, Price (maybe indicator of value), Packaging and General

Perception of the product, to be key attributes sought after by both gift purchaser and receivers. These research results however disagreed with Price as a key purchase driver.

According to the *Chocolate Sweet Sensation Consumer Report*(2005)Packaging Style and Design, as well as Prettiness allow the gift purchasers to create their own sense of style; which must be reflected in the design of the product chosen as a gift.

DeVere et al.,(1983) also added that the selection criteria for a gift can be linked with appropriateness to occasion; while lovingness can be linked to emotional expectations (DeVere et al., 1983).

Chocolate Gifting Occasions and the role of Chocolate therein

Based on the results of the correspondence analysis, three categories of gifting occasions were identified, and in the context of these categories, chocolate gifting is positioned in the category of “Warm Gestures”.




Figure 23: Segmented Correspondence Matrix

This category isidentified by occasions where one would tend to buy warm, less formal gesture gifts, such as chocolate and flowers as a sign of appreciation or nurturing.

Furthermore, chocolate gifting is seen to be less intimate or personalised than gifts such as jewellery and clothing,and gifting occasions that are to an extent intimate such as Valentine's Day and "Thank You" gestures, rather than more formal occasions such as Bosses'Day or Dinner Parties

Results indicate that both Chocolate and Flowers are the most versatile of all the gifts, as they appeal to a wider range of occasions.




Figure 24: Profile of Occasions (ranked by Chocolate occasions)

In general, gifts are predominantly bought for Christmas, Birthdays, Father's Day, Mother's Day and Anniversaries, which is in line with the Unknown(2008) report on *The Economic Significance of Gifting*. Chocolate is however less likely to be bought as a gift for key or major gifting occasions such as Christmas.As explained by both Belk (1979) and Sherry (1983),Christmas gifts serve a diverse social, economic, and personal purpose and are predominantly value expressive; therefore chocolate is a less likely gift selection for this occasion.

Chocolate, however is most likely to be bought as a gift for Easter, Valentine's Day, as a "Thank You" gesture, for Secretary's Day as well as a gesture to say "I'm Sorry". These results agree with the Mintel Report cited by Bainbridge (2008).

Chocolate gifts are bought less frequently than all gifts. Chocolate gifts also have a high probability of being bought once every three to six months.Joy(2001) touches on the significance of the frequency of gifting in her continuum, suggesting that the level of intimacy in a relationship will influence how often gifts are purchased and given. The question in this study didnot, however, link the frequency of purchase to the relationship between giver and receiver.

In conclusion, The overall key purchase drivers were therefore identified (in order of importance) as: 1) Quality;2) Likeability;3) Enjoyment;4) Taste;5) Indulgence;6) Appropriateness for the occasion;7) Packaging Style and Design; 8) Prettiness;9) Lovingness and;10) Brand name.

Chocolate was identified as playing a key role in occasions like Easter, Valentine's Day, as a "Thank You" gesture, for Secretary's Day as well as a gesture to say "I'm Sorry". Chocolate was identified as a least likely gift for key or major occasions, such as Christmas.Chocolates, together with flowers were established as less formal gesture gifts, given as a sign of appreciation or nurturing.

5.3 Discussion pertaining to Research Question 2: The Key Drivers of the Purchase of Chocolate as a Gift Identified by Subgroup

Are the key drivers of the purchasing of chocolate as gifts for different gifting occasions as identified for the South African market, different for different market segments?

The cluster analysis performed, identified four clusters,which all showed real difference in the order of importance of the 24 attributes. Based on their attribute ranking, the four clusters were named and profiled by demographic characteristics, chocolate gifting occasions, as well as the frequency of purchase.




Figure 25: Profile of Clusters

Cluster Oneputs quality first, followed by taste,likeability and enjoyment. When compared to the overall key drivers, taste and brand name ranked relatively above average, whilst indulgence and likability ranked relatively below the overall mean. This subgroup appeared to be indifferent to the key attributes which drove their purchase decision to buy chocolate as a gift. They seemedto buy chocolate gifts, because they felt obliged to. This observation agrees with Komter and Vollebergh (1997),who explain that in some cases, gift giving may be linked to morally obligatory feelings for others.Based on this insight, this cluster was named ***theDetached*****.** The cluster is characterised byrespondents who were mostly older than all the other clusters. It also has the highest proportion of white males, who are high income earners. These results were in line with Areni et al.,(1998)who identified males as less involved in gifting and more likely to rely on

others (e.g. Sales people) for advice. Overlaying the historic background of the South African economy, where older white males hold top executive positions in businesses, this cluster could also be delegating thepurchase decision to their assistants (e.g. secretaries or personal assistants).

The Detached are also most like to buy chocolate gifts on special occasions,such as Easter, Valentine's Day, Bosses' Day, Farewells, and as a gesture to say I'm sorry. They are also likely to buy them for Secretary's Day. Compared with the other clusters, this cluster is least likely to buy chocolate gifts to take to Dinner Parties oras a gesture to say "Thank You".

Cluster Twocited taste and likeability as the most important attributes above quality as a key purchase driver. For this cluster, indulgence, luxury and prestige as well as expensiveness (price),were significantly more important than the others, whilst brand name also played a relatively more important role than average.Parsons (2002) highlights that brand name and expensiveness (price), could be indicators of value to some. Based on their choice or combination of attributes, this cluster was named *the Affluents***.** This segment consists ofslightly younger (between 25 and 44 years of age), high income earning females (although it has an above average male representation), who are most likely married.

The Affluents will generally buy gifts less frequently than the other clusters, as they will mostly buy them on special occasions. They are therefore least likely to buy chocolate as a gift for any of those occasions. However, if they do buy chocolate as a gift, they may consider it for Easter, Get-Well-Soon, Secretary's Day and Valentine's Day or as a gesture to say "I'm Sorry" or "Thank You".

As a segment this cluster seems to be most interested in the more premium indicating attributes. They will buy fewer gifts (including chocolate gifts), less frequently and may therefore spend a little extra when they do.

Cluster Threeis characterised by the more emotional attributes with likeability, enjoyment, memorability, appropriateness, lovingness and reflection of the receiver's personality meaning more to them (more so than all other subgroups). Both Joy (2001) and DeVere et al.,(1983) alsolinked these attributes to a level of effort in gift selection, as well as emotional expectation.This segment puts less emphasis on brand name, luxurious and prestigious and expensiveness (price), as key purchase drivers. With this insight, this subgroup was labelled *the Ingratiaters*.The Ingratiatersconsist mostly of females aged 25 years and older(above average of 45+), who tend to be generally older than other clusters, and are mostly divorced. This cluster has the highest probability of buying chocolate as a gift for most occasions and more especially for Easter, Women's Day, and Secretary's Day and as a "Thank You" gesture. Compared with other clusters, the Ingratiaters are less likely to buy chocolate gifts for Easter and will hardly ever buy it as a Birthday Gift.

With this cluster consisting mostly of women, the results also confirm the significance of gender in gifting (therefore in chocolate gifting),(Bodur and Grohmann, 2005). The emotional links are also in line with the findings by Cleveland et al. (2003),that women tend to give more gifts than men and they also attach more emotional meaning to gifts.

Cluster Fourindexed above average on all the top attributes when compared to the other clusters. They cited likeability and enjoyment as the most important attributes after quality, followed by taste and indulgences. They agreed with cluster two on these five attributes. This cluster put more emphasis on attributes related to the aesthetics of the chocolate gift,with packaging style & design, prettiness, as well as uniqueness playing a key role. This subgroup also rated thoughtfulness and imaginativeness well above average than other groups. This subgroup is mainly concerned with the aesthetics of the gift, the quality, packaging style & design, how pretty it looks, if it is unique and so on. Hollenbeck et al.,(2006) explains that some gift purchasers prefer to create their own sense of style through the gifts they purchase. The aesthetic appeal of the chocolate gift may allow for this sense of expression.

Labelled *the "Buppies"*, this cluster is the youngest (18 – 34 years), made up of mainly African/Black people earning between R14,000 – R19,999 per month and are mostly single.Buppies will most like buy gifts once every three months, however will buy chocolate gifts mostly on Special Occasions. This cluster will mainly buy chocolate gifts as a gesture to say "I'm sorry" or "Thank You", as well as for Valentine's Day. This cluster isleast likely to buy chocolate gifts for Easter; however, they are open to buying chocolates gifts for Christmas and Birthdays.

As the youngest subgroup, the Buppies may also be looking for a level of excitement in the gifting arena. According to the Innova Market Insights report (2009), various flavours and packaging [and design] trends heavily contributetobringing this level of excitement.

5.4 Conclusion

The overall key purchase drivers were identified (in order of importance) as: 1) Quality; 2) Likeability; 3) Enjoyment; 4) Taste; 5) Indulgence; 6) Appropriateness for the occasion; 7) Packaging Style and Design; 8) Prettiness; 9) Lovingness and; 10) Brand name. The order of importance was established to be different for different consumer segments.

Chocolate was identified as playing a key role in occasions like Easter, Valentine's Day, as a "Thank You" gesture, for Secretary's Day as well as a gesture to say "I'm Sorry". Chocolate was identified as a least likely gift for key or major occasions, such as Christmas. Chocolates, together with flowers were established as less formal gesture gifts, given as a sign of appreciation or nurturing.

Four clusters were identified, named and profiled by demographic characteristics, chocolate gifting occasions, as well as their frequency of purchase. These clusters all showed real difference in the order of importance of the 24 attributes.

CHAPTER 6: CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

6.1 Introduction

The chapter draws conclusions from the research work and results, and is followed by recommendations for stakeholder, and concludes with suggestions for future research.

6.2 Conclusions of the study

This research study sought to establish the key drivers of consumer behaviour in the purchase of chocolates as gifts. The study considered where chocolate is positioned as a gift amongst other giftsfor the general market, whilst establishing which gifting occasion would be relevant as chocolate gifting occasions.

Results from this study showed that there are many factors which can be taken into account when considering chocolate as a gift. These straddle from its relevance for the occasion, its presentationand aesthetics of packaging and design, to the relationship between the gift giver and the receiver.

As gifts, chocolategifts are positioned in the “Warm Gestures” category, a category identified by occasions where consumers tend to buy warm, less formal gifts (this would also include flowers as gifts) as a sign of appreciation or nurturing. Chocolate gifts are a popular choice for many occasions and can generally be considered for most gifting opportunities (Gib, 2010; The Ultimate Chocolate Shoppe, 2010). Results from this study agreed with previous research as theyindicated that both Chocolate and Flowers are most versatile asgifts and can be considered as gifts for most occasions barring major ones such as Christmas.

The study also focused on the chocolate gifting market in terms of segmentation and the purchase behaviour within the different segments was identified.Segments wereprofiled in order to be relevant for targeted marketing efforts.

Results showed that different segments considered different attributes in making their purchase decision. Specific attributes relevant to each segment were identified, which could assist marketers and retailers alike in targeting specific consumers with relevant offerings, as chocolate gifting becomes more and more relevant as animportant part of total consumer product sales.

6.3 Recommendations

The study sought to provide chocolate manufacturers with strategic insights into satisfying consumer needs in the chocolate gifting market and providing retailers with insights into key purchase triggers in the chocolate gifting market, enabling them to better layout their stores for an optimal consumer shopping experience.

a) The following recommendations are suggested for chocolate manufactures:

The importance of product quality stems from a desire to please a recipient or reinforce a relationship by giving a desirable item.Quality is an important attribute which can, to a certain extent, influence other key attributes. Manufactures should therefore strive for the best product quality when producing chocolate gifts to ensure consumers are engaged from the onset.

With occasions playing an integral part of the chocolate gifting market, it would be recommended manufactures segment their product portfolio based on specific consumer needs. As different segments are motivated by different attributes to purchase chocolate gifts, manufactures have to ensure they carry a wide range of products which satisfy these needs. These would include products differentiated by packaging, design&style as well as products differentiated for specific occasions.Currently only Easter (and to a certain level Valentine’s Day) is established a chocolate gifting occasion. The recommendation would be for other occasions (including everyday occasions) to be established and marketed more strongly as chocolate gifting occasions.

Another recommendation would be for manufactures to invest in seasonal, innovations targeted to the different segments in order to excite the market with every occasion or season.

b) The following recommendations are suggested for Retailers:

It is recommended for retailers to segment their shelf layout targeting different occasions. Segmenting the shelf lay out would enable retailers to enhance the shopping experience for specific shoppers, making it easier for them to locate and identify the specific product they would prefer to purchase for gifting occasions.This would involve the altering and improvement of their shelf merchandising strategies.

It is also recommended they focus their marketing and promotional strategies on specific chocolate gifting occasions. This would require retailers to ensure that in-store messaging and point of purchase material is clearly aligned to the identified key drivers of the purchase of chocolate as gift for the different target segments. By laying out shelves based on both special and everyday occasions, retailers are likely to increase traffic into their stores as they would be making it easier for consumers to shop the category.

Another recommendation for retailers would be to leveragecertain occasions in order to differentiate themselves from their competitors and improve the shopper experience, thereby increasingshopper loyalty to their stores.

6.4 Suggestions for further research

There are still a significant numberof questions which require exploration with regards to the consumer behaviour in the consumption of chocolate as gift. The researcher recommends that further in-depth studies be conducted focusing on each of the research questions, as the researcher feels more insights could possibly be uncovered.

More research could also be directed in finding out what chocolate gift formats are appropriate to give for the different types of occasions

Further research would also be recommended into the understanding of the meaning of occasions in relation to seasonal chocolate in South Africa.

REFERENCES

Anand (2010) *Internet Penetration In South Africa,* (last), from http://gorumors.com/crunchies/internet-penetration-in-south-africa/.

Anon (2005) Chocolates. Sweet Sensations, *Consumer Reports,* 70(2), pp. 27-29.

Areni, C., Kiecker, P. and Palan, K. (1998) Is it better to give than to receive? Exploring gender differences in the meaning of memorable gifts, *Psychology and Marketing,* 15(1), pp. 81-109.

Atieno, O. (2009) An Analysis of the Strengths and Limitations of Qualitative and Quantitative Research Paradigms., *Problems of Education in the 21st century,* Vol. 13, pp. p13-18.

Bainbridge, J. (2008) Sweet gifts stop giving, *Marketing (00253650)*, pp. 32-33.

Baker, G. A. and Burnham, T. A. (2001) Consumer response to genetically modified foods: Market segment analysis and implications for producers and policy makers, *Journal of Agricultural and Resource Economics*, pp. 387-403.

Basil, M. (2009) Seasonal Festivals and Religious Holidays: Consumption Rituals at the Cherry Blossom and Easter Celebrations.

Beldona, S. and Morrison, A. (2005) Online shopping motivations and pleasure travel products: a correspondence analysis, *Tourism Management,* 26(4), pp. 561-570.

Belk, R. (1976) It's the thought that counts: A signed digraph analysis of gift-giving, *Journal of Consumer Research*, pp. 155-162.

Belk, R. (1979) Gift-giving behavior, *Research in marketing,* 2, pp. 95-126.

Belk, R. (1996) The meaning of gifts and greetings, *Advances in Consumer Research,* 23, pp. 13-13.

Belk, R. W. (1975) Situational variables and consumer behavior, *The Journal of Consumer Research,* 2(3), pp. 157-164.

Bhardwaj, S. and Palaparthy, I. (2008) An Empirical Study on the Factors Influencing the Buying Behavior of the Consumers: LCD Televisions, *ICFAI Journal of Brand Management,* 5(3), pp. 72-80.

Bodie, G. D. and Worthington, D. L. (2010) Revisiting the Listening Styles Profile (LSP-16): A Confirmatory Factor Analytic Approach to Scale Validation and Reliability Estimation, *International Journal of Listening,* 24, pp. 69-88.

Bodur, H. and Grohmann, B. (2005) Consumer responses to gift receipt in business-to-consumer contexts, *Psychology and Marketing,* 22(5), pp. 441-456.

Caplow, T. and Holmes Williamson, M. (1980) Decoding Middletown's Easter bunny: A study in American iconography, *Semiotica,* 32(3-4), pp. 221-232.

Castillo, J. J. (2009) *Convenience Sampling,* (last), from Experiment Resources: http://www.experiment-resources.com/convenience-sampling.html

Cleveland, M., Babin, B., Laroche, M., Ward, P. and Bergeron, J. (2003) Information search patterns for gift purchases: a cross-national examination of gender differences, *Journal of Consumer Behaviour,* 3(1), pp. 20-47.

Creswell, J. (2003) *Research design*, Sage Publications.

Creswell, J. (2009) *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches*, Sage Publications, Inc.

Davies, G., Whelan, S., Foley, A. and Walsh, M. (2009) Gifts and gifting, *International Journal of Management Reviews,* 9999(9999).

DeCoster, J. (1998) *Overview of Factor Analysis,* (last), from http://www.stat-help.com/factor.pdf.

DeVere, S., Scott, C. and Shulby, W. (1983) Consumer perceptions of gift-giving occasions: attribute saliency and structure, *Advances in Consumer Research,* 10(1), pp. 185-190.

Durgee, J. F. and Sego, T. (2001) Gift-Giving as a Metaphor for Understanding New Products that Delight, *Advances in Consumer Research,* 28(1), pp. 64-69.

Fischer, E. and Arnold, S. (1990) More than a labor of love: Gender roles and Christmas gift shopping, *Journal of Consumer Research,* 17(3), pp. 333-345.

Folkes, V. S. (1988) Recent attribution research in consumer behavior: A review and new directions, *The Journal of Consumer Research,* 14(4), pp. 548-565.

Garland, R. (1991) The mid-point on a rating scale: Is it desirable, *Marketing Bulletin,* 2, pp. 66-70.

Garson, G. (2001) *Guide to writing empirical papers, theses and dissertations*.

Gib, A. (2010) *Appropriate Occasions to Give Chocolate Gift Baskets,* (Last updated on), accessed 06 June, 2010, from http://www.articlesnatch.com/Article/Appropriate-Occasions-To-Give-Chocolate-Gift-Baskets/1162657.

Giesler, M. (2006) Consumer gift systems, *Journal of Consumer Research,* 33(2), pp. 283-290.

Glynn, D. (2011) Correspondence Analysis, Exploring data and identifying patterns, Lund University

Godelier, M. (1999) *The enigma of the gift*, University of Chicago Press.

Hair, J. F., Black, W., Babin, B. and Anderson, R. (2010) *Multivariate Data Analysis: A Global Perspective,* 7th ed., Pearson Prentice Hall, New Jersey.

Hollenbeck, C., Peters, C. and Zinkhan, G. (2006) Gift giving: a community paradigm, *Psychology and Marketing,* 23(7), pp. 573-595.

Homick, A. (2007) *An exploration of gift giving: Re-gifting as a gift-giving behavior.*from The University of North Carolina at Greensboro.

Innova Market Insights (2009) Boxed Chocolate Trends,

it news Africa (2009) *Africa's high mobile penetration sets the stage for Internet revolution,* (last), from http://www.itnewsafrica.com/?p=2839.

Jenkins, C. and Dillman, D. (1997) Towards a theory of self-administered questionnaire design, *Survey measurement and process quality*, pp. 165-196.

Joy, A. (2001) Gift giving in Hong Kong and the continuum of social ties, *Journal of Consumer Research,* 28(2), pp. 239-256.

Kalof, L., Dan, A. and Dietz, T. (2008) Essentials of social research.

Komter, A. and Vollebergh, W. (1997) Gift Giving and the Emotional Significance of Family and Friends, *Journal of Marriage & Family,* 59(3), pp. 747-757.

Lahiri, I. and Samanta, P. K. (2010) Factors Influencing Purchase of Apparels from Organized Retail Outlets, *IUP Journal of Marketing Management,* 9(1/2), pp. 73-87.

Leedy, P. and Ormrod, J. (2005) *Practical research: planning and design. 8th edn. Engelwood Cliffs*, NJ: Pearson.

Lowhorn, G. L. (2005) *Qualitative and Quantitative Research: How to Choose the Best Design,* (last

Mackenzie, N. (2010) *Chocolate Confectionery in South Africa*, BMI Research (Pty) Ltd.

Marecek, J., Fine, M. and Kidder, L. (1997) Working Between Worlds: Qualitative Methods and Social Psychology, *Journal of Social Issues,* 53(4), pp. 631-644.

Marshall, M. N. (1996) Sampling for qualitative research, *Family Practice,* 13(6), p. 522.

Mauss, M. (1954) The gift, trans. I, *Cunnison. London: Cohen & West*.

Onwuegbuzie, A. and Leech, N. (2005) Taking the "Q" out of research: Teaching research methodology courses without the divide between quantitative and qualitative paradigms, *Quality and Quantity,* 39(3), pp. 267-295.

Parsons, A. (2002) Brand choice in gift-giving: recipient influence, *Journal of Product & Brand Management,* 11(4), pp. 237-249.

Punj, G. and Stewart, D. W. (1983) Cluster Analysis in Marketing Research: Review and Suggestions for Application, *Journal of Marketing Research (JMR),* 20(2), pp. 134-148.

Research and Market Trends (2006) *The Gifting Report 2006: The Ultimate Guide to the Consumer Gift-Giving Market,* (last), from <http://www.researchandmarkets.com/reportinfo.asp?rfm=rss&report_id=1205867>.

Reynaldo, J. and Santos, A. (1999) Cronbach's Alpha: A Tool for Assessing the Reliability of Scales *Journal of Extension,* 37(2).

Schwartz, B. (1967) The social psychology of the gift, *American Journal of Sociology*, pp. 1-11.

Sherry, J. (1983) Gift giving in anthropological perspective, *Journal of Consumer Research*, pp. 157-168.

Smeyers, P. (2008) Qualitative and quantitative research methods: old wine in new bottles? On understanding and interpreting educational phenomena, *Paedagogica Historica,* 44(6), pp. 691-705.

StatSoft and Inc. (2009) *STATISTICA (data analysis software system)*, version 9.0., last accessed on 26 February, 2011, from, www.statsoft.com.

Summers, J., Lorterapong, A. and Morgan, J. (2006) Factors influencing consumer intentions to purchase seasonally discounted athletic footware in Thailand, *International Business Trends: Contemporary Readings,* 2006, pp. 185-196.

Synnovate (2009) *Quantitative Online Research Methods,* (Last updated on, from http://www.resolutions.co.nz/quantitative_online_research.htm.

Tan, R. (2009) *The Fine Art Of Giving Gift,* (Last updated on), accessed 20 May, 2010, from http://www.articlesnatch.com/Article/The-Fine-Art-Of-Giving-Gift/938666#ixzz0q69EpqTo.

The Free Discionary by Farlex (2011) The Free Discionary,

The Ultimate Chocolate Shoppe (2010) *The Meaning of Giving Chocolate Gifts,* (Last updated on), accessed 20 May, 2010, from

http://www.ultimatechocolateshoppe.com/blog/the-meaning-of-giving-chocolate-gifts-163.html.

Tuckfelt, A. (2008) *Do Holiday Symbols Make Holidays Simple?,* (last), from http://www.chatham.edu/pti/curriculum/units/2008/Tuckfelt.pdf.

Unknown (2008) *The Economic Significance of Gift Giving,* (Last updated on), accessed 28 June 2010, from http://www.itchybrainscentral.com/gift-purchasing-giving-research.html.

Wilson, N. and McClean, S. (1994) Questionnaire design A practical introduction.

Wolf, M. M., Butler, L. J., Martin, A. J. and Foltz, J. D. (2009) Factors Influencing the Purchase Decision for Milk Labelled rBST-free and Organic, *Journal of Food Distribution Research,* 40(1), pp. 187-191.

Wolfinbarger, M. (1990) Motivations and symbolism in gift-giving behavior, *Advances in Consumer Research,* 17(1), pp. 699-706.

Wolverton, M. L. (2009) Research Design, Hypothesis Testing, and Sampling, *Appraisal Journal,* 77, pp. 370-382.

Wooten, D. (2000) Qualitative steps toward an expanded model of anxiety in gift-giving, *Journal of Consumer Research,* 27(1), pp. 84-95.

Appendix A: Research Instrument

Questionnaire					
Section 1: Demographic Information					
1	**Age:**	**2**	**Household Monthly Income (R):**	**3**	**Region**
Under 17		Below 2,999		Gauteng	
18 – 24 years		3,000 – 7,999		KZN	
25 – 34 years		8,000 – 13,999		Western Cape	
35 – 44 years		14,000 – 19,999		Eastern Cape	
above 45 years		Above 20,000		Mpumalanga	
4	**Marital Status:**	**5**	**Race**	North West	
Single		African/Black		Limpopo	
Married		White		Free State	
Divorced		Coloured		Northern Cape	
Widowed		Indian			
6	**Gender:**	Asian			
Male					
Female					
Section 2: General Gifting Background					
7	**Do you buy gifts for people in your life regularly?**	**8**	**Who do you generally buy gifts for?**		
Yes		Family			
No		Close Friends			
(If no, we may stop here.)		Other Friends			
		Colleagues			
9	**How often do you buy gifts?**	**10**	**Which Occasions do you buy gifts for?**	**11**	**Which types of gifts do you generally buy?**
More than once in a month		Christmas		Books	
Once in a month		Easter		Flowers	
Once every 3 months		Birthday		Wine	
Once every 6 months		Valentine's Day		Chocolate	
Once an year		Mother's Day		Gift Voucher	
On special occasions (if applicable refer to Q9)		Women's Day		Clothing	
Never (If never, we may stop here.)		Father's Day		Appliances	
		Boss's Day		Jewellery	
		Secretary's Day		Electronics	
				Other (please specify)	

12	Which type of gifts would you generally associate with the following occasions? (Please tick your choices)

Occasion	Type of gift								
	Books	Flowers	Wines	Chocolate	Gift Voucher	Clothing	Appliances	Jewellery	Electronics
Christmas									
Easter									
Birthday									
Valentine's Day									
Mother's Day									
Women's Day									
Father's Day									
Boss's Day									
Secretary's Day									

Section 2: Factors that influence the purchase of gifts in general.

The following attributes have been identified as reasons why people choose to buy certain types of gifts.

Using a 7-point scale where 1 = Strongly Disagree and 7 = Strongly Agree,

Please rate the following attributes indicating to what degree you agree or disagree with them as key reasons why you would choose to buy a particular gift

1 = Strongly Disagree, **2** = Somewhat Disagree, **3** = Disagree, **4** = Neither Nor, **5** = Agree Somewhat,
6 = Agree, **7** = Strongly Agree

"When I buy a gift, my choice of gift is generally driven by..."

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
they are **tasteful**							
they are **unique**							
they are **appropriate for the occasion**							
they look **pretty**							
they are **liked** by the receiver							
they are new and different (**novel**)							
the chocolate is **handmade**							
of their **size**							
they are **imaginative**							
of the **style** and **design** of the packaging							
of their **brand** name							
of the **quality** of chocolate							
I'm buying a gift on the spare of the moment (**spontaneity**)							
the receiver **enjoys** the chocolate							
they are **memorable**							
they are **desirable** to me (something I would like to receive as a gift)							
they show my affection the receiver (**lovingness**)							
they are **innovative**							
they require me to be **thoughtful** in selecting them							
they are **luxurious** & **prestigious**							
they are **indulgent**							
they are **expensive**							
they are recommended by people I trust (**endorsements**)							
they are a **reflection of the receiver's personality**							

Section 3: Chocolate Gifts							
13	**Who would you buy *chocolate* gifts for?**		**14**	**How often do you buy *chocolate* gifts?**			
Family			More than once in a month			Once an year	
Close Friends			Once in a month			On special occasions (if applicable refer to Q9)	
Other Friends			Once every 3 months			Never (If never, we may stop here.)	
Colleagues			Once every 6 months				

Factors that influence the purchase of chocolate as a gift.

Thinking of Chocolate gifts specifically, to what degree would you agree or disagree with these statements as key reasons why you would choose to buy ***chocolate*** as a gift

"When I buy chocolate as a gift, my choice is driven by..."

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
how tasty it is							
how unique it is							
how appropriate it is for the occasion							
how pretty it look							
whether it will be liked by the receiver							
how new and different (novel) it is							
whether the chocolate is handmade							
the size impression							
how imaginative it is							
the style and design of the packaging							
the brand name							
the **quality** of chocolate							
whether I'm buying a gift on the spare of the moment (spontaneity)							
how much the receiver will enjoy it							
how memorable it will be							
how desirable it is to me (something I would like to receive as a gift)							
whether it shows my affection for the receiver (lovingness)							
how innovative it is							
how thoughtful it requires me to be in selecting it							
how luxurious & prestigious it is							
how indulgent it is							
how expensive it is							
whether it is recommended by people I trust (endorsements)							
whether it will be a reflection of the receiver's personality							

Appendix B: Consistency Matrix

Identify the key drivers of the purchasing of chocolate as a gift for different gifting occasions and consumer segments in South Africa.					
Sub-problem	**Literature Review**	**Hypotheses or Propositions or Research questions**	**Source of data**	**Type of data**	**Analysis**
Actual sub-problem 1: Establish the role of chocolate in gifting in the context of other gifts and occasions with the aim of establishing the key driver thereof	(Summers et al., 2006; Bhardwaj and Palaparthy, 2008; Wolf et al., 2009; Lahiri and Samanta, 2010), (Lahiri and Samanta, 2010), (Wolf et al., 2009), (Research and Market Trends, 2006), (Unknown, 2008), (DeVere et al., 1983), (Tuckfelt, 2008), (Research and Market Trends, 2006), (Fischer and Arnold, 1990), (Sherry, 1983), (Caplow and Holmes Williamson, 1980), (The Ultimate Chocolate Shoppe, 2010), (Innova Market Insights, 2009)	**Research Question 1:**What are the key drivers of the purchasing of chocolate as gifts for different gifting occasions in South Africa?	Web-based Survey questionnaire	Quantitative	Correspondence Analysis

Identify the key drivers of the purchasing of chocolate as a gift for different gifting occasions and consumer segments in South Africa.					
Sub-problem	**Literature Review**	**Hypotheses or Propositions or Research questions**	**Source of data**	**Type of data**	**Analysis**
Actual sub-problem 2: Identify the consumer segmentation of chocolate gift purchasing, relating to demographic characteristicsof purchasers, gifting occasion and frequency of gift purchasing.	(Joy, 2001), (DeVere et al., 1983), (Unknown, 2008), (Bainbridge, 2008), (Research and Market Trends, 2006), (Tuckfelt, 2008), (Wolfinbarger, 1990), (Fischer and Arnold, 1990), (Sherry, 1983), (Basil, 2009), (Caplow and Holmes Williamson, 1980), (Gib, 2010), (The Ultimate Chocolate Shoppe, 2010), (Innova Market Insights, 2009)	**Research Question2:**Are the key drivers of the purchasing of chocolate as gifts for different gifting occasions as identified for the South Africa market different for different market segments?	Web-based Survey questionnaire	Quantitative	Cluster Analysis

Appendix C: Data Tables

Short Descriptors for Survey Questions

Short Descriptor	Survey Question
Quality	the quality of chocolate
Taste	how tasty it is
Indulgence	how indulgent it is
Appropriateness	how appropriate it is for the occasion
Packaging Style & Design	the style and design of the packaging
Prettiness	how pretty it look
Brand Name	the brand name
Lovingness	whether it shows my affection for the receiver (lovingness)
Luxurious & Prestigious	how luxurious & prestigious it is
Thoughtfulness	how thoughtful it requires me to be
Memorability	how memorable it will be
Presence of Endorsements	whether it is recommended by people I trust (endorsements)
Reflection of Receiver's Personality	whether it will be a reflection of the receiver's personality
Uniqueness	how unique it is
Imaginative	how imaginative it is
Novelty	how new and different (novel) it is
Innovativeness	how innovative it is
Spontaneity	whether I'm buying a gift on the spare of the moment (spontaneity)
Expensiveness (price)	how expensive it is
Size Impression	the size impression
Handmade	whether the chocolate is handmade
Likability	whether it will be liked by the receiver
Enjoyment	how much the receiver will enjoy it: Positive
Desirability	how desirable it is to me (something I would like to receive as a gift)

Profile of Respondents

Variable	Percentage
Age	
Under 17	0%
18 – 24 years	6%
25 – 34 years	43%
35 – 44 years	34%
above 45 years	17%
Marital Status	
Single	44%
Married	47%
Divorced	4%
Widowed	4%
Household Income	
Below 2,999	1%
3,000 – 7,999	3%
8,000 – 13,999	12%
14,000 – 19,999	15%
Above 20,000	68%

Variable	Percentage
Gender	
Male	22%
Female	78%
Race	
Africa/ Black	32%
White	45%
Coloured	7%
Indian	15%
Asian	1%
Region	
Gauteng	86%
KZN	14%
Western Cape	0%
Eastern Cape	0%
Mpumalanga	0%
North West	0%
Limpopo	0%
Free State	0%
Northern Cape	0%

Overall Means

		Mean	Minimum	Maximum	Std.Dev.	Valid N
1	Quality	6.48	4.0000	7.0000	0.7611	117
2	Likability	6.37	4.0000	7.0000	0.8366	117
3	Enjoyment	6.34	4.0000	7.0000	0.8526	117
4	Tastefulness	6.31	1.0000	7.0000	1.0377	117
5	Indulgence	5.98	3.0000	7.0000	1.1218	117
6	Appropriateness	5.97	2.0000	7.0000	1.0624	117
7	Packaging Style & Design	5.82	2.0000	7.0000	1.1568	117
8	Prettiness	5.74	1.0000	7.0000	1.2134	117
9	Lovingness	5.62	1.0000	7.0000	1.2855	117
10	Brand Name	5.61	1.0000	7.0000	1.4737	117
11	Desirability	5.54	1.0000	7.0000	1.4829	117
12	Luxurious & Prestigious	5.41	1.0000	7.0000	1.4029	117
13	Memorability	5.33	1.0000	7.0000	1.3261	117
14	Thoughtfulness	5.32	1.0000	7.0000	1.3444	117
15	Reflection of Receiver's	5.18	1.0000	7.0000	1.4180	117
16	Uniqueness	5.13	1.0000	7.0000	1.4653	117
17	Presence of Endorsements	5.08	1.0000	7.0000	1.3781	117
18	Imaginative	5.01	1.0000	7.0000	1.3865	117
19	Novelty	4.92	1.0000	7.0000	1.4512	117
20	Innovativeness	4.74	1.0000	7.0000	1.4820	117
21	Spontaneity	4.70	1.0000	7.0000	1.4219	117
22	Expensiveness (price)	4.64	1.0000	7.0000	1.4882	117
23	Size Impression	4.54	1.0000	7.0000	1.5343	117
24	Handmade	4.22	1.0000	7.0000	1.5926	117

Row (Occasions) Contributions

	Weight (relative)	F1	F2	F3	F4	F5	F6	F7	F8
Christmas	0.112	***0.187***	0.001	0.017	0.000	0.009	0.001	0.186	0.293
Easter	0.035	0.069	0.010	0.453	0.291	0.004	0.000	0.038	0.000
Birthday	0.122	***0.120***	0.003	0.000	0.006	0.008	0.008	0.002	0.016
Anniversary	0.076	0.030	0.003	0.028	0.144	0.072	0.204	0.040	0.002
Farewells	0.058	0.002	0.005	0.149	0.185	0.310	0.001	0.058	0.022
Getwell Soon	0.048	***0.103***	***0.125***	0.051	0.012	0.157	0.083	0.064	0.000
Valentine's Day	0.069	0.009	0.002	0.102	0.042	0.003	0.041	0.056	0.179
Mother's Day	0.084	0.016	0.079	0.001	0.056	0.026	0.486	0.037	0.111
Women's Day	0.062	0.013	0.015	0.024	0.003	0.009	0.006	0.004	0.003
Father's Day	0.069	***0.132***	0.034	0.006	0.099	0.373	0.008	0.195	0.031
Boss's Day	0.049	0.015	0.079	0.141	0.034	0.002	0.060	0.179	0.167
Secretary's Day	0.054	0.070	0.059	0.004	0.008	0.001	0.018	0.119	0.058
Take to Dinner Party	0.055	0.094	***0.534***	0.015	0.090	0.000	0.081	0.002	0.059
"I'm sorry" gesture	0.049	0.078	0.051	0.008	0.026	0.023	0.001	0.021	0.053
"Thank You" gesture	0.058	0.063	0.000	0.000	0.003	0.001	0.001	0.001	0.004

Column (Gifts) Contributions

	Weight (relative)	F1	F2	F3	F4	F5	F6	F7	F8
Books	0.110	0.026	0.014	0.195	0.180	0.005	0.170	0.238	0.063
Flowers	0.209	***0.226***	***0.180***	0.126	0.189	0.039	0.002	0.019	0.009
Wines	0.114	0.014	***0.760***	0.068	0.033	0.005	0.006	0.000	0.000
Chocolate	0.228	***0.181***	0.001	0.442	0.140	0.001	0.000	0.006	0.000
Gift Voucher	0.120	0.060	0.023	0.043	0.139	0.298	0.112	0.185	0.020
Clothing	0.073	***0.166***	0.003	0.026	0.035	0.092	0.195	0.001	0.409
Appliances	0.031	0.098	0.003	0.006	0.006	0.029	0.141	0.272	0.413
Jewellery	0.070	0.086	0.008	0.088	0.275	0.265	0.195	0.013	0.000
Electronics	0.044	***0.142***	0.009	0.006	0.005	0.266	0.178	0.265	0.085

Appendix D: Statistics of items (Attributes)

Summary for scale: Mean=129.991 **Std.Dv.**=17.2894 **Valid N**:117 (Only Chocolate Gifting (Responses) interval.sta) **Cronbach alpha**: .899493 **Standardized alpha**: .903637 **Average inter-item corr**.: .289165						
		Mean if - deleted	**Var. if - deleted**	**StDv. if - deleted**	**Itm-Totl - Correl.**	**Alpha if - deleted**
Tastefulness	how tasty it is	123.6838	282.4214	16.8054	0.3708	0.8980
Uniqueness	how unique it is	124.8633	263.0240	16.2180	0.6596	0.8914
Appropriateness	how appropriate it is for the occasion	124.0171	280.5467	16.7495	0.4149	0.8972
Prettiness	how pretty it look	124.2564	272.3103	16.5018	0.5667	0.8941
Likability	whether it will be liked by the receiver	123.6239	282.6620	16.8126	0.4645	0.8968
Novelty	how new and different (novel) it is	125.0684	267.7389	16.3627	0.5612	0.8939
Handmade	whether the chocolate is handmade	125.7692	266.5365	16.3259	0.5276	0.8949
Size Impression	the size impression	125.4530	269.9914	16.4314	0.4789	0.8961
Imaginative	how imaginative it is	124.9829	265.1792	16.2843	0.6513	0.8917
Packaging Style & Design	the style and design of the packaging	124.1709	272.4494	16.5060	0.5941	0.8936
Brand Name	the brand name	124.3846	273.1768	16.5281	0.4337	0.8972
Quality	the quality of chocolate	123.5128	282.6943	16.8135	0.5140	0.8963
Spontaneity	whether I'm buying a gift on the spare of the moment (spontaneity)	125.2906	272.3600	16.5033	0.4708	0.8962
Enjoyment	how much the receiver will enjoy it	123.6496	281.8344	16.7879	0.4846	0.8964
Memorability	how memorable it will be	124.6581	274.4301	16.5659	0.4616	0.8963
Desirability	how desirable it is to me (something I would like to receive as a gift)	124.4530	271.9059	16.4896	0.4576	0.8966
Lovingness	whether it shows my affection for the receiver (lovingness)	124.3761	274.2346	16.5600	0.4834	0.8958
Innovativeness	how innovative it is	125.2564	265.1138	16.2823	0.6051	0.8928
Thoughtfulness	how thoughtful it requires me to be in selecting it	124.6667	268.2052	16.3770	0.6014	0.8930
Luxurious & Prestigious	how luxurious & prestigious it is	124.5812	271.0468	16.4635	0.5081	0.8952
Indulgence	how indulgent it is	124.0085	276.3503	16.6238	0.5054	0.8955
Expensiveness (price)	how expensive it is	125.3504	276.1764	16.6186	0.3654	0.8990
Presence of Endorsements	whether it is recommended by people I trust (endorsements)	124.9145	277.2918	16.6521	0.3762	0.8984
Reflection of Receiver's Personality	whether it will be a reflection of the receiver's personality	124.8120	273.2980	16.5317	0.4515	0.8966

Appendix E: Factor Analysis

		Factor	Factor	Factor
Tastefulness	how tasty it is	-0.04830	0.62664	0.24197
Uniqueness	how unique it is	0.77613	0.07186	0.28999
Appropriateness	how appropriate it is for the occasion	0.12562	0.58762	0.06918
Prettiness	how pretty it look	0.35144	0.30729	0.40669
Likability	whether it will be liked by the receiver	0.11492	0.78286	0.03691
Novelty	how new and different (novel) it is	0.61523	0.09525	0.26873
Handmade	whether the chocolate is handmade	0.56007	-0.04312	0.36708
Size Impression	the size impression	0.36475	0.10599	0.33958
Imaginative	how imaginative it is	0.84132	0.19075	0.02002
Packaging Style & Design	the style and design of the packaging	0.34159	0.54173	0.18595
Brand Name	the brand name	0.08985	0.27850	0.55159
Quality	the quality of chocolate	0.10797	0.76980	0.13749
Spontaneity	whether I'm buying a gift on the spare of the moment (spontaneity)	0.40959	-0.06852	0.51395
Enjoyment	how much the receiver will enjoy it	0.09947	0.78515	0.10689
Memorability	how memorable it will be	0.61920	0.39993	-0.32504
Desirability	how desirable it is to me (something I would like to receive as a gift)	0.19840	0.23454	0.46962
Lovingness	whether it shows my affection for the receiver (lovingness)	0.45796	0.48514	-0.17927
Innovativeness	how innovative it is	0.74905	-0.00518	0.30002
Thoughtfulness	how thoughtful it requires me to be in selecting it	0.41703	0.30792	0.38576
Luxurious & Prestigious	how luxurious & prestigious it is	0.10634	0.28036	0.70936
Indulgence	how indulgent it is	0.19797	0.61142	0.18038
Expensiveness (price)	how expensive it is	0.12061	0.07809	0.58236
Presence of Endorsements	whether it is recommended by people I trust (endorsements)	0.34764	0.20667	0.01931
Reflection of Receiver's Personality	whether it will be a reflection of the receiver's personality	0.61562	0.22345	-0.16304
	Expl.Var	**4.53670**	**4.19009**	**2.76915**
	Prp.Totl	**0.18903**	**0.17459**	**0.11538**