



Uluslararası Sosyal Araştırmalar Dergisi

The Journal of International Social Research

Cilt: 9 Sayı: 43 Volume: 9 Issue: 43

Nisan 2016 April 2016

www.sosyalarastirmalar.com Issn: 1307-9581

CONTRIBUTORY FACTORS OF COLLEGE STUDENTS' FAST-FOOD PREFERENCES AND AN IMPLEMENTATION IN GAZİANTEP

Yakup DURMAZ*

Ercan İNCE**

Esra ÇIKMAZ***

Abstract

As a result of technological developments, innovations which occur in different parts of the world have started to become widespread faster than before. This situation has increased the demand to fast-food products in recent years. This demand increase necessitates examination of fast food preference contributory factors carefully. External source made fast-food consumption habit generally has preferred by students and children. At this point, determination of students' fast-food consumption's contributory factors is important. This research , with the aim of fast-food preference contributory factors identification, consists of Gaziantep University Vocational School of Tourism and Hotel Management' students' ideas. It is conducted a poll with 152 students to make real this aim. At the end of the study; while "promotion decisions effect" and " product effect" factors are found as determinants, "psychological and social environment effect" are not effective on the fast-food preference of students. Also, as it is seen that students' fast-food preference contributory factors have not statistically significant difference with their age and genders.

Keywords: Fast-Food, Students' Preferences.

1. INTRODUCTION

Foods' preparation styles show discrepancies in every age. Today, many effects such as rapid urbanization, meeting western culture, decreasing food preparation time, effects of mass media, developing food industry cause development of fast-food (fast convenience food) inherently. This development has caused changes in people's lifestyles and food habits. Accordingly, this situation caused outdoor nourishment habit. Fast-food means eating in haste. In other words, it means fast and ready nourishment (Medrol, 1994). Fast, ready nourishment system has occurred as a result of person's competition with time. Especially, this nourishment style meets with approval among schoolchildren and university students. Accordingly, factors such as decor, atmosphere, food quality, easy access, service speed, diversity in menu, special products have great importance on fast-food restaurant preferences of youth (Bayraktar et al., 1995). Then, these factors form the starting point of fast-food consumption style. Today, this style consumption phenomenon is seen as the reason for being of food and beverage services industry. Aim of this study showing contributory factors of university students' fast food, which is the consumption style of modern cultures, preferences in Gaziantep country. Also, it is aimed to identify whether there is correlation between fast-food preferences, buying behaviors and variables such as promotion, psychological and social environment. Absence of research which identifies contributory factors of university students' fast-food preferences creates the starting point of this study. This study is designed with information analysis collected from students in Gaziantep within the frame of mentioned necessities. It is hoped that findings are going to contribute to the topic.

2. RESEARCHES RELEATED WITH THE TOPIC

When we view the topic, we see that there are so many researches about the topic. As a result of literature search, we found many native and foreigner researches. In literature, formed by researches about the "outside food consumption", there is not so many researches especially about the fast-food consumption of students. Literature related researches are shown as briefly below.

Boğaz (2003), made a research to understand fast-food preferences of consumers. At the end of the research, Boğaz (2003) confirmed that shoppers go to restaurants with their husbands/wives or their children; the youth with their friends; and people is short on time go to eat quickly.

* Yrd. Doç. Dr., Hasan Kalyoncu University, Faculty of Economics Administrative and Social Sciences.

** Hasan Kalyoncu University, Faculty of Economics Administrative and Social Sciences.

*** Hasan Kalyoncu University, Faculty of Economics Administrative and Social Sciences.

Gül et al. (2003) in their research, prepared with the contributions of Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Affairs Agricultural Economy Research Institute, stated that %55,4 percentage of the families who live in center of Adana have outdoor food consumption tendency. While preference rate of fast-food restaurants located in city is determined as %18, preference rate of regional restaurants is %11, 3.

Knutson (2000) did a research on Michigan State University students with the aim of specifying their fast food restaurants preferences and restaurant brand perceptions. As the result of this research, Burger King thanks to favorite hamburger Whooper is perceived as bigger and tastier brand with its' hamburgers by the students. Also, the most important effective factor of fast food restaurant preferences is found as hygiene.

Sürücüoğlu and Çakıroğlu (2000) did a research on Ankara University students with the aim of analyzing their fast food consumption preferences. At the end of this research, it shows that students generally prefer regional restaurants and they do not support fast food consumption.

Weslen et al. (1999) did a research on high school students with the purpose of confirming social and cultural factors that affect food consumption behaviors. At the end of this research, it is revealed that the first thing come to mind when it is said food is homemade food and fast food is eaten for fun and passing time.

Özçelik and Sürücüoğlu (1998) did a research on consumers to determine their fast food types' preferences. At the end of this research, it is revealed that male and female consumers prefer fast food restaurants because of their tasty foods.

Pastore et al.(1996) did a research on high school students for determining fast food consumption in America. As a result, they confirmed that % 28.0 percentages of the students consume fast food products.

Bayraktar et al. (1995), with the purpose of determining young's fast food restaurant preference reasons, did a research. At the end of this study, it is determined that factors which affect youth's fast food preference are decor, atmosphere, food quality, easy access, express service, menu range etc.

Wyne et al. (1994) did a research on people who live in Seul, South Korea with the aim of determining fast food consumption frequency. At the end of this research, it is stated that fast food consumption variety is more than the other regions.

Hertzler and Frary (1992) did a research on students with the aim of determining nutritional status and outdoor eating circumstances of the students. As a result of this study, it is determined that male students go to fast food restaurants more than female students.

3. METHODOLOGY

In this part information and data of methodology part of the study is presented with titles; aim and importance of the study, population and sample, content of the survey and reliability of measurement.

3.1. Aim and Importance of Research

Aim of this research is revealing university students' fast food preferences contributory factors in Gaziantep. It is aimed to specifying whether there is correlation between promotion, product, psychological and social environment variables and these factors in their fast food preferences buying behaviors.

This study, which is one of the infrequent researches in this topic, is going to give an idea about marketing factors to the employers while they make their correct decisions. Thereby, this study reveals the present deficiencies and problems and finds some solutions. Thanks to these aspects of the study, it is important to supply data for the different populations.

3.2. Hypothesizes of the Study

These are the hypothesizes for reaching the aims stated above;

H₁: There is statistically significant difference between gender variable and contributory factors which affect fast food preferences of the students

H₂: There is statistically significant difference between age variable and contributory factors which affect fast food preferences of the students

3.3. Population and Sample

Population of this study is 750 students from the Gaziantep University Vocational School of Tourism and Hotel Management. In this study, it is aimed to reach the all students. However, because of some reasons, we could not reach to some students. Under these circumstances, it is reached and conducted a questionnaire to 170 students. However, it is understood that 18 one of the questionnaires are filled up missing and/or incorrectly and analysis is made with 152 questionnaires. Some researches intended to determine sample number for representing population state that 140 samples are acceptable for such a big population (Altunışık et al., 2004; Altunışık et al., 2007). Thus, sample in this study has the characteristics of representing this population.

3.4. Content of the Questionnaire

Questionnaire form is used in this study. The questionnaire is constituted from two parts and totally 17 questions. In the first part, there are 6 questions to making inquiries about demographic information and in the second part; there are 11 questions to making inquiries about contributory factors which affect fast food preferences of the students. Questions in the second part of the questionnaire is prepared by making use of questionnaire used in Güler (2009)'s " Global Firms' Promotional Activities' Effects on Gazi and Bilkent University Students' Buying Behaviors: Coca Cola and Pepsi Example" study. In this part, 5 point Likert Scale is used and is coded as "1=strongly Disagree...5=Strongly Agree". "SPSS 21.0" Statistic Program is used for analyzing the data obtained from questionnaires. This implementation was performed by the researchers in 2014, November.

3.5. Limitedness of the Research

This research is limited with Gaziantep University vocational school of tourism and hotel management students' opinions. Students feel uncomfortable themselves in the classroom while they are fulfilling questionnaire. This is also another limitation. Attitudes in the scale are limited with existing questions. Therefore, it should be considered that results of the study are reflections of the existing questions.

4. RESEARCH FINDINGS

Research finding spart is examined in three titles. According to this, in the first title, demographic characteristics of participant students are reflected. In the second title, it is given place to findings about scale accuracy, factor analysis and normality test. Also, in the third title, findings about contributory factors which affect fast food preferences of the students are shown.

4.1. Findings Related with Demographic Features

In this part, there are findings related with demographic features about hotel owner and managers' gender, age, marital status, personal expense and fast food preference. There, frequency and percentage analysis techniques of descriptive statistical techniques are used. Acquired findings are shown in tables.

Table 1: Range According to Participants' Gender

		N	Percentage (%)
Gender	Male	76	50,0
	Female	76	50,0
	Total	152	100,0

Participants' gender range is seen in Table.1. With reference to this, while 76 participants (%50) are men, 76 participants (%50) are women.

Table 2. Range according to Participants' Age Groups

	N	Percentage (%)
18-23	116	76,3
24-29	28	18,4
30-34	3	2,0
35 and over	5	3,3
Total	152	100,0

Participants' age groups range is seen in Table.2. According to this, while 116 (%76.3) participants are between 18-23 age range, 28 (%18.4) participants are between 24-29 age range, 5 (%3.3) participants are between 30-34 and 3 (%2) of them are between 35 and over.

Table 3: Range according to Participants' Marital Status

	N	Percentage (%)
Married	7	4,6
Bachelor	145	95,4
Total	152	100,0

Range according to participants' marital status are seen in Table.3. Marital status of the participants is analyzed and findings are obtained. From 152 participants in total, 7 (%4.6) participants are married and 145 (%95.4) participants are bachelor.

Table 4: Range according to Participants' Monthly Expense

	N	Percentage (%)
350 TL	59	38.8
351-500 TL	52	34.2
501-750 TL	21	13.8
751-1500 TL	11	7.2
1500 TL Üzeri	9	5.9
Total	152	100.0

Participants' monthly expense range is given in Table.4. According to Table, while minority of participants (%7.2) spend 751-1500 TL monthly, most of them (%38.8) spend 350 TL in a month.

Table 5: Generally, Do You Prefer Fast Food Products?

	N	Percentage (%)
Yes	77	50,7
No	75	49,3
Total	152	100.0

Participants' fast food preference range is seen in Table.5. With reference to the table, while 77 (%50.7) participants prefer fast food, 75 (%49.3) participants do not prefer fast food consumption.

Table 6: Participant Preferences of Fast Food Brands

	N	Percentage (%)
Burger- King	66	43.4
McDonalds	34	22.4
Others	52	34.2
Total	152	100.0

Participants' preferences of fast food brands are seen in Table.6. According to this, 66 (%43.4) participants prefer Burger-King, 34 (%22, 4) participants McDonalds, 52 (%34, 2) participants other fast food brands.

4.2. Reliability, Factor Analysis and Normality Tests

In this part, there is analysis of scale reliability and validity, factor analysis, factor groups and normality tests of the questions which takes a part in the second part of the questionnaire. Acquired findings are shown in tables.

Table 7: Reliability Analysis Results

Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
.840	11

Reliability, factor analysis and normality tests are seen in Table .7. For the reliability analysis of scale questions, it is used Cronbach's Alfa value. Whether statements, which form reliability analysis measurement tool, show consistency or not is understood by measuring their relation. Reliability co-efficient has value between 0 and 1. If this value closer to 1, reliability increases (Ural and Kılıç, 2005:258). According to this data, Cronbach's Alfa value is calculated as 0.840. According to Turan (2012: 8) "if Cronbach's Alfa Value is over 0, 70, it shows the scale's reliability". Hence, it is understood that the scale is reliable.

Table 8: Factor Analysis Results

Bartlett's Test	KMO and	
Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy.		0,809
Bartlett's Test of Sphericity	Approx. Chi-Square	719,463
	Df	66
	Sig.	0

Factor analysis results are seen in Table. 8. Before making factor analysis, it is applied "KMO Test" to test sample size suitability. If KMO value be less than 0.50, factor analysis cannot continue and participant number should be increased to proceed analysis (Akdağ, 2011: 25). As seen in Table.8, KMO value is calculated as 0.809 and it is understood that sample size with 152 participants is enough. In order to applying factor analysis on data, minimum 0.60 KMO value is suggested (Pallant, 2001). Therefore, calculated 0.809 KMO value of this study is so higher than suggested KMO value and this situation shows that data of this study is appropriate for factor analysis. Bartlett's test results ($p < 0.01$) shows that data has normal range, as well. (Akdağ, 2011: 25).

Table 9: Factor Load Distributions

Questions		Factor Distributions		
		1	2	3
1.	Easy Access		0,745	
2.	Brand Recognition		0,806	
3.	Brand Advertisements		0,825	
4.	Brand Trust		0,637	
5.	Advertisement Effect (TV and Others)	0,631		
6.	Personal Selling	0,766		
7.	Sales Promotion	0,829		
8.	Introduction and Public Relations	0,840		
9.	Sponsorship Activities	0,810		
10.	Habit			0,675
11.	Family and Close Friends Advice			0,853

Factor load distributions are seen in the Table.9. As result of applied factor analysis, as it is understood that study has three factors. According to this, 5-9 questions (advertisement effect, personal selling, sales promotion, introduction and public relations) in 1. Factor, 1-4. Questions (easy access, brand recognition, brand advertisements, brand trust) in 2. Factor and 10- 11. questions (habit, family and close friends advice) in 3. Factor come together.

Table 10: Factor Divisions

Factor Divisions					
1.	Factor	2.	Factor	3.	Factor
"Promotion Decisions" Behaviors	Effect on Buying Behaviors	"Product" Behaviors	Effect on Buying Behaviors	"Psychological and Social Environment" Effect on Buying Behaviors	

After factor distributions are analyzed, it is understood that 1. Factor questions are relevant with promotion decisions on buying behaviors, 2. Factor questions are relevant with product effect on buying behaviors and 3. Factor questions are relevant with psychological and social environment on buying behaviors.

Table 11: Kolmogorov - Smirnov Test

Factors	Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test		
	Statistic	SD	p
1. Factor: Promotion Decisions Effect	0,099	152	0,001
2. Factor: Product Effect	0,124	152	0,000
3. Factor: Psychological and Social Environment Effect	0,099	152	0,001

After this step, whether these three factors show normal distribution or not is analyzed with Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test ($n > 30$). As analysis result, $p < 0.05$ is calculated and as it is seen that data does not have normal distribution. So, in data analysis, nonparametric techniques are used. Acquired results are shown in Table. 10.

4.3. Other Findings

In this part, there are analysis of mean, standard deviation, factors and variables, Mann-Whitney U test and Kruskal Wallis H Test of the questions which take a part in the second part of the questionnaire. Obtained findings are shown in tables.

Table 12: Mean and Standard Deviation of Factors

Expressions		
1. Factor Promotion Decisions Effect	Mean	Standart Deviation
Advertisements Effect (TV and Others)	2,8026	1,5313
Personal Selling	2,7829	1,4044
Sales Promotion	2,9934	1,3445
Introduction and Public Relations	3,1974	1,3907
Sponsorship Activities	2,9145	1,5047
2. Factor Product Effect		
Easy Access	3,3684	1,4769
Brand Recognition	3,5461	1,5347
Brand's Advertisements	3,1579	1,5445
Trust Towards to Brand	3,6579	1,4653
Friend Recommendation	3,0329	1,4485
3. Factor Psychological and Social Environment Effect		
Habit	2,9605	1,5306
Family and Close Friends Effect	2,4408	1,5343

According to data, the most important students' fast food preference contributory factor is " Trust towards to Brand ($3,6579 \pm 1,4653$) ". Second and third effective factors are "Brand Recognition ($3,5461 \pm 1,5347$)" and " Easy Access ($3,3684 \pm 1,4769$)".

Least effective three factors are seen as "Advertisement Effect ($2,8026 \pm 1,5313$) , Personal Sale ($2,7829 \pm 1,4044$) and Family and Close Friends' Advice ($2,4408 \pm 1,5343$)".

Table 13. Comparing Fast Food Preference Factors with Mann-Whitney U Test According to Gender

	Gender	Percentage	Mann-Whitney U	Z	P
1. Factor: Promotion Effect	Male	75,26	2793,5	-0,349	0,727
	Female	77,74			
2. Factor: Product Effect	Male	74,63	2746,0	-0,524	0,698
	Female	78,37			
3. Factor: Psychological and Social Environment Effect	Male	78,97	2700,5	-0,698	0,485
	Female	74,03			

According to Table 13, there is not statistical significant difference between contributory factors of students' fast food preferences and their **gender**. In this manner, H_1 hypothesis is rejected.

Table 14: Comparing Fast Food Preference Factors with Kruskal Wallis H Test According to Age

Factors	Group Average Values				Ki Kare	SD	P
	18-23 Age	24-29 Age	30-34 Age	35 and Above Age			
1. Factor	72,89	89,98	73,17	86,8	3,715	3	0,294
2. Factor	74,06	85,36	90	75,4	1,782	3	0,619
3. Factor	74,65	82,45	94,67	75,2	1,257	3	0,739

According to Table 14, there is not statistical significant difference between contributory factors of students' fast food preferences and their age. In this manner, H_2 hypothesis is rejected.

CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTIONS

In this research, Gaziantep University Vocational School of Tourism and Hotel Management students' fast food preferences contributory factors are determined and it is presented whether there is a relation between students' attitudes and some demographic variables. According to this, obtained results are these ones:

Gaziantep University students' fast food preferences contributory factors consist of three factors; "Promotion Decisions Effect, Product Effect, Psychological and Social Environment Effect". First factor "Promotion Decisions Effect" dimensionis formed by 5 items, second factor "Product Effect" is formed by 4 items and finally third factor "Psychological and Social Environment Effect" is formed by 2 items. Mean of "Promotion Decisions Effect" dimension's 5 items is seen as "Partially Agree". According to this result, advertisement effect, personal sale, promotion, introduction and public relations, sponsorship activities have partial effect on fast food preferences of participant students. Mean of "Product Effect" dimension's 4 items is seen as "Strongly Agree". According to this, easy access, brand recognition, brand advertisements and trust towards to brand are totally determinative. In other words, students give a clear idea about these topics. Mean of "Psychological and Social Environment Effect" dimension's 2 items is seen as "Disagree". According to this result, habit, family and close friends' suggestions are not totally determinative. In other words, as it is seen that students do not agree to these aspects. Therefore, scale's product effect dimension's mean is found higher than the other dimensions. Accordingly, it is possible to say that product effect behavior is more at the forefront on students' fast food product preferences. Gender and marital status do not have any decisive effect on students' fast food products and brands preferences.

Some suggestions towards research:

Besides its' contribution to the area for researches in other universities at the west part of country, it is going to give comparison chance for other studies. Also, this research provides opportunity to determining students' tendencies towards Turkish brands.

REFERENCE

- Akbulut, Y. (2010). *Sosyal Bilimlerde SPSS Uygulamaları*, İstanbul: İdeal Kültür Yayınları.
- Akdağ, M. (2011). *SPSS'de İstatistiksel Analizler Ders Notları*
- Arpacı, T. (1992). *Pazarlama*, 1. Baskı, Gazi Yayınları: Ankara
- Bayraktar, M., Babekoğlu, Y. ve Salman, M. (1995). *Tüketicilerin Fast Food Restoran Tercihlerini Etkileyen Faktörler*, A.Ü. Ziraat Fakültesi Yayınları: Ankara.
- Boğaz, H., (2003). *Tüketicilerin Hızlı Hazır (fast food) Yiyecek Tercihleri Üzerinde Bir Araştırma*. Yayınlanmamış Yüksek lisans tezi, Ankara: Ankara Üniversitesi.
- Çağlar, İ., Kılıç, S. (2010). *Pazarlama* 3. Baskı, Nobel Yayınları: Ankara
- Frey, W. A. (1963). *Promotion , Marketing in Business Management*, McMillan Corn ., New York.
- Gül, A., Akbay, A. Ö., Dölekoğlu, C. Ö., Özel, R. ve Akbay, C. (2003). *Adana İli Kentsel Alanda Ailelerin Dışı Gıda Tüketimlerinin Belirlenmesi*. Ankara: Tarımsal Ekonomi Araştırma Enstitüsü, Yayın No 95.
- Güler, D. (2009). *Küresel İşletmelerin Tutundurma Faaliyetlerinin Gazi ve Bilkent Üniversitesi Öğrencilerinin Satın Alma Davranışları Üzerindeki Etkileri: Coca Cola ve Pepsi Örneği*. Yüksek Lisans Tezi. Gazi Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü : Ankara.
- Hertzler, A. A. and R-Frary. (1992). "Dietary Status and Eating Out Practices of College Students." *Diet Assoc* 92 (7), 867-869.
- Kotler, P., Armstrong, G. (1991). *Principles of Marketing*, Prentice Hall Inc., Englewood Cliffs
- Kotler, P. (1984). "Risk of Predation and the Structure of Desert Rodent Communities", *Ecology Management*, 65(3), 689-701.
- Knutson, B. J. (2000). "College Students and Fast Food, Cornell Restaurant Brands", *Cornell Hotel and Restaurant Administration Quarterly*, 41(3), 68-74..
- Kurtz, D. (2008). *Contemporary Marketing*, Thompson South-Western, 13. Edition.
- Lascu, D., Clow, N. K. E. (2004). *Marketing Frontiers Concepts and Tools*, Atomic Dog Publishing, Ohio.

- Merdol, T.K., (1994), *Dünyada ve Türkiye’de fast food türleri. Hızlı hazır yemek sistemi (fast food)*. Türkiye Diyetisyenler Derneği Yayını: Ankara.
- Mucuk, İ.(1980). *Modern Pazarlamada Mamul Planlama ve Geliştirme Stratejileri*: İstanbul
- Mucuk, İ.(2013). *Modern İşletmecilik*, 18. Baskı, Türkmen Kitapevi: İstanbul
- Mucuk, İ.(1982).*Pazarlama İlkeleri*: İstanbul.
- Özçelik, A. Ö. ve Sürücüoğlu, M. S. (1998). “Tüketicilerin “Fast Food Türü” Yiyecek Tercihler”i, *Gıda Dergisi* 23(6): 437-444.
- Pallant, J. (2001). *SPSS Survival Manual a Step-by-step Guide to Data Analysis Using Spss for Windows*. Philadelphia: PA Open University Press
- Pastore, D. R., Fisher, M. and Friedman, S. B., (1996). Abnormalities In Weight Status, Eating Attitudes, And Eating Behaviors Among Urban High School Students. *Journal of Adolescent Health*, 18 (5), 312-319.
- Sürücüoğlu, M. S. ve Çakıroğlu, F. P. (2000). “Ankara Üniversitesi Öğrencilerinin Hızlı Hazır Yiyecek Tercihleri Üzerinde Bir Araştırma”, *A.Ü. Tarım Bilimleri Dergisi*, 6(3):116-121.
- Tokol, T. (1983). “Reklamcılığın Gelişme Potansiyeli ve Sorunları” , *Uludağ Üniversitesi, İ.İ.B.F. Dergisi*.80 (2),65-67.
- Turan, İ.(2012). Temel İstatistik Ders Notları
- Ural, A. ve Kılıç, İ. (2005). *Bilimsel araştırma süreci ve SPSS ile veri analizi*. Detay Yayıncılık: Ankara
- Weslen, A and Fjellström, C. (1999). Attitudes Toward Food Among Teenagers, *Nutrition Throughout The Life Cycle-Children, Teenager ,Adults*, v.99 (9), 68.
- Wright, S. J., Warner, D. (1971). *Winter I. Willis ; Advertising* : New York.
- Wyne, M., M. J., Lee and S. J. Moon, (1994). “Fast food consumption in South Korea”, *Journal of Consumer Studies and Home Economics* 18, 279-291.