

9-30-2022

College Students' Purchase Behaviors of Single-Serve Premium Juices

Robin Hardin

University of Tennessee, robh@utk.edu

Michelle L. Childs

University of Tennessee, mlchilds@utk.edu

Win G-Y Koo

Troy University, wkoo@troy.edu

Kwangho Park

Viterbo University, kpark@viterbo.edu

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.georgiasouthern.edu/jamt>



Part of the [Marketing Commons](#), and the [Sports Studies Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Hardin, Robin, Childs, Michelle, Koo, Gi-Yong, and Park, Kwangho (2022). College students' purchase behavior of single-serve premium juices. *Journal of Applied Marketing Theory*, 9(1), 35-47. ISSN: 2151-3236.

This article is brought to you for free and open access by the Journals at Digital Commons@Georgia Southern. It has been accepted for inclusion in *Journal of Applied Marketing Theory* by an authorized administrator of Digital Commons@Georgia Southern. For more information, please contact digitalcommons@georgiasouthern.edu.

College Students' Purchase Behaviors of Single-Serve Premium Juices

Cover Page Footnote

None



College Students' Purchase Behavior of Single-Serve Premium Juices

Robin Hardin
Michelle Childs
Gi-Yong Koo
Kwangho Park

AUTHOR INFORMATION

Robin Hardin
University of Tennessee
robh@utk.edu

Michelle Childs
University of Tennessee
mlchilds@utk.edu

Gi-Yong Koo
Troy University
wkoo@troy.edu

Kwangho Park
Viterbo University
kpark@viterbo.edu

ABSTRACT

There has been a surge in demand for premium single-serve juices, and college students may be in the forefront of this growing trend because of the perceived social status accompanied by their consumption. External influence (i.e., peer influence and social status) emerged as a component of motivation for the use of premium juices. Findings contribute to Veblen's theory of conspicuous consumption, demonstrating that consumer motivation for status-laden products occurs even for consumable products that are relatively low cost.

Keywords: *College students, Single-serve premium juices, Motivations, Health behavior, Impulse buying.*

INTRODUCTION

College students are a unique consumer group that seeks to acquire goods and services that support their interests (Jadhav et al., 2016; Lee & Kim, 2020). These interests may include health and fitness initiatives to cope with the stress that arises with the transition into higher education as well as a general interest in maintaining a healthy lifestyle (Blonna, 2005; Leppink et al., 2016) or participation in trendy nutritional choices (Lee & Worthy, 2020). One such way to contribute to these goals and outcomes is consumption of single-serve premium juices (e.g., Naked Juices, Kevita Juices, fresh pressed juices from juice bars (e.g., Jamba, Tropical Smoothie Cafe)). There has been a recent surge in demand for premium single-serve juices. In fact, as more consumers are replacing coffee or soft drinks with healthier options (Kalyanaraman, 2018), the vegetable and fruit juice industry is steadily increasing and is expected to reach more than \$257 billion by 2025 (Grand View Research, 2018).

One other factor that may be playing in the demand of single-serve premium juices is the perceived external influence (i.e., peer influence and social status) accompanied by the consumption of them. Selection of food can be driven by peer influence and the social status of items (Elliot, 2014; Hardin et al., 2022), and an individual's social status is assessed through their food consumption choices (Stead et al., 2011). Just as social status is enhanced through simply holding a Starbucks coffee, single-serve premium juices has evolved and materialized as a status symbol (Meltzer, 2019; Rosman, 2013). Consumers may be motivated for consumption of single-serve premium juices for factors related to health, but it is possible that the premium price and current trend of juice consumption may further enhance consumption due to its symbol of status (Hardin et al., 2022). However, researchers have yet to understand the reasons (i.e., motivational factors) that contribute to single-serve premium juice consumption. Thus, the purpose of the study is to examine college students' motivations for purchasing single serve-premium juice, and its impact on future purchase behavior.

College students were the chosen population because they may also be particularly susceptible to peer influence and social status associated with buying (Yurchisin & Johnson, 2009) and impulse buying behaviors (Atalay & Meloy, 2011). Impulse buying is characterized as an immediate unplanned purchase, where buyers had no previous intentions to buy a particular product category or fulfill the buying task (Beatty & Ferrell, 1998). Expressions such as "retail therapy" describe when consumers purchase products to relieve stress and make oneself feel happier. College students may participate in impulsive, unplanned purchasing behavior to regulate and improve their mood, condition or emotion (Atalay & Meloy, 2011). Impulsivity can be a factor related to consumption choices, but there is not a clear understanding of how impulsive buying tendencies interact with their motivational choices and thus, impact the consumption of single-serve premium juices among college students. Thus, this study incorporates impulsive buying behavior to further understand students' consumption motivations for single-serve premium juice. This understanding will aid brand marketers and merchandising experts in an understanding of factors that can lead to consumption of health-related products.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Generational Characteristics

Several studies indicate generational differences across attitudes and behavior (e.g., Becton et al., 2014; Kamenidou et al., 2020; Lee & Kim, 2020; Twenge, 2010). Generation X, known as the lost or "sandwich generation" are most likely to be the age group of parents with college-aged students (aged 41-56). Unlike previous generations, Generation X is characterized as having greater focus on maintaining a work-life balance and are accustomed to being responsible and independent (Kuligowski, 2020). Interestingly, Generation X is the first generation of daycare children with an increased likelihood of two working parents (Ryback, 2016), and thus, their children may be more likely exposed to convenience consumption and immediate gratification. Possibly, delivering these habits as part of their own parenting behavior. Generation X's children are likely within the Generation Z generation (college-aged 21-24). Generation Z is characterized as digitally native and have never experienced life without the internet (Dolot, 2018). Compared to previous generations, Generation Z has strikingly different viewpoints on social and political issues compared to previous generations (Parker & Igielnik, 2020). Generation Z is also less likely to be employed than previous generations as teens and young adults, instead, focusing on being the best-educated generation (Parker & Igielnik, 2020). When employed, this generation is considered less loyal, instead, seek attractive work that allows for flexibility (Gaidhani et al., 2019). Their digitally connected experiences also translate to their educational experiences; Generation Z students crave integration of digital contents within their coursework and related experiences (Vizcaya-Moreno et al., 2020). Although still young, Generation Z has significant spending power, spending a large portion of their income on dining out (Parker & Igielnik, 2020). This generation also exhibits higher awareness of and orientation towards ethical and environmental issues, translating to their buying decisions (Djafarova & Fouts, 2022). However, Generation Z still seeks value and quality when making purchase decisions and can splurge on luxury items that are unique to their interests (NRF, 2017). Generation Z is still very dependent of their parents for consumption decisions due to their age and late entry into the workforce (Parker & Igielnik, 2020).

College Student Health and Buying Behavior

College students are the focus on this study due to their unique buying behaviors (Jadhav et al., 2016; Wang & Xiao, 2009), particularly as it relates to their health. For example, college students regularly are stressed trying to balance their social and academic endeavors, often missing opportunities to maintain a healthy lifestyle, such as, eating healthy, finding time to exercise, and making sleep a priority. Behaviors such as unhealthy eating, smoking, or lack

of exercise are commonly reported among college students (Calamidas & Crowell, 2018). However, an increasing amount of college students are spending time on maintaining a healthy lifestyle (Blonna, 2005; Leppink et al., 2016). In fact, a national study indicated that healthy behaviors including consuming the recommended fruit and vegetable consumption and maintaining moderate to vigorous physical activity positively influences students' grades, when compared to those with reported unhealthy behaviors (Beane, 2020). However, despite these impactful findings, college students may find challenges implementing behaviors to improve their health. Health behaviors may be difficult to sustain with limited time schedules, late hours studying and the lack of a consistent schedule. For this reason, college students may turn to grab-and-go consumption behaviors and may seek convenience as part of their shopping behavior (College Consensus, 2020).

Today's college student is characterized as a multi-tasker and often perceived as time-crunched and stressed (College Consensus, 2020; Konova & Yuan, 2017; Zepp et al., 2018). College students hold high spending power in the United States; reported at \$376 billion in 2019 (Sifontes, 2021) in spite of the high cost of higher education and potential debt accrued. A significant amount of this spending (\$39.6 billion) is spent on food and beverage alone (Sifontes, 2021). The rise of being consistently connected has been pinpointed as a factor that contributes to a high rise in food and beverage spending among this population. Particularly, the high consumption of food and beverage purchases can be attributed to the rise of social media. For instance, college students may splurge for Instagram-worthy images (including food and beverage choices) or may even use purchase behavior as an avenue for socializing and stress reduction (Sifontes, 2021). College students as young adults are oftentimes carrying greater levels of stress stemming from academic rigor, living situations, and alterations in social support systems (Lupien et al., 2009; Leppink et al., 2016), which may impact their purchasing behavior. More specifically, college students' elevated levels of stress can significantly impact academic and health-related outcomes which can be associated with impulsivity and impulsive buying behaviors (Forney & Park, 2009; Leppink et al., 2016).

Conspicuous and Status Consumption

The drive to enhance one's social standing is one of the strongest motivational considerations which significantly shapes consumers' behavior (Amaldoss & Jain, 2005; Goldsmith et al., 2014; Kim & Jang, 2014). Status products are those that possess high-perceived quality, luxury, prestige, and/or high class attached (Shermach, 1997). In essence when individuals seek to consume for status, they are wanting to gain prestige from acquiring status-laden items. Conspicuous consumption is the visual display or use of these status-laden products in front of others' to advance their social standing (O'Cass & McEwen, 2004). Thus, these terms are often used interchangeably (O'Cass & McEwen, 2004).

Grounded in Veblen's (1899/1994) theory of conspicuous consumption, consumers are able to signal their status and standing through purchasing and demonstrating products that radiate social status (Amaldoss & Jain, 2005; Goldsmith et al., 2014; Lee et al., 2019). Historically, society's elite consumers (i.e., leisure class) acquire and showcase high-status items to demonstrate their high social hierarchy to onlookers (Veblen, 1899/1994). For consumers' who occupy a lower social standing (i.e., working class), they may imitate consumption behaviors of those occupying higher social standing by purchasing products or services that are considered prestige, regardless of the items' price-point (Leibenstein, 1950; Veblen, 1899/1994). Consumers are willing to pay more for status-laden items, beyond any equivalence based on product function due to the signaling value of status products (Bagwell & Bernheim, 1996; Goldsmith et al., 2014).

In line with Veblen's theory (1899/1994) of conspicuous consumption, signaling theory (Spence, 1973) further explains consumers' status seeking action. Consumers' use their behavior and status-laden items to distance themselves from undesirable parties while associating themselves with desirable parties (Spence, 1973). Both Veblen's theory (1899/1994) of conspicuous consumption and signaling theory (Spence, 1973) describe consumers' purchase behavior practices in order to visually showcase their social standing to onlookers.

Consumers, and in particular college students, are finding new ways to establish and showcase their social hierarchy as status-laden items are becoming more accessible and varied in the marketplace. Consumer researchers have established that a variety of product categories serve as status symbols which motivate purchase and display behavior, including luxury fashion products (e.g., Giovannini et al., 2015; Shao et al., 2019), cause-associated or charity products (e.g., Jai, 2013; Wallace et al., 2017; 2018; West, 2004), premium food products (e.g., Lee et al., 2019) and dining at luxury cafés (e.g., Kim & Jang, 2014). Growing evidence suggests that college aged or young consumers are contributing to the growth of conspicuous consumption (Barrera & Ponce, 2020). This age-group is characterized as

competitive, which can contribute to their need to demonstrate their status through conspicuous means (Barrera & Ponce, 2021) and can be used for self-expression purposes (Shin et al., 2021). Young consumers are also inclined to spend more on everyday items, such as premium coffee at specialty businesses, because it offers status and prestige to onlookers (Kim & Jang, 2014). The popular press illustrates that the premium single-serve juice trend (e.g., fresh pressed juices) may serve as a status symbol for college aged students as the purchase and display of premium single-serve juices signal consumers' lifestyle and financial status (Kahn, 2019). Premium single-serve juices also conspicuously showcase college students' projected health behaviors and status. Bulk items or similar products consumed in private or at a reduced cost lacks these conspicuous characteristics. In this case, college students may select particular products or brands that serve to craft their self-image and showcase their lifestyle (Munteanu & Pagalea, 2014).

Overall, the aforementioned research indicates that college students may exhibit a variety of motivating factors for consumption of conspicuous and status-laden products in general. However, it is unclear which motivations emerge as important elements for consumption of premium single-serve juices specifically. Thus, the first research question was formed to investigate:

RQ1: What are the motivational factors for premium single-serve juice consumption among college students?

Impulsive Buying

Impulse buying as a buying behavior is characterized as an immediate unplanned purchase, where buyers had no intentions to buy the specific product or fulfill the buying task (Beatty & Ferrell, 1998). Expressions such as “retail therapy” describe an activity where consumers purchase products to relieve stress and alleviate unpleasant psychological states (Baumeister, 2002; Darrat et al., 2016). College students may participate in impulsive, unplanned purchasing behavior to regulate and improve their mood, condition or emotion (Atalay & Meloy, 2011). As a result, researchers have called for an understanding of retail and marketing factors that may curb unhealthy impulse buying; encouraging healthy behaviors (Iyer et al., 2019). One such way to encourage healthy behaviors is through perceived social status of consumption choices. For instance, in a study of young adults, researchers found that food consumption of certain foods can be driven by the perceived social status of consumed items (Elliot, 2014), where an individuals' social status is assessed through their food consumption choices (Stead et al., 2011). Just as holding a Starbucks coffee may be perceived as trendy and capable of communicating social status, premium juices has evolved and emerged as a new status symbol (Hardin et al., 2022; Meltzer, 2019; Rosman, 2013). Some consumers may be motivated for premium-juices consumption for health-related factors, but the premium price and current juice trend may further strengthen consumption choices due to its status-laden symbol (Hardin et al., 2022). Based on the aforementioned, this study seeks to understand the following research questions:

RQ2: Do motivational factors for premium single-serve juice consumption among college students differ by their degree of impulsive buying?

RQ3: Do motivational factors for premium single-serve juice consumption among college students influence future purchase intention?

METHOD

Data Collection

Institutional Review Board approval was obtained prior to invitation to participate in the study. An e-mail was sent to instructors of undergraduate seminar courses and large lecture courses asking them to distribute the e-mail invitation to their students. The email invitation explained the purpose of the study and provided a link to an online questionnaire. There was no incentive for participation, and respondents self-selected into the study with data collection lasting approximately 60 days. The opening of questionnaire explained the purpose of the study, and provided examples (i.e., Naked Juices, Kevita Juices, fresh pressed juices from juice bars (e.g., Jamba, Tropical Smoothie Cafe)) of single-serve premium juices to familiarize respondents with the products. The questionnaire consisted of four parts: (a) motivational factors, (b) impulse buying behavior, (c) purchase behavior, and (d) demographics.

Survey Instrument

Motivations

Several measurement items were identified from a wide range of motivations for consumption to identify possible motivators for premium single-serve juice products. These items were derived from studies on college student behavior for purchase decisions or consumption habits. Eighteen items measured agreement with consumption motivations using a 7-point rating scale anchored by 1 = strongly disagree and 7 = strongly agree. Five potential factors were conceptualized in attempt to determine the motivational factors for consumption of premium single-serve juice products (see Table 1).

Five items were used to measure health benefits which asserts that consumption is based on the perceived health and nutritional benefits of the products as well as providing an alternative to soft drinks. These items were derived from Mai and Hoffman's (2012) study of why consumers purchase health-food products. Three items were used to measure personal preference in that the respondents enjoy the taste of the product and the products provide good value for the price. These items were developed based on Ruihley and Hardin's (2015) examination on why consumers purchase specific food and drink products at sporting events. Social status was measured by four items and provides an indication that the consumers want to be perceived as having a healthy lifestyle. These items were modified based on Eastman et al.'s (1999) scale development for product purchase or use based on social status. Peer influence was measured by three items and references that the single-serve premium juices are consumed based on the recommendations of friends. These items were conceptualized using Mangleburg et al.'s (2004) study of how peer influence impacts purchasing decisions. The fifth motivation factor was convenience. It was measured by three items and can be described as the consumption is based on the readily availability of the products, and that it can be consumed on the go as well as serve as a meal replacement. The items for convenience were constructed using research by Brunner et al. (2010) and De Boer et al. (2004) in their examination of how convenience influenced consumer behavior and purchasing habits.

Impulse Buying

Respondents also answered questions related to their impulsive buying behavior. Nine items were used to measure this concept on a 1 to 7 scale anchored by 1 = strongly disagree and 7 = strongly agree. The statements were modified based on Hausman's (2000) study of impulse buying behavior on consumer choices. Statements included I feel like buying things on the spur of the moment; I often buy things without thinking, and Sometimes I am a bit reckless about what I buy.

Future Purchase Intentions

Future purchase intention was measured by three items on a 1 to 7 scale anchored by 1 = strongly disagree and 7 = strongly agree. This scale was utilized based on behavioral intention scales utilized in existing research examining consumer behavior regarding motivational factors for the purchase of team-related merchandise, fan attendance, and website usage (Childs et al., 2019; Hardin et al., 2012; Koo & Hardin, 2008; Love et al., 2011).

RESULTS

The questionnaire began with a screening question inquiring about the use of premium single-serve juices. Potential respondents ($n = 97$) who indicated they did not purchase these products were exited from the study. Respondents ($n = 145$) who replied they have purchased single-serve premium juices completed the questionnaire. Respondents were a mix of undergraduate students at a large university in the Southeastern United States and were primarily women (61.4%) and White (73.8%). The gender results are representative of the university as the overall undergraduate enrollment as women comprise 52.6% of undergraduate students. The ethnicity is also representative as the undergraduate enrollment is comprised of 78.7% of students who identify as White.

Classification of Impulsive Behaviors

The study employed hierarchical cluster analysis using Ward's method to determine the number of clusters (Punj & Stewart, 1983). Findings indicated that two clusters were appropriate for the study. The K-means cluster analysis was used to assign a group membership after extracting the clusters. Cluster 1 included 71 respondents (48.97%) while 74

respondents (51.03%) were classified into Cluster 2. The results of ANOVAs also supported this classification as all impulse buying behaviors are statistically different between Cluster 1 and Cluster 2 (see Table 1). Thus, the respondents were separated into two groups: (a) Cluster 1 - low impulsive behavior (LIB); and (b) Cluster 2 - high impulsive behavior (HIB).

Table 1. Analysis of Variance for Impulse Buying

Statement	Cluster 1- LIB Mean (SD)	Cluster 2- HIB Mean (SD)	F	p
I often buy things spontaneously.	2.44 (1.58)	5.31 (1.27)	145.93	.000
“Just do it” describes the way I buy things.	1.90 (1.27)	4.99 (1.31)	207.83	.000
I often buy things without thinking.	1.62 (1.05)	4.65 (1.37)	222.55	.000
“I see it, I buy it” describes me.	1.54 (.97)	4.23 (1.56)	154.97	.000
“Buy now, think about it later” describes me.	1.54 (1.01)	4.12 (1.56)	138.88	.000
Sometimes I feel like buying things on the spur of the moment.	2.28 (1.50)	5.35 (1.16)	189.81	.000
I buy things according to how I feel at the moment.	2.28 (1.61)	5.22 (1.17)	158.84	.000
I carefully plan most of my purchases	4.24 (2.30)	3.59 (1.29)	4.37	.038
Sometimes I am a bit reckless about what I buy.	2.01 (1.33)	4.89 (1.50)	149.98	.000

Underlying Structure of Motives

An exploratory factor analysis (EFA) with Varimax rotation was used to understand the underlying structure of the motivational factors addressing RQ1. Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin was .818, higher than the acceptable limit of .5, verifying the sampling adequacy (Field, 2013). One item was cross loaded on more than one factor and the other item’s factor loading was less than 1 therefore removed. The results of the factor analysis identified three factors having Eigenvalues higher than 1 (see Table 2). This extracted factor model accounted for 68.04% of the total variance of motives. The factors were identified as follows: (a) Factor 1 (external influence); 37.78%; (b) Factor 2 (health benefits; 20.22%); (c) Factor 3 (convenience; 10.34%) External influence refers to consumption based on peers’ use of the products as well as the perceived social status accompanying the use of the premium single-serve juices. Health benefits is derived from the perceived health-related benefits from consumption of the product such as the nutrients provided and as alternative to other types of beverages. Convenience is a reference the single-serve nature of the products as well as the readily availability of the products and their use as meal replacements.

Table 2. Exploratory Factor Analysis for Motivations

Item	Factor 1 External Influence	Factor 2 Health Benefits	Factor 3 Convenience
Drinking single-serve premium juices enhances my image.	.841		
I drink single-serve premium juices because my friends do.	.872		
Drinking them provides social status.	.784		
My friends recommend I drink them.	.847		
I want to be perceived as living a healthy lifestyle.	.686		
My friends drink single-serve premium juices.	.634		
They are popular among my friends.	.671		
They have nutritional value.		.875	
They are healthy.		.860	
I want to live a healthy lifestyle.		.722	

They are readily available to purchase.				.825
They are easy to drink on the go.				.781
They provide an alternative to soft drinks.				.614
Eigen Value:		4.912	2.628	1.304

Differences in Motives between Impulsive Behavior Groups

A multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) was used to examine the difference in motives according to the level of impulsive behavior which addressed RQ2 (see Table 3). The result of the Box’s test was not significant ($p \leq .793$), meeting the equality of covariance matrices between clusters. Using Pillai’s trace statistics, the results of MANOVA indicated statistically significant differences between the two impulsive behavior groups with respect to the motives [$F_{(1, 143)} = 937.002, p \leq .001$]. The MANOVA results demonstrated that HIB has significantly higher factor 1 (External Influence; [$F_{(1, 143)} = 6.216, p \leq .014$] than LIB.

Table 3. Descriptive Statistics and MANOVA

Factor	LIB		HIB		F	p ≤
	M	SD	M	SD		
Factor 1 External Influence	3.16	1.22	3.83	1.49	6.216	.014
Factor 2 Health Benefits	5.50	1.18	5.58	1.18	.117	.733
Factor 3 Convenience	5.16	1.27	5.20	1.24	.092	.762

Relationship between Motives and Future Purchase Intentions

Multiple regression analysis was conducted to examine how future purchase intention is influenced by motivational variables related to premium single-serve juice consumption among the college student population to answer RQ3. There was no violation of multicollinearity as the values of VIF were less than 10 and the tolerance statistics were higher than 0.2 (Field, 2013). The overall model was significant, $F_{(3, 109)} = 21.787, p \leq .001$. Results indicated that Factor 1 (external influence; $t=2.144, p \leq .034$), factor 2 (health benefits; $t=3.538, p \leq .001$), and factor 3 (convenience; $t=4.041, p \leq .001$) influenced future purchase intentions. (Table 4).

Table 4. The Influence of Motivations on Behavior

Factor	β	t	p ≤
Factor 1 (External Influence)	.174	2.145	.034
Factor 2 (Health Benefits)	.294	3.538	.001
Factor 3 (Convenience)	3.39	4.041	.001

DISCUSSION AND IMPLICATIONS

College students are interested in the acquisition and display of status-laden products that help to project their perceived lifestyle (Barrera & Ponce, 2021; Shin et al., 2021), and that may also help to showcase their health-related behaviors (Blonna, 2005; Leppink et al., 2016). Premium single-served juices are likely to possess status-laden characteristics when conspicuously displayed to onlookers, due to their premium price and ability to signal the purchasers’ health orientation (Kahn, 2019). For these reasons, an increasing amount of college students are likely to seek fruit and juice beverages as an alternative to coffee or soda (Kalyanaraman, 2018) in line with the general trend of a steadily increasing vegetable and fruit juice industry (Grand View Research, 2018). Overall, to understand this

phenomenon more comprehensively, this study sought to capture the motivational factors for consumption of premium single-serve juice among college students and its influence on future purchase intentions, and further, whether motivational factors differed by students' impulsive buying status.

First, in understanding the factors that contribute to consumption of premium single-serve juices among college students (RQ1), exploratory factor analysis with Varimax rotation was employed. Findings indicated that among the three motivational factors identified, external influence explained the greatest amount of variance (37.78%), indicating that college students heavily rely on their friends or peer group when making consumption decisions. While researchers have emphasized the domination of peer influence on disruptive behavior of college students, such as alcohol consumption (e.g., Talbott et al., 2008; Villarosa et al., 2016), limited research has been conducted on the impact of peer influence on constructive or productive behavior of college students. Based on findings, it is possible for college students' susceptibility to peer influence to be used to encourage healthy beverage or food consumption. Similar to Coke's *Share a Coke with a friend* campaign, brand marketers may consider messaging that encourages group consumption of health products. Marketers should consider identifying influential members of the campus community to encourage healthy behaviors, and the choice of healthy food options. These members could include high-ranking campus administrators or high-profile student-athletes on campus. This could function as public service announcements or even paid endorsements for the student-athletes. Marketers should also be aware of the potential impact social media can have on college students. There are many social media influencers who advocate for healthy living and active lifestyles (Rogers et al., 2022). Marketers should be attuned to who can potentially influence purchase decisions outside of the college campus. This can be social media influencers or other prominent figures who have the ability to impact the purchase decisions and lifestyle choices of college students (Yoon, 2022).

Brands may also consider bundle pricing to encourage peer-group consumption. Previous literature investigating the influence of social status consumption has focused mainly within luxury fashion consumption (e.g., Goldsmith et al., 2014; Kim & Jang, 2014), rather than products that are consumable. Findings from this study contribute to Veblen's theory (1899/1994) of conspicuous consumption, demonstrating that motivation for status consumption can occur even for consumable products that are relatively low cost (Hardin et al., 2022). Brand marketers can capitalize on this finding through product packaging to establish a recognizable logo among the target population much like the function of the Starbucks' logo.

Among motivational factors for premium-single serve juice consumption of college students, health benefits emerged as the second factor, explaining 20.22% of variance. Interestingly, this indicates that among all factors related to consumption, college students are not as motivated by health benefits, when compared to other motivational factors. Despite college students increased focused on maintaining a healthy lifestyle (Blonna, 2005; Leppink et al., 2016) and how premium single-serve juices are oftentimes advertised (e.g., 100% natural ingredients), college students are most concerned with gaining approval from peers, and perceived social status, rather than choosing consumption based exclusively on health outcomes. Based on findings, brand marketers may consider tailoring their approach when targeting college students. The health benefits are important but other factors are in play as well, so it is important not to focus the messaging strictly on health factors.

Lastly, motivational factors for premium-single serve juice consumption of college students, convenience emerged as the third factor, explaining 10.34% of variance. Literature emphasizes college students as a time-crunched population that multi-tasks to achieve outcomes (Konova & Yuan, 2017; May & Elder, 2018). Thus, the convenience of premium single-serve juices may be inherently a personal preference of college students. This indicates the importance of displaying premium single-serve juices to easily grab-and-go or offering merchandise in a convenient setting (e.g., through vending machines in campus buildings) to encourage greater consumption.

Interestingly, items which did not carry over into the factors included, They provide good value for the price; I enjoy the taste; I use them as meal replacements, and I am attracted to the packaging. Given the premium price of single-served juices, college students are likely to showcase this product as a status-laden symbol to advance their social standing (Goldsmith et al., 2014; Kahn, 2019; Kim & Jang, 2014; O'Cass & McEwen, 2004; Shermach, 1997), rather than purchase the product because it offers value or function, or even an enjoyable taste. The lack of incorporation of these items into factors further solidify the strong motivational force of the influence of others', including peer and social influence.

When investigating whether motivational factors for consumption of premium single-serve juices differ by college students' impulsive buying status (RQ2), results indicated that high and low impulsive buyers were most influenced by external influence (i.e., peer influence and social status and by their peers. Impulsive buyers are characterized as

having urges to make sudden or unplanned purchases (Beatty & Ferrell, 1998) that are often related to stress reduction (Darrat et al., 2016). Interestingly, since high and low impulsive buyers were influenced by social status and by their peers, these findings highlight that regardless of impulsive buying status, college students are most concerned with these factors as part of their buying decisions.

Among college students, external influence (Factor 1), health benefits (Factor 2), and convenience (Factor 3) influence purchase behavior (RQ3). Collectively, these findings point to the strong impact of social status and peer influence on college students' consumption practices because findings indicate that these factors positively influence future purchase intentions, regardless of impulsive buying status. Additionally, health benefits and convenience influence future purchase intentions. Thus, brand marketers should consider a greater targeted approach when emphasizing health benefits and the ease of purchase of premium single-serve juices, ensuring health messaging also appeals to buyers.

While this research provided important theoretical and practical implications based on findings, the limitations of this study present opportunities for further research. While there are several brands of premium single-serve juices, this study investigated the product category as a whole. Premium single-serve juice brands are often marketed as a healthy option; however, they vary in how healthy they actual are for consumers. It will be important for future research to dive deeper into whether consumers believe or know the actual ingredients of products upon consumption and its impact on future purchase intentions. Additionally, another limitation of this study is that it only incorporated a limited number of possible motivational factors that influence premium single-serve juice consumption. While motivations were based on previous literature, it is possible that additional motivations may exist. Future research should continue to explore why college students are motivated to consume premium single-serve juices.

REFERENCES

- Amaldoss, W., & Jain, S. (2005). Conspicuous consumption and sophisticated thinking. *Management Science*, 51(10), 1449-1466.
- Atalay, A. S., & Meloy, M. G. (2011). Retail therapy: A strategic effort to improve mood. *Psychology & Marketing*, 28(6), 638-659.
- Bagwell, L. S., & Bernheim, B. D. (1996). Veblen effects in a theory of conspicuous consumption. *The American Economic Review*, 86(3), 349-373.
- Barrera, G. A., & Ponce, H. R. (2021). Personality traits influencing young adults' conspicuous consumption. *International Journal of Consumer Studies*, 45(3), 335-349.
- Baumeister, R. F. (2002). Yielding to temptation: Self-control failure, impulsive purchasing, and consumer behavior. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 28(4), 670-676.
- Beane, A. N. (2020). *Health and academic achievement in college and university students* (Doctoral dissertation, East Tennessee State University). <https://dc.etsu.edu/etd/3702/>
- Beatty, S. E., & Ferrell, M. E. (1998). Impulse buying: Modeling its precursors. *Journal of Retailing*, 74(2), 169-191.
- Becton, J. B., Walker, H. J., & Jones-Farmer, A. (2014). Generational differences in workplace behavior. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 44(3), 175-189.
- Blonna, R. (2005). *Coping with Stress in a Changing World*. McGraw Hill Higher Education.
- Brunner, T. A., van der Horst, K., Siegrist, M. (2010). Convenience food products. Drivers for consumption. *Appetite*, 55, 498-506.
- Calamidas, E. G., & Crowell, T. L. (2018). A content analysis of college students' health behaviors. *American Journal of Health Education*, 49(3), 133-146.

Childs, M., Hardin, R., & Koo, G. Y. (2019). Factors affecting consumer loyalty in the university sports team merchandise context. *International Journal of Sport Management and Marketing*, 19(5/6), 389-406.

College Consensus (2020). How to stay fit and healthy in college. Retrieved from <https://www.collegeconsensus.com/resources/college-life/how-to-stay-healthy-in-college/>

Darrat, A. A., Darrat, M. A., & Amyx, D. (2016). How impulse buying influences compulsive buying: The central role of consumer anxiety and escapism. *Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services*, 31, 103-108.

De Boer, M., McCarthy, M., Cowan, C., & Ryan, I. (2004). The influence of lifestyle characteristics and beliefs about convenience food on the demand for convenience foods in the Irish market. *Food Quality and Preference*, 15, 155-165.

Djafarova, E., & Fouts, S. (2022). Exploring ethical consumption of generation Z: Theory of planned behaviour. *Young Consumers*, 23(3), 413-431.

Dolot, A. (2018). The characteristics of Generation Z. *E-mentor*, 2(74), 44-50.

Eastman, J. K., Goldsmith, R. E., & Flynn, L. R. (1999). Status consumption in consumer behavior: Scale development and validation. *Journal of Marketing Theory and Practice*, 7(3), 41-52.
[DOI: 10.1080/10696679.1999.11501839](https://doi.org/10.1080/10696679.1999.11501839)

Elliott, C. (2014). Food as people: Teenagers' perspectives on food personalities and implications for healthy eating. *Social Science & Medicine*, 121, 85-90.

Field, A. (2013). *Discovering statistics using IBM SPSS statistics*. SAGE.

Forney, J. C., & Park, E. J. (2009). Browsing perspectives for impulse buying behavior of college students. *TAFCS Research Journal*, 1(1), 1-3.

Gaidhani, S., Arora, L., & Sharma, B. K. (2019). Understanding the attitude of generation Z towards workplace. *International Journal of Management, Technology and Engineering*, 9(1), 2804-2812.

Giovannini, S., Xu, Y., & Thomas, J. (2015). Luxury fashion consumption and Generation Y consumers: Self, brand consciousness, and consumption motivations. *Journal of Fashion Marketing and Management*, 19(1), 22-40.

Goldsmith, R. E., Flynn, L. R., & Kim, D. (2014). Status consumption and price sensitivity. *Journal of Marketing Theory and Practice*, 18(4), 323-338.

Grand View Research (2018). *Fruit and vegetable juice market size analysis report by product*. Retrieved from <https://www.grandviewresearch.com/industry-analysis/fruit-vegetable-juice-market>

Hardin, R., Childs, M., Koo, G., & Park, K. (2022). An emerging social status: Single-serve premium juice consumption [Paper presentation]. *Society of Health and Physical Educators America National Convention & Expo*. New Orleans, LA.

Hardin, R., Koo, G., Ruibley, B. J., Dittmore, S. & McGreevey M. (2012). Motivation for consumption of collegiate athletics subscription web sites. *International Journal of Sport Communication*, 5(3), 368-383.

Hausman, A. (2010). A multi-method investigation of consumer motivations in impulse buying behavior. *Journal of Consumer Marketing*, 17(5), 403-419.

Iyer, G. R., Blut, M., Xiao, S. H., & Grewal, D. (2019). Impulse buying: a meta-analytic review. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 48, 384-404.

Jadhav, V., & Khanna, M. (2016). Factors influencing online buying behavior of college students: A qualitative analysis. *The Qualitative Report*, 21(1), 1-15.

- Jai, L. (2013). Giving to be Seen: The influence of Facebook charitable advertisements on conspicuous donation behavior, Unpublished dissertation, University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee Archives, Milwaukee, WI.
- Kahn, J. (2019). What you need to know about how your juice is made. Retrieved from <https://www.mindbodygreen.com/0-12450/what-you-need-to-know-about-how-your-juice-is-made.html>
- Kalyanaraman, S (2018). Is it too late for the beverage industry to save soda? *BrandWatch*. Retrieved from <https://www.brandwatch.com/blog/soda-beverage-health-drinks/>
- Kamenidou, I. E., Stavrianea, A., & Bara, E. Z. (2020). Generational differences toward organic food behavior: Insights from five generational cohorts. *Sustainability*, 12(6), 2299.
- Kim, D., & Jang, S. S. (2014). Motivational drivers for status consumption: A study of Generation Y consumers. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 38, 39-47.
- Kononova, A. G., & Yuan, S. (2017). Take a break: Examining college students' media multitasking activities and motivations during study-or work-related tasks. *Journalism & Mass Communication Educator*, 72(2), 183-197.
- Koo, G. & Hardin, R. (2008). Difference in interrelationship between spectators' motives and behavioral intentions based upon emotional attachment. *Sport Marketing Quarterly*, 17(1), 30-43.
- Kuligowski, K. (2020). Generation X: Who are they? *Business News Daily*. Retrieved from <https://www.businessnewsdaily.com/15950-who-is-gen-x.html>
- Lee, H., Jang, Y., Kim, Y., Choi, H. M., & Ham, S. (2019). Consumers' prestige-seeking behavior in premium food markets: Application of the theory of the leisure class. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 77, 260-269.
- Lee, S. T., & Kim, K. T. (2020). Propensity to plan, financial knowledge, overconfidence, and credit card management behaviors of millennials. *Family and Consumer Sciences Research Journal*, 49(2), 123-143.
- Lee, H., & Worthy, S. (2021). Adoption of Fad Diets through the Lens of the Diffusion of Innovations. *Family and Consumer Sciences Research Journal*. Advance online publication.
- Leibenstein, H. (1950). Bandwagon, snob, and Veblen effects in the theory of consumers' demand. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 64(2), 183-207.
- Leppink, E. W., Odlaug, B. L., Lust, K., Christenson, G., & Grant, J. E. (2016). The young and the stressed: Stress, impulse control, and health in college students. *The Journal of Nervous and Mental Disease*, 204(12), 931-938.
- Love, A., Hardin, R., Koo, G., & Morse, A. (2011). Effects of motives on satisfaction and behavioral intentions of volunteers at a PGA TOUR Event. *International Journal of Sport Management*, 12(1), 86-101.
- Lupien, S. J., McEwen, B. S., Gunnar, M. R., & Heim, C. (2009). Effects of stress throughout the lifespan on the brain, behaviour and cognition. *Nature Reviews Neuroscience*, 10(6), 434-445.
- Mai, R., & Hoffman, S. (2012). Taste lovers versus nutrition fact seekers: How health consciousness and self-efficacy determine the way consumers choose food products. *Journal of Consumer Behavior*, 11, 316-328.
- Mangleburg, T. F., Doney, P. M., & Bristol, T. (2004). Shopping with friends and teens' susceptibility to peer influence. *Journal of Retailing*, 80, 101-116.
- May, K. E., & Elder, A. D. (2018). Efficient, helpful, or distracting? A literature review of media multitasking in relation to academic performance. *International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education*, 15(1), 1-17.
- Meltzer, M. (2019). Why is everyone drinking celery juice as if it will save them from dying. *The New York Times*. Retrieved from <https://www.nytimes.com/2019/06/27/style/celery-juice-craze.html>

Munteanu, C. C., & Pagalea, A. (2014). Brands as a mean of consumer self-expression and desired personal lifestyle. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 109(1), 103-107.

NRF (2017). Despite living a digital life, 98 percent of Generation Z still stop in-store. Retrieved from <https://nrf.com/media-center/press-releases/despite-living-digital-life-98-percent-generation-z-still-shop-store>

O'Cass, A., & McEwen, H. (2004). Exploring consumer status and conspicuous consumption. *Journal of Consumer Behaviour*, 4(1), 25-39.

Parker, K., & Igielnik, R. (2020). On the cusp of adulthood and facing an uncertain future What we know about Gen Z so far. Pew Research. Retrieved from <https://www.pewresearch.org/social-trends/2020/05/14/on-the-cusp-of-adulthood-and-facing-an-uncertain-future-what-we-know-about-gen-z-so-far-2/>

Punj, G., & Stewart, D. W. (1983). Cluster analysis in marketing research: Review and suggestions for application. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 20(2), 134-148.

Rogers, A., Wilkinson, S., Downie, O., & Truby, H. (2022). Communication of nutrition information by influencers on social media: A scoping review. *Health Promotion Journal of Australia*, 33, 657-676.

Rosman, L. (2013). What's behind the green juice fad? *The Wall Street Journal*. Retrieved from <https://www.wsj.com/articles/what8217s-behind-the-green-juice-fad-1384215807?tesla=y>

Ruihley, B. J., & Hardin, R. (2015). Gameday food and beverage: The perspective of college football fans. *Journal of Applied Marketing Theory*, 6(1), 27-43.

Ryback, R. (2016). From Baby Boomers to Generation Z: A detailed look at the characteristics of each generation. *Psychology Today*. Retrieved from <https://www.psychologytoday.com/us/blog/the-truisms-wellness/201602/baby-boomers-generation-z>

Shao, W., Grace, D., & Ross, M. (2019). Consumer motivation and luxury consumption: Testing moderating effects. *Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services*, 46, 33-44.

Shermach, K. (1997). What consumers wish brand managers knew. *Marketing News*, 31(12), 9-17.

Shin, S. A., Jang, J. O., Kim, J. K., & Cho, E. H. (2021). Relations of conspicuous consumption tendency, self-expression satisfaction, and SNS use satisfaction of Gen Z through SNS activities. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 18(22), 11979.

Sifontes, B. (2021). College student spending habits for 2021. *Lexington Law*. <https://www.lexingtonlaw.com/blog/credit-cards/college-student-spending-habits.html>

Spence, M. (1973). Job marketing signaling. *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 87, 355–374.

Stead, M., McDermott, L., MacKintosh, A. M., & Adamson, A. (2011). Why healthy eating is bad for young people's health: Identity, belonging and food. *Social Science & Medicine*, 72(7), 1131-1139.

Talbott, L. L., Martin, R. J., Usdan, S. L., Leeper, J. D., Umstattd, M. R., Cremeens, J. L., & Geiger, B. F. (2008). Drinking likelihood, alcohol problems, and peer influence among first-year college students. *The American Journal of Drug and Alcohol Abuse*, 34(4), 433-440.

Twenge, J. M. (2010). A review of the empirical evidence on generational differences in work attitudes. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 25(2), 201-210.

Veblen, T. (1899/1994). *The theory of the leisure class*. London: Routledge.

Villarosa, M., Kison, S., Madson, M., & Zeigler-Hill, V. (2016). Everyone else is doing it: Examining the role of peer influence on the relationship between social anxiety and alcohol use behaviours. *Addiction Research & Theory*, 24(2), 124-134.

Vizcaya-Moreno, M. F., & Pérez-Cañaveras, R. M. (2020). Social media used and teaching methods preferred by generation z students in the nursing clinical learning environment: A cross-sectional research study. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 17(21), 8267.

Wallace, E., Buil, I., & de Chernatony, L. (2017). When does “liking” a charity lead to donation behaviour?: Exploring conspicuous donation behaviour on social media platforms. *European Journal of Marketing*, 51(11–12), 2002–2029. <https://doi.org/10.1108/EJM-03-2017-0210>

Wallace, E., Buil, I. & de Chernatony, L. (2018). Consuming good on social media: what can conspicuous virtue signalling on Facebook tell us about prosocial and unethical intentions? *Journal of Business Ethics*, 151(1), 1-16.

Wang, J., & Xiao, J. J. (2009). Buying behavior, social support and credit card indebtedness of college students. *International Journal of Consumer Studies*, 33(1), 2-10.

West, P. (2004). *Conspicuous compassion: Why sometimes it really is cruel to be kind*. London: Civitas Institute of the Study of Civil Society

Yoon, S. (2022). Introduction to the special issue on the future of advertising. *International Journal of Advertising*, 41(5) 823-826.

Yurchisin, J., & Johnson, K. K. (2004). Compulsive buying behavior and its relationship to perceived social status associated with buying, materialism, self-esteem, and apparel-product involvement. *Family and Consumer Sciences Research Journal*, 32(3), 291-314.

Zepp, P., Potter, D., Haselwood, C., & Britt-Lutter, S. (2018). The influence of coping strategies on college students' grade point averages. *Family and Consumer Sciences Research Journal*, 47(1), 73-86.

ABOUT THE AUTHORS

Robin Hardin (Ph.D., University of Tennessee). Dr. Hardin is a professor in the Sport Management program in the Department of Kinesiology, Recreation, & Sports Studies at the University of Tennessee.

Michelle Childs (Ph.D., University of North Carolina at Greensboro). Dr. Childs is an associate professor in the Department of Retail, Hospitality, and Tourism Management at the University of Tennessee.

Gi-Yong Koo (Ed.D., University of Arkansas). Dr. Koo is a professor in the Sport Management program in School of Hospitality, Sport, and Tourism Management at Troy University.

Kwangho Park (Ph.D., Troy University) Dr. Park is an assistant professor in the Dahl School of Business at Viterbo University.