



The Pepsi Paradox: A review

George Van Doorn*, Beyon Miloyan

School of Health Sciences and Psychology, Department of Psychology, Federation University Australia, Northways Road, Churchill 3842, Australia

ARTICLE INFO

Keywords:

Coca-Cola
Coke
Identification
Preference
Taste
Choice
Consumer
Brand

ABSTRACT

The Pepsi Paradox refers to the observation that Pepsi is preferred to Coke in blind taste tests, despite Coke being regarded as the more successful brand. We begin by describing the origins of the Pepsi Paradox. We then outline a neural hypothesis for why it occurs. Next, we carefully assess the published behavioural studies related to the Pepsi Paradox, and on people's ability to distinguish colas by taste. We conclude that the existing research has failed to provide sufficient evidence for the existence of the Pepsi Paradox. In fact, there does not even seem to be a consistent taste preference for either beverage in the reviewed studies.

1. Introduction

In 1975, PepsiCo launched the Pepsi® Challenge (PepsiCo, 2005). Two unlabelled glasses of cola were presented side-by-side (one containing Pepsi and one containing Coke®), and people were asked to indicate their preferences for each cola following a taste test. PepsiCo noted that people tended to choose Pepsi as the preferred cola. Here, the Pepsi Paradox relates to the issue of being unable to gain a market advantage over a rival's less preferred product. In this paper, we carefully review the existing experimental research on the Pepsi Paradox (hereafter, the Paradox). We begin by reviewing a neural hypothesis for why it occurs, followed by an examination of the available behavioural evidence. Although the existing studies that claim to have demonstrated empirical support for the Paradox have been widely cited in the neuroscience, neuromarketing, and taste perception literatures,¹ we argue that not a single one has provided adequate evidence for its existence.

2. A neural hypothesis of the Pepsi Paradox

Koenigs and Tranel (2008) proposed a neural hypothesis of the Paradox, in which the ventromedial prefrontal cortex (vmPFC) plays a causal role. The hypothesis starts by assuming that there exists a default preference for Coke in the population, and that a network involving the vmPFC plays a critical role in *tagging* Coke as the higher value brand. Hence, when brand information is available, people tend to prefer Coke. Accordingly, it is hypothesised that damage to the vmPFC causes this default preference for Coke (i.e., the preferred brand) to shift in favor of

Pepsi (i.e., the preferred product). In other words, people with lesions to the vmPFC should demonstrate a preference for Pepsi despite the availability of brand information, whereas brand information typically overrides taste information.

3. Experimental work assessing the Pepsi Paradox

In experimental research, the Paradox has been defined in terms of two criteria: (1) Pepsi is preferred to Coke in blind taste tests, and (2) Coke is preferred to Pepsi in branded taste tests (Koenigs & Tranel, 2008).

3.1. On people's preferences for colas

McClure et al. (2004) first claimed to provide experimental evidence consistent with the Paradox. They tested a sample of 67 participants by having them complete two-alternative forced-choice preference tasks using de-carbonated² forms of the beverages under four conditions. In the two 'blind' conditions (Group 1: blind, $n = 16$; Group 2: blind, $n = 17$), one cup contained Coke, the other contained Pepsi, and both cups were unlabelled. In the Group 3 'semi-blind' condition ($n = 16$), both cups contained Coke, and one cup was labelled "Coke" whereas the other cup was unlabelled. In the Group 4 'semi-blind' condition ($n = 18$), both cups contained Pepsi, and one cup was labelled "Pepsi", whereas the other cup was unlabelled. The results did not indicate that Pepsi was preferred over Coke in the absence of brand information, and therefore the first criterion of the Paradox was not met. In relation to

* Corresponding author.

E-mail address: george.vandoorn@federation.edu.au (G. Van Doorn).

¹ Over 1200 articles according to Google Scholar.

² The sodas were 'decarbonated' for technical reasons (i.e., carbonation built up in delivery tubes causing unreliable delivery whilst participants were lying down in an fMRI scanner).

the second criterion, the authors found that Coke consumed from a labelled cup was preferred over Coke from an unlabelled cup. However, people did *not* show a discernible preference for either labelled or unlabelled Pepsi. The observation that preferences for labelled Coke in Group 3 were more pronounced than the preferences for labelled Pepsi in Group 4 was taken to support the second criterion of the Paradox.

There are two caveats concerning the conclusion that these data are consistent with the Paradox. First, only the ‘blind’ conditions (i.e., Groups 1 and 2) directly assessed cola preferences in a way that allows testing for the existence of *one* of the components of the Paradox, such that a preference for Pepsi over Coke in this condition would provide support for criterion one. Second, the semi-blind conditions appear to be mis-specified: the Paradox pertains directly to preferences for one beverage over the other. Therefore, rather than presenting the same beverage with and without a label and comparing preferences for labelled Coke and Pepsi from two separate conditions, labelled Coke and labelled Pepsi should have been presented side-by-side. As such, the first criterion was not supported, and the second criterion was not properly addressed.

Koenigs and Tranel (2008) tested the aforementioned hypothesis that the vmPFC plays a causal role in the Paradox in a sample of 44 participants with and without brain lesions (vmPFC lesion group, $n = 12$; brain-damaged comparison group, $n = 16$; normal comparison group, $n = 16$). In a series of ‘semi-blind’ taste tests (consistent with the ‘semi-blind’ conditions in McClure et al.’s study), they found that vmPFC patients preferred the labelled Pepsi to the unlabelled Pepsi, but did not show a preference for either labelled or unlabelled Coke. Furthermore, the other groups did not demonstrate a clear preference. Thus, they reported that damage to the vmPFC abolishes the Paradox, despite failing to find evidence for the existence of either criterion of the Paradox in the control groups. Relatedly, the vmPFC group did *not* prefer Pepsi to Coke in the blind taste test. Although the authors did not design a condition where labelled Coke and Pepsi were compared directly, in a separate study ($n = 15$), Kühn and Gallinat (2013) paired the same amalgamated beverage (an admixture of Coke, Pepsi, and River Cola) with each brand’s logo over many trials, and did not find evidence for a difference in people’s preferences for “Coke” and “Pepsi” (elicited using subjective liking ratings).

Finally, Yamada et al. (2014) instructed participants ($n = 66$) to provide reasons for (dis)liking Coke or Pepsi in blind taste tests. They found that (i) people who were administered a taste test without additional instruction (control condition) preferred Coke to Pepsi, (ii) those who were administered a taste test and asked to provide reasons for disliking each beverage (negative analysis condition) showed no clear preference for either beverage, and (iii) people who were administered a taste test and asked to provide reasons for liking each beverage (positive analysis condition) preferred Pepsi to Coke. The authors suggested that people in the positive analysis condition preferred Pepsi because people perceive Pepsi to taste sweeter than Coke and sweetness provides “a more plausible basis for experienced pleasantness” (Yamada et al., 2014, p. 3). One problem with this conclusion is that, rather than being taken *prima facie*, the explanation that sweetness equates to preference should be demonstrated empirically. It is, after all, also plausible that people might disfavour a beverage because it is perceived to taste *too* sweet. Nonetheless, these findings do not appear to be directly relevant to the Paradox: in order to address the first criterion of the Paradox, the authors should have averaged across all conditions (i.e., reported the within-subjects main effect of ‘brand preference’), however this was not done. Finally, given that participants in Yamada and colleagues’ experiment were only administered blind taste tests, nothing can be said about the second criterion of the Pepsi Paradox (i.e., labelled preferences).

3.2. On the identification of colas

A series of seminal papers addressed whether people are able to

distinguish colas by taste (e.g., Bowles & Pronko, 1948; Pronko & Herman, 1949; Prothro, 1953; Thumin, 1962). In the first of these studies, Bowles and Pronko (1948) had participants blindly and consecutively drink (i) three name brands of cola (i.e., Coke, Pepsi, or Royal Crown [RC]; Part 1; $n = 96$), or (ii) three glasses of the same brand of cola (Part 2; $n = 60$). Participants were no better than chance at identifying the correct brand of cola in either condition.

In a follow-up study, Pronko and Bowles (1948) used the same procedure to address whether people were able to distinguish three little-known colas (i.e., Hyde Park, Kroger, or Spur). In a series of blind, consecutive taste tests, Pronko and Bowles (i) alternated between the brands (Part 1; $n = 96$), or (ii) administered the same cola three times (Part 2; $n = 60$). Not a single participant, in either condition, was able to identify any of the colas. In fact, the colas were always identified as one of Coke, Pepsi, or RC.

Pronko and Herman (1949) then assessed whether narrowing the response options improved performance, by instructing participants that they were being asked to distinguish between Coke, Pepsi, or RC cola. In Part 1, participants ($n = 105$) blindly drank three different brands of cola consecutively. In Part 2, participants ($n = 60$) blindly drank the same cola three times consecutively. Although participants were no better than chance at identifying Pepsi or RC, they were able to identify Coke at above chance levels when it was presented as one of three colas (Part 1), but not when it was presented three times in a row (Part 2). About a decade later, Thumin (1962) replicated and extended this work, finding that people ($n = 79$) can often discern between Coke and Pepsi when the following conditions are met: (i) when the range of response options is restricted (i.e., when participants are explicitly told that they must distinguish between Coke, Pepsi, or RC), and (ii) when using the method of paired comparisons (i.e., participants are presented with two *different* cups of cola). However, using a method similar to Pronko and Herman (1949), Prothro (1953) found that a Lebanese cohort ($n = 60$) was unable to identify Coke or Pepsi at above chance levels. Instead, the Lebanese participants were able to identify the product of a then-popular local cola brand (Williams Champagne) in blind taste tests, suggesting that local factors may play a role in taste perception, product identification and, possibly, preference (see Section 4).

Finally, Kappes, Schmidt, and Lee (2007) administered a series of blind taste tests and found that Coke and Pepsi were not rated as being different in terms of various “mouthfeel” attributes (i.e., bite, burn, numbing, carbonation, body, and mouthcoating).

4. Study design and ecological validity

In the present review, we assessed the existing research on the Pepsi Paradox in terms of two criteria: (1) Pepsi is preferred to Coke in blind taste tests, and (2) Coke is preferred to Pepsi in branded taste tests (Koenigs & Tranel, 2008). Alternatively, the Paradox can be conceptualized as the conditional probability of preferring Pepsi over Coke in a series of blind (or, preferably, double-blind) forced-choice taste tests, given a preference for Coke over Pepsi in a series of branded forced-choice taste tests. We think this constitutes a stronger experimental statement of the Paradox. After all, if the individual does not prefer Coke to Pepsi in branded taste tests (or, at least, does not state a preference for Coke), then there is no contradiction.

Nonetheless, the preferences that are revealed in the laboratory are not necessarily the same as those that are revealed in the markets. It has been argued that Coke outperforms Pepsi in terms of sales (Zmuda, 2011), and that the Coca-Cola® company outperforms PepsiCo in its approach to advertising and branding its namesake beverage (Jensen, 2014). The latter includes historical approaches to marketing that span the last century. For example, two notable marketing campaigns were the introduction of the iconic ‘Santa Claus’ advertisement in the 1920s (The Coca-Cola Company, 2012), and when the Coca-Cola Company shipped its namesake beverage to American troops during World War II

Download English Version:

<https://daneshyari.com/en/article/8838555>

Download Persian Version:

<https://daneshyari.com/article/8838555>

[Daneshyari.com](https://daneshyari.com)