

Snapple case

Business



Unorganized distribution system (Deighton, 2003: 6). • Quaker failed at attempts to negotiate with the already established Snapple distributors and lost out on their attempts to distribute Snapple and Gatorade together. This move also had to have an affect on their relationships with distributors and how they pushed the brand.

- The inability to ship and stock the new size offerings also had an effect on product distribution and how much was actually able to be on shelves in the cold channel. 4. Size and quantity manufacturing. (Deighton, 2003: 6, 14-17).
- The decision to offer larger bottles and cases did not go over well as many of the trucks at the time could not ship the new products, more stores could not easily shelve the same and more then anything consumers were not buying the new sizes.
- Most consumers purchase Snapple for single serving consumption and did not plan on going further then that; leading to lower sales on the new options. 5. Decline of overall annual sales. (Deighton, 2003: 6, 14-16). • Main issue across the board.

Seems to be mostly attributed to the uncontrollable alteration of the Snapple brand image in many ways. • New competitor AriZona seemed to take away some of the niche market as it was deemed “ new” II. Problem Statement The change in Snapple’s perceived image appears to be the main cause in its overall sales decline. The wholesome ideals and real life, down to earth, quirky feel that Snapple built itself with seemed to dissipate after Quakers acquisition. This loss of image appeared to turn its normal consumer base away quickly. III.

Alternatives