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#### Abstract

The purpose of this paper is to explore and understand the effects of presence and absence of monetary and non-monetary promotional strategies on branded electronics durables in the state of Gujarat, India. The respondents were asked questions pertaining to promotion availed, price of the product, deals, quality of life, word-of-mouth, repurchase intention, and brand loyalty. The study reveals that presence of promotion is beneficial for the organization and 'Monetary promotions' are more effective than 'non-monetary' ones in enhancing value to consumers and value to firms. This paper illustrates a strong, but straightforward and relatively economical way for SMEs and even large organizations to study the effectiveness of promotional strategies they undertake to boost the market share. The effect of Absence and presence of promotional strategies, and the use of Monetary and non-monetary promotional strategies as a base to enhance value to consumer and businessmen has been researched.
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## 1. Introduction

Building a brand has been an ultimate goal of many entrepreneurs all across the globe. A strong brand lends credibility and status to business which in turn helps the firm to gain many advantages like higher prices, strong market share, healthy market penetrations, receptive and responsive advertising and promotions, and more successful product line extensions. Effective promotional strategies are also employed to help brandbuilding endeavour.

The benefit of promotion is also to increase sales of firms by attracting a greater number of consumers. Existing consumers of firm who are brand loyal may consider the availed promotion as value addition. Whereas for the new ones, it might be a reason to give product a try. Promotional offers are to be designed very thoughtfully by marketers to make it irresistible. Effectiveness of promotional expenditure is sometimes
compared with the advertisement expenditure for a better utilisation of funds from the finance point of view. Implementation of promotional strategies is a subjectmatter of extensive research as the data available so far on the said subject are inadequate. The choice of monetary and non-monetary promotion strategies will depend upon various factors like socio-economic status of consumers, region of market, price of product, government policies, etc. It is still very difficult for the marketer to know about the distinct impact of each one i.e. monetary and non-monetary, on promotion of sales. According to (Chandon, Wansink, \& Laurent, 2000), monetary promotions offer more utilitarian advantages whereas non-monetary promotions provide more hedonic satisfaction. These relationships are not in absolute terms as they are a matter of intensity when observed in isolation. For instance, monetary promotion such as coupons, might have hedonic satisfaction enjoyment, though its main objective is to offer utilitarian advantage (Mittal, 1994). Researchers in the past have mainly focused on the use and effectiveness of monetary promotional strategies. Nevertheless, in reality, monetary as well as non-monetary sales promotion are used. Monetary promotional strategies include discounts, coupons, price packs and rebates while non-promotional strategies include free gifts, loyalty programme, and sweepstakes. The characteristics of monetary promotion is transaction based and that of non-monetary is relationship-centred and rewards at a later stage. In a continuous effort by the marketer to offer promotion uninterruptedly, consumers can form an attitude towards the brand, which can be perceived as a measure of sales increase. It is believed that consumers do need reasons to buy products that they are desirous to for some time. The financial constraint is a highly demotivating factor for any consumer and can put off plans to buy products. Promotional strategies can emerge as a favourable reason to nudge consumers to take a pro-buying decision. Manufacturers who solely rely on promotional tactics and not on quality might lose
market share in the long run as promotional measure are not to be used for aggressive selling. Therefore, it is imperative for a businessman to bring about radical changes in products and services they offer with continuous market research and back it up with promotional strategies to increase brand equity and market share. Absence of promotions is something that a seller must decide when they are confident about their brand with an excellent track record in the past and with strong research. Looking forward to discounts, coupons, rebates and not availing it can be a detrimental factor for businesses. Besides, the important factor shall be the tactical moves by arch-rivals and competitors in market. There is quite good a possibility that the competitor has come up with an attractive promotional strategy that consumers may like and shall go for it, increasing the likelihood of reduced sales for all those who have complete absence of such offers. It is therefore recommended to keep a close tab on all moves of competitors so that a countermove can be initiated on a timely basis.

### 1.1 Objectives of the Study

- To understand the effect of presence of promotional strategies on the value to consumers and value to firms.
- To understand the effect of absence of promotional strategies on the value to consumers and value to firms.
- To understand the effect of non-monetary promotional strategies on the value to consumers and value to firms.
- To understand the effect of monetary promotional strategies on the value to consumers and value to firms.
- To understand the comparative effectiveness of monetary and non-monetary promotional strategies.


## 2. Review of the Literature

Promotion functions as a direct incentive that extends value addition to products. Consumers respond to monetary and non-monetary sales promotion strategies differently. Depending on various factors, in some context, monetary promotion is a better choice whereas in some other contexts non-monetary promotion is desired. To select a suitable promotional strategy, marketers must take in consideration important aspects linked to features of products. Characteristics like attributes of product, price, weight, durability, cost, size and market characteristics like age, sex, geographical location, patterns of shopping, and income. (Pride \& Ferrell, 2009)

Monetary promotions are targeted to allow consumers to avail deals that enables them to buy products at a smaller price, hence appealing them by giving them opportunity and occasion of price saving. However, the benefits of monetary promotion are not restricted to just price-
saving but it also offers benefits like convenience of shopping, product quality, good standard of living. (Chandon et al., 2000)

Consumers react differently when faced with the promotional offers and perceive them to maximise their level of satisfaction and utility. Some researchers found that in promotional tactics, monetary promotions are better than that of non-monetary ones (Alvarez Alvarez \& Vázquez Casielles, 2005).

The word discount is most ubiquitously heard word by consumers and has a deep impact on the decision making of purchase of product. Some researchers have favoured the use of monetary promotional strategies over non-monetary ones as consumers are more inclined to get now than in future. It is also said that brand loyalists attach more value with monetary promotional strategy in comparison to consumers who are non-brand loyal. Consumers provide greater value perceptions to price discounts (Owens, Hardman, \& Keillor, 2001).

Although there are noteworthy advantages of monetary promotions there are shortcomings as well. Continuation of monetary promotions may increase the risk of negatively affecting prices in long-term. Research also states that monetary promotions have adverse effects on brand association and on quality perceptions. Monetary promotions negatively impacts the perception of hedonistic satisfaction and utilitarian advantage for consumers but it harms utilitarian advantage more (Montaner \& Pina, 2008).

Non-monetary promotional strategies are used by many marketers in different situation when market research suggests so. Researchers advise non-monetary promotional strategies as it does not have any damaging effect on the brand value of a product. As a matter of fact, it is helpful in boosting the brand value of a product. In the long run, as a perspective, promotional strategies that are non-monetary are considered more favourable in comparison to monetary ones. Nonmonetary promotions never attempt to degrade the brand value and brand image. On the contrary, they are even helping in creating brand equity. On quality perceptions of a product, non-monetary promotions make a positive impression. Therefore, premiums are more effective than discounts on price (Mela, Gupta, \& Lehmann, 1997).

For brands that are established, non-monetary promotion is preferred. The benefits of it are seen in hedonistic satisfaction and utilitarian advantage enjoyed by consumers with the former being more noticeable. Consumers who are more inclined to avail non-monetary benefits will seek out such gains of value expressions (Reid, Thompson, Mavondo, \& Bruns $\varnothing$, 2015)
Researchers state that non-monetary promotion benefits are more favourable in the long-run and thus quite helpful in enhancing the brand equity. Literature review reveal that non-monetary strategies does not affect the
pre-conceived idea of price in the mind of consumer and even improves consumer expectations about product. The negative side of it; may create a sense of deception in two phases, before and after buying product with promotional offer. For those consumers who are habituated to monetary offers, and even those who do not like non-monetary promotions, the perception would result in negative brand equity, because of which consumer may switch brand (Liu, Cheng, \& Ni, 2011).

Of all priorities of consumers, savings and gains on purchase of products have their places in them. Consumers make purchases to fulfil their needs. Promotions can lead to influencing consumers to buy more or to try a new product. Any promotion adopted by a marketer cannot just be a replacement for quality and value perceived by consumers (Gilbert \& Jackaria, 2002).

## 3. Methodology

The research was conducted in six areas of Gujarat namely Ahmedabad, Surat, Mehsana, Gandhinagar, Bharuch and Jamnagar. From these cities, through convenience sampling, consumers who had purchased electronics durables were chosen and were requested to fill in the questionnaire. In all there were 128 questionnaires, of which 9 were incomplete and thus were rejected. Out of 119 questionnaires, 42 belonged to consumers who availed monetary promotion, 36 belonged to the ones who availed non-monetary promotion and the rest 41 belonged to consumers who did not get any kind of promotion.
Questionnaires were classified on the basis of promotion availed - 1. Monetary, 2. Non-Monetary and 3. Absence of promotion. In every category, the sub-categories were 1. Value to consumers and 2. Value to firms. In value to consumers the points are $\mathbf{- 1}$. less price than other brands of same quality 2 . quality for a deal price and 3. improvement in standard of living. In value to firms the points are 1. Word of Mouth 2. Decision to repurchase in future and 3. Brand Loyalty.


Fig 1: Effects of Promotion
Respondents were asked questions based on 7-point Likert scale of agree - disagree. The data was then
collected and was further tabulated to compute MANOVA and Paired T-Test.

## 4. Findings and Discussion

### 4.1. Hypotheses

1. $\mathbf{H}_{0}$ : There is no significant difference between effects of Monetary, and Non-monetary promotional strategies.
2. $\mathbf{H}_{1}$ : There is a significant difference between effects of Monetary, and Non-monetary promotional strategies.
3. $\mathbf{H}_{0}$ : There is no significant difference between effects of presence of promotional strategies and absence of it.
4. $\mathbf{H}_{1}$ : There is a significant difference between effects of presence of promotional strategies and absence of it.

### 4.2. Data Analysis and Interpretation <br> Computation of MANOVA

TABLE 1 MANOVA: PILLAI TEST

| Cases | df | Approx. <br> F | Trace <br> Pillai | Num <br> df | Den df | p |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| (Intercept) | 1 | 1440.255 | 0.987 | 6 | $111.000<.001$ |  |
| Promotion | 2 | 14.990 | 0.891 | 12 | $224.000<.001$ |  |
| Residuals | 116 |  |  |  |  |  |

TABLE 2 MANOVA: WILKS TEST

| Cases | df | Approx. <br> F | Wilks' <br> $\boldsymbol{\Lambda}$ | Num <br> df | Den df | p |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| (Intercept) | 1 | 1440.255 | 0.013 | 6 | $111.000<.001$ |  |
| Promotion | 2 | 32.162 | 0.133 | 12 | $222.000<.001$ |  |
| Residuals | 116 |  |  |  |  |  |

TABLE 3 MANOVA: HOTELLING-LAWLEY TEST

| Cases | df | Approx. <br> F | Trace <br> H-L | Num <br> df | Den df | p |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| (Intercept) | 1 | 1440.255 | 77.852 | 6 | $111.000<.001$ |  |
| Promotion | 2 | 57.920 | 6.319 | 12 | $220.000<.001$ |  |
| Residuals | 116 |  |  |  |  |  |

TABLE 4 MANOVA: ROY TEST

| Cases | df |  | Approx. Largest Num |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Root | df df | p |  |  |  |
| (Intercept) | 1 | 1440.255 |  | 6 | $111.000<.001$ |  |
| Promotion | 2 | 117.410 | 6.290 | 6 | $112.000<.001$ |  |
| Residuals | 116 |  |  |  |  |  |

## Assumption Checks

TABLE 5 BOX'S M-TEST FOR HOMOGENEITY OF COVARIANCE MATRICES

| $\boldsymbol{\chi}^{2}$ | $\mathbf{d f}$ | $\mathbf{p}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 24.515 | 42 | 0.986 |

ANOVA

TABLE 6 ANOVA: LESS PRICE

| Cases | Sum of <br> Squares | df | Mean <br> Square | F | p |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| (Intercept) | 1896.008 | 1 | 1896.008 | 1717.232 | $<.001$ |
| Promotion | 148.915 | 2 | 74.458 | 67.437 | $<.001$ |
| Residuals | 128.076 | 116 | 1.104 |  |  |

TABLE 7 ANOVA: QUALITY

| Cases | Sum of <br> Squares | df | Mean <br> Square | F | p |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| (Intercept) | 1944.210 | 1 | 1944.210 | 1832.305 | $<.001$ |
| Promotion | 151.705 | 2 | 75.853 | 71.487 | $<.001$ |
| Residuals | 123.084 | 116 | 1.061 |  |  |

TABLE 8 ANOVA: STANDARD OF LIVING

| Cases | Sum of <br> Squares | df | Mean <br> Square | F | p |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| (Intercept) | 1716.840 | 1 | 1716.840 | 1334.768 | $<.001$ |
| Promotion | 141.955 | 2 | 70.978 | 55.182 | $<.001$ |
| Residuals | 149.205 | 116 | 1.286 |  |  |

TABLE 9 ANOVA: WORD OF MOUTH

| Cases | Sum of <br> Squares | df | Mean <br> Square | F | p |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| (Intercept) | 1809.210 | 1 | 1809.210 | 1311.136 | $<.001$ |
| Promotion | 112.724 | 2 | 56.362 | 40.846 | $<.001$ |
| Residuals | 160.066 | 116 | 1.380 |  |  |

TABLE 10 ANOVA: REPURCHASE

| Cases | Sum of <br> Squares | df | Mean <br> Square | F | p |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| (Intercept) | 1525.008 | 1 | 1525.008 | 1128.370 | $<.001$ |
| Promotion | 142.216 | 2 | 71.108 | 52.614 | $<.001$ |
| Residuals | 156.776 | 116 | 1.352 |  |  |

TABLE 11 ANOVA: BRAND LOYALTY

| Cases | Sum of <br> Squares | df | Mean <br> Square | F | p |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| (Intercept) | 1568.269 | 1 | 1568.269 | 1025.509 | $<.001$ |
| Promotion | 160.337 | 2 | 80.168 | 52.423 | $<.001$ |
| Residuals | 177.394 | 116 | 1.529 |  |  |


| TABLE 12: DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { N } \\ & \text { 会 } \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Valid | 119 | 119 | 119 | 119 | 119 | 119 |
| Missing | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Mean | 3.992 | 4.042 | 3.798 | 3.899 | 3.580 | 3.630 |
| S.E. of Mean | 0.140 | 0.140 | 0.144 | 0.139 | 0.146 | 0.155 |
| SD | 1.532 | 1.526 | 1.571 | 1.520 | 1.592 | 1.692 |
| Var. | 2.347 | 2.329 | 2.467 | 2.312 | 2.534 | 2.862 |
| ShapiroWilk | 0.943 | 0.936 | 0.940 | 0.934 | 0.920 | 0.926 |
| P -value of ShapiroWilk | < . 001 | < . 001 | < . 001 | < . 001 | < . 001 | < . 001 |
| Min | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 |
| Max | 7.000 | 7.000 | 7.000 | 7.000 | 7.000 | 7.000 |

TABLE 13: T-TEST: PAIRED TWO SAMPLE FOR MEANS OF MONETARY AND NON-MONETARY

|  | Monetary <br> Promotion | Non-Monetary <br> Promotion |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Mean | 5.203333333 | 3.676666667 |
| Variance | 0.025466667 | 0.098946667 |
| Observations | 6 | 6 |
| Pearson | 0.672403604 |  |
| Correlation |  |  |
| Hypothesized | 0 |  |
| Mean Difference | 5 |  |
| df | 15.67610901 |  |
| t Stat | $9.60133 \mathrm{E}-06$ |  |
| P(T<=t) one-tail | 2.015048373 |  |
| t Critical one-tail | $1.92027 \mathrm{E}-05$ |  |
| $\mathrm{P}(\mathrm{T}<=\mathrm{t})$ two-tail | 2.570581836 |  |
| t Critical two-tail |  |  |

TABLE 14: T-TEST: PAIRED TWO SAMPLE FOR MEANS OF MONETARY AND ABSENCE

|  | Monetary <br> Promotion | Absence of <br> Promotion |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Mean | 5.203333333 | 2.611666667 |
| Variance | 0.025466667 | 0.027656667 |
| Observations | 6 | 6 |
| Pearson | 0.516722132 |  |
| Correlation | 0 |  |
| Hypothesized | 5 |  |
| Mean Difference | 39.60193191 |  |
| df | $9.67675 \mathrm{E}-08$ |  |
| t Stat | 2.015048373 |  |
| P(T<=t) one-tail | $1.93535 \mathrm{E}-07$ |  |
| t Critical one-tail | 2.570581836 |  |
| P(T<=t) two-tail |  |  |
| t Critical two-tail |  |  |

TABLE 15: T-TEST: PAIRED TWO SAMPLE FOR MEANS OF NON-MONETARY AND ABSENCE

|  | Non-Monetary <br> Promotion | Absence of <br> Promotion |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Mean | 3.676666667 | 2.611666667 |
| Variance | 0.098946667 | 0.027656667 |
| Observations | 6 |  |
| Pearson | 0.196641041 |  |
| Correlation |  |  |
| Hypothesized | 0 |  |
| Mean Difference | 5 |  |
| df | 8.01144494 |  |
| t Stat | 0.000244807 |  |
| P(T<=t) one-tail | 2.015048373 |  |
| t Critical one-tail | 0.000489613 |  |
| P(T<=t) two-tail | 2.570581836 |  |
| t Critical two-tail |  |  |

The results from the Manova Tables (Tables 1 to 4 ) show that the results are significant with < . 001 with the use of Pillai test, Wilks Test, Hotelling-Lawley Test and Roy Test. Also, from the Anova tables (Tables 6 to 11) it can be observed that the F values are all different. For less price, the F value is 67.437 , for quality it is 71.487 , for standard of living it is 55.182, for word of mouth it is 40.846, for repurchase it is 52.614 and for brand for brand loyalty it is 52.423 . Therefore, it can be said that there is a significant difference in the values to consumers and value to firm based on the promotional strategies applied by marketer. The null hypothesis that there is no significant difference between the promotional strategies is rejected. All consumers have used the rating from 1 to 7 in categories of values. From the table of descriptive statistics (Table 12), minimum and maximum values are 1 and 7 respectively. From the
tables of Paired T-Test the results of comparison can be observed. In comparison of Monetary and Non-monetary promotion, given in Table 13, the T-Stat 15.67 exceeds the critical value 2.57 . Therefore, there is a difference between monetary and non-monetary promotion. From Table 14, showing the comparison between Monetary and absence of promotion, the T-Stat 39.60 exceeds the $t$ critical value 2.57 . Hence it can be determined that there is a significant difference between Monetary promotion and absence of promotion. Table 15 shows the difference between Non-Monetary promotion and absence of promotion. The computed T-Stat value 8.01 exceeds the critical T value 2.57 and therefore it is concluded that there is a significant difference between Non-monetary promotion and absence of promotion.

## 5. Conclusion

Effectiveness of promotion as promotional strategy is of considerable interest and debate for owners across the globe. Pervious studies have shown that the effectiveness of promotional strategy does prevail if the benefits they offer are congruent with the products. Factoring in various parameters, the marketers must be careful to decide when to offer promotion and when not to. The decision of choosing between monetary and nonmonetary promotional strategy will depend on type of product, kind of consumers, price, region, socioeconomic factors, quality, brand equity and government policies. Upon enough market research, promotional strategy must be determined and be reviewed from time to time.

## References

[1] Alvarez Alvarez, B., \& Vázquez Casielles, R. (2005). Consumer evaluations of sales promotion: The effect on brand choice. European Journal of Marketing, 39(1/2), 54-70.
[2] Chandon, P., Wansink, B., \& Laurent, G. (2000). A benefit congruency framework of sales promotion effectiveness. Journal of Marketing, 64(4), 65-81.
[3] Gilbert, D. C., \& Jackaria, N. (2002). The efficacy of sales promotions in UK supermarkets: A consumer view.
International Journal of Retail \& Distribution Management, 30(6), 315-322.
[4] Liu, T.-C., Cheng, T., \& Ni, F.-Y. (2011). How consumers respond to the behavior of missing a free gift promotion: Inaction inertia effect on products offered as free gifts. The Journal of Social Psychology, 151(3), 361-381.
[5] Mela, C. F., Gupta, S., \& Lehmann, D. R. (1997). The long-term impact of promotion and advertising on consumer brand choice. Journal of Marketing Research, 34(2), 248-261. [6] Mittal, B. (1994). An integrated framework for relating diverse consumer characteristics to supermarket coupon redemption. Journal of Marketing Research, 31(4), 533-544. [7] Montaner, T., \& Pina, J.-M. (2008). The effect of promotion type and benefit congruency on brand image. Journal of Applied Business Research (JABR), 24(3). [8] Owens, D. L., Hardman, M., \& Keillor, B. (2001). The differential impact of price-related consumer promotions on
loyal versus non-loyal users of the brand: A field study investigation. Journal of Promotion Management, 6(1-2), 113-131.
[9] Pride, W. M., \& Ferrell, O. C. (2009). Foundations of Marketing: Custom Edition 2009-2010. Cengage Learning. [10] Reid, M., Thompson, P., Mavondo, F., \& Bruns $\varnothing$, K. (2015). Economic and utilitarian benefits of monetary versus non-monetary in-store sales promotions. Journal of Marketing Management, 31(3-4), 247-268.

## ABOUT THE AUTHOR (S)

Javed S. J. Khorajia is a research scholar of D. N. Institute of PG Studies in Commerce affiliated to Sardar Patel University Vallabh Vidyanagar, Anand. He is a NET-SLET qualified postgraduate in Commerce and English, has a degree in education and has completed M.Phil. in commerce. He has published 3 research papers. Currently employed in Burhani English School, Sidhpur as a Higher Secondary Teacher, he teaches Commerce and Economics. He loves teaching students with the ultimate goal of current relevance and its applicability in modern times. He is a voracious reader and passionately keeps himself abreast with the latest developments in the field of commerce and management.

Dr. Sejalben R. Christian is the officiating principal of Shri D.N. Institute of P.G. Studies in Commerce affiliated with Sardar Patel University. Dr. Christian has 11 years of administrative $\&$ research and 8 years of teaching experience at P.G. level. She obtained Ph.D., M.Phil, M.Com, PGDCA, B.Ed and Diploma in Kathak. She wrote more than 15 books, and she has credited many research Publications at national and international level. She holds many positions, i.e. Senate member, Member of BOS, IQAC Coordinator, Chairperson of the research committee, etc. Under her leadership, the institute has achieved many milestones.

