

# THE EFFECT OF PRICE PROMOTION INTO BRAND SWITCHING WITH SPECIAL REFERENCE TO BATHING SOAPS

Prof (Dr) Harpreet Singh Grewal\*

## ABSTRACT

*Price promotions help in increasing the sales of a product because the market is full of price sensitive customers. The problem is that fast moving consumer goods companies are facing competition due to brand switching because price promotion technique makes the customer to switch to different brands. The paper covers a study on the effect of price promotion into brand switching with special reference to bathing soaps.*

## INTRODUCTION

Sales promotion is an activity designed to boost the sales of a product or service. It is about stimulating customers to buy a product. Sales promotion can be said materials that act as a direct inducement, offering added value, or incentive for the product, to resellers, sales persons or consumers. Sales promotions are designed for immediate or short-term increase in the product sales. Communication program goals must lead consumers to take the final step.

Companies must communicate with their customers; this communication should not be left to chance. The companies must design this communication for a specific target audience i.e. target market. Sales are lifeblood of business. The ultimate aim of sales promotion unlikely to turn them brand loyal users. Sellers often think of sales promotion as a design to build up brand loyalty. Sales promotion also offers and incentive to sell. Sales promotion includes tools for consumer promotion (samples, coupons, cash discount, offers reduced price, premium price, patronage rewards, free materials, warranties and demonstration contest) trade promotion (e.g. Buying allowance, free good merchandise allowance, co-operative advertising, advertising and display allowance push money. Dealers sales contest and sales force promotion (e.g. bonus, contests, sales relies) sales promotion tools are highly diverse.

## LITERATURE REVIEW

Raghubir Priya (1998), "Coupon Value: a signal

for proxy "Journal of Marketing Research, 35(August), 316-324.

This article is depend on the value of coupons. What is the price estimate of the coupon. Coupon is a sales promotion tool so higher the promotional discount then higher the benefit. In the article it is estimated that a coupon have higher value then it is more attractive and more consumer attract towards it due to brand switching property. In this coupon value should be predicted on the dependency of the price of product. The author used here two examples: a visit of museum and a newspaper. If coupon value is more than the value of product then it will be more beneficial. In short, price promotions lead to high price promotions. The study tells that coupon value effect in that brands offering higher valued coupons are perceived to higher price. By the result that marketer of new brand or current brand for which consumer are not aware for the real price, must be acceptable about offering high values unless they may tell us price information(as past price) so coupons of high value is more effective than the lower value of coupon.

Ailawadi Kusum L. and Neslin Scott A. (1998)," The effect of promotion on competiton: buying more and consuming it faster," Journal of Marketing Research, 35(August), 390-398.

In this article, author investigate the sales promotion effect on consuming pattern of household. They used the scanner data in this promotion have n effect on brand switching and shifting the demand

---

\* Principal (Management), Shri Guru Ram Rai Institute of Technology & Science Patel Nagar, Dehradun

category. They used two product categories yogurt and ketchup. It is an empirical research that measures promotion's potential to increase category demand. Promotions affect on consumption form its fundamental ability to increase household inventory level. Higher inventory, in term, can increase consumption through two mechanism. Fewer stock out and increase in the consumer's usage rate of the category. Fewer stock out means more opportunity to consume the product. After a study on purchase increasing tells that sales promotion also increases consumption due to higher inventory level and then fewer stock out under the promotion. In this, it is examined that household increase their usages rate according to economic and behavioral theory. By this household purchase the goods according to the price. So this study provides the information about the flexible usage rate and constant usage rate. In this yogurt category is more flexible and ketchup category has less flexible consumption. So in this study, it is told that the importance of the flexible usage rate phenomenon by effect of promotion on consumption.

Raghubir Priya and Corfman Kim (1999), "When do price promotions affect Pretrial Broad Evaluation," *Journal of Marketing Research*, 36 (May), 211-222.

This article tells that price promotion is an important tool for maximize the sales but for brand evaluation quality of product is very necessary. If the product has a better quality then it will be purchased again after promotion (when price promotion scheme is stopped). Consumer thinks that price promotion (as discount scheme) reduces the price for a given quantity or increase the quantity available at the same price. Price promotion mainly used to encourage the sales and awareness among the non users of product. So, such promotions may be used for new brand introductions. If the quality of product, is not according to consumer, they will not purchase again those who purchased it in response to promotion. So for the success of product, after trial there should be a better combination between price promotion and quality of product as in the reference of brand evaluation.

Garretson Judith A. and Burton Scot (1998), "Alcoholic beverage sales promotion: An initial

Investigation of the role of warning message and Brand characters among consumers over and under the legal drinking age," *Journal of Public policy & Marketing*, 17 (1), 35-43.

In this article, author studied the sales promotion of alcoholic beverages. This article tells that by which ways we can promote it. Because there are many problems such as risky consumption, more deaths are linked to alcohol consumption for person age 15 to 24 years than any other cases. And use of alcohol by this age group cause least efficiency and consistency in colleges. So for the promotion of the beverages firstly warning information should be used as a warning label that build believe and attitude of customers toward the alcoholic beverages, secondly brand character should be used. Consumers have a positive attitude toward that product which includes brand characters with warning label (message) for consumption.

Erdem Tulin and Sun Baohong (2002), "An empirical investigation of the spillover effects of advertising and sales promotion in Umbrella Branding," *Journal of Marketing Research*, 39 (November), 408-420.

In this article, author investigates and finds evidence for advertising and sales promotion spill over effect for umbrella brands in frequently purchased packaged categories. They used two categories – toothpaste and toothbrushes., to test for marketing mix synergies for umbrella brands they used advertising effect, price-cut, coupon, display and features of product I both category. They used (5) brands of every category. They tested on brand 1 & brand 2 separately by (20% increase in coupon availability, Advertising, Displays, Features and 20% decrease in price).By the result, the smallest cross effects are the price cross-effects in many cases. The cross-effect of coupon availability on sales range from 5-13% across product categories and across brand 1 and brand 2. The advertising cross-effects range from 4% to 8%. The display cross-effect range from 3% to 7%. Similarly the feature cross-effects in toothbrush are 5% for both brands 1&2. Finally, price cross-effect range from 3% to 6% as well in both categories. The simulation results

for a temporary policy change by brand 1 (brand 2) in the toothpaste category suggest as the percentage of the own-effects, cross-effect on brand 1's (brand 2's) toothpaste sales are 27%, 54%, 30% and 28% (23, 61, 43 & 64%) for price, coupon availability, advertising and display respectively. The result suggests that the need for integration exists for all the marketing-mix elements, including sales promotions and especially couponing strategies for increasing the sales.

Swait Joffre and Erdem Tulin (2002), "The effect of temporal consistency of sales promotions and availability on consumer choice behavior," *Journal of Marketing Research*, 39(August), 304-319.

In this article, the author focus on a particular aspect of marketing mix consistency over time in the context of frequently purchased packaged consumer goods: they investigate the impact of temporal consistency on store promotions, as well as the availability of the product on the shelf, on consumer product evaluations (utilities) and choices. In this specific points, temporal (in) consistency captures the degree of variability of prices, displays, and features, as well as availability over time, for a stock-keeping unit. The effect of sales promotion and availability consistency on consumer choices have several managerial implication. If inconsistency is found to affect consumer choice probabilities negatively because of adverse brand equity effects, manufactures need to avoid inconsistency.

However, (price variability) can also be an effective way for retailers to employ price discrimination strategies based on differential consumer search costs. It would be important for manufacturers to know whether the deal effect of price variability out weighs the brand equity effect on consumer utility or vice-versa. Also, the level of sales promotion variability and especially price variability has been shown to affect the consumer stock choices. These results suggest that sales promotion mix and availability inconsistency have an overall negative impact on consumer' utilities and thus their choices. Therefore, it is important for both manufacturer and retailers to establish the direction and magnitude of sales promotion mix consistency and

availability effect on consumer choices

Pauwels Koen, Hanssens Dominique .M, and Siddarth S. (2002), "The long-term effects of price promotions on category incidence, brand choice. And purchase quantity," *Journal of marketing research*, 39 (November), 421-439.

In this article, authors want to clarify that to what extent do price promotions have a long term effect on the components of brand sales, category incidence, brand-choices and purchase quantity. The authors answer this question by using persistence modeling on weekly sales data of a perishable and a storable product derived from a scanner panel. Their analysis reveals that permanent promotion effect are virtually absent for each sales component. In this, two category (soap and yogurt), four stores and 3 brand of soap and 6 brands of yogurt is used. They use persistence modeling to examine whether and to what extent price promotions have a long term impact on the three components of brand sales on the basis of scanner panel they compute for each store the category incidence, brand choices and purchase quantity for each components, they test for permanent change in time series and examine whether such change are due to price stocks of the major brands in store.

Further, for component series that are found to be stationary, they apply an impulse response approach to estimate the time it takes for the dependent variable to revert to its mean after being stocked by price promotion. Finally they quantify the impact of a price promotion on each sales component. These finding support the notion that brand choices are in equilibrium in mature markets and that price promotions produce only temporary benefits for established brand.

Heerde Horald J. Van, Gupta Sachin and Wittink Dick R. (2003), "Is 75% of the sales promotion bump due to brand switching?" No, only 33% is," *Journal of Marketing Reseach*, 40 (November), 481-491.

In this article, the authors want to declare the statement that 55% of sales promotion is due to brand switching is not true. In this opinion, it is only 33% the authors demonstrate that their results does not simply

that if brand gains 100 units in sales during a promotion, the other brands in this category loses 74 units. In this, authors use the household data and published household decomposition results and also use the results by different authors as Gupta's, Bucklin and Shrinivasna etc. The main finding is that the primary demand effects of promotions are greater than what has been assumed so far: 66% in unit sales rather than 25% in terms of elasticity's. A possible direction for further research is to decompose primary demand effect into increased consumption effects, cross category effects, stock piling effects and cross-store effects. These effects differ strongly in attractiveness for retailers and magnitude so as to measure net sales promotion effect for both parties. Finally, strategic decision should depend on the nature of the decomposition of a sales increase due to promotion. The finding is that, the net secondary demand effect is only approximately 33% of the total unit sales effect.

Chandon Pierre, Wansink Brian and Laurent Gilles (2000), "A benefit congruency framework of sales promotion effectiveness," *Journal of Marketing*, 64(October), 65-81.

In this article, authors arise the question, "are the monetary savings the only explanation for consumer response to a sales promotion? To address the question, this research builds a framework of the multiple consumer benefits of a sales promotion the authors find that monetary and non-monetary promotions provide consumers with different levels of three hedonic benefits (opportunities for value expression, entertainment and exploration) and three utilization benefits (saving, higher product quality and improved shopping convenience). Monetary promotions are more effective for utilitarian products than hedonic products. The authors also discuss the implications of the multi-benefits and the benefit congruency framework for understanding consumer response to sales promotions, reexamining the value of every day-low-price policies and designing more effective sales promotions. Perhaps, coupons and temporary price reductions are the most common form of sales promotions, most research has assumed that monetary savings is the only consumer benefit of sales

promotion. The purpose of this research is to provide an integrative framework of the consumer benefits of sales promotion. Sales promotion can provide consumers with an array of hedonic and utilitarian benefits beyond monetary savings. Non-monetary promotions provide more hedonic benefits and fewer utilitarian benefits than monetary promotions.

Chan Tat, Narsimhan Chakravarthi and Zhang Qin. (2008), "Decomposing promotional effects with a dynamic structural model of flexible consumption," *Journal of Marketing Research*, 45 (August), 487-498

In this article, the authors offer a methodology to decompose the effect of price promotions into brand switching. Stockpiling and change in consumption by explicitly allowing for consumer heterogeneity in brand preference and consumption needs. They develop a dynamic structural model of a household that divides when, what and how much to buy, as well as how much to consume, to maximize its expected utility over an infinite horizon. In this model there are three main product attributes; brand, water or oil based, and light or regular in fat content.

The grouping of 33 stock keeping units (SKUs) by product attributes generates 12 product alternatives. The first 11 products are based on SKUs that share the same three attributes-brand name, water or oil, and light or white (regular) and the last product consists of SKUs that belong to other brands. For each purchase occasion, authors construct the price, features and display of the product bought as the weighted average over the SKUs that belong to this product alternative. The weight used in the quantity sold for a product that a household does not purchase in a week, the price, features and displays are constructed as the numerical average over all the SKUs that belong to the product alternative in the household's most frequently visited store. The stockpiling effect for the two larger-share brands (53% for starlets and 51% for chicken of the sea) is greater than that for the smaller-share brands (32% for 3-diamond and 35% for the control). The brand-switching effect is relatively small for larger-share brands but substantially greater

for smaller-share brands. The comparisons imply that from a manufacturer's perspective the strategy of temporarily cutting price to steal sales from other brands might not be that effective for larger-share brands. Unlike in the one-period game, a larger brand's profits could be hurt in the long run is the case because a large portion of its sales increase comes at the expense of future sales. This is because these brands have more brand loyals who may tend to stockpile more during promotions. They show that larger-share brands can increase profits by reducing the frequency of price promotions. For brand loyals, the majority of increase in purchases from price promotions can be attributed to stockpiling, whereas brand switchers do not stockpile. Brand loyals increase their consumption more than brand switchers. Brand loyals are more price elastic than brand switchers because of their flexible consumption and stockpiling.

## **METHODOLOGY**

### **Hypothesis:**

**H0:** Price promotion has a significant effect into brand switching

**H1:** Price promotion has no significant effect into brand switching.

### **Research Objective:**

- (1). To study the various price promotion techniques used for consumers.
- (2). To study the effect of price promotions into brand switching.

### **Research Design:**

Causal research design is being used.

### **Data Collection:**

After reviewing the literature a questionnaire was designed to collect the primary data. Close-ended questions were used for convenience of the respondents. Scaling techniques was used for rating various attributes of different brands. The brands chosen were Lux, Godrej no.1, Dettol, Lifebuoy and Superia.. These brands were mostly consumed based

on the findings through pilot survey. .

### **Sample Design:**

Convenience sampling was used.

**Sample Area:** Dehradun

**Sample Size:** 200

### **LIMITATIONS**

1. The research is being restricted to Dehradun city, so the result could not be universally true.
2. Respondents some times were non co-operating and unwilling to respond.

### **ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION**

For price promotion techniques out of 200 respondents, 64% are aware of 'Cash discount', 29% are of 'Price pack deal' and 1% are aware of 'Cent

**Table: 1**

Awareness of price promotion techniques

Price Promotion Technique	Response
Cash discount	64%
Cent off deal	1%
Gift premium	24%
Price pack deal	29%
Quantity discount	20%
Money Back Offer	2%

off deal'.

Out of 200 respondents, 39% are consuming 'Lux', 32% are consuming 'Lifebuoy' and the least

**Table: 2**

Brand of soap consumed

Brand	Response
Lux	39%
Godrej No1	10%
Dettol	12%
Lifebuoy	32%
Superia	7%

7% are consuming 'Superia'.

Mean value is 3.56 so more respondents lie between 'Probably Yes' and 'Uncertain'.

**Out of 200 respondents, 48 respondents have been forwarded to customer profile and 152**

**Table: 3**

Price promotion the motive for purchase of brand

Definitely Yes	Probably Yes	Uncertain	Probably No	Definitely No	Mean
33%	27%	16%	11%	13%	3.56

**respondents are forwarded to further research**

For Price promotion technique for purchasing that brand out of 152 respondents, 55.26% said 'Cash discount', 32.90% said 'Price pack deal' and

**Table: 4**

Price promotion technique for purchasing that brand

Price Promotion Technique	Response
Cash discount	55.26%
Cent off deal	1.32%
Gift premium	2.63%
Price pack deal	32.90%
Quantity discount	6.58%
Money Back Offer	1.32%

1.32% each for 'Cent off deal and 'Money back offer'.

Mean value is 3.72 so more of the respondents are little **near to more effectiveness.**

For past consuming of the brand, out of 152

**Table: 5**

Rating of price promotion technique

Highly Effective 1	2	3	4	Not Effective at all 5	Mean
43.42%	21.05%	13.15%	10.52%	11.84%	3.72

respondents, 78.94% said 'yes' and 21.06 said 'no'.

**Out of 152 respondents, 32 have been**

**Table: 6**

Before purchasing the brand, consuming any other brand

YES	No
78.94%	21.06%

**forwarded to customer profile and 120 are forwarded to further research.**

Out of 120 respondents, 31.67% said 'Godrej no.1', 20% said 'Lifebuoy', 15% said 'Lux', 13.34% said Dettol, 11.66% said Superia and 8.33% said any other.

**Table: 7**

**Brand being consumed**

Brand	Response
Lux	15%
Godrej No1	31.67%
Dettol	13.34%
Lifebuoy	20%
Superia	11.66%
Any other	8.33%

Price promotion motive for consuming past brand out of 120 respondents, 80% said 'yes' and 20% said 'no'.

**Table: 8**

Price promotion motive for consuming the past brand

YES	NO
80%	20%

**Out of 120 respondents, 24 have been forwarded and 96 are forwarded to further research**

For the price promotion technique was for purchasing that brand, out of 120 respondents, 39.58%

**Table: 9**

The price promotion technique was for purchasing that brand

Price Promotion Technique	Response
Cash discount	39.58%
Cent off deal	2.08%
Gift premium	8.34%
Price pack deal	35.41%
Quantity discount	12.50%
Money Back Offer	2.08%

said 'cash discount', 35.41 said 'price pack deal', 12.50% said 'quantity discount', 8.34% said 'gift premium', 2.08% said 'cent off deal' and 2.08% says 'Money back offer'.

Mean value is 2.70 so most of the respondents **are little near to average of effectiveness.**

Out of 200 respondents for brand lux mean value is 3.48 so more of the respondents lie between

**Table: 10**

Rating of the price promotion technique

Highly Effective 1	2	3	4	Not Effective at all 5	Mean
16.67%	18.75%	14.58%	18.75%	31.25%	= 2.70

**Table: 11**

Price promotion motive for consuming brand

Response	Definitely Yes	Probably Yes	Uncertain	Probably NO	Definitely NO	Mean
<b>Brand</b>	Response in percentage (%)					
Lux	35.90	23.07	12.82	10.25	17.49	3.48
Godrej no.1	40	30	10	10	10	3.8
Dettol	25	16.66	33.33	16.66	8.33	3.33
Lifeboy	31.25	34.37	15.62	9.37	9.37	3.68
Superia	28.57	28.57	14.28	14.28	14.28	3.42

probably yes and uncertain, for brand godrej no.1 mean value is 3.8 so more of the respondents are between probably yes & uncertain, for brand dettol mean value is 3.33 so more of the respondents are between probably yes and uncertain, for brand lifebuoy mean value is 3.68 so more of the respondents are between probably yes and uncertain, for brand superia mean value is 3.42 so more of the respondents are between probably yes and uncertain.

For brand lux (57.14% said price pack deal and 42.86 said cash discount), brand godrej no.1(62.50%

**Table: 12**

Price promotion technique for purchasing brand

Price Promotion	Cash discount	Cent off deal	Gift premium	Price pack deal	Quantity discount	Money back offer
<b>Brand</b>	Response in percentage (%)					
Lux	42.86			57.14		
Godrej NO.1	62.50			37.50		
Dettol	77.78		22.22			
Lifeboy	69.23	3.84		23.07	3.84	
Superia					80	20

said cash discount and 37.50 said price pack deal), brand dettol (77.78% said cash discount and 22.23 % said gift premium), brand lifebuoy (most of the respondents said cash discount) and brand superia (80% said quantity discount and 20% said money back offer).

Out of 152 respondents for lux (67.86% said yes and 32.14% said no), for godrej no.1 (87.50%

**Table: 13**

Before purchasing the brand, any other brand was being consumed

Response	Yes	No
<b>Brand</b>	Percentage (%)	
Lux	67.86	32.14
Godrej NO.1	87.50	12.50
Dettol	77.78	22.22
Lifeboy	88.46	11.54
Superia	80	20

said yes and 12.50% said no), for dettol (77.78% said yes and 22.22% said no), for lifebuoy (88.46% said yes and 11.54% said no), for superia (80% said yes and 20% said no).

Out of 152 respondents for lux (67.86% said yes and 32.14% said no), for godrej no.1 (87.50% said yes and 12.50% said no), for dettol (77.78% said yes and 22.22% said no), for lifebuoy (88.46% said yes and 11.54% said no), for superia (80% said yes and 20% said no).

For price promotion motive, out of 120

**Table: 14**

Price promotion motive for consuming the past brand

Response	Yes	No
<b>Brand</b>	Percentage (%)	
Lux	88.89	11.11
Godrej NO.1	89.47	10.53
Dettol	87.50	12.50
Lifeboy	83.33	16.67
Superia	85.71	14.29
		100

respondents for past brand lux (88.89% said yes and 11.11% said no), for past brand godrej no.1(89.47% said yes and 10.53% said no) for past brand dettol (89.47% said yes and 12.50% said no), for past brand lifebuoy (83.33% said yes and 16.67% said no), for past brand superia (85.71% said yes and 14.29% said no), for any other consuming brand said only no.

For brand lux (62.50% said cash discount and

**Table: 15**

Price promotion technique for purchasing the past brand

Price Promotion	Cash discount	Cent off deal	Gift premium	Price pack deal	Quantity discount	Money back offer
<b>Brand</b>	Response in percentage (%)					
Lux	62.50			37.50		
Godrej NO.1	41.18	5.88		47.06	5.88	
Dettol	42.86		57.14			
Lifeboy	40			60		
Superia					83.33	16.67

37.50% said price pack deal), brand godrej no.1 (more of the respondents said price pack deal), brand dettol (57.14% said gift premium 42.86% said cash discount), brand lifebuoy (60% said price pack deal and 40% said cash discount) and brand superia (83.33% said quantity discount and 16.67% said money back offer).

**Table : 16**

Comparative table of effectiveness of price promotion technique

Brand	Present mean	Past mean	Difference
<b>Lux</b>	<b>4.17</b>	<b>2.44</b>	<b>1.73</b>
<b>Godrej NO.1</b>	<b>3.81</b>	<b>2.29</b>	<b>1.52</b>
<b>Dettol</b>	<b>3.55</b>	<b>3.14</b>	<b>0.41</b>
<b>Lifeboy</b>	<b>3.88</b>	<b>2.80</b>	<b>1.08</b>
<b>Superia</b>	<b>3.30</b>	<b>3.16</b>	<b>0.14</b>

For brand lux **mean difference** (1.73) is more than any other and for every brand mean difference is positive so present price promotion scheme are more effective than past.

**Frequency of present price promotion techniques**

**Chi-Square Test**

**Table: 17**

Present price promotion

PRICPRCT

	Observed N	Expected N	Residual
1.00	84	25.3	58.7
2.00	2	25.3	-23.3
3.00	4	25.3	-21.3
4.00	50	25.3	24.7
5.00	10	25.3	-15.3
6.00	2	25.3	-23.3
Total	152		

**Table: 18**

**Test Statistics**

	PRICPRCT
Chi-Square <sup>a</sup>	230.105
df	5
Asymp. Sig.	.000

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected frequencies less than 5. The minimum expected cell frequency is 25.3.

**Table: 19**

Effectiveness

**EFFECTCT**

	Observed N	Expected N	Residual
1.00	66	30.4	35.6
2.00	32	30.4	1.6
3.00	20	30.4	-10.4
4.00	16	30.4	-14.4
5.00	18	30.4	-12.4
Total	152		

**Table: 20**

**Test Statistics**

	EFFECTCT
Chi-Square <sup>a</sup>	57.211
df	4
Asymp. Sig.	.000

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected frequencies less than 5. The minimum expected cell frequency is 30.4.

The value of chi square ( $\chi^2$ ) statistics test assumption significance level is .05. The value of 'present price promotion technique' .000 and 'effectiveness of present price promotion technique' .000 are less than assumption significance level so the null hypothesis is rejected in present price promotion.

**Frequency of past price promotion techniques**

**Table: 21**

Past price promotion

PRICPRPT

	Observed N	Expected N	Residual
1.00	38	16.0	22.0
2.00	2	16.0	-14.0
3.00	8	16.0	-8.0
4.00	34	16.0	18.0
5.00	12	16.0	-4.0
6.00	2	16.0	-14.0
Total	96		



**Table: 22**

**Test Statistics**

	PRICPRPT
Chi-Square <sup>a</sup>	80.000
df	5
Asymp. Sig.	.000

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected frequencies less than 5. The minimum expected cell frequency is 16.0.

**Table: 23**

**Effectiveness  
EFFECTPT**

	Observed N	Expected N	Residual
1.00	16	19.2	-3.2
2.00	18	19.2	-1.2
3.00	14	19.2	-5.2
4.00	18	19.2	-1.2
5.00	30	19.2	10.8
Total	96		

**Table: 24**

**Test Statistics**

	EFFECTPT
Chi-Square <sup>a</sup>	8.167
df	4
Asymp. Sig.	.086

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected frequencies less than 5. The minimum expected cell frequency is 19.2.

The value of chi square ( $\chi^2$ ) statistics test assumption significance level is .05. The value of 'past price promotion technique' .000 is less than assumption level. And 'effectiveness of past price promotion technique' .086 is greater than assumption significance level so the null hypothesis is accepted in past price promotion.

**CONCLUSION**

The conclusion of study is that awareness of cash discount is more than any other, mostly respondent give preference cash discount and price pack deal as a price promotion in soap category. In case of purchased the brand by respondent, mostly respondent has been purchased 'Lux' and 'Lifebuoy' in soap category.

In case of price promotion, the motive of purchasing the brand, mostly respondents were near

to probably yes. In case of type of price promotion, mostly respondent said cash discount on 'Lux' and price pack deal for 'Lifebuoy'. And for the effectiveness of price promotion, mostly respondents were near to effective portion.

Most respondents said price promotion highly effective for Lux than any other. In past consuming brands, mostly respondents said Godrej No. 1. In price promotion, the motive of purchasing the brand, mostly respondents said yes.

Respondents said price pack deal and cash discount on Godrej No.1. In case of effectiveness, mostly respondents were near to average and for brand Godrej No.1 mostly respondents were near to last effective.

In chi-square test, null hypothesis is rejected for present price promotion. Null hypothesis is accepted for the effectiveness of past price promotion.

As the research is focused on the objectives, various price promotional tools used for consumers and effect of price promotion into brand switching. By the least effectiveness price promotion tool, mostly consumer switch to different brands, so the research will be useful for the bathing soap companies. The research is limited as in Dehradun, further research can be conducted national wide by using this data. More product category can be used for the further research by applying this pattern.

**REFERENCES**

Chan, Tat Narsimhan, Chakravarthi and Zhang, Qin. (2008), "Decomposing promotional effects with a dynamic structural model of flexible consumption," *Journal of Marketing Research*, 45 (August), 487-498

Chandon, Pierre Wansink, Brian and Laurent, Gilles (2000), "A benefit congruency framework of sales promotion effectiveness," *Journal of Marketing*, 64(October), 65-81.

Heerde, Horald J. Van, Gupta, Sachin and Wittink, Dick R. (2003), "Is 75% of the sales promotion bump due to brand switching?" No, only 33% is," *Journal of Marketing Research*, 40 (November), 481-491

- Pauwels, Koen Hanssens, Dominique M., Siddarth, S.(2002) "The long-term effects of price promotions on category incidence, brand choice. And purchase quantity," *Journal of Marketing research*, 39 (November), 421-439.
- Swait, Joffre and Erdem, Tulin (2002). "The effect of temporal consistency of sales promotions and availability on consumer choice behavior," *Journal of Marketing Research*, 39 (August), 304-319.
- Erdem, Tulin and Sun, Baohong (2002), "An empirical investigation of the spillover effects of advertising and sales promotion in Umbrella Branding," *Journal of Marketing Research*, 39 (November), 408-420
- Garreston, Judith A. and Burton, Scot. (1998), "Alcoholic beverage sales promotion: An initial Investigation of the role of warning message and Brand characters among consumers over and under the legal drinking age," *Journal of Public Policy & Marketing*, 17 (January), 35-43.
- Raghubir, Priya and Corfman, Kim (1999), "When do price promotions affect Pretrial Broad Evaluation," *Journal of Marketing research*, 36 (May), 211-222.
- Ailawadi, kusum L. and Neslin, scott A. (1998), " The effect of promotion on competiton: buying more and consuming it faster," *Journal of Marketing Research*, 35(August),390-398.
- Raghubir, Priya (1998), " Coupon Value : a signal for proxy" *Journal of Marketing Research*, 35 (August), 316-324.
- Julian, Cummins (1994) "Sales Promotion" Universal Book Stall New Delhi
- Kothari, C.R. (2002), "Research Methodology" , Wishwa Prakashan, New Delhi.
- Terence, A. Shimp (1989) "Advertising, Promotion" Thomson South Western Publication.
- Gupta, S.P (2004) "Statistical Method" Sultan Chand & Sons, New Delhi.

## SUBMISSION DETAILS

- The manuscripts should be prepared using MS Word software with Times New Roman font and the text should be double spaced with 1 inch margin on all the sides on A4 normal size paper.
- The cover page should have the title of the paper, author(s) name(s), their affiliation, contact address (es), Email and phone no(s).
- The manuscript should accompany and executive summary (abstract) of about 200 words.
- The names of the authors(s) should not be used anywhere in the body of the manuscript to minimize any biases in the review process.
- References, Figure, Tables etc. should be put at the end of the paper. References should be in standard APA style.
- The editorial committee shall review all the submissions and the decision of the editorial committee shall be communicated to the authors. Editorial selection of works for publication will be made based on content, without regard to the stature of the authors.
- The manuscripts may be submitted through e-mail at [vedaang.editor@gmail.com](mailto:vedaang.editor@gmail.com)

# Vedaang Subscription Form

## Subscription Rates for One Year

	Indian Rupess (INR)
Companies	500
Academic Institutes	400
Individuals	300
Students	200
Alumuni	250

---

### ORDER FORM

I/We would like to subscribe to Vedaang. (Please tick the appropriate category box)

Individual

SGRRITS Alumni

Academic Institutions

Students

Companies

Mailing Address

Name .....

Address.....

.....

City.....Pin Code .....

Country .....Phone .....Email.....

Payment Details

&Demand Draft

No. ....

Dated .....

Drawn on Bank .....

\* (Favoring SGRRITS, Dehradun)