

“The impact of sales promotion tools on consumer’s behavioral intentions for convenience products”

Dr. Mohammed Ahmed Hassan

Assistant Professor of Marketing
Faculty of Commerce
University of Alexandria
(Damanhour Branch)
Egypt

Dr. Dalia Abdelrahman Farrag

Assistant Professor of Marketing
Marketing and International
Business Department
Head of Marketing courses
College of Management &
Technology
The Arab Academy for Science,
Technology & Maritime Transport
Egypt

August 2010

Abstract

This research evaluates the impact of different sales promotion tools, namely - price discount, Product demonstration/sampling, buy one get one free (bonus pack) and sweepstakes, on five consumers' behavioral responses (product trial, brand switching, stockpiling, purchase acceleration and spending more) for buying convenience products from supermarkets in Alexandria and Cairo. A total of 300 selected customers/ shoppers were surveyed using a structured questionnaire.

Findings: the results showed that price discounts and buy-one-get-one-free offers and were found to be the most effective for encouraging stockpiling, purchase acceleration and spending more. In-store demonstrations/sampling came third place in specifically encouraging product trial. On the other hand, sweepstakes and games were found to be not effective at all in inducing the four behaviors investigated in this study.

Keywords: Price discount, In-store demonstrations, Buy one get one free, sweepstakes, Product trial, purchase acceleration, stockpiling, brand switching, spending more, Egyptian Customers.

INTRODUCTION

In a fiercely competitive marketplace, brand managers strive to understand the impact of sales promotions on consumers in order to design suitable and effective marketing campaigns. Consumer promotions now account for almost a quarter of the marketing budget of consumer product companies. From the consumer point of view, this means that consumers are being bombarded by consumer promotions aimed at persuading them to purchase and purchase *now*.

Therefore, it is necessary for marketers to understand which promotional tool is relatively more effective in obtaining a given behavioral outcome which will help them increase their sales by offering the right promotional tools to stimulate the desired behavioral response from consumers. Hypermarket, Supermarket, and Discounters in Egypt increased at a compounded annual growth rate (CAGR) of 7.5% between 2003 and 2008. In addition to the fact that Food and Grocery market sales accounted for a 90.3% share of the hypermarket, supermarket, and discounters format in 2008. (www.companiesandmarkets.com). Sales promotions is one of the most popular and common tools that are extensively used to attract consumers to adopt certain behaviors inside supermarkets.

There are many previous studies that have been conducted discussing consumer responses to sales promotions (e.g., Bawa and Shoemaker, 1987 and 1989; Blattberg and Neslin, 1990; Leone and Srinivasan, 1996; Huff and Alden, 1998). However, there has been much emphasis on coupons at the expense of other equally important promotional tools such as bonus packs and price discounts. Coupons in general are not a very common promotional tool used in Egyptian supermarkets and convenient stores. This is why this study investigates the impact of other commonly adopted tools namely; price discounts, bonus packs (e.g. buy one get one free) product displays/sampling and sweepstakes on five main behavioral responses; brand switching, stockpiling, purchase acceleration (buying earlier than planned), product trial and spending more. Previous research has shown that sales promotion can encourage such behavioral responses (Shi *et al.*, 2005).

This research was designed to examine the relationship between different sales promotion tools and the responses of consumers in Egypt. Since previous research has not linked the full range of sales promotion devices to the full range of behavioral response in the Egyptian context, the following research question is proposed: *What is the impact of sales promotion tools on consumers' behavioral responses in Egypt?*

More specifically, the research has two main objectives:

1. Evaluate the effectiveness of each specific tool in inducing each of the five behaviors.
2. Evaluate the effectiveness of the four promotional tools in inducing individual buying behaviors.

PRIOR LITERATURE

The growth of research in the use of sales promotion as a marketing strategy is associated with the proliferation of super and hyper markets for selling convenient products and the drastic changes in shopping patterns for consumers around the world.

Sales promotion has been defined as 'a direct inducement that offers an extra value or incentive for the product to the sales force, distributors, or the final consumer with the primary objective of creating an immediate Sale' (Haugh, 1983), Belch and Belch (2003) have proposed a similar definition. Totten & Block (1994) stated that the term sales promotion refers to many kinds of selling incentives and techniques intended to produce immediate or short term sales effects. According to Shimp (2003), sales promotion refers to any incentive used by a manufacturer to induce the trade (wholesalers, retailers, or other channel members) and/ or consumers to buy a brand and to encourage the sales force to aggressively sell it. Retailers also use promotional incentives to encourage desired behaviors from consumers.

The many definitions of sales promotion have a common viewpoint: they all involve a temporary and tangible modification of supply, for the ultimate goal of direct impact on the behavior of the consumer, retailer or sales force. Within the marketing mix, sales promotion has one of the strongest impacts on short-term consumption behavior (Laroche *et al.* 2003). It is more short-term oriented and capable of influencing behavior. It is an 'action-focused' marketing event (Blattberg & Neslin 1990).

Sales promotion primarily has sales objectives; this justifies the tendency of companies to invest a large part of their budget on these actions. The intention is to give the product greater appeal and value. The objectives of sales promotion will be reached to greater extent when the consumer does not expect it. If the consumer is capable of anticipating when a sales promotion action will take place, the results obtained will decrease. The sales promotion technique to be developed will be different depending on the objectives. There is a wide range of possibilities. For example Brassington and Pettit (1997) classified sales promotion techniques as being either: Money based, Product-based, Gift-, prize- or merchandise-based or Store-based.

Although the work of Gilbert and Jackaria (2002) goes some way towards comparing consumer behavioral response to a number of sales promotion tools, none of the previous studies of sales promotion has actually compared the full range of behavioral responses across the full range of sales promotion techniques except for a study by (Shi *et al.*, 2005) in Hong Kong.

Consumer's Sales Promotion Tools

A price discount is a temporary reduction of the list price of the product. The major strategic goal of a price discount is to discriminate between informed and uninformed consumers, or between loyal users and switchers. Research suggests that price discounts are particularly effective in inducing purchase acceleration and product trial (Gilbert & Jackaria, 2002). There is a well-developed literature explaining the demographic and psychographic characteristics of the deal-prone segment (Bawa & Shoemaker, 1987a; Blattberg & Neslin, 1990). An emerging view is that psychographics play a direct role in

determining deal proneness and demographics help determine consumers' psychographics (Ailawadi *et al.* 2001).

Games such as sweepstakes (known as 'lucky draws') are used by supermarkets to attract traffic. People participate in these games for reasons such as the perceived value of the prize, or perceived fun and interest (Ward & Hill, 1991). This particular sales promotion tool has received limited research. It is also not very popularly used in Egypt compared to other promotional tools.

Product demonstrations/sampling is widely used in Egyptian supermarkets, especially to promote new product ideas or new brands. In their study, Ram and Sheth, (1989) indicated that product demonstrations help reduce the resistance of consumers to new products by lowering functional and psychological barriers thus encouraging product trial. However, Gilbert and Jackaria, (2002) found that a free sample as a promotional offer had no significance on product trial, whereas Pramataris *et al.* (2001); Fill, (2002), and Shimp, (2003), have shown otherwise.

Finally, bonus pack promotions (e.g. buy one get one free) may be offered to shoppers at the regular price, thus adding value to the product. Since an additional amount is given free of charge, consumers may be persuaded to buy the product. This means they must compare and evaluate the additional quantity received with respect to any costs they may incur. The literature examining the impact of bonus packs on stockpiling by consumers for example is inconclusive: Helsen and Schmittlein, (1992) found a significant link between buy one get one free and intention to stockpile, whereas Laroche *et al.*, (2003) did not.

Behavioral responses to Promotional Tools

Looking first at brand switching, a fundamental finding is that promotions influence consumer choice: that is they cause consumers to switch from brand A to brand B. It is possible that consumers who do not buy the brand will want to acquire it because they are attracted by the sales promotion (Gupta, 1993). However, Brandweek, (1994)

found that some people who change brand due to a promotion change back to their favorite brand when buying that category of product later. Gupta, (1998), and Bell *et al.*, (1999) have examined the magnitude of the brand switching effect, at least relative to dynamic effects such as stockpiling, and have found that brand switching accounts for the majority of the current period promotion effect.

Consumer stockpiling is a fundamental consequence of sales promotions (Neslin, 2002). It occurs because the promotion induces consumers to buy more than they would have otherwise (Blattberg *et al.*, 1981; Neslin *et al.*, 1985), so consumers end up with more quantity than they would have had in the absence of the promotion. Stockpiling can be induced because stockpiling consumers are motivated to trade off inventory carrying cost to get a better price (Blattberg *et al.* 1981; Krishna, 1992).

Purchase acceleration means that a customer purchases a product at an earlier time than planned (Shoemaker, 1979) as the result of a sales promotion, for reasons similar to those of the stockpile (Aggarwal & Vaidyanathan, 2003). Sales promotions can encourage consumers to either buy large quantities of the promoted product or buy that product at an earlier time. Both these are outcomes and examples of purchase acceleration. Davis *et al.*, (1992) was among the first researchers in marketing to demonstrate temporal purchase acceleration as a consequence of promotion. Wilson, (1984) demonstrated that deal purchases typically involved multiple units (larger quantities). Shoemaker (1979) examined both temporal as well as quantity acceleration in his study. Blattberg *et al.* (1981) reconfirmed shoemaker's findings for four different product categories. They showed that promotions shortened purchase time as well as increased purchase quantities.

Sales promotions tools when used strategically not only increases brand awareness, but also encourage customers to try new products. Price promotion does influence new product trial (Brandweek, 1994). In a different study, Ehrenberg *et al.* (1994) found that the short-term peaks in sales were due primarily to purchases made by occasional users of a brand rather than by new customers. Furthermore, the study concluded that these occasional users, after taking advantage of the price reduction, would most likely return

to their favorite brands in their portfolio rather than buy the promoted brand at full price. However, Shimp (2003) and Fill (2002) among other studies have documented a link between price promotion and product trial.

Product trial can be induced by promotions such as in-store demonstrations, because they lower the customer's perceived risk associated with trying a new, less familiar product for the first time (Blattberg *et al.* 1981). Blackwell and colleagues argued that new products are more likely to succeed when consumers can experiment with or try the idea on a limited basis, with limited financial risk. Product trial involves actually trying or using a product (Kardes, 1999). According to Peter and Olsen (1996), triability refers to the degree to which a product can be tried on a limited basis or divided into small quantities for an inexpensive trial. Banks (2003) wrote that with sales promotion, brands have a chance to quickly affect consumer choice and behavior by adding value through an on pack offer, by achieving incremental display or by encouraging trial via sampling or couponing. Finally, consumers may also spend more as they might purchase regular-priced items in addition to the promoted merchandise when they are attracted to store by a promotion (Mulhern and Padgett, 1995).

Research on the use of promotional tools in Egypt and the Arab region in general is scarce. Although most Fast Moving Consumer Goods (FMCG's) companies purchase retail audits on a regular basis to track down the performance of their brands in terms of market share and sales, however there is no indication upon which specific tool triggers what kind of behavior as this study attempts to do. The bulk of the extant literature on these relationships remains from the Western perspective (Ndubisi and Chew, 2006). There is an urgent need for research focusing on the Egyptian consumers and the Egyptian shopping environment that has drastically developed from mini groceries to super and hyper markets, from buying bread from the baker and meat from the butcher to buying everything from one place, from paying cash to using credit cards. All this has induced consumers to shop more and marketers' to create and develop new ways to attract consumers to buy more.

induced by individual promotional tools. Through this comparison, the five behaviors in response to each of the four tools can be ranked, and thus the effectiveness of each specific tool in inducing each of the four behaviors will be identified.

- H1a: There is a significant difference among consumer behavioral responses induced by price discounts
- H1b: There is a significant difference among consumer behavioral responses induced by free samples
- H1c: There is a significant difference among consumer behavioral responses induced by sweepstakes
- H1d: There is a significant difference among consumer behavioral responses induced by buy one get one free offers

Second hypothesis:

The second hypothesis is concerned with comparing the effectiveness of the four promotional tools in inducing individual buying behaviors. The four tools will be ranked in terms of the behavior induced by each. This highlights which tools are most effective in inducing one specific behavior.

- H2a: There is a significant difference among the brand switching response induced by the sales promotion tools.
- H2b: There is a significant difference among the purchase acceleration response induced by the sales promotion tools.
- H2c: There is a significant difference among the stockpiling response induced by the sales promotion tools.
- H2d: There is a significant difference among the product trial response induced by the sales promotion tools.
- H2e: There is a significant difference among the spending more response induced by the sales promotion tools.

Sampling and Data Collection:

A total final sample of 300 shoppers have been surveyed using a structured questionnaire in Egypt and specifically in Cairo and Alexandria as they possess the largest number of super and hyper markets for food products. The questionnaire was administered face to face with respondents to ensure a high response rate, accurate sampling and a minimum of interviewer bias, while permitting interviewer assessments, providing necessary explanations and giving the benefit of a degree of personal contact (Oppenheim, 1992, p.103). Scale items for the promotional tools and behavioral responses were selected based on a previous study by Gilbert and Jackaria (2002). A five point Likert scale (1=strongly disagree to 5=strongly agree) was used to indicate the respondents behavioral response to each of the three sales promotion tools. A total of 344 questionnaires were distributed and only 300 were returned which represents a response rate of 87%. The respondents were defined as 'supermarket shoppers'. Shoppers who visit super/hypermarkets on a regular basis were interviewed. The interview was conducted with the decision maker in the family the family was considered one unit.

The alpha coefficients relating the four behavioral responses to each tool were: price discount 0.75; product demonstration/ sampling 0.83; sweepstakes and games 0.92; bonus packs 0.82, all quiet satisfactory.

RESEARCH FINDINGS

Before discussing the findings of our hypotheses testing the following tables demonstrate the actual sample structure for the study.

Table 1: Gender

	Frequency	Percent
Male	98	32.7
Female	202	67.3
Total	300	100.0

Table 2: Age

	Frequency	Percent
21 - 25 yrs	31	10.3
26 - 30 yrs	43	14.3
31 - 35 yrs	77	25.7
36 - 40 yrs	36	12.0
41 - 50 yrs	37	12.3
More than 50 yrs	76	25.3
Total	300	100.0

Table 3: Occupation

	Frequency	Percent
Housewife	84	28.0
Private Business	22	7.3
Professional (Doctor, Lawyer... etc)	20	6.7
Employee in Public Sector	30	10.0
Employee in Private Sector	144	48.0
Total	300	100.0

Table 4: Education

	Frequency	Percent
University Graduate	221	73.7
Completed high School	2	7
Diploma Holder	10	3.3
Completed Masters	37	12.3
Completed PHD	13	4.3
Others	17	5.7
Total	300	100.0

Table 5: Marital Status

	Frequency	Percent
Single	91	30.3
Married	189	63.0
Widowed	11	3.7
Divorced	9	3.0
Total	300	100.0

Table 6: Monthly Household Income

	Frequency	Percent
Less than 1000L.E.	33	11.0
1001 – 3000L.E.	86	28.7
3001 – 6000L.E.	99	33.0
6001 – 9000L.E.	51	17.0
More than 9000L.E.	31	10.3
Total	300	100.0

Majority of the sample are females, given the fact that that they are the main decision makers in the household when it comes to food and convenient products in general.

Most of which are married mainly belonging to middle age brackets as well as mothers belonging to high age brackets (above 50years). This is also consistent with the occupation segmentation which is mainly skewed towards housewives and employees in the private sector. Majority of the sample are university graduates (74%) mainly belonging to middle income brackets. Although many super and hyper markets have become attractive shopping points to low, middle as well as high income brackets due to the product variety and assortments that they hold as well as the special offers and extensive use of sales promotions to specially attract lower income bracket families.

Testing the Hypothesis

A two-step statistical analysis was carried out for making the comparisons and testing the research hypotheses. First, repeated measures ANOVA were used to compare the variables. If the results of the test indicated a significant difference among them, the second step was to conduct paired-sample *t*-tests to isolate the source of the difference. Through this two-step process, the five different buying behaviors induced by each of the four sales promotion tools, and the effect of the four tools on each individual buying behavior, were ranked, and the differences among the variables were determined.

The results of this analysis are shown in Table 7, 8 and 9.

Table 7: Repeated Measures ANOVA- Promotional Tools (Wilk's Lambda)

Wilk's Lambda (P<0.05*)				
	Price Discounts	Product sampling/ Demonstrations	sweepstakes	buy one get one free
Buying Behavior	0.78*	0.73*	0.65*	0.69*

Table 8: Repeated Measures ANOVA- Buying Behavior (Wilk's Lambda)

Wilk's Lambda (P<0.05*)					
	Brand Switching	Purchase Acceleration	Stockpiling	Product Trial	Spend More
Promotional Tools	0.68*	0.77*	0.83*	0.79*	0.80*

Table 9: Mean Behavioral responses to the Sales Promotion Tools

	Price discount	In-store demonstration	Sweepstakes	Buy one get one free
Brand switching	2.44 ^{2b}	<u>2.88</u> ^{1a}	2.14 ^{1b}	<u>2.63</u> ^{2ab}
Purchase acceleration	<u>3.66</u> ^{1a}	2.80 ^{1b}	2.41 ^{1b}	<u>3.48</u> ^{1a}
Stockpiling	<u>3.55</u> ^{1a}	2.85 ^{1b}	2.46 ^{1b}	<u>3.26</u> ^{1a}
Product trial	<u>2.66</u> ^{2a}	<u>2.99</u> ^{1a}	2.16 ^{1b}	<u>2.67</u> ^{2a}
Spend more	<u>3.25</u> ^{1a}	2.68 ^{1b}	2.29 ^{1b}	<u>2.89</u> ^{2a}
Total	15.54	14.20	11.46	14.93
Average	3.11	2.84	2.29	2.99

a: 1st highest significant mean

b: 2nd highest significant mean

Regarding the first hypothesis, first of all repeated measures ANOVA were run to compare each of the five different buying behaviors in response to each sales promotion tool. The results indicated significant differences among the five buying behaviors for each sales promotional tool as it is indicated in table 7 (significant Wilk's Lambda, $p<0.05$). Paired- sample *t*- tests were then conducted to compare the means of the five responses for each of the promotional tools.

For price discounts, it can be seen that the five behaviors induced by price discounts can be divided into two groups. The first group includes purchase acceleration (mean= 3.66), stockpiling (mean= 3.55), and spending more (mean= 3.25). These means are significantly different from those of the second group composed of product trial (mean= 2.66) and brand switching (mean= 2.44). This indicates that customers feel that price discounts are more effective in inducing the behaviors of the first group than those of the second group. H1a is supported.

In-store demonstrations and product sampling have been recently commonly used in Egyptian super and hyper markets attempting to attract shoppers to try new brands and products. However, by means of paired -sample t-tests, it was found that consumers do not consider in-store demonstrations/sampling very effective in inducing the five buying behaviors. They were more effective in inducing product trial (mean=2.99) as compared to the other behaviors as it's clear from table 9. Thus H1b was not supported.

Regarding sweepstakes that are usually presented in the Egyptian market in the form of contests and less commonly games, there seemed to be no significant triggering of a specific behavioral outcome as it is clear from table 9, again H1c was not supported. Finally, bonus packs like for example buy, on get one free, The results of Paired-sample *t*-tests showed that bonus packs were most effective in inducing purchase acceleration (mean=3.48) followed by stockpiling (mean=3.26) and spending more (mean=2.89). However they were less effective in inducing product trial (mean=2.67) and brand switching (mean=2.63); to conclude H1d is supported.

On the other hand, the second hypothesis focused on the effectiveness of promotional tools in inducing individual behaviors. The same analytical procedures were followed like the first hypothesis. Again repeated measures ANOVA were run to compare how each buying behavior was affected by the four sales promotion tools. The results indicated significant differences among the four promotional tools for each buying behavior as it is indicated in table 8 (significant Wilk's Lambda, $p < 0.05$). Paired- sample

t-tests were then conducted to compare the means of the four promotional tools induced by each type of buying behavior.

Starting with brand switching and after running paired-sample *t*-test; comparing the relative effectiveness of the tools showed similar means across all promotional tools thus the brand switching effects is not that strong (all means below 3), therefore H2a was not supported. On the other hand the effect of purchase acceleration induced by the four promotional tools was significant and can be divided into two groups. The first group consists of purchase acceleration effects induced by price discounts (mean=3.66) and bonus packs (mean=3.48). These effects are significantly stronger than the effects induced by in-store product demonstrations (mean= 2.88) and finally sweepstakes and games (mean=2.63). H2b is supported.

Stockpiling effects of the four promotional tools showed a pattern similar to that of purchase acceleration effects: that is, price discounts (mean= 3.55) and bonus packs (buy one get one free) (mean= 3.26) were considered the most effective tools in inducing stockpiling. The responses to these measures are significantly different from the responses for the other two tools; in-store-demonstrations (mean= 2.85) and sweepstakes (mean= 2.46). As for product trail all means scored below 3 with in-store demonstrations highest (mean=2.99) followed by the other three promotional tools. So, H2c and d are supported.

Finally, paired- sample *t*-tests found that all the promotional tools were significantly different from each other in inducing respondents to spend more. Price discounts (mean=3.25) were considered the most effective, followed by bonus packs/ buy one get one free offers (mean=2.89). In-store demonstrations (mean=2.68) and sweepstakes (mean= 2.29) were less effective. H2e is supported.

Overall, price discounts was considered the most effective promotional tool (overall mean=3.11) as it's clear from the last row in table 9, followed by bonus packs/buy one get one free (overall mean= 2.99). Consumers claimed that these two promotional

activities are quite effective in inducing most of the desired buying behaviors. In-store demonstrations/sampling (overall mean= 2.84) was ranked the third most effective tool in inducing the five buying behaviors and finally sweepstakes/games (overall mean=2.29) were considered the least effective.

DISCUSSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The proliferation of supermarkets, hypermarkets and food chain stores in Egypt and the Arab Region has tempted marketers to better tailor their offerings to their target markets and attempt to understand their behavior and perceptions towards shopping for convenient goods in general. This research has investigated the effectiveness of four promotional tools commonly used in Egyptian super and hyper markets to induce various forms of buying behavior.

Looking first at price discounts, the results showed that they were more effective in inducing shopper's behavior in general; more specifically they are most effective in encouraging purchase acceleration (to buy earlier than planned), stockpiling and spending more. This is consistent with the findings of (Gilbert & Jackaria 2002, and Neslin *et al.* 1985). On the other hand price discounts were found to be least effective in inducing brand switching which is consistent with the findings of Shi *et al.*, (2005). However it is inconsistent with the findings of (Begon~a Alvarez and Rodolfo Va'zquez Casielles, 2005) who found that immediate price reductions (price cuts) exerts a greater influence on the brand choice process.

Egyptian consumers perceive price discounts as the most obvious form of saving that is simple and most straight forward compared to other promotional tools; as shoppers need only compare the value of the offer with the reference price. With a country suffering from high levels of illiteracy, constant price increases and high unemployment rates; real price cuts is the most believable and logical form of saving from the point of view of the Egyptian consumer. Similarly bonus packs as buy one get one free offer were found to be also appealing to Egyptian consumers and shoppers as it induces the same behaviors as price discounts but with lesser impact. With bonus packs, consumers know how much

more they can get from the deal. Maybe the only drawback is that they might buy more quantity than they actually need at the moment and also the hassle of storage. This is consistent with the findings of Gilbert and Jackaria (2002) and Shi *et al.*, (2005).

The other two tools namely in-store sampling or product demonstrations and sweepstakes (games) were found to be not so effective in encouraging consumers and shoppers towards specific behaviors. Actually the only obvious behavior induced by in-store sampling/demonstrations was product trial. This is consistent with the findings of Pramataris *et al.* (2001) Ndubisi and Chew, (2005), who found that product sampling, had a significant impact on product trial. This kind of promotional tool has become very common at Egyptian super and hyper markets. However, marketers should think about more creative and innovative ways for utilizing this tool inside and outside stores like sending free tasting samples of new products to loyal customers. Attractive in-store display practices are necessary to gain the greatest sales from product trial. On the other hand, sweepstakes and games are relatively less effective in inducing the four target buying behaviors. This is due to the fact that while sweepstakes and games add excitement and fun to the supermarket shopping experience, consumers realize that the chance of winning a substantial prize is slim.

This study has also focused on behavior responses of Egyptian shoppers and consumers. The primary goal of most sales promotion campaigns is to immediately increase sales. Therefore, the behaviors of purchase acceleration, stockpiling and spending more are the most desirable for super/hyper markets. This study has found that in general the promotional tools commonly used in Egypt are effective in this regard. Overall, the four promotional tools studied were considered less effective in inducing brand switching which is inconsistent with the findings of Gupta (1988), Chintagunta (1993), Chiang (1991), Bucklin *et al.*, (1998), and Bell *et al.*, (1999) who have examined the magnitude of the brand switching effect, at least relative to dynamic effects such as stockpiling, and have found that brand switching accounts for the majority of the current period promotion effect. There may be other reasons for consumers to switch to other

brands like for example a bad experience with a brand and not necessarily sales promotional tools. Furthermore, Egyptian consumers have a high resistance to change and should be induced with more convincing reasons to switch to other brands. This also raises the issue of the importance of branding in general even for convenient products. Even the most essential products for Egyptian families have become branded like rice, sugar, oil, jam and bread.

The overall, findings of this research are very relatively consistent with findings of research conducted in similar countries to Egypt such as Hong Kong and Malaysia and inconsistent to studies conducted in different countries such as the U.K and the States. The ranking of the four promotional tools in terms of their effectiveness in inducing the desired behavior suggests that consumers prefer tools that are simple and need less involvement.

MANAGERIAL IMPLICATIONS AND FUTURE RESEARCH

The results can help marketers appreciate which tool is relatively more effective in obtaining a given promotional outcome which will hence increase their sales by offering the right promotional tools to stimulate the desired behavioral response from consumers. Therefore marketing managers need to carefully plan their promotional budgets and the allocation of the budget over different forms of promotions. For example, promotions that emphasize price discounts, free sample, and buy one get one free offers are likely to be more effective than sweepstakes.

Sales promotion could contribute to communication objectives as well as the sales objectives, therefore future research similar to that proposed by Vakratas and Ambler (1999) in the advertising domain is recommended to measure the interaction between the communication and behavioral effects of sales promotion. Product price should also be included in the variables as various promotional drivers of behavioral responses may differ with respect to product price, for example promotional drivers of highly priced

items, might differ from low price items. Therefore, it is recommended that future research examine the moderation effect of product price in order to see if the observed effects could be generalized across product values.

Finally, this research focused on the effect of sales promotional tools on consumers' behavior for convenience products only. Future research can be conducted on the services sector or other product categories that can provide different findings and insights into which tools are more relevant to which products, services or industries and can trigger different kinds of behavioral response.

REFERENCES

- Aggarwal, P. & Vaidyanathan, R. (2003) "Use it or lose it: purchase acceleration effects of time-limited promotions." *Journal of Consumer Behavior*, 2(4), pp. 393-412.
- Ailawadi, K.L., Neslin, S.A. & Gedenk, K. (2001) "Pursuing the value-conscious consumer: store brands versus national brand promotion." *Journal of Marketing*, 65(1), pp. 71-89.
- Banks, P. 2003. Store was set to rage on. *Ireland's Marketing Monthly*. 1 on line, available at: <http://www.marketing.ie/sep03/article4.htm>.
- Bawa, K. & Shoemaker, R.W. 1987. The effects of a direct mail coupon on brand choice behavior. *Journal of Marketing Research*. 24: pp.
- Bawa, K. & Shoemaker, R.W. 1989. Analyzing Incremental Sales from a Direct Mail Coupon Promotion. *Journal of Marketing*. 53 (3): pp.66-76
- Bawa, K. & Shoemaker, R.W. (1987a) "the coupons-prone consumer: some findings based on purchase behavior across product classes." *Journal of Marketing*, 51(4), pp. 99-110.
- Bawa, K. & Shoemaker, and R.W. (1987b) "the effects of direct mail coupons on brand choice behavior." *Journal of Marketing Research*, 24(4), pp. 370-376.
- Begoña Alvarez Alvarez, Rodolfo Vázquez Casielles (2005). "Consumer evaluations of sales promotion: the effect on brand choice" *European Journal of Marketing*, Vol: 39. Issue ½.
- Belch, G.E. & Belch, M.A. (2003) *Advertising and Promotion: An Integrated Marketing Communications Perspective*, 6th edn. Boston, MA: McGraw-Hill.
- Bell, David R., Jeongwen Chiang, and V. Padmanabhan (1999), "The Decomposition of Promotional Response: An Empirical Generalization," *Marketing Science*, 18 (4), 504-526.
- ———, Ganesh Iyer, and V. Padmanabhan (2002), "Price Competition Under Stockpiling and Flexible Consumption," *Journal of Marketing Research*, 39 (August), 292-303.

- Blattberg, R.C. & Neslin, S.A. (1990) *Sales promotion: Concepts, Methods, and Strategies*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Blattberg, R.C. & Neslin, S.A. 1990. *Sales Promotion, : Concepts, Methods, and Strategies*. N.J.: Prentice Hall.
- Blattberg, Robert C., Gary Eppen, and Joshua Lieberman (1981), "A Theoretical and Empirical Evaluation of Price Deals for Consumer Nondurables," *Journal of Marketing*, 45 (January), 116-29.
- Brandweek, 1994. Promotional influence spurs buyers to try something new. *Brandweek*. 35 (12): 32-34.
- Bucklin, Randolph E., Sunil Gupta, and S. Siddarth (1998), "Determining Segmentation in Sales Response across Consumer Purchase Behaviors," *Journal of Marketing Research*, 35 (May), 189-97
- Chiang, Jeongwen (1991), "A Simultaneous Approach to the Whether, What, and How Much to Buy Questions," *Marketing Science*, 10 (Fall), 297-315.
- Chintagunta, Pradeep K. (1993), "Investigating Purchase Incidence, Brand Choice, and Purchase Quantity Decisions of Households," *Marketing Science*, 12 (Spring), 184-208
- Davis, S., Inman J.J, & McAlister, L. 1992. "Promotion has a negative effect on brand evaluations-or does it? Additional disconfirming evidence." *Journal of Marketing Research*. 24: pp.143-148.
- Ehrenberg, A.S.C., Hammond, K. & Goodhardt, G.J.1994. "The after-effects of price related consumer promotions." *Journal of advertising Research*. 34 (4): pp.11-21.
- Fill, C. 2002. *Marketing communications: Con texts, Strategies and Applications*. 3rd Edition. Italy: Pearson Education Limited.
- 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), pp. 315-322.
- Gupta, S. (1993) "Reflections on the impact of sales promotions on when, what and how much to buy." *Journal of Marketing Research*, 30(4), pp. 522-524.

- Gupta, S. (1988). "Impact of Sales Promotions on When, What, and How Much to Buy," *Journal of Marketing Research*, 25 (November), 342-55.
- Haugh, L.J. (1983) "Defining and redefining. *Advertising Age*, 14 February, p. 44.
- Helsen, K. & Schmittlein, D.C. (1992) "Some characterizations of stockpiling behavior Under uncertainty." *Marketing Letters*, 3(1), pp. 5-16.
- Huff, L.C. & Alden, D.L. (1998) "An investigation of consumer response to sales Promotions in developing markets: a three-country analysis." *Journal of Advertising Research*, 38(3), pp. 47-56
- Krishna, A. (1992) "Modeling the impact of consumer price expectations for multiple brands on consumer purchase behavior." *Marketing Science*, 11, pp. 266-286.
- Kardes, F.R. 1999. *Consumer Behavior: Managerial Decision Making*. New York: Addison Wesley Longman
- Laroche, M., Pons, F., Zgolli, N., Cervellon, M. & Kim, C. (2003) "A model of consumer response to two retail promotion techniques." *Journal of Business Research*, 56, July, pp. 513-522.
- Leone, R.P. & Srinivasan, S.S. 1996. "Coupon Face Value: Its Impact on Coupon Redemptions, Brand sales, and Brand Profit ability." *Journal of Retailing*. 73 (3): pp.273-89
- Mulhern, F.J. & Padgett, D.T. (1995) "The relationship between retail price promotions and regular price purchases." *Journal of Marketing*, 59(4), pp. 83-90.
- Ndubisi, Nelson, Oly and Chew Tung Moi (2005), "Customers behavioral responses to sales promotion: the role of fear of losing face", *Asia Pacific Journal of Marketing and Logistics*, Vol. 17 No. 1, pp.32-49.
- Ndubisi, Nelson, Oly and Chew Tung Moi (2006), "Awareness and usage of promotional tolls by Malaysian consumers: the case of low involvement products" *Management Research News*, Vol. 29, No. ½, pp.28- 40.
- Neslin, S.A. (2002) Sales promotion. *Handbook of Marketing*, 13, London: Sage, pp. 311-338.
- Neslin, S.A., Henderson, C. & Quelch, J. (1985) "Consumer promotions and the acceleration of product purchases." *Marketing Science*, 4(2), pp. 147-165.

- Oppenheim, A. (1992), *Questionnaire. Design, Interviewing and Attitude Measurement*, Printer Publishers, London.
- Peter, J.P. & Olson, J.C. 1996. *Consumer Behavior and Marketing Strategy*, 4th Edition. N.Y.: Irwin
- Pramataris, K.C., Vrechopoulos, A.P. and Doukidis, G.I. (2001), "The transformation of promotional mix in the virtual retail environment: an initial framework and comparative study", available at: www.eltrun.aueb.gr/papers/iec.htm (accessed 28 November 2004).
- Ram, S. & Sheth, J.N. (1989) "Consumer resistance to innovations: the marketing problem and its solution". *Journal of Consumer Marketing*, 6(2), pp. 5-14.
- Shimp, T A. 2003. *Advertising, Promotion, and Supplemental Aspects of Integrated Marketing Communications*. Sixth Edition. United States of America:
- Shi Yi- Zheng, Ka-Man Cheung and Gerard Prendergast (2005), "Behavioral response to sales promotion tools. A Hong Kong Study" *International Journal of Advertising* Vol.24 No.4, pp.467- 486.
- Shoemaker, R. (1979) "An analysis of consumer reactions to product promotions." *Educators' conference proceedings*. Chicago, American Marketing Association, pp. 244-248.
- Totten, John C., & Block, Mar tin P. 1994. *Analyzing Sales Promotion Text & Cases: How to Profit from the New Power of Promotion Marketing*, 2nd Edition. U.S.A.: The Dartnell corporation.
- Vakratas, D. & Ambler, T. (1999) "How advertising works: what do we really know?" *Journal of Marketing*, 63(1), pp. 26-44.
- Ward, J.C. & Hill, R.P. (1991) "Designing effective promotional games: opportunities and problems." *Journal of Advertising*, 20(3), pp. 69-81
- Wilson, Ron (1984) "Scanning at St Helens Co-op: The first Hugin NSC Datachecker system in Europe", *International Journal of Retail & Distribution Management*, Vol. 12 Iss: 1, pp.31 - 35