THINK INDIA JOURNAL

ISSN:0971-1260
Vol-22- Issue-35-December-2019

Consumer Evaluation of Free Gift Promotion Scheme with Special Reference to FMCG Products

C.Suresh
Ph.D. Research Scholar
Department of Business Administration
Annamalai University

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this paper is consumer evaluation of Free Gift Promotion Scheme with Special Reference to FMCG Products. It focuses to imporve gift promoiton scheme it is extreamly important for the managers to know which demographic characteristics of the respondents should receive greater attention. This study suggest them to decide discrete gift scheme for innovative people who are price conscious. The creation of effective gift schemes, marketers should assure that those gift schemes should bring lot of excitements. Introducing sudden gifts, gift of unexpected level like giving four products for a product can induce the buying intention. Introducing creative display methods with gift related informations such as point of purchase, personalised sales promotions may create a favorable attitude of the consumers to have a greater loyalty.

1. INTRODUCTION

Merchants can create different promotional campaigns as incentives to attract orders. By providing samples to all customers in the store, regardless of whether they purchase something, they encourage customers to buy products they may not have considered before. Small businesses don't have the budget that Costco does but can still provide free samples to customers. Do you have a new product that you're trying to sell? Give out samples! This works best with food but can also work at spas and salons with tester lotions and perfumes or aromatherapy products. If you're promoting a new face product, let people try it out! People like something they can try before buying.

According to Peattie and Peattie (1995), sales promotions techniques are divided into two category likes value-increasing and value-adding promotions. The retailers are used value-increasing promotions such as price deals, coupons, and refund offers are the most popular sales promotional techniques. Value-adding promotions including free gifts, samples, loyalty schemes, or competition are often overlooked. Wakefield and Barnes, (1996) argue these types of sales promotions may play a more positive role of adding entertainment value for what is paid. Lichtenstein, Netemeyer, and Burton (1995), on the other hand, classified sales promotions into price or non-price promotions. Notwithstanding, price-based value increasing promotions have the potential to erode the image of the company as consumers often use price as a surrogate measure of quality (Tellis & Gaeth, 1990).

The marketers want to understand how consumers evaluate this marketing tool. Monetary promotions (e.g., coupons, discounts, etc.) are a key tool to achieve short-term objectives, but can negatively influence other parameters in the long-term, for example, quality perceptions, price sensitivity and brand equity (e.g., Mela, *et al.*, 1997; Yoo, *et al.*, 2000; Ataman *et al.*, 2010). To avoid these adverse long-term effects, marketing managers are increasingly using non-monetary promotions (e.g., free gifts, free samples, sweepstakes and contests).

ISSN:0971-1260
Vol-22- Issue-35-December-2019

2. REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Free Samples and Premiums are also among the most important tools of sales promotion. Free samples are trial amount of a certain product distributed to customers through so many different ways like handing them in front of office buildings, send them by mail or attach the sample to another different product. Free samples stimulate the trial of a new product during the introduction stage of the product (Clow and Baack 2007). However, the problem of samples is that it is the most expensive sales promotion tool. Premiums are goods offered for free or with a very low price to induce customers to buy the product. Many examples explain premiums like the inclusion of a toothbrush with a tooth paste or the inclusion of a kid toy with kids products in order to attract the segment of children who will ask their parents to purchase that product for them in order to enjoy the accompanied product. Premiums could in the package, out of the package or even sent by mail (Pride and Ferrel 2008).

Gifts are used to influence attitudes and purchase intentions of potential consumers, maintain or increase purchases by existing consumers, along with other short term objectives (Bodur and Grohmann, 2005). However, as the findings of previous studies suggest, the effects from a free gift offer may be limited by different factors (Darke and Chung, 2005; Chang, 2009). For instance, Simonson, *et al.,* (1994) found that sales promotions, such as premiums, can reduce purchase intentions when consumers perceive the gift as providing little or no value.

Astous and Jacob's (2002) study was one the first to delve into the impact of several factors on consumer reactions to gift promotions. Specifically, these authors studied the impact of three categories of variables on gift promotions success: Objective characteristics of the offer (whether the value of the gift was mentioned); Attitudinal variables (the interest in the product, interest in the gift or the attitude toward the brand), and Consumer characteristics (deal proneness or compulsive buying tendencies).

a. Nature of the Promoted Product: Utilitarian Vs Hedonist

Sales promotions can be used across various product types. Two general categories of products have been studied in sales promotions research: utilitarian and hedonic products. Utilitarian products are viewed as more functional and instrumental. Consequently, they are judged in terms of how well they function. On the other hand, hedonic products are typically linked to more experiential consumption. Therefore, they are judged in terms of how much pleasure they provide.

The benefit congruence framework proposed by Chandon, *et al.,* (2000) posits that sales promotions should be more effective if there is congruence between the benefits the promoted product provides and the benefits the promotion generates. These authors showed that monetary promotions provide stronger utilitarian benefits (i.e. monetary savings, product quality and shopping convenience) while non-monetary promotions provide stronger hedonic benefits (i.e. value expression, entertainment and exploration). Therefore, the use of monetary promotions should be more successful for utilitarian products, whereas non-monetary promotions should be more effective for hedonic products.

b. Gift attractiveness

Gift attractiveness is another factor that can influence consumers' responses to gift promotions. The gift represents a product offered free, or at a relatively reduced price, that individuals get when they purchase a product on offer. Although it seems logical to offer attractive gifts, organisations sometimes make mistakes. As explained next, gifts may not always add value to the promoted product (Chang, 2009).

ISSN:0971-1260
Vol-22- Issue-35-December-2019

In general, the appropriateness of the gift is considered a key characteristic of the perfect gift (Areni *et al.,* 1998; Larsen and Watson, 2001). Thus, when a promotional offer includes an attractive gift, consumers' perceptions improve.

It is necessary to highlight the importance of selecting suitable and attractive gifts to encourage brand and product purchase. As Simonson, *et al.,* (1994) found, there are several psychological mechanisms that may decrease the product's choice probability when sales promotions are used. For instance, consumers may perceive that they are paying for unnecessary gifts and, consequently, conclude that the product does not offer good value. It is also possible that the consumer avoids buying the promoted product so as not to have to justify their behaviour to their peer group (Simonson, 1989). Furthermore, consumers may feel they are being manipulated (Alvarez and Vazquez, 2005). All these situations may provoke the opposite effect to the desired result (Simonson, *et al.,* 1994).

c. Perceived fit

Perceived fit, which refers to the congruence or proximity between the promoted product and the gift, is an important variable in the gift promotion evaluation process. Several research streams in marketing such as brand extensions (Aaker and Keller, 1990), sponsorship (Simmons and Becker-Olsen, 2006) or cause-related marketing (e.g., Nan and Heo, 2007) have analysed the influence of this factor. There is, however, limited research on fit in a sales promotions context. Chandon *et al.* (2000) analysed a specific type of perceived fit based on the nature of the benefits (i.e., utilitarian or hedonic) of both the promoted product and the gift. Further, d'Astous and Landreville (2003), extending findings from the previous research streams, studied the influence of perceived fit in gift promotions in a more general sense (the strength of the link between the promoted product and the gift). Their results showed that fit has a significant effect on consumers' responses to promotional offers. Similar results were found by d'Astous, *et al.,* (2004) in the context of performing arts.

Different theoretical approaches have been used to support the effects of fit, such as balance theory (Basil and Herr, 2006), congruence theory (Lafferty, 2007), and categorisation theory (Czellar, 2003; Klink and Smith, 2001). Without going into detail about each theory, in general terms, when fit is high, consumers experience cognitive consistency and respond favourably to the offer. However, when there is a low fit, consumers experience cognitive inconsistency and report negative reactions. Therefore, it is expected that fit will have a positive effect on the overall evaluation of gift promotions.

d. Deal proneness and perceptions of hedonic benefits

Deal proneness is defined as "a general proneness to respond to promotions because they are in deal form" (Lichtenstein *et al.*, 1990, p. 55). Despite much attention on characterising deal-prone consumers (Webster, 1965; Montgomery, 1971; Blattberg *et al.,* 1978; Ailawadi *et al.,* 2001), more attention has recently been paid to study deal proneness as a valid latent consumer trait (DelVecchio, 2005; Lichtenstein, *et al.*,1995).

Deal proneness is an important individual characteristic influencing consumers' perceptions of benefits from the promotion (Chandon, *et al.,* 2000). Traditionally, monetary promotions research has assumed that monetary savings were the only benefit that leads consumers to respond to sales promotions (Blattberg and Neslin, 1990). Research studies, however, have considered a wider range of benefits which sales promotions may generate and which could contribute to a better understanding of consumers' responses (Ailawadi, *et al.*, 2001; Chandon, *et al.,* 2000).

Chandon, *et al.,* (2000) developed a framework of different consumer benefits from sales promotions. They list six benefits, which can be classified as utilitarian and hedonic benefits.

ISSN:0971-1260
Vol-22- Issue-35-December-2019

Utilitarian benefits include the saving benefits, the quality benefits (i.e., increase in the quality of the product bought) and the convenience benefits (i.e., reduction in search and decisions costs). Chandon, *et al.,* (2000) found that monetary promotions are evaluated primarily on the basis of these benefits. By contrast, non-monetary promotions are evaluated mainly on the basis of hedonic benefits. Therefore, this study focuses on the hedonic benefits (i.e. value expression benefit, the exploration benefit and the entertainment benefit).

e. Consumers' overall evaluation of gift promotions

In general, research has found that the overall evaluation or attitude that consumers have toward an offering is strongly correlated to behaviour or intentions. In the context of gift promotions, this overall evaluation refers to how consumers assess a particular gift promotion. As posited earlier, the overall evaluation of the promotion is the result of a set of cognitions as well as a set of affective responses.

The theory of reasoned action has been used to explain the relationships between attitudes, intentions and behaviour (Fishbein and Ajzen, 1975). This theory proposes that attitudes and subjective norms influence intentions, which in turn impact behaviour. Within this theory, consumers' attitudes toward promotions have been found to play a key role in their acceptance, in the monetary context (Bagozzi, *et al.*, 1992; Shimp and Kavas, 1984). More recently, Vaidyanathan, *et al.,* (2000) showed that attitude toward promotions has a strong effect on willingness to buy. Similarly, Laroche, *et al.,* (2003), who proposed and validated a cognitive-affective-conative multidimensional model, found that consumers' behavioural intentions toward two types of promotional tools (coupons and two-for-one promotions) increased as consumers expressed positive feelings toward them.

Therefore, consistent with previous studies, it is proposed that the purchase intentions arising from gift promotions will be driven, in part, by consumers' overall evaluations of these promotions.

3. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Measure

Consumer evaluation towards free gift scheme is a multi-dimensional construct. In the case of free gift scheme, the researcher identified five dimensions: hedonic nature of the gift, gift attractiveness, perceived fit, deal proneness and hedonic benefit. This study focuses on these five factors of consumer evaluation towards free gift scheme.

Respondents were asked to express their ***hedonic nature of using gift*** on semantic-differential scales. Scale anchors were Practical Purpose/Just for fun, Purely Functional/Pure enjoyment, and for a routine need/for pleasure; the scale is adopted from the Wakefield and Inman (2003). Two dimensions (gift attractiveness and perceived fit) are adopted from d'Astous and Landreville (2003). ***Gift Attractiveness*** is measured by a two items scale, namely, 'gift interest', and 'gift pleases'. The three items used to measure ***perceived fit*** are 'appropriate for the product', 'logical choice for the product', and 'good association between the gift and the product'. These items are measured by 7-point Bipolar scale, where 1 denotes Strongly Disagree and 7 denotes Strongly Agree.

Deal - Proneness is measured by three items, developed by Lichtenstein, et al. (1993) namely, 'most of the time I buy the brand that's on sale', and 'more likely to buy brands on sale', 'more likely to buy brands that are on special gift'. The ***hedonic benefits*** of the product and the gift were measured based on Chandon et. al., (2000). The nine items are 'I feel good about myself', 'I can be proud of my purchase', 'I feel like I am a smart shopper', 'I feel like trying new brands', 'I can avoid buying the same brands', 'I can get new ideas of things to buy', 'promotions are fun', 'promotions are entertaining', and 'promotions are enjoyable'. These items are measured by 7-point Bipolar scale where 1 denotes Strongly Disagree and 7 denotes Strongly Agree.

ISSN:0971-1260
Vol-22- Issue-35-December-2019

Main Study

Chennai city was taken as the research area due to accessibility and also Chennai is one of the major metros in India. The population of this study was those who purchased FMCG Free Gift scheme during the last six months. The data were collected from the supermarkets in Chennai City. Convenience stores by supermarkets were excluded because of three reasons. First, free gift promotion scheme is commonly practiced in supermarkets, but are rarely observed in small retailer shop. Second, most of the consumers had experienced purchasing a product under free gift promotion scheme from supermarkets. Third, consumers typically travel around non-stop in convenience retailer shops, hence limiting the opportunity for the researcher to distribute the questionnaires. A hard copy questionnaire was administered to the respondents for the data collection. Kaden (2007) stated that a robust sample for most marketing research studies is about 300. Although a 300-sample size is sufficient, the present study aimed at 600 responses to increase the accuracy. Hence, the researcher 700 questionnaires were distributed to customers. Among them, 27 were only partially completed, 96 respondents mentioned that they had no experience in purchasing with price off/discount scheme. Finally, effective sample size was settled at 577.

4. DATA ANALYSIS

Table 1: Respondents opinion towards evaluation of gift scheme based on gender

Factors	Gender, Mean value and (SD)		T-test	
	Male	Female	t- value	P- value
Hedonic nature of the Gift	3.325 (1.32)	3.765 (1.58)	5.859	0.017*
Gift Attractiveness	3.180 (1.45)	3.137 (1.49)	0.034	0.855(NS)
Perceived fit	3.409 (1.35)	3.732 (1.51)	4.002	0.048**
Deal-Proneness	3.552 (1.25)	3.980 (1.38)	1.691	0.196(NS)
Hedonic Benefit	3.625 (1.19)	3.810 (1.24)	0.729	0.395(NS)

Source: Primary data, * Significant at one percent level, NS-Not Significant

** Significant at five percent level

Table 1 shows the mean and standard deviation of consumer evaluation towards free gift scheme with respect to the gender of the respondents. In order to test whether respondents differ significantly with respect to gender towards evaluation of free gift scheme regarding FMCG t-test was performed and the result shows that hedonic nature of the gift ($t = 5.859$; $p = 0.017$) and perceived fit ($t = 4.002$; $p = 0.048$) on free gift scheme towards FMCG have significant outcome. That is, the respondents differ significantly in their hedonic nature of the gift and perceived fit on free gift scheme towards FMCG with respect to their gender. Regarding hedonic nature of the gift, it is interesting to note that female respondents (mean = 3.765; SD = 1.58) inclined to give more importance to hedonic nature of the gift compared to male respondents (mean = 3.325; SD =1.32). With reference to perceived fit, it is remarkable to note that female respondents (mean=3.732; SD=1.51) inclined to give more importance to perceived fit compared to male respondents (mean=3.409; SD=1.35). The other factors namely, gift attractiveness, deal proneness, and hedonic benefit does not differ significantly with respect to gender. During the purchasing bath soap through gift schemes, female respondents evaluate the hedonic nature of the gift and perceived fit of the gifts than male respondents as female are expecting higher logical association.

Table 2: Respondents opinion towards evaluation of gift scheme based on age

ISSN:0971-1260
Vol-22- Issue-35-December-2019

Factors	Age, Mean value and (SD)					Significant	
	Up to 20 Years	21-30 Years	31-40 Years	41-50 Years	Above 50 Years	F-value	P- value
	A	B	C	D	E		
Hedonic nature of the Gift	3.592 (1.52)	3.531 (1.53)	3.526 (1.44)	3.477 (1.10)	3.002 (1.38)	0.195	0.941(NS)
Gift Attractiveness	3.167 (1.62)	3.344 (1.44)	2.985 (1.46)	3.321 (1.59)	1.833 (0.41)	1.687	0.157(NS)
Perceived fit	3.629 (1.26)	3.516 (1.44)	3.505 (1.40)	3.644 (1.50)	3.613 (1.83)	0.040	0.997(NS)
Deal-Proneness	3.889 (1.50)	3.630 (1.29)	3.809 (1.38)	4.166 (1.18)	3.000 (1.27)	0.999	0.411(NS)
Hedonic Benefit	3.691 (1.53)	3.644 (1.27)	3.723 (0.99)	4.144 (1.21)	3.147 (1.26)	0.813	0.519(NS)

Source: Primary data, * Significant at one percent level, NS-Not Significant

** Significant at five percent level

Table 2 shows the, mean, standard deviation scores and ‘F’ value of respondents’ opinion towards hedonic nature of the Gift, Mean and standard deviation values are calculated for each group towards FMCG Product. In the case of FMCG product, it is very clear from the table 2 that different age group of peoples does not show any difference on Hedonic nature of the Gift. Further to know the statistical difference among the various age groups of respondents, one-way analysis of variance has been applied. The obtained ‘F’ value is 0.195, which is not significant at 0.941 level. It means among the different age group of respondents there is no much difference in their perception towards Hedonic nature of the Gift on FMCG product. In the case of FMCG product, it is very clear from the table 2 that different age group of peoples does not show any difference on Gift Attractiveness. Further to know the statistical difference among the various age groups of respondents, one-way analysis of variance has been applied. The obtained ‘F’ value is 1.687, which is not significant at 0.157 level. It means among the different age group of respondents there is no much difference in their perception towards Gift Attractiveness on FMCG product.

In the case of FMCG product, it is very clear from the table 2 that different age group of peoples does not show any difference on Perceived fit. Further to know the statistical difference among the various age groups of respondents, one-way analysis of variance has been applied. The obtained ‘F’ value is 0.040, which is not significant at 0.997 level. It means among the different age group of respondents there is no much difference in their perception towards Perceived fit on FMCG product. In the case of FMCG product, it is very clear from the table 2 that different age group of peoples does not show any difference on Deal-Proneness. Further to know the statistical difference among the various age groups of respondents, one-way analysis of variance has been applied. The obtained ‘F’ value is 0.999, which is not significant at 0.411 level. It means among the different age group of respondents there is no much difference in their perception towards Deal-Proneness on FMCG product. In the case of FMCG product, it is very clear from the table 2 that different age group of peoples does not show any difference on Hedonic Benefit. Further to know the statistical difference among the various age groups of respondents, one-way analysis of variance has been applied. The obtained ‘F’ value is 0.813, which is not significant at 0.519 level. It means among the different age group of respondents there is no much difference in their perception towards Hedonic Benefit on FMCG product.

Table 3: Respondents opinion towards evaluation of gift scheme based on education

ISSN:0971-1260
Vol-22- Issue-35-December-2019

Factors	Education, Mean value and (SD)			Significant	
	Under Graduation	Post-Graduation	Professional Course	F- value	P- value
	A	B	C		
Hedonic nature of the Gift	3.424 (1.53)	3.681 (1.27)	3.204 (1.58)	0.755	0.472 (NS)
Gift Attractiveness	3.079 (1.36)	3.120 (1.53)	3.731 (1.67)	1.108	0.333 (NS)
Perceived fit	3.297 (1.37)	3.720 (1.44)	4.025 (1.51)	2.118	0.125 (NS)
Deal-Proneness	3.704 (1.20)	3.787 (1.15)	3.591 (1.55)	0.129	0.879 (NS)
Hedonic Benefit	3.827 (1.32)	3.596 (1.31)	3.487 (1.41)	0.726	0.486 (NS)

Source: Primary data, * Significant at one percent level, NS-Not Significant

** Significant at five percent level

For the factor Hedonic nature of the Gift, Mean and standard deviation values are calculated for each group towards FMCG Product. In the case of FMCG product, it is very clear from the table 3 that different education group of peoples does not show any difference on Hedonic nature of the Gift. Further to know the statistical difference among the various education groups of respondents, one-way analysis of variance has been applied. The obtained 'F' value is 0.755, which is not significant at 0.472 level. It means among the different education group of respondents there is no much difference in their perception towards Hedonic nature of the Gift on FMCG product. In the case of FMCG product, it is very clear from the table 3 that different education group of peoples does not show any difference on Gift Attractiveness. Further to know the statistical difference among the various education groups of respondents, one-way analysis of variance has been applied. The obtained 'F' value is 1.108, which is not significant at 0.333 level. It means among the different education group of respondents there is no much difference in their perception towards Gift Attractiveness on FMCG product.

In the case of FMCG product, it is very clear from the table 3 that different education group of peoples does not show any difference on Perceived fit. Further to know the statistical difference among the various education groups of respondents, one-way analysis of variance has been applied. The obtained 'F' value is 2.118, which is not significant at 0.125 level. It means among the different education group of respondents there is no much difference in their perception towards Perceived fit on FMCG product. In the case of FMCG product, it is very clear from the table 3 that different education group of peoples does not show any difference on Deal-Proneness. Further to know the statistical difference among the various education groups of respondents, one-way analysis of variance has been applied. The obtained 'F' value is 0.129, which is not significant at 0.879 level. It means among the different education group of respondents there is no much difference in their perception towards Deal-Proneness on FMCG product. In the case of FMCG product, it is very clear from the table 3 that different education group of peoples does not show any difference on Hedonic Benefit. Further to know the statistical difference among the various education groups of respondents, one-way analysis of variance has been applied. The obtained 'F' value is 0.726, which is not

ISSN:0971-1260
Vol-22- Issue-35-December-2019

significant at 0.486 level. It means among the different education group of respondents there is no much difference in their perception towards Hedonic Benefit on FMCG product.

Table 4: Respondents opinion towards evaluation of gift scheme based on profession

Factors	Profession, Mean value and (SD)				Significant		Bonferroni Post Hoc Test
	Student	Employee	Business	Profession	F-value	P- value	
	A	B	C	D			
Hedonic nature of the Gift	3.270 (1.54)	3.587 (1.52)	3.701 (1.31)	3.308 (1.37)	0.577	0.631(NS)	---
Gift Attractiveness	3.476 (1.47)	3.000 (1.48)	3.138 (1.33)	3.250 (1.60)	0.557	0.645(NS)	---
Perceived fit	3.254 (1.38)	3.900 (1.39)	2.851 (1.28)	3.846 (1.41)	4.351	0.006*	C vs B D
Deal-Proneness	3.493 (1.37)	4.093 (1.38)	3.552 (1.15)	3.398 (1.23)	2.286	0.082(NS)	---
Hedonic Benefit	3.475 (1.20)	3.975 (1.21)	3.426 (1.14)	3.659 (1.25)	1.627	0.187(NS)	---

Source: Primary data, * Significant at one percent level, NS-Not Significant

** Significant at five percent level

Table 4 shows that the factor Hedonic nature of the Gift, Mean and standard deviation values are calculated towards FMCG. In order to examine the table 4 one way ANOVA was applied. With regard to mean value are 3.27 on student, 3.70 on business, 3.58 on Employees and 3.30 on professional. It is very clear from the table 4 that there is no much difference opinion to the respondents' among different profession groups towards Hedonic nature of the Gift on FMCG. The obtained 'F' value is 0.577 and 'p' value is 0.631 which means that there is no significant difference among various profession of respondents' opinion about Hedonic nature of the Gift on FMCG product. For the factor Gift Attractiveness, Mean and standard deviation values are calculated towards FMCG. In order to examine the table 4 one way ANOVA was applied. With regard to mean value are 3.48 on student, 3.14 on business, 3.00 on Employees and 3.25 on professional. It is very clear from the above table that there is no much difference opinion to the respondents' among different profession groups towards Gift Attractiveness on FMCG. The obtained 'F' value is 0.557 and 'p' value is 0.645 which means that there is no significant difference among various profession of respondents' opinion about Gift Attractiveness on FMCG product.

For the factor Perceived fit, Mean and standard deviation values are calculated for each group towards FMCG Product. From the mean score, all the Professions have been given more importance towards the FMCG Product. In order to examine the table 4 one way ANOVA was applied. With regard to student mean value are 3.25 which obtained Perceived fit towards FMCG product, 3.85 on professional, 2.85 on business, and 3.90 on employees. It is very clear from the above table that there is much difference opinion to the respondents' among different profession groups towards perceived fit on FMCG products. Further, the standard deviation also shows that there is much difference. The obtained 'F' value is 4.351 and 'p' value is 0.006. The result shows that there is significant difference among different profession groups of respondents at 0.006 level which means that significant difference among various profession of respondents' opinion about Perceived fit on FMCG product.

ISSN:0971-1260
Vol-22- Issue-35-December-2019

In order to check the differentiating groups, post Hoc Bonferroni test was applied and the result reveals that the perceived opinion among employees and professional respondents are highly different with business respondents. For the factor Deal-Proneness, Mean and standard deviation values are calculated towards FMCG product. In order to examine the table 4 one-way ANOVA was applied. With regard to mean value are 3.49 on student, 3.55 on business, 4.09 on Employees and 3.39 on professional. It is very clear from the above table that there is no much difference opinion to the respondents' among different profession groups towards Deal-Proneness on FMCG product. The obtained 'F' value is 2.286 and 'p' value is 0.082 which means that there is no significant difference among various profession of respondents' opinion about Deal-Proneness on FMCG product.

5. SUGGESTIONS

Introducing creative display methods with gift related informations such as point of purchase, personalised sales promotions may create a favorable attitude of the consumers to have a greater loyalty. By gifting most suitable items which have strong association with the respective product can psychologically bound the customers with the same brand. Acquiring suitable gifts with high quality products make the consumer to attain good self-image as a smart purchaser. This psychological attachment should be perfectly managed by the marketers and they may introduce creative gifts with higher price value so that they could easily position their brand name in the mind of the consumer for a larger period of time.

To imporve gift promoiton scheme it is extreamly important for the managers to know which demgraphic characteristics of the respondents should receive greater attention. This study suggest them to decide discrete gift scheme for innovative people who are price conscious. But gift schemes for bath soap should be designed and determined by considering the evaluation process of students who are always passion towards the benefits of the gifts, company may give gifts like educational equipments, books, stationeries etc. Attractive gift promotional schemes like E-gift vouchers, gift cards should be created by the specialty goods company in such a way to induce the interest of the respondents to make them feel pleasure with utilization fit with the product.

Marketers may understand this perception towards information sources and the impact on gift benefits on the source of information. A systematic content analysis of gift schemes would be required to periodically check the effectiveness of the gift schemes for FMCG. It is suggested here that during the creation of effective gift schemes, marketers should assure that those gift schemes should bring lot of excitements. Introducing sudden gifts, gift of unexpected level like giving four products for a product can induce the buying intention.

6. CONCLUISION

The importance of Seles promotion in modern marketing has increased mainly on account of its ability in promoting sales and preparing the ground for future expansion. The main objective of sales promotion is to attractive the prospective buyer toward the product, and induce the customer to buy the product at the point of purchase. By gifting most suitable items which have strong association with the respective product can psychologically bound the customers with the same brand. Acquiring suitable gifts with high quality products make the consumer to attain good self-image as a smart purchaser. This psychological attachment should be perfectly managed by the marketers and they may introduce creative gifts with higher price value so that they could easily position their brand name in the mind of the consumer for a larger period of time.

REFERENCES

Wakefield, K. L., and Barnes, J. H. (1996), "Retailing Hedonic Consumption: A Model of Sales Promotion of a Leisure Service", *Journal of Retailing, 72* (4), 409-427. doi: 10.1016/S0022-4359 (96)90021-4.

ISSN:0971-1260
Vol-22- Issue-35-December-2019

Peattie, K. and Peattie, S. (1995), "Sales Promotion - A Missed Opportunity for Services Marketers?", *International Journal of Service Industry Management*, 6 (1), 22-39.

Lichtenstein, D. R., Netemeyer, R. G., and Burton, S. (1995), "Assessing the Domain Specificity of Deal Proneness: A Field Study", *Journal of Consumer Research, 22* (3), 314-326.

Stremersch, Stefan and Gerard J. Tellis (2002), "Strategic Bundling of Products and Prices: A New Synthesis for Marketing", *Journal of Marketing,* 66, 55-72.

Harlam, Bari, Aradhna Krishna, Donald R. Lehmann, and Carl Mela (1995), "The Impact of Bundle Type, Price Framing and Familiarity on Evaluations of the Bundle", *Journal of Business Research*, 33 (1), 57-66.

Garretson, J., and K. Clow. (1999), "The Influence of Coupon Face Value on Service Quality Expectations, Risk Perceptions and Purchase Intentions in the Dental Industry", *Journal of Services Marketing,* 13 (1), 59-72.

Bodur, H.O. and Grohmann, B. (2005), "Consumer Responses to Gift Receipt in Business-to-Business Consumer Contexts", *Psychology and Marketing*, 22 (5), 441-456.

Darke, P.R. and Chung, C.M.Y. (2005), "Effects of Pricing and Promotion on Consumer Perceptions: It Depends on How you Frame it", *Journal of Retailing,* 81 (1), 35-47.

Chang, C. (2009), "Effectiveness of Promotional Premiums: the Moderating Role of Affective State in Different Contexts", *Psychology and Marketing,* 26 (2), 175-194.

Chandon, P., Laurent, G., and Wansink, B. (2000), "A Benefit Congruency Framework of Sales Promotion Effectiveness", *Journal of Marketing*, 64 (4), 65-81.

Areni, C.S., Kiecker, P. and Palan, K.M. (1998), "Is it Better to Give than to Receive? Exploring Gender Differences in the Meaning of Memorable Gifts", *Psychology and Marketing*, 15 (1), 81-109.

Larsen, D. and Watson, J.J. (2001), "A Guide Map to the Terrain of Gift Value", *Psychology and Marketing,* 18 (8), 889-906.

Simonson, I., Carmon, Z. and O'Curry, S. (1994), "Experimental Evidence on the Negative Effect of Product Features and Sales Promotions on Brand Choice", *Marketing Science,* 13 (1), 23-40.

Alvarez, A. B., and Casielles, R. V. (2005), "Consumer Evaluations of Sales Promotion: The Effect on Brand Choice", *European Journal of Marketing, 39 (1),* 54-70. doi: 10.1108/03090560510572016.

Aaker, D.A. and Keller, K.L. (1990), "Consumer Evaluations of Brand Extensions", *Journal of Marketing,* 54, 27-41.

Nan, X. and Heo, K (2007), "Consumer Responses to Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR),Initiatives", *Journal of Advertising*, 32 (2), 63-74.

Chandon, P., Laurent, G., and Wansink, B. (2000), "A Benefit Congruency Framework of Sales Promotion Effectiveness", *Journal of Marketing*, 64 (4), 65-81.

d'Astous, A. and Landreville, V. (2003), "An Experimental Investigation of Actors Affecting Consumers' Perceptions of Sales Promotions", *European Journal of Marketing*, 37 (11/12), 1746-1761.

ISSN:0971-1260
Vol-22- Issue-35-December-2019

d'Astous, A., Legoux, R. and Colbert, F. (2004), "Consumer Perceptions of Promotional Offers in the Performing Arts: An Experimental Approach", *Canadian Journal of Administrative Sciences*, 21 (3), 242-254.

Basil, D.Z. and Herr, P.M. (2006), "Attitudinal Balance and Cause-Related Marketing: An Empirical Application of Balance Theory", *Journal of Consumer Psychology*, 16 (4), 391-403.

Lafferty, B.A. (2007), "The Relevance of Fit in a Cause–Brand Alliance when Consumers Evaluate Corporate Credibility", *Journal of Business Research*, 60 (5), 447-453.

Czellar, S. (2003), "Consumer Attitude towards Brand Extensions: An Integrative Model and Research Propositions", *International Journal of Research in Marketing*, 20 (1), 97-115.

Lichtenstein, D.R., Netemeyer, R.G. and Burton, S. (1990), "Distinguishing Coupon Proneness from Value Consciousness: An Acquisition-Transaction Utility Theory Perspective", *Journal of Marketing*, 54, 54-67.

Webster, F.E (1965), "The Deal-Prone Consumer", *Journal of Marketing Research*, 2, 186-189.

Montgomery, D.B. (1971), "Consumer Characteristics Associated with Dealing: An Empirical Example", *Journal of Marketing Research*, 8, 118-120.

Blattberg, R. and Neslin, S. (1990), "*Sales Promotion: Concepts, Methods, and Strategies*", Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs, NJ.

Fishbein, M.A. and Ajzen, I. (1975), "Belief, Attitude, Intention and Behavior: An Introduction to Theory and Research", Addison-Wesley, Reading, MA.

Shimp, T.A. and Kavas, A. (1984), "The Theory of Reasoned Action Applied to Coupon Usage", *Journal of Consumer Research*, 11 (3), 795-809.

Laroche, M., Pons, F., Zgolli, N., Cervellon, M.C. and Kim, C. (2003), "A Model of Consumer Response to Two Retail Sales Promotions Techniques", *Journal of Business Research*, 56, 513-22.