

The Differences in the Effect of Non-Monetary Promotion Frame on Purchase Intent

Nurainun^a, Jasman J. Ma'ruf^b, Mirza Tabrani^c, M. Shabri Abd Majid^d,
^aDoctoral Program student of Management Science, Universitas Syiah Kuala
Banda Aceh and Lecturer of Economic and Business Faculty, Universitas
Malikussaleh. Indonesia, ^{b,c,d}Lecturers at Program in Management Science
Universitas Syiah Kuala, Banda Aceh, Indonesia,

The research objectives are to identify and analyse the effects of non-monetary promotional frames, which are extra content, extra products, and prizes, on the intention of buying. Perceptions of transaction value and promotional offers which can be trusted as a mediator variable. These promotional frames are applied to hedonic products i.e. desirable expensive famous brand cosmetics. In addition, promotional frames are also applied to unknown products. There is a brand created specifically for this research as a comparator. From several pre-tests conducted in a preliminary study it was decided that perfume products were to be the objects in this research. In addition, it also tests product attraction, gift suitability with promoted products, and equality of promotion value as well as promotion frame credibility. The research design used in Convention studies is the experimental design of the experimental laboratory in the form of 3x2 between subject factorial designs. Participants participating in the study were homemakers and professionals. One Way ANOVA is used to analyse differences in influences from non-monetary promotional frames on each variable, and ANCOVA is used to test the mediation effect of the transaction value variables and the promotional bids that can be trusted... The results found that there were differences in the influence of three promotional frames i.e. extra content, extra products, and prizes on the intention of buying but only for famous brand perfume products. Whereas unknown brand perfume products were found to have difference influence buying intent but not significant. On variable perception transaction, value found difference of influence from non-monetary promotion frame both to famous product and to unknown product. But the mediation effect of the transaction value and the reliable promotional offer on the purchase intention only occur in the brand of famous cosmetic brands.

Key words: *Buying intent, transaction value, reliable promotional offer, non-monetary promotion, Famous brand cosmetics.*

Introduction

Sales promotions can increase sales rapidly, but the effects of this sales promotion are asymmetry. This means that the promotional frame effect is not the same and can provide different effects that are influenced by the product type, because different products will give different effects although the promotional frame is the same (Blattberg and Neslin, 1989). The marketers must be able to identify the exact promotion frame, to increase the profit.

If the wrong choice of a promotional frame is used, it will instead be harmful for the product, brand equity and the market it is promoted to. (Yoo et al. 2000). Researchers have divided sales promotions into monetary promotions and non-monetary promotions. Studies on monetary promotion have often been conducted by previous researchers such as studies on discount promotions with percentage frames and nominal value. Researchers have previously mentioned that research on non-monetary promotions is still uncommon, researchers more often do research on the effects of the frame of monetary promotion such as discount, coupon, rebates (D'astous et al. 2002), or some of the researchers compare between monetary promotions such as discounts with non-monetary promotions such as premium.

These two promotional frames are less precise to compare, as consumers may have different perceptions of the value of the transactions offered. Because monetary promotion such as discount gives a direct profit that is cutting the selling price so that it is perceived to reduce losses, while non-monetary promotion does not result in reduced prices to be paid by consumers so it is the only benefit. Therefore, in this study researchers identified the effects of non-monetary promotional frames such as extra premium contents and extra products.

Buying intent is one of the important indicators that marketers need to measure when applying a promotional frame. Because the intention of buying arising into the benchmark of a successful promotion or not. If a given promotion does not pose a buying intent for the customer, then there must be something inappropriate about the promotion. The results of previous studies have shown that different promotional frames even with equivalent values will give different effects on the perception of value and buying intent (Chen et al. 1998; Sinha and Smith, 2000; Munger and Grewal, 2000; Gendall et al. 2006; Devlin et al. 2007; Palazon and Delgado, 2009; Lowe, 2010). The consumers perceive different values of different promotional frames. Consumers evaluate the value of the different promotional frames based on the value of the transactions offered in the promotional frame even if the offered promotional value is equal. The research from Sinha and Smith (2000) mentions that there is a difference in the value of transactions of different promotional frames with equal promotional value. If the value of the

promotion is too high it becomes suspect to consumers (Ong et al. 1997), but if the value of the promotion too low consumers are found to be not interested in the promotion offered.

Therefore, consumers will consider the value of savings offered too small and become uninterested in the promotion offered (Gupta and Cooper, 1990). Previously Chang (2008) had examined the effects of a premium promotional frame on a trustworthy promotional offer, but only in prize promotion. Dan Grewal et al., (1998) have mentioned that a trustworthy promotional offer is a potential variable as mediation.

Therefore, it is important to identify the offer of promotional value that the customer can trust because it will affect the evaluation of the value of transactions and buying intent from consumers. The researchers previously applied promotional frames on inexpensive products and expensive prices (Chen et al. 1998). However, it is still a little bit more research needed on hedonic products like cosmetics at expensive prices. Therefore, in this study frame non-monetary promotion applied to cosmetic products at an expensive price. In addition, non-monetary promotion is also more appropriate in the hedonic products (Chandon et al. 2000). Based on that, the research question that can be formulated in this research is whether there are differences in the influence of non-monetary promotional frames such as extra content, extra products (Buy 2 get 1 free) and prizes on buying intent, value transactions and bids of reliable promotional values on cosmetic products. Based on the research question then the objective in this study is to identify differences in the influence of non-monetary promotion frame on intention of buying, transaction value and the offer of reliable promotional value.

Literature Reviewer

Sales Promotions and Framing Effects

Researchers have divided sales promotions into monetary promotions such as discounts and rebates that influence consumer reference value, and non-monetary promotion such as extra or premium products separated from reference values. The perceived monetary promotion may reduce the loss that the consumer has to pay because it affects the price of the reference set, and non-monetary promotion is to be considered as an advantage because by paying the reference price that has been established the consumer then gets the additional products (Diamond and Campbell, 1989). How consumers are to perceive a promotional frame, whether to profit or reduce losses, depends on how the promotion is framed. Will it be framed as reducing losses (discounts) or as additional profits (extra products or prizes). Promotions of equal value can be framed differently based on the framing effect of the prospect theory that mentions that the same decision can be framed differently (Kahmenan and Tversky, 1979). Because of how a framed bid view would be predicted, the effect would be against the displayed offer (Fischhoff, 1983). This is the basis for marketers in determining the exact

promotion frame that the consumer will later perceive. In this study, non-monetary promotion used is extra content, extra products, and prizes (premium). Researchers define extra content in addition to the equity of a product by paying a fixed price (Shimp and Andrews, 2013; Ong et al., 1997). While premium is a gift received by consumers when buying a particular product (Crask et al., 1995) extra products like buy 2 for 1 are other forms of extra or premium contents. When in the same form then the promotion becomes extra content but when in different forms it becomes premium transaction value.

Buying intent is a behaviour that tends to buy a product (Dodds and Monroe, 1985). Purchase intent arises when consumers have evaluated the promotional value offered by marketers. The greater the discount value offered then the greater the intention of buying consumers (Gupta and Cooper, 1992). In addition, the promotional frame affects the buying intent of consumers (Munger and Grewal, 2000). Different promotional frames give different effects on the intention of buying customers. The study conducted by Kim and Kramer (2006) found that different promotional frames were perceived as the higher your savings values than the other frames. In addition, the perception of higher saving value raises higher buying intent. Based on this, it can be formulated the first hypothesis in this study, namely:

1.1.H1A: Non-monetary promotion is extra content, buy 2 get 1 free, have a different effect on the intention of buying the famous brand cosmetic products

1.2.H1B: Non-monetary promotion is extra content, buy 2 get 1 free and the prize has a different effect on the intention of buying unknown brand cosmetic products (Nilai Transaksi) to purchase the value of the intent

When consumers evaluate a product then consumers will expect the highest satisfaction of the product it evaluates (Monroe and Petroshius, 1981), from this concept comes the definition that the value is the ratio of quality and price (Lichstenstein et al., 1990). Monroe and Chapman (1987) mentioned that the perception of value consisted of perception of transaction value and acquisition value. The value of the transaction is a consumer evaluation of the promotional value offered while the value of acquisition is a comparison by consumers based on the benefit of a product with money incurred to purchase the product. The results of studied conducted by Sinha and Smith (2000) found that there is a difference in the transaction value of three different forms of promotion with equivalent values of 50% discount, buy one get one free and mixed promotion i.e. buy two 50% discount. It has been previously been mentioned that most researchers compare monetary promotions and non-monetary promotions. Though these promotions are not precise compared to the influence of the price of reference to be paid as consumers are not the same, nevertheless, the results of the study can be applied to non-monetary promotion because if the promotional value is small, consumers prefer the promotion

of extra (non-monetary) products. Based on this, the second hypothesis that can be formulated in this research is:

H2a. The non-monetary promotion frame is the extra content, B2G1; the prize has a different influence on the value of transactions for famous brand cosmetic products.

H2b. Frame of non-monetary promotion that is extra content, B2G1, prizes have different influence on the value of transactions for the brand's cosmetic products unknown. The perception of the positive transaction value of the promotional frame will be the intention of buying consumers. The study of Grewal et al. (1998) found a positive relationship between the perceptions of the value of the transaction with the intention of buying. The more consumers have a positive perception of a promotional value, the greater the desire to buy the product. Based on this, it can be formulated with the third hypothesis in this study, namely:

H3a. Perceptions of transaction value mediates influence. Frame non-monetary promotion on the intention of buying famous brand cosmetic products.

H3b. Perception of transaction value by the influence of non-monetary promotion frame on intention to buy brand cosmetic product unknown.

Trusted Promotion Bid Values

Frames of untrusted promotional values will cause consumers not to be interested in the promotions offered. Because consumers can underestimate the value of the offered promotion, if the given savings value is too low. It is in accordance with the study conducted by Gupta and Cooper (1992). However, the value of too high promotion can also lead to suspicion, which can be seen from the study conducted by Ong et al. (1997) who found that the promotion of extra content is more reliable than a large discount promotion. In addition, the study by Diamond (1992) found that extra promotional products were more liked than discount promotions if their value was small. Ong (1999) also mentioned that the promotion of extra content could be trusted based on the quantity and price of the product given the promotion of the extra content. As for the premium Promotion (prize), consumers will be interested in the promotion when the prizes are offered attractive (Buil et al., 2013)

In addition, is the same variant as the product sold (Raghubir, 2004)? Based on this, the fourth hypothesis that can be formulated in this research is:

H4a. Non-monetary promotional frames are influential differently on bids of reliable promotional value for famous brand cosmetic products.

H4b. Frame of non-monetary promotion affects differently on bids of reliable promotional value for famous brand cosmetic products.

A trusted promotional frame can improve the perception of value and customer buying intent. As stated by Compeau and Grewal (1998) the more consumers believe in a promotional offer is true it will be the greater the impact, so mentioning that a trustworthy promotional offer is a potential variable as mediation. Based on that, the next hypothesis that can be derived is the promotion frame that is believed to increase the perception of value and intent of buying customers.

As stated by Compeau and Grewal (1998) the more consumers believe in a promotional offer as being true the greater the impact, so mentioning that a trustworthy promotional offer is a potential variable as mediation.

Based on that, the next hypothesis that can be derived is:

H5a. A trustworthy promotional value offer radiated the influence of non-monetary promotional frames on the intention of buying famous brand cosmetic products.

H5b. Credible promotional value offers the influence of non-monetary promotional frame on intent to purchase unknown brand cosmetic products.

Method and Data Collection

To test the hypothesis in this study used experimental design 3 (extra contents, buy two gift) x 2 (famous brand vs unknown Brand) between subject factorial design. In addition, there are various pre-tests to determine the types of products to be promoted, the product's appropriability of prizes and the appeal of prizes. To test the hypothesis in this study used experimental design 3 (extra contents, buy two gift) x 2 (famous brand vs unknown Brand) between subject factorial design. In addition, there are various pre-tests to determine the types of products to be promoted, the product's appropriability of prizes and the appeal of prizes.

The survey was conducted on 44 executives and homemakers. As measured by uninterested/very interested, worthless/invaluable, meaningless/very meaningful, from Palazon and Delgado, (2009), with 7 points of semantic differential scale. Results of pre-tests show that White Musk is the most desirable variant by customers. From the results of the survey conducted in 37 respondents found that the White Musk body lotion size of 200 ml was the most attractive product. Testing the suitability of products with prizes for B2G1 is no longer done, because in the promotion of product gifts body lotion in the gift cube is also identified as products that are planted and matched with the products promoted. In addition, for this

second pre-tests the respondents used executives and homemakers. For the product brand unknown selection of gifts adapted to the famous products. The Unknown brand is a brand created by researchers for the needs of this research. Studies conducted by Kwon and Kwon (2007) found that women were more interested in promotion than men were. For each participant is given a SOAP gift bar brand Body Shop so that they focus on the experiments given.

The treatment is given in the experimental form of paper and pencil experiments, namely the form of promotional brochures. There are three promotional frame brochures that are used that are promotion of extra content, promotion of B2G1 and promotional brochure gifts for famous brands and unknown brands. The six brochures are shown to participants, each participant is only given one promotional brochure after paying attention to the brochure, and the participants are welcome to fill in the questionnaire provided. Previously, participants were also given research instructions that were part of the control in this experiment.

Table 1: Experimental design

Non-Monetary Promotions	Brand Name	
	Body Shop (terkenal)	Sweet Romance (tidak dikenal)
Extra Content	Extra Content 30%	Extra Content 30%
B2G1	Gratis Body lotion 200 ml	Gratis Body Lotion 200 ml
It's a gift	Gift cube white musk	Gift cube sweet romance

Variable Measurements

Dependent variables consist of buying intent, transaction value and bid value bids that can be trusted. The intention of buying is measured by three item questions from Grewal et al. (1998) which uses 7 bipolar scales i.e. consider not buying/considering buying, certainly not going to buy/will definitely buy, will not buy/will buy. To measure the transaction value used 3 items (Grewat et al.1998) As measured by 7 points likert scale, i.e. 'I am very pleased with the promotion offered', 'I am glad that it can save money from this promotion', 'I am glad to know I am getting an interesting item from this promotion', 'the benefits provided by this promotion makes me happy', 'the value of promotion offered is very interesting'.

Then the researcher added another two questions. For variable promotion bid values that can be trusted used three question items from Ong et al., (1997) as measured by 7 points likert scale i.e. the promotion is not trustworthy, the promotion is not realistic, the promotion given can be trusted. Check manipulation is to identify the credibility of the promotional frame. To avoid participants not trusting and not interested in the promotional frames offered. Check this

manipulation following the procedures performed by Sinha and Smith (2000), Palazon and Delgado (2009), Chang (2009), which is measured by seven semantic differential points of unbelieving/believable. All promotional frames are perceived to be trusted with an average credibility of 5.1. In addition, a check of manipulation compares the composition of the product promoted to the promotional value in the promotional brochure. This comparison is measured by seven semantic differential points of the un-prominent/prominent, developed by researchers for this study. The comparison rating of product images promoted with the promotional value has a rating of 4, 96 to 5.5 for famous brands and unknown brands

Results and Discussion

To test the hypothesis of Anova and ANCOVA (analysis covariant) is used in this study. One Way Anova is used to identify differences in influences from promotional frames against each dependent variable. While ANCOVA is used to test the mediation effect of the transaction value variables and the promotional bids that can be trusted. Table 1 delivers results. One way Anova for each dependent variable. H1A states that there is a difference in the influence of non-monetary promotional frames on the intention of buying famous branded cosmetic products are supported. As for hypothesis 1b otherwise, rejected. From table two can be seen a significant difference for the intention of buying famous brand cosmetics ($\alpha = 0,024$, $F = 3,859$ * *), while on the unknown brand there is a difference but not significant ($\alpha = 0,281$, $F = 1,287$). In the 2a and 2b hypothesis that there is a difference in the effect of non-monetary promotional frames on the value of transactions of famous branded cosmetic products and the unknown brand is declared supported. There are significant differences from each promotional frame offered both to the famous brand ($\alpha = 0,040$, $F = 3,319$ * *) and the Unknown brand ($\alpha = 0,043$, $F = 3,254$ * *). Table 2 One way Anova Promos Non Monetary.

	Average brand value best known average brand Value Average brand value unknown			Average brand value unknown		
	NB ($\alpha=0.024$. $F=3.859^{**}$)	NT ($\alpha=0.040$. $F=3.319^{*}$ *)	Believabil ity ($\alpha=0.053$. $F=3.016^{*}$)	NB ($\alpha=0.281$; $F=1.287$)	NT ($\alpha=0.043$; $F=3.254^{*}$ *)	Believabi lity ($\alpha=0.909$; $F=0.406$)
Promotion extra type of Content	4.20	5.07	5.09	4.21	5.15	4.65
B2G1	4.37	4.80	5.01	4.00	4.90	4.91
Reward	5.07	5.45	5.54	4.57	5.56	5.00

From the ANCOVA results contained in table 2, H3a can be seen stating that the transaction value of the effect of a non-monetary promotion frame with purchase intent is otherwise acceptable. Terms of mediation testing in this study followed the procedures of Hastak and Olson (1989) and Baron and Kenny (1986) as well as Munger and Grewal (2000), that the first relationship frame non-monetary promotion at a significant transaction value ($\alpha = 0,040$, $F = 3,319 * *$), both Relationship value transactions against the intention of buying must be significant ($\alpha = 0,000$, $F = 72,293 * * *$). And the third relationship frame non-monetary promotion on the buying intention is also significant ($\alpha = 0,024$, $F = 3,859 * *$). From the results of ANCOVA, which includes the value of transactions as covariate occurs decrease the significance of the difference in the effect of promotion frame on intent to buy (be $\alpha = 0,09$, $F = 2,370 *$). In addition, the direct relationship value of transactions on the intention of buying also be reduced ($\alpha = 0,000$, $F = 58,817 * * *$). Based on this there is a mediation effect. Lack of fit test result shows this model fit because of significance above 5%. Table 3 Results of ANCOVA.

		Brand famous		brand unknown	
Covariates	Buying intention			buying intent	
	α	F	α		F
Transaction value	0.09	2.370*	0.991		0.009
Believability	0.164	1.841	-		-

Whereas a mediation testing 3b hypothesis could not be resumed because the first condition of mediation could not be fulfilled. A. 4a hypothesis that states there is a difference in the influence of promotional frames on bids of trusted promotional values for well-known brands stated acceptable ($\alpha = 0,053$, $F = 3,016 * * *$) While the 4b hypothesis is not supported ($\alpha = 0,909$, $F = 0,406$). The same procedure with the three hypotheses is also done on H5a that says the offer of trustworthy promotional value to the effect of non-monetary promotional frame with the intention of buying. The first condition that can be fulfilled is that the promotional frame has a different effect on a reliable promotional value bid ($\alpha = 0,053$, $F = 3,016 * * *$), the second requirement of the bid value of the promotion that can be trusted significantly on the buying intent ($\alpha = 0,000$, $F = 30,890 * * *$). The third term relationship frame non-monetary promotion with the intention of buying is also significant ($\alpha = 0,024$, $F = 3,859 * *$). The first condition that can be fulfilled is that the promotional frame has a different effect on a reliable promotional value bid ($\alpha = 0,053$, $F = 3,016 * * *$), the second requirement of the bid value of the promotion that can be trusted significantly on the buying intent ($\alpha = 0,000$, $F = 30,890 * * *$). The third term relationship frame non-monetary promotion with the intention of buying is also significant ($\alpha = 0,024$, $F = 3,859 * *$). When a trustworthy promotional value bid is entered as a covariate, the direct influence between the promotional frame and the buying intent

becomes insignificant ($\alpha = 0,164$, $F = 1,841$). In addition, there is a decrease in the F value to 25.505 * * *. Based on that, the H5a stating that the reliable promotional value offer is the effect of non-monetary promotional frame with acceptable buying intent. H5B cannot be extended because the third condition cannot be fulfilled. When a trustworthy promotional value bid is entered as a covariate, the direct influence between the promotional frame and the buying intent becomes insignificant ($\alpha = 0,164$, $F = 1,841$). In addition, there is a decrease in the F value to 25.505 * * *. Based on that, the H5a stating that the reliable promotional value offer is the effect of non-monetary promotional frame with acceptable buying intent.

Conclusion

Non-monetary promotional frame effects are extra content, B2G1, and prizes with equal value. Previous research compares the frame between monetary and non-monetary promotion. Both studies conducted on reputed brands and unknown brands gave different effects. On the famous brand, effect of this non-monetary promotional frame looks significantly different on the buying intention, the value of the transaction and the promotional offer that can be trusted. Brands are unknown, different effects are only significant on the transaction value but not on the intention of buying and trustworthy promotional offer. This demonstrates that the brand name greatly affects the perception of consumers when evaluating a promotion. Brand knowledge and brand familiarity make consumers more sensitive to the promotions they offer. Prizes give the highest effect to the consumer, only then the extra content and B2G1. The results of the study provide implications for being able to select the appropriate promotion frame when using sales promotions so as to not cause a negative perception for consumers. Because promotions that are too large are harmful to brand equity and create the suspicion that marketers have engineered or changed the price of what it should be. However, it would also not cause interest when the promotional value was too small (Gupta and Cooper, 1992). In addition, marketers should also consider the product type and brand image when using a promotional type.

REFERENCES

- Baron, R.M., and Kenny, D.A. (1986), "The moderator- mediator variable distinction in social psychological research; conceptual, strategic and statistical consideration," *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, Vol. 51, No. 6, pp.1173-82.
- Blattberg, Robert C., and Neslin, Scott A. (1989), "Sales promotion: The long and short of it", *Marketing Letters*, Vol. 1, No. 1, pp. 81-97.
- Buil, Isabel., Chernatony, L.de., and Montaner, Teresa. (2013), "Factors influencing consumer evaluations of gift promotions," *European Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 47, No. 3 /4, pp. 574-595. Chandon, P., Wansink, B. and Laurent, G. (2000), "A benefit congruency framework of sales promotion effectiveness." *Journal of Marketing*, Vol.64, No.4, pp.65-81.
- Chang, Chingching. (2009), "Effectiveness of promotional premiums: the moderating role of affective state in different contexts", *Psychology & Marketing*, Vol. 26, No. 2, pp. 175-194. Chen, S.F., Monroe, K.B., and Lou, Y.C. (1998). "The effects of framing price promotion messages on consumers' perceptions and purchase intentions", *Journal of Retailing*, Vol. 74, No.3, pp. 353-372.
- Compeau, Larry D. & Grewal, Dhruv. (1998)." Comparative price advertising: An integrative review". *Journal of Public Policy & Marketing*, Vol.17, No. 2, pp. 257-273.
- Crask, Melvin., Fox, Richard. J., and Stout, Roy. G. (1995). *Marketing research principles and applications*. 3th ed. New Jersey. Prentice Hall Englewoods Cliffs.
- d'Astous, Alain., and Jacob, Isabella. (2002). "Understanding consumer reactions to premium-based promotional offer". *European Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 36, No. 11/12, pp. 1270-1286. Devlin, James., Ennew, Chistine., McKechnie, Sally., and Smith, Andrew. (2007), "A study of time limited price promotions", *Journal of Product & Brand Management*, Vol. 16, No. 4, pp. 280-285
- Diamond, D. William, and Johnson, R. Robert. (1990), "The framing of sales promotions: an approach to classification", *Advances in Consumer Research*, Vol. 17.
- Diamond, W.D. (1992). "Just What is a" Dollar's Worth"? Consumer reaction to price discount vs extra product promotions". *Journal of Retailing*, Vol. 68, No.3, pp. 254-270.
- Dodds, William. And Kent B, Monroe. (1985), "The effect of brand and price information on subjective product evaluation," *Advances in Consumer Research*, Vol.2



- Fischhoff, Baruch. (1983), "Predicting frames", *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Learning, Memory, and Cognition*, Vol. 9, No. 1, pp. 103-116.
- Gendal, Philip., Hoek, Janet., Pope, Tracy., and Young, Karen. (2006), "Message framing effects on price discounting", *Journal of Product & Brand Management*, Vol. 15, No.7, pp.458-465
- Grewal, D., Monroe, K.B., and Krishnan, R. (1998). "The effects of price-comparison advertising on buyers' perceptions of acquisition value, transaction value and behavioral intention", *Journal of Marketing*, Vol.62, No.2, pp.46-59.
- Grewal, D., Krishnan, R., Baker, Julie., and Borin, Norm. (1998). "The effects of store name, brand name and price discount on consumers' evaluations and purchase intention", *Journal of Retailing*, Vol. 74, No.3, pp.331-325.
- Gupta, Sunil., and Cooper, L.G., (1992), "The discounting of discount and promotion threshold", *Journal of Consumer Research*, Vol. 19, pp. 401-411.
- Hastak, Manoj., and Olson, C. Jerry. (1989), "Assesing the role of brand-related cognitive responses as mediators of communication effect on cognitive structure, *Journal of Consumer Research*, Vol.11, pp.444-456
- Kahneman, D., And Tversky, A. (1979), "Prospect theory: An analysis of decision under risk, *Econometrica*. 47, 263-291.
- Kim, Min Hyeong., and Kramer, Thomas. (2006), "Pay 80% versus "get 20% off: The effect of novel discount presentation on consumers' deal perceptions", *Market Lett*, Vol. 17, pp. 311-321.
- Kwon, Kyoung-Nan., and Kwon, Yoo Jin. (2007), "Demographics in sales promotion proneness: A socio-cultural approach", *Advances in Consumer Research*, Vol. 34, pp. 288-294.
- Lowe, Ben. (2010), "Consumer perceptions of extra free product promotions and discount: the moderating role of perceived performance risk", *Journal of Product & Brand Management*, Vol. 19, No.7, pp. 496-503.
- Monroe, K.B. and Susan, M. Petroshius. (1981), "Buyers perceptions of price: an update of evidence in perspectives", in *Perspectives in Consumer Behavior*, 3rd ed., H. Kassarian and T.S. Robertson, eds. Glenview, IL. Scoot, Foresman, and Company, pp.44-55,
- Lichtenstein, D.R., Netemeyer, R.G., and Burton, Scot. (1990), "Distinguishing coupon proneness from value consciousness: An acquisition-transaction utility theory perspective", *Journal of Marketing*, Vol.54, No.3, pp. 54-67.
- Monroe, K.B. and Chapman, J.D. (1987), "Framing effects on buyer's subjective product evaluation", *Advances in Consumer Research*, Vol.14, pp.193-197.



- Munger, L.J., and Grewal, D. (2001), “The effects of alternative price promotional methods on consumers’ product evaluations and purchase intentions”, *Journal of Product & Brand Management*, Vol.10, No, 3, pp. 185-197
- Ong, Beng Soo., Nin Ho, Foo., Tripp, Carolyn. (1997). “Consumer perceptions of bonus packs: an exploratory analysis”. *Journal of Consumer Marketing*, Vol.14, No. 2, pp. 102-112.
- Ong, Beng Soo. (1999). “Determinants of purchase intentions and stockpiling tendency of bonus packs”, *American Business Review*, pp. 57-64.
- Palazon, Mariola., and Delgado-Ballaster, Elena. (2009a), “Effectiveness of price discount and premium promotion”, *Psychology & Marketing*, Vol. 26, No. 12, pp. 1108-1129.
- Raghubir, Priya. (2004), “Free gift with purchase: promoting or discounting the brand?”, *Journal of Consumer Psychology*, Vol. 14, No. 1&2, pp. 181-185.
- Shimp, Terence. A., and Andrews, J. Craig. (2013), “Advertising, promotion, and other aspects of integrated marketing communications”. 9th edition, South-Western Cengage Learning
- Sinha, Indrajit., and Smith, M.F. (2000), “Consumers perceptions of promotional framing of price”, *Psychology & Marketing*, Vol. 17, No. 3, pp. 257- 275.
- Yoo, Boonghe., Dongthu, Naveen., and Lee, Sungho. (2000), “An examination of selected Marketing mix elements and brand equity”, *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, Vol. 28, No. 2, pp. 195-211.