# CHAPTER ONE

**INTRODUCTION**

# Background to the Study

In every country or state, enterprises occupy a place of pride and importance. Enterprise in the view of Obi (2002) is of three major categories; Small, Medium, and Large scales. This study focuses on Small and Medium Enterprises popularly referred to as SMEs. According to the Company and Allied Matters Act (2009), Small and Medium Scale Enterprises can be referred to as business establishments with working capital and assets base excluding land as low as N1, 000,000 to N50,000,000. Similarly, the Central Bank of Nigeria (CBN) (2010) defined Small and Medium Scale Enterprises as business ventures with assets base excluding land to be between N1,000,000 to N50,000,000 and number of employees ranging from 5 to 100.

Small and medium scale enterprises (SMEs) consists of the most widely spread enterprises in Nigeria, involving men and women with varying years of experience and educational qualifications doing business in both urban and rural area of the country. Some of them are graduates of different categories while others are not. In Nigeria, small and medium scale enterprises come in different categories. This study covered the fast food outlets and the producers of beverages in Imo State.

Small and medium scale enterprises are usually owned and managed by individuals called business owners, entrepreneurs or business operators. The
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nature of the business is such that managers are employed to handle the affairs of the business by helping to source for business opportunities and plan promotional activities to increase patronage. The position small and medium scale enterprises occupy in the economic development of States and Nigeria as a whole, makes it such that the business can be located both in the urban and rural areas.

Small and medium scale enterprises are very important and contribute to the development of the national economy. Adeleke (2004) noted that SMEs represent a crucial segment of the business sector that by its nature provides employment to jobless individuals which help to reduce the level of crime in the society. Onuogu (2001) stated that small and medium scale enterprises represent a veritable vehicle for the achievement of national economic objectives of employment generation, and poverty reduction as well as the development of the sector. In addition to the aforementioned benefits, CBN (2004) affirmed that it is undoubtedly accepted that small and medium scale enterprises form the bedrock of any nation‘s industry by providing more employment per unit of capital invested. Small and medium scale businesses have played major roles in economic growth and development due to their collective, larger output and employment effects. Wilson (2006) stressed that small scale businesses have been of economic and social significance internationally in that its development can no longer be left unnoticed. Small and medium scale enterprises in Nigeria are promoted by some organizations such as; Nigeria Investment Promotion

Commission (NIPC), the Association of Nigerian Development Finance Institution (ANDFI), as well as Individual Development Finance Institutions (IDFIS). These organizations through advocacy and capacity-building initiatives have continued to canvass for better support structures for the smooth operations of SME subsector in Nigeria. To this effect, it is pertinent for small and medium scale business operators to carry out marketing activities of their establishments using the appropriate marketing strategies to increase customers‘ patronage.

Marketing according to Kotler (2006) is any human activity directed at satisfying needs and wants through exchange processes. It plays the unique role of providing opportunity for buying, selling, standardization, grading, and provision of avenues for obtaining marketing information which helps in the identification and satisfaction of consumer needs, which is the key to business prosperity. Most often it does seem that SMEs are faced with the problem of improper combination of marketing mix components which result in the disruption of the marketing activities and lead to less profit maximization. Marketing mix, according to Kotler and Armstrong (2010) is a set of controllable tactical marketing tools utilized by firms to produce the responses they want in the target market. They further identified marketing mix components to include; product, price, place, and promotion. Product is anything that can be offered to a market for attention, acquisition, use or consumption that might satisfy want or need. Price is the amount of money,

value or sacrifice paid for a product or service. Place is seen as those fragments of network between production and consumption, it is a channel of distribution; while, promotion is a marketing related communication between sellers and buyers. It is, therefore, important that small and medium scale business operators produce or manufacture their products according to consumers‘ needs. They also have to make it available at a price that the customers find reasonable and supply the products to the consumers at the different outlets they can conveniently approach. The small and medium scale business operators should also inform the consumers about their products and their characteristics, utilizing the appropriate promotional tools.

Utilization, according to Hornby (2006) is the use or implementation of something, especially for a practical purpose. While, extent means how far something is true or how great an effect it has. From the foregoing, it is obvious that adequate utilization of the marketing components helps in attracting customers which leads to business growth. Studies have shown that small and medium scale business operators are not performing to the maximum which may be associated with utilization of the marketing mix. It is based on this background that this study was carried out to determine the extent of utilization of the marketing mix by small and medium scale business operators in Imo State.

# Statement of the Problem

Small and Medium scale Enterprises seem to have dominated the investment landscape of Nigeria. According to Nigeria Institute of Management (NIM) (2005) small and medium scale enterprises play significant roles in economic development of Nigeria because they employ greater percentage of the active working population and generate more than half of the National Gross Domestic Product (GDP). However, over a period of years, some researchers observed failure on the part of SMEs in Nigeria. Oyebamiji and Ayemni (2013) discovered that SMEs in Nigeria have not performed credibly well and hence have not played its role in the economic development of Nigeria as expected. From the foregoing, the challenges facing the small scale enterprises as Oyebamiji and Ayemni noted could stem from poor application of good marketing strategy, and effective use of the marketing mix components such as product, price, place and promotion to increase customer patronage.

Aniukwu (2010) observed that Imo state has a great number of SMEs springing up on daily bases with old ones folding up leaving little or no significant impact on the economic development of the state. The concern of this study therefore is that there appears to be failure in business on the part of small and medium scale business operators which can be attributed to their inability to make use of marketing mix components effectively. This study is carried out to determine the extent of utilization of product, price, place and

promotion components of marketing mix by small and medium scale enterprises in Imo State.

# Purpose of the Study

The major purpose of this study was to determine the extent small and medium scale business operators in Imo State utilize the marketing mix components as a strategy for increased customer patronage. Specifically, the study sought to:

1. Determine the extent small and medium scale business operators in Imo State utilize product components of marketing mix.
2. Determine the extent small and medium scale business operators in Imo State utilize price components of marketing mix
3. Determine the extent small and medium scale business operators in Imo State utilize place components of marketing mix.
4. Determine the extent small and medium scale business operators in Imo State utilize promotion components of marketing mix.

# Significance of the Study

The findings of this study would be of great benefit to the following stakeholders: small and medium scale business operators, business educators, state ministry of commerce, and fellow researchers. Small and medium scale business operators being the main stakeholders in this study would benefit greatly from the findings that would emanate from the study in connection with product, price, place and promotion. The findings of this study would help both

the existing and potential small and medium scale business operators in Imo State in utilizing marketing mix components to increase customer patronage. The findings showcased the benefits of utilizing the right marketing mix components to grow businesses. In addition, the study provided beneficial information that will help the business operators properly utilize product components, pricing components, place components and promotion components to increase customer patronage.

Business educators would benefit from the findings of this study. This is because, the business educators are charged with the responsibility of educating and guiding students for career development in business education. Therefore, this study would provide business educators with adequate information on product, price, place and promotion components which they will inculcate into their students, so when the students graduate and intends to establish small and business scale enterprise, they will be able to utilize the adequate information on the product, price, place and promotion components of marketing mix to increase customer patronage.

The findings of the study would be of immense benefit to Imo State ministry of commerce and industry and Chamber of Commerce Owerri. The study will provide information to the ministry that will help to inform would be SME operators who intends to register their establishments on the best place to locate them. Finally, the study would be of great benefit to future researchers, in that it will serve as a good academic text that contains the required information for

academic exercise in the area of small scale business enterprise and marketing mix.

# Scope of the Study

The scope of this study covered the extent of utilization of marketing mix components by registered small and medium scale enterprises in Imo State. The marketing mix components addressed include product components, pricing components, place components, and promotion components. The status of the respondents discussed in this study include, gender, years of experience, location of their establishments, and their educational qualification. The study did not extend to small and medium scale enterprises that are not registered with the Imo State Ministry of Commerce and Industry and Chamber of Commerce Owerri. This was to enable the researcher narrow her study to SMEs with the required characteristics since there are many SMEs in the area of study.

**[**

# Research Questions

The study was guided by the following four research questions:

1. To what extent do small and medium scale business operators in Imo State utilize the product components of marketing mix?
2. To what extent do small and medium scale business operators in Imo State utilize the price components of marketing mix?
3. To what extent do small and medium scale business operators in Imo State utilize the place components of marketing mix?
4. To what extent do small and medium scale business operators in Imo State utilize the promotion components of marketing mix?

# Null Hypotheses

The following null hypotheses were tested at 0.05 level of significance:

1. Male and female SME operators in Imo State do not differ significantly in their mean ratings of product components utilization.
2. Male and female SME operators in Imo State do not differ significantly in their mean ratings of price components utilization.
3. Male and female SME operators in Imo State do not differ significantly in their mean ratings of place components utilization.
4. Male and female SME operators in Imo State do not differ significantly in their mean ratings of promotion components utilization.
5. SME operators in Imo State with less than 10 years experience and those with 10 years and above experience do not differ significantly in their mean ratings of product components utilization.
6. SME operators in Imo State with less than 10 years experience and those with 10 years and above experience do not differ significantly in their mean ratings of price components utilization.
7. SME operators in Imo State with less than 10 years experience and those with 10 years and above experience do not differ significantly in their mean ratings of place components utilization.
8. SME operators in Imo State with less than 10 years experience and those with 10 years and above experience do not differ significantly in their mean ratings of promotion components utilization.
9. Urban and rural SME operators in Imo State do not differ significantly in their mean ratings of product components utilization. Urban and rural SME operators in Imo State do not differ significantly in their mean ratings of price components utilization.
10. Urban and rural SME operators in Imo State do not differ significantly in their mean ratings of place components utilization.
11. Urban and rural SME operators in Imo State do not differ significantly in their mean ratings of promotion components utilization.
12. Graduate and non- graduate SME operators in Imo State do not differ significantly in their mean ratings of product components utilization.
13. Graduate and non- graduate SME operators in Imo State do not differ significantly in their mean ratings of product components utilization.
14. Graduate and non- graduate SME operators in Imo State do not differ significantly in their mean ratings of price components utilization.
15. Graduate and non- graduate SME operators in Imo State do not differ significantly in their mean ratings of place components utilization.
16. Graduate and non- graduate SME operators in Imo State do not differ significantly in their mean ratings of promotion components utilization.

# CHAPTER TWO

**REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE**

This Chapter reviewed relevant literature relating to this study. The review was done under the following sub headings:

# Conceptual Framework

Marketing Mix

Small and Medium Scale Enterprises

**Theoretical Framework** Theory of Equilibrium Bass Combination Theory

# Theoretical Studies

Utilization of Product Components of Marketing Mix for effective marketing

Utilization of Price Components of Marketing Mix for Effective Marketing

Utilization of Place Components of Marketing Mix for Effective Marketing

Utilization of Promotion Components of Marketing Mix for Effective Marketing.

Consumer Behaviour and SME Marketing Strategies

# Empirical Studies

**Summary of Review of Related Literature**
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# Conceptual Framework

Concept as defined by Eboh (2009) is the distinct meaning of a term, that is, it can be in form of phrase or a single word. According to Khan (1999) concept is an idea or a principle that is concerned with something. In research, major concepts of interest can be arranged to form a structural background or framework that depicts the relationships that exist among the concepts of the phenomenon. The author further described conceptual framework as a schematic description and illustration of the causative mechanisms and relationship deducible from the research problems. The conceptual framework of this study will be based on the concept of assessment, marketing mix and small and medium scale enterprise.

# Marketing Mix

According to Rajagopal (2004), marketing mix is the combination of factors which a company uses as tools for pursuing its marketing objectives in the identified market targets. These factors have to be strategically mixed in establishment‘s market planning to optimizing profit, market expansion and customer satisfaction. Thus marketing mix components are assembled keeping in mind the needs of target customers, and it varies from one organization to another depending on its available resources and marketing objectives. The author further noted that Marketing decisions generally fall into the following four controllable categories:

Product Price Place Promotion

According to Onuoha (2006) the term ―Marketing mix‖ became popularized after Borden published his 1964 article ―The Concept of the Marketing Mix‖. Borden began using the term in his teaching in the late 1940‘s after Culliton had described the marketing manager as a ―mixer of ingredients‖. The ingredients in Borden‘s marketing mix includes product planning, pricing, branding, distribution channels, personal selling, advertising promotions, packaging, display, servicing, physical handling, fact finding and analysis. Kotler in the early 1980s grouped these ingredients into four categories that today are known as the 4P‘s of marketing. They are; product, price, place and promotion.

In the view of Inyanga (2006) the development of the marketing mix is an evolution process, whose goal is an internally consistent and mutually supportive plan that cannot be overemphasized. Tinkering with one in the mix generally means the marketing strategist must alter all the other P‘s in some way, because one P affects the others. Marketing mix is an imperative concept in modern marketing and academically it is referred to as the set of controllable tools that the firm blends to produce the response it wants in the target market,

so it consists of everything the firm can do to influence the demand for its product (Kotler & Armstrong, 2006). Proctor and Gamble (2005) opted that it is important to realize that marketing mix strategy of any company can have one major function, that is, strategic communication of the organization with its customers. He further argued that marketing mix provides multiple paths as such communication can be achieved either in spoken form and written communications.

Rajagopal (2004) stressed that marketing mix is an integrated approach for promoting the marketing activities in order to expand the product market

.According to Kotler and Armstrong (2006), the specific components of marketing mix are product, pricing, place and promotion. The planning and management of these components in detail and the particulars of these components form the 4P of marketing as indicated below;

# The 4P’s of Marketing Mix Components

Product Price Place Promotion

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **PRODUCT** | **PRICE** | **PLACE** | **PROMOTION** |
| Product quality | Price list | Channels | Persuasive advertisement |
| Product brand  name | Bids | Long distance  coverage | Print advertising |
| Product Packaging | Price Quotation | Locations of  establishment | Radio and television  advertising |
| Repair and  maintenance | Coupons | Prompt order  handling | Internet advertising |
| Product Guaranty | Odd pricing | Product handling | Mobile advertising |
| Product Size | Credit facility | Delivery by sea | Cash refund |
| Product Warranty | Discount  structure | Delivery by air | Lucky draws |
| Product physical  appearance | Leader pricing | Door to door  delivery | Price-off deals |
| Product expiring  date | Multiple unit  pricing | Delivery by truck | Point of purchase display |
| Product brand  label | Price listing | Delivery by car | Interactive relationships |
|  |  | Delivery by  motor cycle | Press release |
|  |  |  | Press Conference |
|  |  |  | Community notices |
|  |  |  | Bill boards |
|  |  |  | Sponsored publications |
|  |  |  | Sponsored television  programme |

# Source: Onuoha and Egbuta (2010)

Rajagopal also added that marketing mix determines the rightness of a product in the market with a view to provide consumer satisfaction to a larger extent. Thus, the implication of the marketing mix lies in identifying a right product, with an appropriate planning of the product line at the right price is done with potential scope of business expansion, product diversification and qualitative improvement in product through the right promotion policies. The American Marketing Association defines marketing mix as a combination of variables that can be selected to achieve the marketing objectives.

For Kotler (2001), the marketing mix is the particular blend of controllable marketing variables that a firm uses to achieve its objects in the targeted market. This means that only variables under the control of the firm that can influence the level of customers response to the firm offering is a marketing mix variable. The marketing mix is lased on the notion that consumer‘s satisfaction, being the underlying purpose of the marketing function, can be achieved through the integration of a number of controllable marketing variables popularly known as the 4 P‘s (Product, Price, Place and Promotion). The combination of the 4P‘s which constitutes the core of the firms marketing system is known as marketing mix.

Ejionueme (2009) pointed out that a good marketing manager should be able to control each components of the marketing mix. A strategy for each component must be uniquely constructed to achieve an optimum marketing mix.

He noted that any mix is only as good as its weakest component hence an excellent product with a poor distribution system will likely fail. Anyanwu and Onuoha (1999), stated that the marketing mix elements of a firm are those controllable variables that the marketer or the firm utilizes optimally to achieve the marketing and corporate objectives of the firm at a profit. These elements have different baptismal names: such as the marketing variables, marketing components, marketing ingredients, the 4P‘s of marketing and the controllable elements of the marketing system. The author further stated that marketing mix are controllable in the sense that they are at the discretion of the marketer or the firm to determine what product to produce, how and when to produce it, the quality to produce, the packing and labelling pattern it should bear. The marketer determines the price to sell the product, when to give credit and discounts or not and the route or channel the product should follow to get to the final consumer, whether or not the products should be promoted, using any or a combination of the promotional tools and media of communication and the amount to spend on each promotional variable are equally within the power of the firm and its marketing department.

Kotler (2001) noted that the 4P‘s represents the seller‘s view of the marketing tools available for influencing buyers. Meanwhile from the buyers‘ point of view, each marketing tool is designed to deliver a customer benefit. Despite all that has been said about marketing mix, and the fact that marketing

mix ana1yze is used as a synonym for the 4 P‘s of marketing, it is criticized. According to Kotler and Armstrong (2004) marketing mix has limitations in that it caters for sellers view of market analysis and not customers view, the authors develop the 4 C‘s to address customers view by matching the 4P‘s of marketing with the 4 C‘s of marketing to address customers views .Secondly, they observed that the marketing mix framework was particularly useful in the early days of the marketing concept when physical product represented a larger portion of the economy. Onuoha (2006) stated that in organizations today, marketing strategies are integrated into organizations with a wider variety of products and markets. The author noted that marketing mix is gradually extending to fifth and sixth P‘s, which are people and process, however, the marketing mix most commonly used by establishments still remains the 4 P‘s.

# Small and Medium Scale Enterprises

In a global context, a general definition of Small and Medium Scale Enterprises (SMEs) using size and scale of operation is not easy, but within the fixed co-ordinates of national boundaries. Countries define SMEs as it meets their economy needs. Osuala (2004) stated that there is no generally accepted definition of SMEs, rather, it varies from one country to another. Small and medium scale Enterprises (SMEs) were defined by National council on Industry (2010) as business enterprises whose total costs excluding land is between

N1,000,000 to N50,000,000. Small and medium scale industries, establishments are some of the terms that are used interchangeable by some authors to describe small and medium scale enterprises (SMEs). According to Olagunji (2000) Small and Medium Scale Enterprise as all business ventures which are set up to provide one satisfaction (utility) or the other for a defined market target and with capital and asset base as low as N1,000,000 and as high as N50,000,000. National Institute of management (2005) viewed small and medium scale Enterprises as enterprises employing between 5-100 people. Small and Medium Scale business enterprise according to Ajagun (2005) are establishments that posses the following characteristics: employ staff strength between 5-100, employ the services of manager and accountant, ownership is held by individual or small group; the area of operation can be in rural or urban areas and the relative si According to CBN (2008), a lot has been said and written about small and medium scale enterprises all over the world, all the massive attention and support given to SMEs relate to the widely acclaimed fact that SMEs are job and wealth creators to the Nation

In recognition of the crucial roles played by Small and Medium scale Enterprises with respect to economic growth and development, the Nigerian government as described by CBN (2009) had various initiatives aimed at promoting the efficiency of SMEs in the country, the most tangible among the different incentive package that vary with almost every change in government

leadership was the focus on enhancing the financial opportunities for SMEs

.According to Ajagu (2005), the introduction of SMEs Equity Investment Scheme (SMIEIS) which aims at revamping the SMEs as engine of growth in the economy and a veritable tool for the development of indigenous technologies, rapid industrialization, and the generation of employment for the for sustainable economic development in Nigeria, has greatly helped in giving Small and Medium Scale Enterprises a place in the development of Nigeria as a nation.

Small and Medium Scale Enterprises occupy a place of pride in Nigeria. Due to the significant roles played by SMEs in Nigeria economy the enterprises has been recognized as a veritable business activity in the country that helps in the improvement of Nigerian economy, special measures and program have been designed and policies initiated and executed by government to encourage SMEs development and hence make them more vibrant. The highlights of these measures according to the Central Bank of Nigeria (2010) include;

* 1. Fiscal incentives and protective fiscal policies.
  2. Specialized financial institutions and funding schemes for the SMEs
  3. Favorable tariff structure.
  4. The Small and Medium Equity Investment Scheme (SMEIS) funding scheme.
  5. Selective exemption and preferential treatment in excise.
  6. Establishment of export processing zones.
  7. Selective reservation of items for exclusive manufacturing in the SME subsector.
  8. Government‘s full weight and support for NEPAD and AGOA activities and operation.

It is expected that the SMEs implementation of the above mentioned policies and programme will help them to develop and make more impact.

# Theoretical Framework

A theory is a set of related statements that are arranged to give functional meaning to set of events. Pearson (2007) described a theory as an idea or set of ideas intended to explain something. In the view of Hawkins (2005) a theory is a set of concepts and principles which are logically consistent and serves to co- ordinate observed facts of relationships and to suggest further relationship that could be tested out experimentally. Theories are therefore, a set of ideas formulated to explain the principles of a subject. For the purpose of this study, the following marketing theories will be considered:

1. Theory of Equilibrium
2. Bass Combination theory

# Theory of Equilibrium

The theory that supply and demand will reach equilibrium in a free- market economy, also known as the theory of general equilibrium, dates to the 1700 by a Scottish economist Adam Smith. Smith proposed that acting purely out of self-interest despite their differing interests of producers and consumers will come to terms on what sellers will produce and what buyers will purchase and how the goods and services will be priced. In the late 1800 a French economist Leon Walras attempted to support the theory with mathematical equations, which Debreu a professor of economics from the University of California later conducted a research to prove the consistency of the theory. The research later earned him a Nobel Prize award in 1962, in rewarding the researcher, the Nobel committee noted that his principal work proved the existence of general equilibrium in the setting of prices.

Demand and Supply, in economics, are the basic factors determining price. According to the theory, or law of supply and demand, the market prices of commodities and services are determined by the relationship of supply to demand. Theoretically, when supply exceeds demand, sellers must lower prices to stimulate sales, conversely, when demand exceeds supply, buyers bid up as they compete to buy goods. The terms supply and demand do not mean the amount of products actually sold and bought, this is because, in any sale the amount sold is equal to the amount bought, and such supply is the amount

available for sale or the amount that sellers are willing to sell at a specific price. Omeje, (2004) also defined demand and supply as the quantity of goods or services which a producer is willing to make available at a given price and at a given period of time. On the other hand, demand sometimes called effective demand, is the amount purchasers are willing to buy at a specified price. Orumana, (2000) opined that the quantity of a commodity which a consumer is willing to buy determines the price to be paid at a given time.

The theory of equilibrium takes into consideration the influence of price of factors that increase or decrease the cost of production, and regards the factors as active because it affects the price of the product after production. Such factors include, change in consumption habits, restrictive practices of monopolies, among others. In the view of Anyaele (2000) equilibrium operates with the price system. The price system refers to the forces of demand and supply which interact to establish the price at which products are exchanged. The author further noted that equilibrium market price is the price where the quantity suppliers are willing to offer is same at the quantity the consumers are willing to buy. In other words, it is the price at which the quantity supplied equals the quantity demanded.

This theory is related to the present study as it emphasized the role of price in determining the demand and supply of a product. Since price is one of the marketing mix components utilized by business establishments to increase

sales, this theory is considered adequate to this study as it reveals that for proper utilization of pricing in marketing. This therefore means that small and medium scale enterprises should have an understanding of who their consumers are and as well as the factors that affects their demand for a product, and base on that should fix price for product for patronage and profit maximization.

# Bass Combination Theory

The Bass combination theory was propounded by Mahajan and Wind in 1986. The Bass theory is similar in some respects to theories of infectious diseases or contagion models, in that it attempts to estimate how many customers will buy a product, as products gain more acceptances over time. The theory represents not the spread of disease, but the impact of communication efforts about a product whether those efforts are external in nature, such as mass advertising, or more informal in nature, such as word of mouth communication or observation and imitation. This theory draw ones attention to the fact individuals differ in their adoption of any particular product depending on the type of information the have about the product. The implication of this theory is that when a product is launched, customers‘ tries to obtain information as to which product is superior compared to existing product. Such information could come from the mass media and from the other external sources as in the case of innovative customers. Customers utilize the interpersonal method like word-of

mouth communication and observation for information. Bass theory captured the relative importance of two classes of customers (regular and irregular customers). The bass theory thus assumes that new product adopters are influenced by two types of communication; mass media and interpersonal communication, and that the mass media effects, which have a greater impact on innovative customers, will be greater at the outset of the product launch; whereas the interpersonal communication effects, which have a greater impact on the much larger number of imitative customers, will be greater during the later periods of the diffusion process. Bass theory requires that business operators make provision for proper promotion and distribution of products at the beginning of every financial year.

This theory relates to the present study in that it pointed out the need for business establishments to utilize promotion and distribution tools of marketing mix to get customers patronize their product which will help in the organization profit maximization.

# Theoretical Studies

**Utilization of Product Components of Marketing Mix for Effective Marketing**

A lot of definition have emanated from different marketing experts. In the view of Kotler and Armstrong (2006) product is anything that can be offered to a market for attention, acquisition, use or consumption and that might satisfy a

want or need. The authors identified the definition points component of product include quality, brand name, packaging, sizes, warranty and to the fact that product is not limited to physical goods that provided satisfaction but extends to services that may give psychological satisfaction as well. The product is the most visible marketing mix element of the firm since it is what actually brings buyers and sellers together. According to Burshirt and Houston (2006) a product is anything capable of satisfying a consumer want or need. It can take a variety of forms including a physical object, a service, a place, an organization, an idea or a personality. Sherve and Smith (2000) recognized the traditional and expanded approach to defining a product under the traditional approach; a product is seen as the entire bundle of utility that is offered by a marketer to the market place. This bundle contains a potential for satisfaction that comes in part from a tangible, objective premature of the product. Satisfaction is also derived from the intangible, subjective features of a product.

Maxwell (2009) added that product is an embodiment of goods and services and is not restricted only to physical or tangible product known as commodity. Boone (2004) stated that product is a bundle of tangible and intangible attributes, including packaging, colour and branch plus the services and reputation of the seller. This accounts for why some people may prefer to buy higher prices goods than their cheaper counterparts from a particular seller. The author further noted that functionally, the products may serve the purpose

but may not be enough for an ego conscious consumer. Products can also be viewed from the angle of the benefits they offer, therefore, markets are divided into segments on the basis of benefits which reflect the needs and wants of each segment. A better understanding of product can be drown from the following classification of products occur according to Onugu (2011) they include;

1. Product nature
2. Number of times of us
3. Customer type and purpose

He noted that the nature of the product is adopted and distinguished based on their tangible and intangible nature. These are goods or product that can be toughed, smelt of felt before purchase, which can be produced, stored and used on a later date and there are products that are perishable, Heterogenic and inseparable because of their nature and therefore should be presented a menu that its importance can felt and presented to meet the needs of its users.

Onwuka (2007) stated that number of time of use of a product determines should be considered in making product durable, product survive several number of times of use, it could come in form of consumer durables or industrial durables to suit the consumer needs. Such consumer durable, like kitchen pots, refrigerators, dish washer among others and industrial durables like machines and gadgets are all produced considering the consumers‘ needs and satisfaction and therefore should be packaged and made available for sale to

attract high profit margin for the organization. Customer type of purpose is another reason for classification of products. Ezem (2008) stated that the type of consumer determines the type of product to be produced and for these reasons; products should be produced considering its users. Kotler and Armstrong (2006) further classified products into industrial and consumer product. In the view of Anyanwu (2007) industrial producers are those products bought by organizations purchasing agents or by middlemen in order to make other goods, to resell other, or to carry some other exchange related activities. The planning of marketing strategy for the industrial products sold in the market place should be well planned to enable its consumers. He added that because of the nature of the industrial products, sellers should solicit for buyers by offering the services required of them when the needs arise as a result of a fault or damage within the warranty time. On the other hand consumer products are not always meant for immediate consumption and use and therefore should be produced with specific characteristics and feature in mind.

Obieke (2005) Classified consumer products to include: convenience goods, shopping goods, special goods. Onuoha (2006) stated that because of the nature of these product classifications, it is important that organizations follow sequentially and also observe the process of new product development. He identified the process to include;

1. Idea generation
2. Idea screening
3. Concept development and testing
4. Marketing strategy
5. Business Analysis
6. Product development
7. Test marketing
8. Commercialization

He further observed that from the idea generation, when a products is conceived to idea screening when the clearer picture of what product should be and who it should be made for, concept development that entails stating the product idea in such a way that is meaningful to the consumer, marketing strategy considered to ensure customers hearts are wined to move from the old product to the new, to business analysis when sales and profit projection of the new product is determine, product development to assume a shape to ensure the idea is turned into workable products and to market testing and commercialization, a lot of attention is required by the consumer to make the products be attracted and patronized. Onuoha (2006) stated that it is important that establishments realize the importance of new product to customers to help the establishment utilize marketing mix appropriately.

Importance of New Product

In the view of Inyanga (2006) the importance of new product development from the producers and consumers perspectives includes;

1. Existence of competition and competitive in the industry and market makes the producer to grow, out-compete or meet up competitors products offerings market shares and growth positions.
2. Profit motive- the existence of new products, everything being equal, brings much success to the innovating firm in terms of profits through increase in sales turnover and revenue. This means that small medium size enterprises that intends to increase sales turnover and profit motive should go into new products development as it profits most the person who offers and serves best.
3. Increase in market shares and quest for leadership- it is the intention of most firms to constantly and continuously increase their market shares and become market leaders. This is done from existing structure, something that could assist them with the love of the customers, thereby increase their market share and lead.
4. The consumers who care about something new and wish to have them most times enjoy the opportunity and utilizes even to be confuse of the product immediately it enters market.
5. Status- searching consumers utilizes the opportunity but the product because of their social status and therefore, is good category for market segment (target market) for a manufacturer of new products.

In the view of Onuoha (2004) there are four stages a product has to pass through in terms of cost, sales and yield after it has been developed. These stages include;

1. Introduction stage
2. Growth stage
3. Maturity/saturation stage
4. Decline stage

Product life cycle in the view of the author is the sales and profit history of any given product. The stages of introduction, growth, maturity/saturation and decline are crucial and therefore should carefully study. Managerial activities should be utilized to strengthen its growth from one level to the other.

Uzoma (2009) stated that serious attention should be paid to the products to forestall quick extinction and related services that a company offers to its customers. It therefore means that a product is made of the different components that made up the product along with its after sales service. All these are included in the product development strategy. Onwuka (2007) argued that product is the most important aspect of the marketing mix for two main reasons. First, for manufacturers, products arc the market expression of the company‘s productive

capabilities and determine its ability to link with consumers. So product policy and strategy are of prime importance to an organization, and product decision dictates the scope and direction of the companies‘ activity. Moreover, the market indicators such as profits, sales, image, market shares, reputation and stature are also dependent on them.

Secondly, it is imperative to realize that the product of any organization is both a component and a determinant of the marketing mix as it has a great influence than the other elements of the mix. Advertising, personal selling, channels of distribution, physical distribution and pricing. So without proper product policy, a company cannot pursue the other elements of the marketing mix. To Ahukanuah, (2001), a product is anything that satisfied a consumer needs while Boone (2004) sees a product as something that is capable of satisfying a customer‘s needs or wants. Product Satisfaction is also derived from the intangible, subjective features of a product, that is, one with additional features, this, could be in the form of an extra service such as a free 24hours help line or free legal cost cover among others.

# Utilization of Price Components of Marketing Mix for Effective Marketing

Generally, human wants are insatiable, so consumers in the market place have needs which firms can satisfy through the manufacturing of products. According to Kotler and Armstrong (2006) Pricing is very essential in

marketing since the decision associated with pricing is the basis of developing any marketing mix. Decision on pricing could affect all the marketing controllable, it is only price that generates revenue and because of it marketers give it more attention than is given to other marketing mix variables. For every product in life, there is a price to pay. The price paid depends on the quality and value of the product. According to Kotler and Armstrong in Onuoha (2008) price can be defined as the amount of money charged for a product or services or the same of the values they consumers exchange for the benefits of having or using the product or services. The author further defined price as a sacrifice made to acquire a given product, which may be monetary or non-monetary. When it is monetary, the value for such product is expressed in terms of specified currency. However, when the sacrifice is non –monetary, it is more of psychological dissipation of intangible efforts that cannot easily be qualified in monetary terms. In the view of Onuoha (2008) the price which an enterprise sets for its product can go a long way in determining the products success in the market as well as the enterprise survival. He observed that pricing affect the activities of groups like labour unions, competitors, distributors, government, among others. Pricing as a sensitive activity should be handled with care to benefit the company, and at the same time allow it to maintain strong competitive position in the market. Baker (2006) noted that the following factors should be considered when setting the price of a product.

1. Cost of products
2. Profit
3. Competitors price
4. Willingness of buyers to pay such price

No matter how good a product is made, promoted and distributed, if it is poorly priced, the guarantee of its success becomes doubtful and questionable. It is the major determinant of the market demand for a product and affects the firms competitive position, market share sales volume, net profit and total marketing programme.

According to Barker, (2008), the theoretical fixing of a price for goods and services starts with the. Interplay of the forces of demand and supply. Price may be defined as the value of a commodity or service expressed in monetary terms. The general price level is reflected by wage standard of living and profit. All of which are expressed in monetary value. Anyanwu (2007) stated that pricing is important to every business organization because it indicates and shapes the margin between cost of operation and sales revenue. They further stated that price classify the situation in which a company operates as pure competition, monopolistic competition, oligopoly, monopoly etc. From the marketer point of view, an efficient price is a price that is very close to the maximum that customers are prepared to pay. In economic terms, it is a price that shifts most of the customers‘ surplus to the producer. A good (pricing

strategy would be the one which could balance between the price floor (the price below which the organization ends up in losses) and the price ceiling (the price beyond which the organization experience a no demand situation).

Kotler and Armstrong (2004) refer concept of price as the amount of money that customers have to pay to obtain the product. Setting a price is not something simple. The authors noted that customers are not always attracted to a product as a result of low price, they also respond to quality. If the product of is not fulfilling, the customers may not buy. Boone (2004) stated that in product patronage Price is either fixed or negotiable between the buyer and the sellers. A fixed price is that price which the seller agrees to sell his product while negotiable price is the price which the seller and the buyer bargains to arrive at. Price is the amount in the current medium of exchange for economic goods. Price represents cost to the seller for producing and distributing the product and to the buyer; it is the cost of consuming the product. Within financial services, the price can often be referred to in different ways such as charges, interest, rate, premium among others. An appropriate pricing policy has a positive impact on profit making and sales realization. Pricing is a directly related factor to the profit and sales of products under different markets conditions. The pricing policy adopted will reflect the positioning of the product in the market. These issues may be viewed as either high price or low price policies. The effective

pricing strategies may be considered according to the product act in the market embryonic, mature and aging (Rajagopal, 2004).

Price is a marketing tool that can be used creatively to help attract consumer traffic, create consumer satisfaction and build consumer loyalty. Pricing decision must address the issue of how much to charge the final consumer in order to achieve acceptable sales level and profit margins. Price is one of the representations of the value of a product or service. The right price is the amount of money that the customer is willing and able to pay and the seller is willing to accept in an exchange for product or services. The right price allows the seller to make a fair profit while providing the consumer with value satisfaction before, during and after the sales.

From the consumer point of view, price can act as a forceful attraction or as an absolute repellent in the consumers store selection process. It can also serve as either an incentive or a deterrent in the decision to buy. Some consumers consider price the most important criterion in selecting stores and products. Others arc far less sensitive to price. Brink and Key (2006) saw price as what one gives up in exchange for a product or service. He further stated that, price is the value that consumers placed on a product. They stated that it is the exchange value of a product that is very important for prompt organization product sales. They identified the following Pricing Strategies as suitable for prompt product sales:

1. Cost plus Mark up Pricing: Adding a mark-up or profit percentage to the unit cost of production.
2. Penetration Pricing: Charging a lower price than that of competitors when entering a market with the aim of increasing the price after the product has become well accepted in the market. Penetration price may be less than cost of production.
3. Skimming Pricing: Charging a higher price than that of competitors to give the impression that the product is superior to others and reducing the price later after status conscious customers have brought it. Lowering the price later would enable the less affluent customers to enjoy the product.
4. Competitive Price: Charging what competitors arc charging or having competitor‘s reaction in mind while setting price.
5. Odd Pricing: Pricing just below the exact naira amount.
6. Prestige Price: Fixing a permanently high price on a product in order to enhance the status of its buyers. Perfumes, deodorants and other products that satisfy people‘s esteem or ego needs are usually price this way. (P.225-227).

In the view of Inyanga (2006) pricing strategy of an enterprise should be planned based on the pricing objectives. There are numerous objectives that pricing is set to achieve and they can be abridging in major points as highlighted by Ezem, 2008).

* 1. Sales oriented pricing objectives: based on facilitating sales over a period of time. It looks into the income level of the customers to place a price they can afford to pay.
  2. Profit oriented pricing objectives: designed to generate reasonable returns from every product sold. It may follow after the strategy of skimming pricing strategy whereby the product is sold at a relative price.
  3. Status – quo pricing objectives: under this arrangement, the price is set on the basis of what the competitors‘ price shows i.e., the price is fixed based on the going rate, which signifies the general price range in the organization as charged by the competitors. According to Inyanga, (2006) every organization should ensure that their pricing objectives are set and achieved for profit maximization.

The author further noted pricing objectives to include the following;

1. To achieve target return on investment (ROI) or on net sales
2. Price stabilization
3. To maintain or improve share of the market
4. To met or prevent competitors
5. To maximize profit
6. To maintain arrival and growth of the firm
7. To create demand for a new product
8. To minimize and maintain status quo
9. To gain quick cash in flow and revenue (p.28)

According to Ibekwe, (2010) pricing objectives are essential in determining the price of product. He further stated that the interaction between the forces of demand and supply determines the price of a product. Demand as we know is the quantity of goods and services that the consumer is willing and able to buy at a given price and at a given period while supply is the quantity of goods and services that the producer is willing and able to offer for sale at a given price over a period of time. When prices are high, the supply for the product increases while the demand for it drops, this will result in excess supply in the market. This will force the price down and when the price reduces or drops the supply for the product/services decreases but demand for them will increase so at that point there will be excess demand in the market. This situation force price to rise a bit to a point of balance that is, a price between the high price and the low price, at that point, demand and supply becomes equal, which becomes a price of equilibrium.

The Role of Price

According to Ibekwe (2010), Price plays the following roles:

1. Survival of The Business: In seeking to achieve normal profit, if not super normal profit, the entrepreneur will set prices that will bring adequate profit for the business. Price determines how much profit is made. The price of the product thus determine; the survival of the business, If the set

price of a product is too low, the firm cannot break-even and the result is running at a loss, but when prices are moderately set, the firm will maximize profit at a large volume of sales.

1. Cash Flow: Price of a product determines the cash flow. Set price should be that that will encourage high rate of turnover. The law of demand states that the lower the price, the higher the quantity demanded. This knowledge will guide the firm to fix such a price that will increase the rate of turnover and maximized profit at the long run.
2. Product Quality: If the objective of maintaining product quality must be realized, then appropriate price of product is necessary.
3. Profit: The aim or reason of the firm for going into- the business is to maximize profit. The price of the product determines how much profit is to be made.
4. Competition: The price determines how much the entrepreneur can compete in the market. When proper price is fixed, it gives the retailer a competitive power.
5. Viability: The fixed price of a product tells the firm if the marketing of that particular line of product is viable and worthwhile.
6. Quantity To Supply: The fixed price as we can see from the diagram above leads the firm or directs the firm on the quantity of his merchandise to supply at a given time.(p. 29-30).

# Utilization of Place Components of Marketing Mix for Effective Marketing

According to Ibekwe (2010) a firm may have a high quality product come up with a reasonable and profitable pricing strategy, and even effectively promotion strategies, but if they are unable to move the product to the prospective customers will have problem in retaining customers and thus may have great challenge of increased patronage, in fact, when an enterprise promote a product not effectively distributed, such enterprise will end up promoting the ones available because if the desirable is not available the available becomes the desirable. The author noted that increase patronage is hinged on proper distribution of products.

Distribution or place as the case may be according to Onuoha (2004) is the flow of title to goods and services as they move along the channel of distribution from point of production to point of consumption. Place otherwise called distribution is also seen as the way something is shared or exists over a particular area. Ramu, (2000), affirmed that the term Channel of distribution can be traced to the French word ―canal‖ which suggests a path that goods take as they flow from producers to consumers. A channel of distribution consists of

~ producer, consumer and many intermediary organizations which transfer the title or possession of the products from producers to consumers. Channel of distribution is the process, activities and route by which goods arc moved from producers to consumers. Anyanwu (2007) sees it as those fragments of network

between production and consumption. Distribution can also be defined as a set of institution which performs all activities (functions) utilized to move a product and its title from production to its consumption. He further noted that a channel of distribution for a product is a route taken by the title of the goods as they move from the producer to the ultimate consumer or industrial users. According to Anyanwu (2007), before an organization will decide on a distribution strategy needs to consider the answer to the following questions:

1. What is the nature of the product?
2. Who are the customers?
3. Where arc the customers?
4. How do they like to buy the product?
5. What distribution channel do they find acceptable?
6. How are the competitors? (p.43).

As goods, passes through the channel of distribution they gain added value. Burshirt and Homston (2006) pointed out that the functions of a channel is physical distribution of products, several functions are involved in the physical distribution such as breaking bulk, accumulating bulk, creating assortments, reducing transactions, transport and storing. Production is not complete until the product is in the hands of the target market. Distribution function adds time and place utilities, since it is responsible for transferring products from the point of production to the point of use. This is done over time

and most times across long distances. For instance, majority of the electronics used in Nigeria are produced abroad and imported into Nigeria through various means.

In the view of Brink and Key (2006) a channel provides distribution of goods from the manufacturer to the consumer. From the above assertion, one can understand that channel of distribution has distinct aspects as the pipeline for the products and also a direction of flow for the product. Another aspect of the channel of distribution that is always emphasized is the trade channel. A trade channel is the direction and path of movement of a product as it changes form and is transferred from one hand to the next in the process of production until it reaches the final consumer. Every trade channel therefore starts with the original producer of the first raw material and ends with the final consumer of the product it will be used to produce.

In the view of Anyanwu (2007) place under marketing mix involves all the company‘s activities that make the product available to the targeted customers. Based on various factors, Kotler and Armstrong (2004) observed that such tools as sales, communication and contractual consideration, are various ways of making the product available to customers. In an attempt to move these goods and services, marketing intermediates or middlemen assist in exchanging tithes and possessions. According to Anyanwu (1999) under

marketing mix analysis, companies consider five (5) different channel decisions which include:

1. Choosing single or multiple channel of distribution.
2. The length of the distribution channel
3. The types of intermediaries
4. The number of distributors
5. Which intermediary to use based on the quality and reputation? (P, 5)

It is not enough to provide a qualitative product, reasonably price it and effectively promote it when it could not be easily made available to the ultimate consumer or industrial user where, when and how it is needed by the users.

―Place‖ in marketing is made up of channel chosen by the product and the physical movement of the product as it gets to the final user. In addition to the various institutions that facilitate the movement from the sellers view point place is a strategic competitive force, this means that it is within the marketing manager‘s power to develop and maintain a product flow system, which is superior to his competitors. From the consumers point, place means having an adequate supply of goods at the right time and location. Place to the consumer means convenience and freedom of choice. The consumer does not want to be forced to make extra store trips just because the retailer is not stocked with the desired goods. According to Anyanwu (1999) distribution deals with the process of getting what is produced to be conveyed from the producers‘ warehouse to

the final consumer. In most cases, wholesalers and retailers are distributive agents.

Distribution functions are as follows:

* 1. Transfer of title to the goods from one person to another.
  2. Physical movement of the goods from the place of production to that of consumption.
  3. Storage of the goods until the time they are to be conveyed to another person or place.
  4. Communication of information about the availability, price and characteristics of the goods.
  5. The financing of the goods in transit, inventory as well as on purchasing.
  6. Place relates to the distribution of the product or services, i.e. Where the products are sold and how they are sold. (p. 29).

Onuoha (2006) stated that before an organization can decide on a distribution strategy, he needs to consider the answers to such questions as: What is the nature of the product? Where are the consumers? How do they like to buy? What distribution channel do they find acceptable Preferable? How are the competitors‘ products distributed? The author further noted that the answer an organization has concerning the above mentioned questions determines how successful the chosen distribution channel will be. Most financial services operating today distribution through a variety of different channels. ‗They may

well sell through intermediaries and brokers as well as through their own sales force. They may operate a branch network and; telephone call centre, and many companies now also distribute through the internet. Uzoma, (2009) opined that a good channel system helps organization to utilize variety methods in making their product known and patronized by customers.

A channel system in the view of Ramu (2000) is any combination of channels and sale; effort to reach different target market customers. The objectives (effective management of channel systems are to increase sale; growth, engender competitive advantage, increase customer vain, frequently, there may be a chain of intermediaries, each passing the product down the chain to the next organization before it finally reaches the customer or end user. The process is known as the ―distribution chain‖ or the ―channel‖. Each of the elements in these chains will have their own specific needs which the producer must take into account, along with those of all the other important end user. Distribution channel may not be restricted to physical product alone. They may be just as important for moving a service from producer to consumer in a certain sectors, since both direct and indirect channels may be used. Hotels, for example may sell their services (typically rooms) directly or through travel agents, tour operators, airlines, tourist boards, centralized reservations system among others.

There are many channel members that help to facilitate the distribution of products from where it is produced to where it is needed. The most conventional ones are wholesales, retails, distributors, jobbers, dealers among others. Onuoha (2006) stated that these channel members engage in distributing the company‘s products from time to time. The distribution can be physically carried out as this attract benefits product movement, storage, reduction of marketing cost, information availability and provision of alternatives in distribution , these are:

1. Direct supply channel.

Here the producer sells to the consumers directly. This is common in industrial goods market. This type may be through the manufacturers own retailer shop. This happens when the producer decides to be involved in the production and retailing at the same time. This is known as vertical integration.

1. Merchant Supply Channel

Here the manufacturer sells to the merchant who in turn sells to the final consumers. The Short Channel Here the manufacturer sells to the retailer who in turn sells‘ to the final consumers**.** Long Channel In this channel, the manufacturer sells to the wholesaler. The wholesaler sells to the retailer who in turn sells to the final consumers. Onuoha (2006) identified the importance of the role of the channels to include;

* 1. Availability of Product: Place enables retailer to get and trade on product that arc produced in a far away place in their locality.
  2. Bulk breaking: these are producers that sell in a very large quantity that retailer may not be able to afford but with the aid of the long channel of distribution, the wholesaler buys and break the bulk then sell to retailers in smaller quantities.
  3. Creating Assortments: A retailer can visit a shop of a single wholesaler and buy products of different producers from that single wholesaler thereby eliminating the trouble of visiting the different producers that may b~ in different towns.
  4. Reduce Cost Of Transaction: Distribution aids the retailer to eliminate cost of transaction such as transportation cost, cost to visit various producer, cost of delivery, cost of storing large stock, and cost of deterioration and expiring products etc.
  5. Enjoys Promotion Benefit: The retailer enjoys the benefit of promotion activities sponsored by the producers and the wholesalers. (p.18).

# Utilization of Promotion Components of Marketing Mix for Effective Marketing

Promotion is an essential component of business growth, and is generally seen as strong tool used in creating awareness. In the view of Akarahu (2010)

promotion is an important tool used in attracting and persuading customers to patronize a company‘s product and services. Ibekwe (2010) defined promotion as the marketing related communication between the seller and the buyer. It means communication with individuals, groups, or organization to directly or indirectly accept an organizations products or services. It is crucial to the growth of any business as it creates the needed awareness of an establishment‘s product to the public which results in increased sales volume. Klutz and Boone (1994) opined that promotion has become increasingly important to business enterprise both large and small. The long-term rise in outlays for promotion is well documented and attests to management faith in the ability of promotional effort to produce additional sales. The author further stated that it is the responsibility of the marketing manager to plan the organizational promotional strategy in accordance with the overall organization objectives and goals. Promotion as an effort aimed at generating sales and building a favourable attitude for an organizations product or services.

According to Anyanwu (2007) noted that the transmission of a message from a sender to a receiver is essential for effective communication; it creates opportunity for buyer –seller relationships. The author further stated that all communication effort of business enterprises should aim at informing and reminding customers of their products, services and their benefits and

persuading them to buy products of the establishment. The activities of promotion according to the author are further noted below:

1. Setting marketing objectives and goals
2. Developing advertising message
3. Recruiting and training sales persons
4. Establishing sales territories (p. 12).

The above mentioned activities of promotion help organizations to communicate effectively with their customers. Benneth (2009) noted that promotion being a transfer of information that aims at convincing people of patronage should be strategically planned and executed step by step. The authors further noted the following as steps to effective promotion. The promotional message must be designed and delivered as to gain attention of the intended objectives. The promotion should seek to employ signs which refer to experience common to source and destination, so as to achieve its objectives. In view of the above, promotion messages should be packaged to attract the attention and patronage of its user. According to Inyanga (2006) promotion should be utilized to create and exploit differences for positioning and convincing the public that ones product or services is better and different from that of its competitors.

This therefore means that organizations should plan and budget their promotional activities to achieve the organizations goals. In the view of Kotler

and Keller (2006) one of the hardest marketing decisions of organizations is on promotional budget. This time authors noted, involves how, what, and when to spend on promotion. They further identified four methods of promotional budgeting to include; affordable method which involves setting promotional budget of the level the company can afford. This method in his opinion is often used by small business, reasoning that the company cannot spend more on promotion than it has budgeted based on its working capital. This method completely ignores the effects of promotion on sales which lead to an uncertain annual promotional budget for making long-range market planning difficult.

Percentage of sales method involves setting promotional budget at a setting percentage of current or forecasting sales. Thus, the percentage of sales budget is based on availability of funds rather than on opportunities. This method wrongly views sales as a cause of promotion rather than as the result. Competitive parity method involves setting the promotional budget to match competitors. Its advantage is that it forces management to spend and promote their products.

The authors noted that objective-and-task-method is the most logical budget setting which involves developing the promotion budget by defining specific objectives thus determining the task must be performed to achieve these objectives and estimate the cost of performing the task. According to Boone (2004), the traditional function of promotion is to inform the market about the

availability of particular product. Brink and Kay (2006), opined that the major function of an organization is to sell their products, services or idea to the public to enable them increase their sales volume. They further stated that organization that aim at achieving this must ensure that their promotion strategy is in line with the objective already set. Brink & Kay, enumerated the following as the functions of promotion.

1. To change the location and shape of the demand for a company‘s product
2. To increase product sales volume at any given price
3. To increase consumer awareness of a products existence, characteristics and usefulness of the product
4. To create psychological satisfaction and to ad real value to the company‘s products. (p. 20).

An establishment promotional effort should be agreed towards presenting the products and services in such a manner that it can be differentiated from that of its competitors. Uzoma (2008) observed that promotion properly planned helps to point out a product, which will cause the product command a higher price in the market place with the aim of influencing financial level of the establishment.

Consequently, the achievement of the above objectives is dependent on the type of promotional mix an establishment utilizes in promoting their products and services. Akarahu (2010) stated that promotional mix is the

combination of promotional communication method used to achieve the promotional objectives of the marketing mix. Anyanwu and Onuoha (1999) noted that it involves the combination of strategies elements such as advertising, sales promotion, personal selling, publicity and public relations. Adeleke (2004) opined that, he who refuses to promote and communicate his business ideas, activities and products to the consumers is like a man who winkles in the dark, he knows what he does but nobody knows what he is doing. Good product, good pricing and good and good distribution are not substitutes to bad promotion. All should complement each other to make an organization achieve its objectives, according to Kotler and Armstrong (2006) promotional mix variables include; other benefits. Kotler in Ejionueme, (2000) developed effective promotion programmes procedure. This includes:

1. Identify the target audience.
2. Specify the type of response, sought awareness, brand preference, purchase or brand loyalty.
3. Choose a message based on the target audience and the message.
4. Specify the sources credibility, attribute — patriotism, trustworthiness, expertise. Honesty or sociability.
5. Execute programme
6. Collect the feedback (p.15).

The author also noted that promotion strategies utilized by establishments determines the number of their customers. It is therefore important that good promotion strategies be utilized by organizations.

# Promotional Strategies

Promotional strategies are closely related to the process of communication that involves the transmission of a message from a sender to a receiver. Promotional strategy involves how a business organization informs prospective buyer about its product and focus its attention on the communication dimension of the marketing mix and takes an active role in the marketing process with individuals, groups or organizations directly or indirectly to facilitate exchange of product or ideas. However, Kotler and Armstrong (2004) noted that promotional strategies include all means through which a company communicates the benefit and values of its products and persuades the targeted customers to buy them. The author added that the best way to understand promotion is through the concept of the marketing communication process. Promotion is the company strategy to cater for the marketing communication process that requires interaction between two or more people or groups, encompassing senders, message media and receivers.

Anyanwu and Onuoha(2000 )stated that Promotional mix is the combination of promotional communication method used to achieve the promotional objective of the marketing mix. This involves the combination of

strategy element such as personal selling, advertising, sales promotion and publicity, the authors further stated that he who refuses to promote and communicate his business ideas, activities and products to the consumer is like a man who winkles in the dark. He knows what he does but nobody else knows what he is doing. Good product, good pricing and good distribution are not substitutes to bad promotion. All should complement each other to make an organization grow.

# The Promotional Mix or Tools

According to Anyanwu & Onuoha (2000) promotional components include:

1. Advertising
2. Personal selling
3. Sales promotion
4. Public relations
5. Publicity

# Advertising

Advertising involves the presentation of messages about goods and services by means of a medium that is paid for. According to Ramu (2000), advertising is a paid, mass — mediated attempt to persuade. The Advertising Practitioners Council of Nigeria (APCQN) defines it as a form of communication through the media about products, services or ideas paid for by identified sponsors. It is the product of great forces that have shaped modern

society. Advertising is more than just the commercials and magazines, newspapers, video games, the internet and billboards. It involves planned efforts ensuring that the goods get to the target customers. Ramu, further noted that print advertising, radio, television, billboards, mobile, internet among others are very essential and should be utilized by organizations for effective advertising.

# Personal Selling

Despite the importance of advertising and sales promotion in disseminating information and stimulating interest in products and services, there are situation when personal contact between seller and buyer is necessary. According to Kotler (2001), personal selling is the use of customer‘s direct channels to reach and deliver goods and services to customers without using marketing middlemen. It is therefore logical to observe that personal selling marketing build a long-term relationship with the consumer. Personal selling requires proper recruitment and selection of goods sales people as careful sales person selection can generally increase the overall sales force performance. This affirms the view of Kotler and Armstrong (2006) that if the marketers does a good job of using sales representatives who understand customers needs, effective result oriented sales will be made at every sales point .

The aim of personal selling‘s to make personal contact with the customers. According to Drucker (2005) the knowledge and understanding of

the customers needs helps in interactive moments which makes purchasing easier. Therefore, an organizational personal selling which involves two ways personal communication between sales people and individual customers whether face to face, by telephones, should aim at convincing customers to buy. Baker (2008) opined that the effect of personal selling on an organization depends on how sales force strategy and design are planned and carried out. The author further stated that the following steps stimulated sales through personal contact and should therefore be considered in planning personal selling strategy, such as;

1. Identify influential individuals
2. Create opinion leader
3. Use influential and believable people to testify the patronage of products
4. Establish online discussion group the functions and strategies of personal selling as observed above should be well utilized by small and medium scale enterprises for profit maximization. According to personal selling planning should involved selling through sales experts for quick attraction of target customers. (p. 27).

The importance of personal selling to business establishments cannot be over- emphasized; Akanwa (2007) stated that organizations that intend to attract its customers should understand the benefits of utilizing personal selling as a promotional strategy. Personal selling as a promotional tool is essential for an

organizational growth, it helps organizations to create and leave an impression of acceptance and warm to its customers especially to the establishments that offer services that require person to person contact. Small and medium scale enterprises like restaurants, hotels, fast food, super markets among others use the strategy of person to person in carrying out business activities on daily bases which lead to profit maximization.

According to Procter and Gamble (2005) enterprise, that intends to grow should endevour to qualify the parameter that enables them maximize profit. The authors identified the following basic structuring evaluation that organizations should make:

1. Set sales target for coming business year for the period of five years
2. The promotional budget should be reviewed in the light of the sales target to ascertain whether the proposed expenditures will be sufficient to gestate the desired sales volume
3. Personal and non personal selling is a complementary activity and should not be segregated when determining the size of the promotional budget, which means that management should decide the amount that should spent on promotion.
4. The optimum mix of personal and non personal promotional efforts will vary by products, firm, industry and market and is subject to change

overtime; therefore, the total budget should be allocated roughly in accordance with the relative importance attached to each.

1. The adequacy of the sales budget may be evaluated by reference to past sales data or if the firm has no previous experience of direct selling, information can be extracted from related published data of sales by the organization. (p. 45).

From the above structuring evaluation for budgeting for personal selling, medium scale enterprises should plan and budget too effectively on before utilizing the personal selling and other variable of marketing mix for profit maximization. In utilization personal selling variable, Kotler (2001) stated that the interaction effect of personal selling increases the chances of a sales person securing orders from his customers as the seller stands the chance, bringing satisfaction to buyers. Customers are provided with what they want without much unnecessary delay in that sales people in their personal selling activity may offer some special service such as, making financial adjustment when necessary, offer repair services of products to customers, make a change in case of spoilt or damaged product as a result of wrong packaging, collect information for management decision among others. All these efforts when properly utilized, positively affect organizational growth.

# Sales Promotion

The essence of being in business by any business outfits is to produce for sales and profit. To remain in business enterprises should generate enough sales from its products to cover operating cost and post reasonable profit, to achieve this, organizations must device effective sales promotional strategy. Kotler and Armstrong (2006) defined sales promotion as that promotional tool that consists of short-term incentives to encourage purchase or sales of a product or services.

Sales promotion are usually short campaigns often run in association with media, most of which involves the collection of tokens either from other products or services rendered by the advertisers or published in the newspapers as key ingredient in marketing campaigns that consist of a diverse collection of ingredient in marketing campaigns that consist of a diverse collection of incentives tools, mostly short-term designed to stimulate quicker or greater purchase of a particular products or services by consumers.

Sales promotion is demand-stimulating devices designed to supplement advertisement and promote sales. The above definition did not capture all the elements of modern sales promotion. One should add that effective sales promotion increases the basic value of a product for a limited time and directly stimulate consumer purchasing, selling effectiveness, or the effort of sales force. Anyanwu (2007) pointed out that sales promotion is a direct involvement that offer extra incentives anywhere along the marketing route to enhance or

accelerate the product movement from producers to consumers. There are three important elements to consider within the definitions.

1. Sales promotion may be used anywhere in the marketing channel from manufacturer to wholesaler than to dealer and from dealer to customer, or manufacturer to customer.
2. Sales promotion normally involves a direct inducement such as money, prices, extra products, gifts or specialized interaction that provides extra incentives to buy now or buy more, visit a store, display a product or take some other action.
3. Sales promotion is designed to change the timing of purchase or to shift inventory to others in the channel. (p.38).

Davis (2008) affirms that sales promotion refers to any incentive used by a manufacturer to induce their consumers to buy a brand and to encourage the sales force to aggressively sell it. He contends that retailers also use promotional incentives to encourage desired behavior from consumers come to my store rather than a competitor‘s, buy one brand rather than another, purchase larger quantities and so on. From Shrimp‘s point of view, sales promotion involves incentives. This is in line with the definitions above but added that these incentives (sweepstakes, coupons, premiums, display benefits allowance and so on) are added to, not substitute for the basic a purchaser typically requires when buying a particular product or service.

Sales promotion includes all other marketing activities other than personal selling, advertising, public relations, that stimulate consumer purchasing and dealer effectiveness (Ejionueme, 2009). Sales promotion in the view of Kotler (2001) is usually aimed at end — users. Sometimes, it is aimed at trade customers or companies‘ employees. Examples of sales promotion tools includes free sample, bon uses, trade shows/exhibitions, coupons etc. sales promotion is usually used to complement other promotional tools like advertising by yielding faster sales responses. Sales promotion is also used to improve the effectiveness of personal selling ingredient. It is usually a short run tool aimed at stimulating immediate increase in demand. Sales promotion relates to those selling activities, which are in-between advertising and salesmanship e.g. trade shows and displays. The primary purpose of sales promotion activities is to supplement and co-ordinate the other promotional efforts of the firm.

# Public Relations

Public relation according to Onuoha (2006) is a planned promotional tool utilized by organizations to influence some group‘s attitude or opinion about its product and services. It‘s objectives as noted by Kurtz and Boone (2004) includes;

1. Evaluate public attitudes
2. Identifies the policies and procedures of the organization or its individuals with key aspects of the public interest.
3. Executes a programme of action to earn public understanding and acceptance. (p.40).

The British Institute of Public Relations defined the function as that deliberate planned and sustained effort to establish and maintain mutual understanding between an organization and its public relations. Public relation is a vital link in a progressive company‘s marketing communication mix. Solid public relations campaigns with specific objectives that fits into the overall marketing plans and focus on targeted audience are planned. These campaigns tend to achieve and maintain a corporation‘s positive image in the eyes of the public. Programmes are therefore created to capitalize on such image and minimize those factors that can generate a negative image (Ejionumem, 2009) Public relations can therefore be described as the planned effort to influence opinion through socially responsible and acceptable performance based on mutual satisfaction. While, Nweze (2009) believes that the ―essence of public relation is mutual accommodation‖ Maxwell (2009) opted that public relations activities includes helping the public to understand the company and its products. Often Public relations are conducted through the media, i.e. newspaper, television, magazines among others.

# Publicity

Publicity, in the view of Kotler and Armstrong (2006) entails obtaining free but commercially significant news presentation of a company or its product in a printed or electronic medium, such as newspaper, radio and television organizations usually have little control over the message in the media, at least, not as they do in advertising. Regarding publicity, reporters and writers decided what will be said.

# Consumer Behaviour and Small and Medium Scale Marketing Strategies

Every business establishment requires consumer patronage to survive. Consumer therefore is the most important element in the marketing environment. This is because every marketing effort aims at affecting how the consumers think and behave towards the organization and its marketing offers. According to Engel, Blackwell and Kollat in Mmeremikwu (2008) consumer behaviour consists of those acts of individuals directly involved in obtaining and using economic goods and services including the decision process that precede and determine these acts.

Analysis of the Consumer Behaviour: The consumer is considered to be sovereign, where consumer behavior as a rule is purposeful and goal oriented. The goods and services of the companies are accepted or rejected by the consumers on the basic of the extent they are perceived as relevant to the needs and life style (Rajagopal 2004). Consumer sovereignty presents a formidable

challenge, but can be influenced by understanding the needs of the consumer and provided the goods or services offered, meets the consumer needs. The consumer is the central focus of every retail business for survival. Therefore, there is a continued battle to draw, the attention of the consumer and to retain their patronage. And in order to do this, the retailer must understand that it is the consumer who sets the agenda for the whole process of business and need to understand the consumer‘s characteristics in terms of expectations, buying behavior, value system and other attributes that compels patronage (Klein, 2000). The Consumer Buying Decision Process according to Otunze (2009) is the consumer buying process as felt need or want. Pre-purchase activity and Purchase decision usually work with Post purchase feelings. The author further noted that the basic needs of human being, that is, food, shelter, clothing and security can be satisfied in many ways. For instance the decision to take water to soothe taste may be short-changed for a substitute such as a bottle of coca- cola. The felt need can be considered as a problem, which requires solution and in the process of seeking solution leads naturally to alternative ways of resolving the problem. Small and medium scale operators who intend to achieve their target should endeavour to make goods and services available in varieties customers would want. One of the attributes of the consumer buying process, which the entrepreneur should gather information about, is the pre-purchase activity. Otunze outlined the sequence of buying process as follows:

* 1. Awareness
  2. knowledge
  3. liking
  4. preference
  5. Conviction purchase. (p.37).

The implication of these buying process as noted in Ibekwe (2010) is that a business operator is that, it helps to ensure that list of alternatives are included in the store and present a positive image of the store. Offering them the type of product or services the customers requires will make your store the preferred one. However, Kotler (2001) postulated a model of sequence of communication task and specific task. The model uses a hierarchy-of-effect model of the communication process that includes unaware stage, Aware- comprehension, and image attitude action stage. According to Onuoha (2006) Kotlers‘s model assures that mental steps of consumers start with unawareness of a brand, they move to awareness and it is followed by comprehension aid conviction about the brand and then leads to action phase. He therefore suggested a 6-M approach for consumer behavioural analysis, which is: merchandise, marketing, motives, messages, media and measurement which are achieved through post purchase decisions.

The purchase decision in the view of McCarthy (1991) comprise of small decision, which can be influence to take alternative decision. The actual time of

purchase is important since it can either help or hinder the decision process. Therefore additional information provided in the store can lead to additional purchases. Ease of purchase lack of queues, treatment by sale attendants or personnel and efficient handling of problems and complaints can make a lasting impression can lead to continued patronage or permanent loss customer. Satisfaction is the key of any purchase. Inyanga (2006) therefore, stated that knowing exactly who uses the product, where and when it is used, what other products it is used with, is one potential question that would provide answer which the entrepreneur can sometime use in ensuring customer satisfaction.

Dissatisfaction, as noted by Onuoha (2008) may result not from the product performance but sometimes from psychological syndrome such as tension that the product will not work or comments by close associates about the product. This may cause customer to return the product. The knowledge of this should equip the entrepreneur with re-assuring strategy that would instil some level of confidence in them. The entrepreneur can say this: ―if it does not work bring it back and I will refund your money.‖ (p.23) this statement may reassure the customer to take the decision to buy.

The value attached to a product determines the purchase force of the customer. According to Omeje (2004) Value is the importance or usefulness of something that makes one, wanting to own or have it. The author noted that customers make purchases when they feel that it has value that satisfies their

desire. However, in some cases is pre-value and post-value. That is the value for which the consumer buys the product and the value discovered after purchase. Benneth (2009) added that consumers taste determines the value that will be attached to the product and thus the brand to be purchased.

The customer value chain is the sequence of values a customer attached to a good or service before purchase is made and the values discovered alter the product was purchased. Onuoha (2008) sees consumers value as ideas and principles, which people consider correct, desirable or important. In order words, it is the perceived value before buying the goods and the value realized after purchase. Example, a customer purchases a car for luxury and economy. He would as well want the car to be durable, reliable, load capacity and so on. The entrepreneur should therefore assess the total customer cost and values associated with the offer of each competing company and portion his strategy of adding values to the customer delights chain.

Buyer‘s satisfaction plays an important role in sustaining his behavior towards the repeat purchase or further association with the brand. Satisfaction, in the view of Kotler and Armstrong (2006) is the level perception of the buyer. Ezem (2008) stated that until consumers are satisfied, utility cannot be said to have been derived.

# Empirical Studies

The review of empirical studies revealed that a few studies had been carried out on marketing, but not directly related to the present study. Various scholars have carried out a number of studies on the utilization of pricing and promotion mix by various business establishments to attract customer patronage. Oyedepo (2008) undertook a study to find out the impact of advertising on tourism industries in Nigeria with special interest on the hotels. The population of the study was made up of 194 hotel customers, 50 hotel managers and 50 hotel accountants who had been in the business above ten years. The respondents were asked to rate the impact of advertising on the hotels in the South West on Nigeria over ten years in relation to the following:

1. use of print advertising (b) use of radio advertising (c) use of television advertising (d) use of billboard advertising. The findings indicated that business managers frequently utilize television and radio advertising to advertise their products and services more than printed documents this was as a result of lack of interest in perusing documents unlike the radio and television which is popularly and easily used by mostly every home. Oyedepo‘s study is related to the present one in that the researcher investigated the impact of advertising on tourism industry in south west, and advertising is an aspect of promotion which is a component of marketing mix. While, the present study assessed how small

and medium scale business operators utilize marketing mix components in Imo State.

Another study was conducted by Frances (2008) to find out the effect of promotion mix on the growth of small and medium scale enterprises in Rivers State of Nigeria. Four research questions and four hypotheses guided the study. The population of the study comprised 150 entrepreneurs in the area of study. The researcher used questionnaire for data collection, mean ratings and standard deviation were used to answer the research questions while t-test and ANOVA were used to test the null hypotheses. The respondents were required to rate the impact of the identified promotion mix components. The study revealed that the use of internet and social networks are not yet popular means of marketing especially in the rural areas. France‘s study differs from the present study in that while the researcher assessed the use of promotion mix components by small and medium scale enterprises in Rivers State, the present study assessed the utilization of marketing mix by small and medium scale enterprises in Imo State. France‘s study is related to the present study in that, the study was on promotion mix which is an aspect of the present study.

Anokwu (2008) carried out a study to identify the perception of small and medium scale business operators on the use of pricing strategies to attract customer patronage in Abia State. Six research questions and six hypotheses guided the study. The population of the study comprised 250 operators of

SMEs in Umuahia and Aba in Abia State. The researcher used questionnaire for data collection. Mean ratings, were used to analyze the research questions while t-test were used to analyze the hypotheses. The findings revealed that the use of odd-pricing, low pricing and multiple among others help to attract customer patronage Anokwu‘s study differs from the present one in that while the researcher investigated on the use of pricing components by small and medium scale business operators, the present study is to find out the impact of not just pricing but all the other marketing mix components on small and medium scale business operators in Imo State. Anokwu‘s study is related to the present study in that, the study was on the use of pricing strategy by SMES which is an aspect of the present study.

Another study was conducted by Akarahu (2010) to find out the perceived influence of promotion mix on the growth of fast food businesses in Imo State. Five research questions and five hypotheses guided the study. The population of the study comprised 86 managers, and 06 accountants of 86 registered fast food companies in Imo State. The researcher used questionnaire for data collection. Mean was used to analyze the research questions while t- test was used to answer the null hypotheses. The study looked at the impact of the use of promotion mix components such as advertising, sales promotion, personal selling, publicity and public relations to attract customer patronage. The study revealed that fast food businesses in Imo State utilize advertising and

public relations more frequently than other promotion mix components and the use of these two components to a great extent has increased customer patronage resulting in opening of other new branches. Akarahu‘s study differ from the present one in that while the researcher investigated the influence of promotion mix on fast food businesses in Imo State, the present study is on the use of all the marketing mix components by SMEs in Imo State. Akarahu‘s study is related to the present study in that, the study was on the influence of promotion mix which is an aspect of the present study. Also, the both studies shares same study area.

# Summary of Review of Related Literature

The review of related literature for this study was organized under conceptual framework, theoretical framework, theoretical studies and review of empirical studies. Under the conceptual framework, such concepts like Small and medium scale enterprise, marketing mix, were looked into. Small and medium scale enterprise was defined as business establishment with assets base of #1,000,000 to # 5, 000,000 excluding land. Marketing mix is a set of controllable tools that the firm blends to produce the response it wants in the target market.

Five sub-topics were discussed under theoretical studies. The subjects treated include: utilization of product for effective marketing, utilization of price for effective marketing, utilization of place fro effective marketing, utilization

of promotion for effective marketing, and identifying and understanding consumer purchasing value, buying decision.

The empirical studies that are related to the study were also reviewed. They were reviewed to give the study its empirical base. The studies revealed advertising is an important tool for attracting customers‘ patronage. The study also revealed that the use of internet and social network are yet to be fully utilized by organizations to attract customers. It was also found out that the use of pricing tool of marketing mix help in increased customer‘s patronage, and that the use of promotional tools of advertising, sales promotion, personal selling, publicity and public relations aid in attracting customers patronage of organization product and services. From the mass of literature review made, it was apparently found out by the researcher that most of the literature reviewed focused on how the use of price and promotion is used by business organizations to increase patronage. But, a few empirical literatures were found on the use of marketing mix by small and medium scale business operators to increase customer patronage. Availability of such empirical literature would have been the basis for steaming the tide of incessant small and medium scale enterprises failure in Imo State in South Eastern Nigeria. Hence, this present study is geared towards filling the gap.

# CHAPTER THREE METHOD

This chapter presents the general method and procedure the researcher employed in carrying out the study. It is divided into the following headings: research design, area of the study, population of the study, instrument for data collection, validation of instrument, reliability of the instrument, method of data collection and method of data analysis.

# Research Design

This study adopted a descriptive survey research design. Descriptive survey research design according to Arua (2008) is a design used to collect data from every member of a population or from a carefully selected sample. Obikeze (2009) noted that questionnaire is one of the major tools for survey research. The design is therefore, suitable for the study since it makes use of questionnaire to collect data from the entire population (SME business operators) in Imo State.

# Area of the Study

This study was carried out in Imo State. The State is located in the South eastern part of Nigeria. It shares boundaries with Abia, Anambra, Rivers, and Delta States. Administratively, the State is divided into three senatorial zones which are; Owerri, Okigwe and Orlu. The major occupations of the inhabitants of the state include farming, and commerce among others. Imo State enjoys
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social amenities like; electricity, water supply, good road network, health facilities, academic institutions among others. Imo State has several small and medium scale enterprises such as; fast food outlets, retail outlets, factories among others. Imo State is considered most appropriate for the study because of its several commercial activities and large number of small and medium scale enterprises located both in the rural and urban areas of the state. The choice of the area is based on the fact that the researcher had enough small and medium scale business operators facing similar problems as identified in the problem statement to administer and collect data required for the study.

# Population of the Study

The population of this study comprised all the 250 registered and operational small and medium scale business operators in the three senatorial zones in Imo State. Information gathered from the Ministry of Commerce and Industry and Owerri Chamber of Commerce Imo State, revealed that there were 250 registered and operational small and medium scale enterprises in Imo state with staff strength of 5-100. This consisted of owners of SMES from the three senatorial zones. The distribution of small and medium scale enterprises in the three zones were calculated (see Appendix C)

The population of the study therefore comprised all the 250 respondents. This consisted of registered SME operators in the three zones. Since the

population was not too large to necessitate sampling, the entire population was used for the study. The choice of the SME operators was informed by the fact that they were the major stakeholders and therefore would be in a position to give correct and first hand information on the extent marketing mix components were utilized by their establishments.

# Instrument for Data Collection

The instrument for data collection was a researcher structured questionnaire. A synthesis of the views and positions gathered from the review of related literature guided the construction of the questionnaire. The instrument was captioned ―Questionnaire on Utilization of Marketing Mix Components by Small and Medium Scale enterprises for increased customer patronage‖ (QUMMC). The instrument has two sections ―A‖ and ―B‖. Section A sought the background information of the respondents, while Section B is aimed at assessing the utilization of marketing mix components by small and medium scale enterprises for increased customer patronage.

Section B1 contained items on product components utilized by small and medium scale business operators. It has 12 items. B2 is on pricing components utilized by small and medium scale business operators to attract customers, it contains 11 items. Section B3 contains items on place components utilized by small and medium scale business operators for increased customer patronage, it has10 items. Section B4 contains items on promotion components utilized by

small and medium scale business operators for increased customer patronage, it has 22 items. The instrument had five point response options as follows:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Very Great Extent (VGE) |  | 5 |
| Great Extent (GE) |  | 4 |
| Moderate Extent (ME) |  | 3 |
| Little Extent (LE)  Very Little Extent (VLE) | 1 | 2 |

The instrument is enclosed (see Appendix B).

# Validation of the Instrument

To validate the instrument, the research topic, purpose of the study, research questions and hypotheses together with the draft instrument were given to three experts, two from Vocational Education Department (business unit) Nnamdi Azikiwe University Awka, and one from Measurement and Evaluation Department, Imo state University Owerri. The experts were requested to examine and scrutinize the items in terms of content relevance, suitability, and item clarity, appropriateness of language as well as coverage of the dimensions of the study. The experts examined the items and made some suggestions which guided the construction of the final draft.

# Reliability of the Instrument

To establish the reliability of the questionnaire, Cronbach‘s Alpha reliability test was used to determine the internal consistency of the instrument.

In doing this, the researcher administered the instrument on a sample of 20 small and medium scale business operators in Aba metropolis of Abia State. This was to ensure that respondents used were excluded from the study population. Their responses were used to calculate the reliability coefficient using Pearson Product Moment. The reliability coefficients obtained were as follows: section 1, 0.98, section 2, 0.99, section 3, 0.98, section 4, 0.98. The overall coefficient of the entire instrument was 0.98. The result was an indication of the internal consistency of the instrument, which was considered satisfactory for the study.

# Method of Data Collection

Copies of the questionnaire were administered on the respondents by the researcher with the help of five research assistants. The research assistants were instructed on how to go about the administration and retrieval of the questionnaire. The contents of the questionnaire as well as the purpose of the study were explained to the research assistants to enable them guide the respondents as the need might arise. The research assistants were also instructed to approach the respondents with courtesy and respect so as to secure their attention and cooperation in the administration and collection of the questionnaire. The research assistants were allocated the specific zones to cover. Three research assistants and the researcher covered SMEs in Owerri zone, while the remaining two assistants covered SMEs in Orlu and Okigwe. The

respondents were given two weeks within which to study and respond to the questionnaire. All the copies of the questionnaire were retrieved thereafter. A total of 250 copies of the instrument were administered on the respondents.

# Method of Data Analysis

The data collected were analyzed using mean, standard deviation and t- test statistic. All the research questions were answered using mean and standard deviation. Hypotheses 1 to 16 were tested using t-test. The mean of the questionnaire items were computed and interpreted based on the statistical real

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| limit of numbers as follows:  Response Categories | Point | Boundary Limit |
| **Key**: Very Great Extent (VGE) | 5 | 4.50 -5.00 |
| Great Extent (GE) | 4 | 3.50 -4.49 |
| Moderate Extent (ME) | 3 | 2.50-3.49 |
| Little Extent (LE) | 2 | 1.50-2.49 |
| Very Little Extent (VLE) | 1 | 0.50-1.49 |

Each item was interpreted based on the real limit of the codes assigned to the response categories. Thus, items with mean ratings of 4.50 to 5.00 were regarded as Very Great Extent; those that ranged between3.50 to 4.49 were regarded as Great Extent; those that ranged between 2.50 to 3.49 were regarded as Moderate Extent; those that ranged between 1.50 to 2.49 were regarded as

Little Extent; those that ranged between 0.50 to 1.49 were regarded as Very Little Extent.

Hypotheses were tested using t-test statistic at 0.05 level of significance. The null hypotheses of no significant difference were rejected when the t- calculated was equal to or greater than the critical value otherwise the null hypotheses were accepted. All analysis was done using the statistical package for social sciences (SPSS) version 20.

# CHAPTER FOUR PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA

This chapter presents the data collected and analyzed in the course of the study. They are presented in tables in accordance with the research questions and hypotheses that guided the study.

# Research Question 1

To what extent do small and medium scale business operators in Imo State utilize product components of marketing mix?

The data relating to this research question is presented in Table 1.

**Table : 1 Respondents’ Mean Ratings and Standard Deviations on the Utilization of Product Components of Marketing Mix.**

**N=250**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Mean | Std. Dev | Remarks |
| 1. Product quality | 3.97 | 1.24 | Great Extent |
| 5. Product size | 3.13 | 1.02 | Moderate Extent |
| 6. Product packaging | 3.18 | 1.26 | Moderate Extent |
| 7. Product brand name | 3.09 | 1.33 | Moderate Extent |
| 8. Product brand label | 3.03 | 1.31 | Moderate Extent |
| 9. Product physical appearance | 2.96 | 1.37 | Moderate Extent |
| 10. Product warranty | 2.82 | 1.41 | Moderate Extent |
| 11. Product usage instruction | 3.04 | 1.36 | Moderate Extent |
| 12. Product expiry date | 2.91 | 1.28 | Moderate Extent |
| 13. Availability of SON certification | 2.93 | 1.30 | Moderate Extent |
| 14. Product design | 2.80 | 1.32 | Moderate Extent |
| 15. NAFDAC registration number | 2.94 | 1.57 | Moderate Extent |
| **Overall Mean** | **3.07** | **1.31** | **Moderate Extent** |

The overall mean response of 3.07 in table 1 shows that small and medium scale business operators utilize product components of marketing mix to a moderate extent. The item by item analysis shows that item 1 (product quality) with mean rating 3.97 is utilized to a great extent while the rest of the items fell within the
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moderate extent category as indicated by their mean ratings which ranges from

2.80 to 3.18. The standard deviation scores for items on product quality (SD = 1.24) and product size (1.02) where the relatively small compared to others. This is an indication that the respondents were more cohesive in their rating of these items.

# Research Question 2

2. To what extent do small and medium scale business operators in Imo State utilize price components of marketing mix?

The data relating to this research question is presented in Table 2.

**Table 2: Respondents’ Mean Ratings and Standard Deviations on the Utilization of Price Components of Marketing Mix.**

**N=250**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Mean | Std. Dev. | Remarks |
| 1. Discount structure | 3.56 | 1.26 | Great Extent |
| 2. Price list | 3.35 | 1.21 | Moderate Extent |
| 3. Rebates | 2.94 | 1.13 | Moderate Extent |
| 4. Credit facilities | 2.91 | 1.20 | Moderate Extent |
| 5. Low pricing | 2.90 | 1.35 | Moderate Extent |
| 6. Price quotations | 3.05 | 1.33 | Moderate Extent |
| 7. Price bundling | 2.96 | 1.22 | Moderate Extent |
| 8. Coupons | 2.84 | 1.28 | Moderate Extent |
| 9. Odd-even- pricing | 2.61 | 1.17 | Moderate Extent |
| 10. Multiple unit pricings | 2.78 | 1.19 | Moderate Extent |
| 11. Leader pricing | 2.84 | 1.47 | Moderate Extent |
| **Overall Mean** | **2.98** | **1.26** | Moderate Extent |

Analysis in table 2 shows the overall mean response of 2.98 indicating that small and medium scale operators utilize price components of marketing mix to a moderate extent. However, the item by item mean shows that item 1 (discount structure; mean = 3.56) is utilized to a great extent while the rest of the other

aspects of pricing component of marketing were utilized to a moderate extent as their means (2.61-3.35) fell within the moderate extent category.

# Research Question 3

To what extent do small and medium scale business operators in Imo State utilize place components of marketing mix?

The data relating to this research question is presented in Table 3.

**Table 3: Respondents’ Mean Ratings and Standard Deviations on the Utilization of Place Components of Marketing Mix.**

**N=250**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Mean | Std. Dev. | Remarks |
| 1. Delivery by road | 4.06 | 1.16 | Great Extent |
| 2. Delivery by air | 2.65 | 1.38 | Moderate Extent |
| 3. Delivery by water | 2.35 | 1.30 | Little Extent |
| 4. Long distance delivery | 3.04 | 1.29 | Moderate Extent |
| 5. After sales service | 2.99 | 1.33 | Moderate Extent |
| 6. Door-to-Door delivery | 3.06 | 1.36 | Moderate Extent |
| 7. Technical advice | 2.95 | 1.37 | Moderate Extent |
| 8. Prompt order handling | 2.95 | 1.31 | Moderate Extent |
| 9. Location of establishment | 3.06 | 1.35 | Moderate Extent |
| 10. Storage facilities | 2.96 | 1.41 | Moderate Extent |
| **Overall Mean** | **3.01** | **1.33** | **Moderate Extent** |

The overall mean response of 3.01 in table 3 shows that small and medium scale business operators utilize place components of marketing mix to a moderate extent. The item by item analysis further shows that item 1 (delivery by road, mean = 4.06) is utilized to a great extent while the rest of the items are utilized to a moderate extent except delivery by water (mean, 2.35) which is utilized to a little extent.

# Research Question 4

To what extent do small and medium scale business operators in Imo State utilize promotion components of marketing mix?

The data relating to this research question is presented in Table 4.

**Table 4 : Respondents’ Mean Ratings and Standard Deviations on the Utilization of Promotion Components of Marketing Mix.**

**Table 4. Mean Responses on the utilization of promotion components of marketing mix**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Mean | Std. Dev | Remarks |
| 1. Internet adversities | 3.26 | 1.72 | Moderate Extent |
| 2. Print advertising | 3.32 | 1.26 | Moderate Extent |
| 3. Radio advertising | 3.49 | 1.32 | Moderate Extent |
| 4. Television advertising | 3.50 | 1.32 | Great Extent |
| 5. Mobile advertising | 3.28 | 1.31 | Moderate Extent |
| 6. Cash refund | 2.80 | 1.26 | Moderate Extent |
| 7. Lucky draws | 2.90 | 1.39 | Moderate Extent |
| 8. Price off deals | 2.68 | 1.24 | Moderate Extent |
| 9. Point of purchase display | 3.00 | 1.36 | Moderate Extent |
| 10. Interactive relationships | 3.28 | 1.39 | Moderate Extent |
| 11. Press release | 3.06 | 1.39 | Moderate Extent |
| 12. Press conference | 2.78 | 1.31 | Moderate Extent |
| 13. Community notices | 3.10 | 1.41 | Moderate Extent |
| 14. Billboards | 3.10 | 1.38 | Moderate Extent |
| 15. Sponsored publications | 2.98 | 1.35 | Moderate Extent |
| 16. Sponsored programmes | 2.92 | 1.32 | Moderate Extent |
| 17. Special events | 2.97 | 1.29 | Moderate Extent |
| 18. News letters | 2.80 | 1.36 | Moderate Extent |
| 19. Community development services | 2.80 | 1.33 | Moderate Extent |
| 20. Customer care services | 3.06 | 1.36 | Moderate Extent |
| 21. Social interaction programmes | 3.02 | 1.39 | Moderate Extent |
| 22. Social networks | 2.91 | 1.58 | Moderate Extent |
| **Overall Mean** | **2.91** | **1.37** | **Moderate Extent** |

As shown in table 4 the overall mean response was 2.91. This is an indication that small and medium scale operators utilize promotion components of marketing mix to a moderate extent. However, only one aspect of the promotion

components (television advertising) is utilized to a great extent as shown by its mean rating of 3.50

# Results of Test of Hypotheses Hypothesis 1

1. Male and female SME operators in Imo State do not differ significantly in their mean ratings of product components utilization.

**Table 5: t-test Analysis on the Utilization of Product Components of Marketing Mix as a Result of their Gender.**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **MALES (n=80)** | | | **FEMALES (n=170)** | | **df** | **t-cal** | **t-crit** | **Decision** |
|  | Mean | SD | Mean | SD |  |  |  |  |
| Product quality | 4.03 | 1.25 | 3.94 | 1.24 | 248 | .50 | 1.96 | **NS** |
| Product size | 2.90 | .89 | 2.24 | 1.06 | 248 | -2.48 | 1.96 | **S** |
| Product packaging | 3.04 | 1.32 | 2.25 | 1.24 | 248 | -1.26 | 1.96 | **NS** |
| Product brand name | 2.79 | 1.33 | 2.24 | 1.31 | 248 | -1.25 | 1.96 | **NS** |
| Product brand label | 2.66 | 1.32 | 2.20 | 1.27 | 248 | -3.08 | 1.96 | **S** |
| Product physical appearance | 2.83 | 1.41 | 2.02 | 1.35 | 248 | -1.04 | 1.96 | **NS** |
| 1.  Product warranty | 2.70 | 1.48 | 2.88 | 1.38 | 248 | -.92 | 1.96 | **NS** |
| Product usage instruction | 2.75 | 1.35 | 2.18 | 1.35 | 248 | -2.36 | 1.96 | **S** |
| Product expiry date | 2.80 | 1.52 | 2.96 | 1.15 | 248 | -.95 | 1.96 | **NS** |
| Availability of SON certification | 2.59 | 1.39 | 3.09 | 1.23 | 248 | -2.88 | 1.96 | **S** |
| Product design | 2.38 | 1.24 | 2.99 | 1.31 | 248 | -3.55 | 1.96 | **S** |
| NAFDAC registration number | 2.41 | 1.38 | 3.18 | 1.60 | 248 | -3.70 | 1.96 | **S** |

The t-test analysis presented in table 5 shows that male and female SME operators did not differ significantly in their mean ratings of product components utilization. This was shown by the fact that the calculated t-values in 6 of the 12 items were less than the critical t- value of 1.96. Therefore the null hypothesis of no significant difference between the two groups was not rejected. **Hypothesis 2**

1. Male and Female SME operators in Imo State do not differ significantly in their mean ratings of price components utilization.

**Table 6: t-test Analysis on the Utilization of Price Components of Marketing Mix as a Result of their Gender.**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **MALES (n=80)** | | |  | **FEMALES (n=170)** | | **df** | **t- cal** | **t- crit** | **Decision** |
|  | Mean | SD | | Mean | SD |  |  |  |  |
| Discount structure | 3.45 |  | 1.36 | 3.61 | 1.21 | 248 | -.95 | 1.96 | **NS** |
| Price list | 3.01 |  | 1.23 | 3.51 | 1.18 | 248 | -3.08 | 1.96 | **S** |
| Rebates | 2.59 |  | 1.18 | 3.10 | 1.12 | 248 | -3.42 | 1.96 | **S** |
| Credit facilities | 2.75 |  | 1.19 | 2.98 | 1.20 | 248 | -1.43 | 1.96 | **NS** |
| Low pricing | 2.58 |  | 1.27 | 3.05 | 1.37 | 248 | -2.60 | 1.96 | **S** |
| Price quotations | 2.71 |  | 1.25 | 3.21 | 1.34 | 248 | -2.81 | 1.96 | **S** |
| Price bundling | 2.48 |  | 1.22 | 3.19 | 1.15 | 248 | -4.53 | 1.96 | **S** |
| Coupons | 2.40 |  | 1.20 | 3.04 | 1.27 | 248 | -2.88 | 1.96 | **S** |
| Odd-even- pricing | 2.43 |  | 1.11 | 2.70 | 1.19 | 248 | -1.74 | 1.96 | **NS** |
| Multiple unit pricings | 2.39 |  | 1.14 | 2.97 | 1.17 | 248 | -3.70 | 1.96 | **S** |
| Leader pricing | 2.38 |  | 1.37 | 3.06 | 1.47 | 248 | -3.51 | 1.96 | **S** |

The t-test analysis presented in table 6 shows that male and female SME operators differ significantly in their mean ratings of pricing components utilization. This was shown by the fact that the calculated t-values in 8 out of the 11 items in the above table were greater than the critical t-value of 1.96. Therefore the null hypothesis of no significant difference between the two groups was therefore rejected.

# Hypothesis 3

1. Male and female SME operators in Imo State do not differ significantly in their mean ratings of place components utilization.

**Table 7: t-test Analysis on the Utilization of Place Components of Marketing Mix as a Result of their Gender.**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **MALES (n=80)** | | | **FEMALES (n=170)** |  | **df** | **t-cal** | **t- crit** | **Decision** |
|  | Mean | SD | Mean | SD |  |  |  |  |
| Delivery by road | 3.89 | 1.31 | 4.14 | 1.08 | 248 | -1.62 | 1.96 | **NS** |
| Delivery by air | 2.36 | 1.21 | 2.78 | 1.43 | 248 | -2.27 | 1.96 | **S** |
| Delivery by water | 1.98 | 1.12 | 2.52 | 1.34 | 248 | -3.17 | 1.96 | **S** |
| Long distance delivery | 2.91 | 1.45 | 3.11 | 1.20 | 248 | -1.11 | 1.96 | **NS** |
| After sales service | 2.60 | 1.35 | 3.17 | 1.29 | 248 | -3.21 | 1.96 | **S** |
| Door-to-Door delivery | 2.89 | 1.48 | 3.14 | 1.29 | 248 | -1.38 | 1.96 | **NS** |
| Technical advice | 2.58 | 1.36 | 3.12 | 1.34 | 248 | -3.00 | 1.96 | **S** |
| Prompt order handling | 2.59 | 1.31 | 3.12 | 1.29 | 248 | -3.02 | 1.96 | **S** |
| Location of establishment | 2.54 | 1.33 | 3.31 | 1.30 | 248 | -4.33 | 1.96 | **S** |
| Storage facilities | 2.54 | 1.36 | 3.16 | 1.39 | 248 | -3.32 | 1.96 | **S** |

The t-test analysis presented in table 7 shows that male and female SME operators differ significantly in their mean ratings of place components utilization. This was shown by the fact that the calculated t-values in 7 out of the 10 items were greater than the critical t-value of 1.96. Therefore the null hypothesis of no significant difference between the two groups was therefore rejected.

# Hypothesis 4.

1. Male and female SME operators in Imo State do not differ significantly in their mean ratings of promotion components utilization.

**Table 8: t-test Analysis on the Utilization of Promotion Components of Marketing Mix as a Result of their Gender.**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **MALES (n=80)** |  | **FEMALES (n=170)** | | **df** | **t-cal** | **t-crit** | **Decision** |
|  |  | SD |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Mean |  | Mean | SD |  |  |  |  |
| Internet advertising | 2.78 | 1.69 | 3.49 | 1.68 | 248 | -3.12 | 1.96 | **S** |
| Print advertising | 2.98 | 1.24 | 3.48 | 1.27 | 248 | -2.97 | 1.96 | **S** |
| Radio advertising | 3.08 | 1.42 | 3.69 | 1.20 | 248 | -3.54 | 1.96 | **S** |
| Television advertising | 3.18 | 1.40 | 3.65 | 1.30 | 248 | -2.65 | 1.96 | **S** |
| Mobile advertising | 2.95 | 1.43 | 3.44 | 1.26 | 248 | -2.72 | 1.96 | **S** |
| Cash refund | 2.41 | 1.33 | 2.98 | 1.20 | 248 | -3.39 | 1.96 | **S** |
| Lucky draws | 2.69 | 1.35 | 2.99 | 1.44 | 248 | -1.61 | 1.96 | **NS** |
| Price off deals | 2.33 | 1.27 | 2.85 | 1.23 | 248 | -3.13 | 1.96 | **S** |
| Point of purchase display | 2.69 | 1.40 | 3.15 | 1.30 | 248 | -2.54 | 1.96 | **S** |
| Interactive relationships | 2.73 | 1.58 | 3.54 | 1.26 | 248 | -4.40 | 1.96 | **S** |
| Press release | 2.65 | 1.30 | 3.25 | 1.43 | 248 | -3.17 | 1.96 | **S** |
| Press conference | 2.50 | 1.27 | 2.91 | 1.33 | 248 | -2.32 | 1.96 | **S** |
| Community notices | 2.75 | 1.34 | 3.27 | 1.45 | 248 | -2.71 | 196 | **S** |
| Billboards | 2.91 | 1.42 | 3.19 | 1.35 | 248 | -1.51 | 196 | NS |
| Sponsored publications | 2.68 | 1.28 | 3.12 | 1.39 | 248 | -2.44 | 196 | **S** |
| Sponsored programmes | 2.41 | 1.17 | 3.16 | 1.33 | 248 | -4.31 | 196 | **S** |
| Special events | 2.60 | 1.20 | 3.14 | 1.28 | 248 | -3.18 | 196 | **S** |
| News letters | 2.46 | 1.29 | 2.96 | 1.36 | 248 | -2.74 | 196 | **S** |
| Community development services | 2.49 | 1.21 | 2.95 | 1.38 | 248 | -2.59 | 196 | **S** |
| Customer care services | 2.66 | 1.39 | 3.25 | 1.30 | 248 | -3.25 | 196 | **S** |
| Social interaction programmes | 2.54 | 1.37 | 3.24 | 1.40 | 248 | -3.73 | 196 | **S** |
| Social networks | 2.44 | 1.45 | 3.14 | 1.58 | 248 | -3.34 | 196 | **S** |

The t-test analysis presented in table 8 shows that male and female SME operators differ significantly in their mean ratings of promotion components utilization. This was shown by the fact that the calculated t-values in 20 out of the 22 items in the above table were greater than the critical t-value of 1.96. Therefore the null hypothesis of no significant difference between the two groups was therefore rejected.

# Hypothesis 5

1. SME operators in Imo State with less than 10 years experience and those with 10 years and above experience do not differ significantly in their mean ratings of product components utilization.

**Table 9 : t-test Analysis on the Utilization of Product Components of Marketing Mix as a Result of their Years of Experience.**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Inexperienced (n=138)** | | | **Experienced (n=112)** | | **df** | **t-cal** | **t-crit** | **Decision** |
|  | Mean | SD | Mean | SD |  |  |  |  |
| Product quality | 3.95 | 1.22 | 3.99 | 1.28 | 248 | -.26 | 1.96 | **NS** |
| Product size | 3.12 | 1.04 | 3.15 | 1.01 | 248 | -.27 | 1.96 | **NS** |
| Product packaging | 3.01 | 1.25 | 3.39 | 1.25 | 248 | -2.38 | 1.96 | **S** |
| Product brand name | 3.14 | 1.39 | 3.03 | 1.26 | 248 | .70 | 1.96 | **NS** |
| Product brand label | 3.01 | 1.31 | 3.04 | 1.32 | 248 | -.18 | 1.96 | **NS** |
| Product physical appearance | 3.09 | 1.39 | 2.79 | 1.34 | 248 | 1.69 | 1.96 | **NS** |
| 1.  Productwarranty | 2.87 | 1.38 | 2.76 | 1.45 | 248 | .62 | 1.96 | **NS** |
| Product usage instruction | 2.97 | 1.36 | 3.13 | 1.37 | 248 | -.94 | 1.96 | **NS** |
| Product expiry date | 2.96 | 1.31 | 2.86 | 1.24 | 248 | .61 | 1.96 | **NS** |
| Availability of SON  certification | 2.86 | 1.33 | 2.02 | 1.27 | 248 | -.98 | 1.96 | **NS** |
| Product design | 2.86 | 1.36 | 2.71 | 1.26 | 248 | .88 | 1.96 | **NS** |
| NAFDAC  registration number | 2.86 | 1.53 | 3.03 | 1.63 | 248 | -.82 | 1.96 | **NS** |

The t-test analysis presented in table 9 shows that inexperienced and experienced SME operators did not differ significantly in their mean ratings of

product components utilization. This was shown by the fact that the calculated t- values in 11 out of the 12 items were less than the critical t-value of 1.96. Therefore the null hypothesis of no significant difference between the two groups was therefore rejected.

# Hypothesis 6

1. SME operators in Imo State with less than 10 years experience and those with 10 years and above experience do not differ significantly in their mean ratings of price components utilization.

**Table 10: t-test Analysis on the Utilization of Price Components of Marketing Mix as a Result of their Years of Experience.**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Inexperienced (n=138)** | | | **Experienced (n=112)** | | **df** | **t- cal** | **t- crit** | **Decision** |
|  | Mean | SD | Mean | SD |  |  |  |  |
| Discount structure | 3.57 | 1.28 | 3.55 | 1.24 | 248 | -.07 | 1.96 | **NS** |
| Price list | 3.20 | 1.20 | 3.54 | 1.21 | 248 | -2.17 | 1.96 | **S** |
| Rebates | 2.92 | 1.23 | 2.96 | 1.00 | 248 | -.24 | 1.96 | **NS** |
| Credit facilities | 2.71 | 1.11 | 3.15 | 1.26 | 248 | -2.94 | 1.96 | **S** |
| Low pricing | 2.76 | 1.29 | 3.06 | 1.41 | 248 | -1.76 | 1.96 | **NS** |
| Price quotations | 2.88 | 1.29 | 3.27 | 1.36 | 248 | -2.33 | 1.96 | **S** |
| Price bundling | 2.88 | 1.22 | 3.07 | 1.21 | 248 | -1.26 | 1.96 | **NS** |
| Coupons | 2.89 | 1.32 | 2.77 | 1.23 | 248 | .76 | 1.96 | **NS** |
| Odd-even- pricing | 2.63 | 1.07 | 2.59 | 1.28 | 248 | .28 | 1.96 | **NS** |
| Multiple unit pricings | 2.79 | 1.18 | 2.78 | 1.21 | 248 | .09 | 1.96 | **NS** |
| Leader pricing | 2.70 | 1.37 | 3.02 | 1.57 | 248 | -1.73 | 1.96 | **NS** |

The t-test analysis presented in table 10 shows that inexperienced and experienced SME operators did not differ significantly in their mean ratings of pricing components utilization. This was shown by the fact that the calculated t- values in 8 out of the 11 items in the table were less than the critical t- value of

1.96. Therefore the null hypothesis of no significant difference between the two groups was therefore not rejected.

# Hypothesis 7

1. SME operators in Imo State with less than 10 years experience and those with 10 years and above experience do not differ significantly in their mean ratings of place components utilization.

**Table 11: t-test Analysis on the Utilization of Place Components of Marketing Mix as a Result of their Years of Experience.**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Inexperienced (n=138)** | | | **Experienced (n=112)** |  | **df** | **t-cal** | **t- crit** | **Decision** |
|  | Mean | SD | Mean | SD |  |  |  |  |
| Delivery by road | 4.16 | 1.08 | 3.94 | 1.25 | 248 | 1.51 | 1.96 | **NS** |
| Delivery by air | 2.53 | 1.37 | 2.79 | 1.38 | 248 | -1.52 | 1.96 | **NS** |
| Delivery by water | 2.21 | 1.27 | 2.52 | 1.32 | 248 | -1.87 | 1.96 | **NS** |
| Long distance delivery | 2.89 | 1.27 | 3.23 | 1.29 | 248 | -2.10 | 1.96 | **S** |
| After sales service | 2.92 | 1.39 | 3.07 | 1.26 | 248 | -.89 | 1.96 | **NS** |
| Door-to-Door delivery | 3.01 | 1.39 | 3.13 | 1.32 | 248 | -.68 | 1.96 | **NS** |
| Technical advice | 2.80 | 1.36 | 3.13 | 1.36 | 248 | -1.95 | 1.96 | **NS** |
| Prompt order handling | 2.82 | 1.30 | 3.11 | 1.32 | 248 | -1.73 | 1.96 | **NS** |
| Location of establishment | 3.00 | 1.36 | 3.13 | 1.35 | 248 | -.78 | 1.96 | **NS** |
| Storage facilities | 2.93 | 1.40 | 2.99 | 1.42 | 248 | .31 | 1.96 | **NS** |

The t-test analysis presented in table 11 shows that inexperienced and experienced SME operators did not differ significantly in their mean ratings of place components utilization as the calculated t-values for 9 out of the 10 items in the were less than the critical t-value of 1.96. The null hypothesis of no significant difference between the two groups posited by the researcher was not rejected.

1. SME operators in Imo State with less than 10 years experience and those with 10 years and above experience do not differ significantly in their mean ratings of promotion components utilization.

# Hypothesis 8

**Table 12: t-test Analysis on the Utilization of Promotion Components of Marketing Mix as a Result of their Years of Experience.**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Inexperienced (n=138)** | | | **Experienced (n=112)** | | **df** | **t-cal** | **t-crit** | **Decision** |
|  | Mean | SD | Mean | SD |  |  |  |  |
| Internet adversities | 3.29 | 1.77 | 3.22 | 1.65 | 248 | .31 | 1.96 | **NS** |
| Print advertising | 3.18 | 1.24 | 3.49 | 1.32 | 248 | -1.91 | 1.96 | **NS** |
| Radio advertising | 3.38 | 1.43 | 3.63 | 1.12 | 248 | -1.55 | 1.96 | **NS** |
| Television advertising | 3.39 | 1.39 | 3.63 | 1.29 | 248 | -1.42 | 1.96 | **NS** |
| Mobile advertising | 3.21 | 1.43 | 3.37 | 1.21 | 248 | -.92 | 1.96 | **NS** |
| Cash refund | 2.75 | 1.32 | 2.87 | 1.20 | 248 | -.74 | 1.96 | **NS** |
| Lucky draws | 2.64 | 1.32 | 3.21 | 1.47 | 248 | -3.17 | 1.96 | **S** |
| Price off deals | 2.70 | 1.28 | 2.66 | 1.25 | 248 | .26 | 1.96 | **NS** |
| Point of purchase display | 2.90 | 1.34 | 3.13 | 1.36 | 248 | -1.32 | 1.96 | **NS** |
| Interactive relationships | 3.17 | 1.48 | 3.41 | 1.33 | 248 | -1.32 | 1.96 | **NS** |
| Press release | 2.89 | 1.40 | 3.26 | 1.41 | 248 | -2.06 | 1.96 | **S** |
| Press conference | 2.70 | 1.30 | 2.88 | 1.35 | 248 | -1.12 | 1.96 | **NS** |
| Community notices | 2.91 | 1.41 | 3.35 | 1.43 | 248 | -2.45 | 196 | **S** |
| Billboards | 3.06 | 1.37 | 3.16 | 1.39 | 248 | -.59 | 196 | **NS** |
| Sponsored publications | 2.81 | 1.29 | 3.19 | 1.44 | 248 | -2.17 | 196 | **NS** |
| Sponsored programmes | 2.83 | 1.29 | 3.03 | 1.35 | 248 | -1.15 | 196 | **NS** |
| Special events | 2.83 | 1.23 | 3.13 | 1.32 | 248 | -1.86 | 196 | **NS** |
| News letters | 2.86 | 1.41 | 2.73 | 1.28 | 248 | .71 | 196 | **NS** |
| Community development services | 2.84 | 1.28 | 2.76 | 1.42 | 248 | .48 | 196 | **NS** |
| Customer care services | 3.03 | 1.36 | 3.10 | 1.34 | 248 | -.40 | 196 | **NS** |
| Social interaction programmes | 2.93 | 1.37 | 3.12 | 1.49 | 248 | -1.00 | 196 | **NS** |
| Social networks | 2.72 | 1.48 | 3.14 | 1.66 | 248 | -2.10 | 196 | **S** |

The t-test analysis presented in table 12 shows that inexperienced and experienced SME operators did not differ significantly in their mean ratings of promotion components utilization. This was shown by the fact that the calculated t-values in 17 out of the 21 items were less than the critical t-value of

1.96. Therefore the null hypothesis of no significant difference between the two groups was not rejected.

1. Urban and rural SME operators in Imo State do not differ significantly in their mean rating of product components utilization.

# Hypothesis 9

**Table 13: t-test Analysis on the Utilization of Product Components of Marketing Mix as a Result of their Location.**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Urban (n=190)** |  | **Rural (n=60)** |  | **df** | **t-cal** | **t-crit** | **Decision** |
|  | Mean | SD | Mean | SD |  |  |  |  |
| Product quality | 4.21 | 1.08 | 3.22 | 1.42 | 248 | 5.71 | 1.96 | **S** |
| Product size | 3.24 | .96 | 2.78 | 1.15 | 248 | 3.08 | 1.96 | **S** |
| Product packaging | 3.28 | 1.25 | 2.87 | 1.27 | 248 | 2.25 | 1.96 | **S** |
| Product brand name | 3.12 | 1.35 | 3.00 | 1.28 | 248 | .61 | 1.96 | **NS** |
| Product brand label | 3.14 | 1.33 | 2.68 | 1.20 | 248 | 2.36 | 1.96 | **S** |
| Product physical appearance | 3.03 | 1.37 | 2.72 | 1.35 | 248 | 1.56 | 1.96 | **NS** |
| 2.  Product warranty | 2.95 | 1.42 | 2.40 | 1.32 | 248 | 2.68 | 1.96 | **S** |
| Product usage instruction | 3.10 | 1.39 | 2.87 | 1.28 | 248 | 1.16 | 1.96 | **NS** |
| Product expiry date | 2.99 | 1.30 | 2.65 | 1.20 | 248 | 1.83 | 1.96 | **NS** |
| Availability of SON  certification | 3.01 | 1.31 | 2.67 | 1.26 | 248 | 1.79 | 1.96 | **NS** |
| Product design | 2.81 | 1.33 | 2.75 | 1.28 | 248 | .31 | 1.96 | **NS** |
| NAFDAC  registration number | 3.01 | 1.61 | 2.72 | 1.46 | 248 | 1.24 | 1.96 | **NS** |

The t-test analysis presented in table 14 shows that urban and rural SME operators did not differ significantly in their mean ratings of product components utilization. This was shown by the fact that the calculated t-values in 7 out of 12 items in the above table were less than the critical t-value of 1.96. Therefore the null hypothesis of no significant difference between the two groups was therefore not rejected.

# Hypothesis 10

1. Urban and rural SME operators in Imo State do not differ significantly in their mean rating of price components utilization.

**Table 14: t-test Analysis on the Utilization of Price Components of Marketing Mix as a Result of their Location.**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Urban (n=190)** |  | **Rural (n=60)** |  | **df** | **t- cal** | **t- crit** | **Decision** |
|  | Mean | SD | Mean | SD |  |  |  |  |
| Discount structure | 3.66 | 1.19 | 3.25 | 1.41 | 248 | 2.21 | 1.96 | **S** |
| Price list | 3.44 | 1.18 | 3.08 | 1.29 | 248 | 1.98 | 1.96 | **S** |
| Rebates | 2.91 | 1.14 | 3.02 | 1.11 | 248 | -.63 | 1.96 | **NS** |
| Credit facilities | 2.94 | 1.16 | 2.80 | 1.33 | 248 | .80 | 1.96 | **NS** |
| Low pricing | 2.99 | 1.35 | 2.60 | 1.34 | 248 | 1.96 | 1.96 | **NS** |
| Price quotations | 3.14 | 1.35 | 2.78 | 1.25 | 248 | 1.80 | 1.96 | **NS** |
| Price bundling | 2.98 | 1.20 | 2.92 | 1.28 | 248 | .35 | 1.96 | **NS** |
| Coupons | 2.93 | 1.23 | 2.53 | 1.37 | 248 | 2.12 | 1.96 | **S** |
| Odd-even- pricing | 2.64 | 1.14 | 2.53 | 1.26 | 248 | .60 | 1.96 | **NS** |
| Multiple unit pricings | 2.87 | 1.16 | 2.52 | 1.27 | 248 | 2.00 | 1.96 | **S** |
| Leader pricing | 2.97 | 1.45 | 2.42 | 1.46 | 248 | 2.59 | 1.96 | **S** |

The t-test analysis presented in table 14 shows that urban and rural SME operators did not differ significantly in their mean ratings of pricing components utilization for the calculated t-values for 6 out of the 11 items above were less than the critical t- value of 1.96. The null hypothesis not rejected.

# Hypothesis 11

1. Urban and rural SME operators in Imo State do not differ significantly in their mean rating of place components utilization.

**Table 15: t-test Analysis on the Utilization of Place Components of Marketing Mix as a Result of their Location.**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Urban (n=190)** |  | **Rural (n=60)** |  | **df** | **t-cal** | **t-crit** | **Decision** |
|  | Mean | SD | Mean | SD |  |  |  |  |
| Delivery by road | 4.18 | 1.08 | 3.68 | 1.32 | 248 | 2.92 | 1.96 | **S** |
| Delivery by air | 2.91 | 1.33 | 1.82 | 1.20 | 248 | 5.69 | 1.96 | **S** |
| Delivery by water | 2.50 | 1.31 | 1.87 | 1.16 | 248 | 3.36 | 1.96 | **S** |
| Long distance delivery | 3.12 | 1.23 | 2.82 | 1.44 | 248 | 1.57 | 1.96 | **NS** |
| After sales service | 3.07 | 1.35 | 2.73 | 1.27 | 248 | 1.70 | 1.96 | **NS** |
| Door-to-Door delivery | 3.11 | 1.34 | 2.90 | 1.40 | 248 | 1.05 | 1.96 | **NS** |
| Technical advice | 3.05 | 1.33 | 2.63 | 1.44 | 248 | 2.06 | 1.96 | **S** |
| Prompt order handling | 3.01 | 1.30 | 2.77 | 1.36 | 248 | 1.23 | 1.96 | **NS** |
| Location of establishment | 3.18 | 1.33 | 2.67 | 1.37 | 248 | 2.61 | 1.96 | **S** |
| Storage facilities | 3.05 | 1.35 | 2.68 | 1.56 | 248 | 1.98 | 1.96 | **S** |

The t-test analysis presented in table 15 shows that urban and rural SME operators did differ significantly in their mean ratings of place components utilization. This was shown by the fact that the calculated t-values in 6 out of the 10 items in the table were greater than the critical t- value of 1.96. Therefore the null hypothesis of no significant difference between the two groups was rejected.

# Hypothesis 12

1. Urban and rural SME operators in Imo State do not differ significantly in their mean rating of promotion components utilization.

**Table 16: t-test Analysis on the Utilization of Promotion Components of Marketing Mix as a Result of their Location.**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Urban (n=190)** |  | **Rural (n=60)** |  | **df** | **t-cal** | **t-crit** | **Decision** |
|  | Mean | SD | Mean | SD |  |  |  |  |
| Internet adversities | 3.60 | 1.59 | 2.18 | 1.65 | 248 | 5.95 | 1.96 | **S** |
| Print advertising | 3.45 | 1.27 | 3.92 | 1.25 | 248 | 2.84 | 1.96 | **S** |
| Radio advertising | 3.54 | 1.23 | 3.33 | 1.53 | 248 | 1.08 | 1.96 | **NS** |
| Television advertising | 3.54 | 1.36 | 3.37 | 1.30 | 248 | .88 | 1.96 | **NS** |
| Mobile advertising | 3.26 | 1.34 | 3.33 | 1.34 | 248 | -.35 | 1.96 | **NS** |
| Cash refund | 2.81 | 1.25 | 2.78 | 1.33 | 248 | .12 | 1.96 | **NS** |
| Lucky draws | 3.02 | 1.38 | 2.52 | 1.46 | 248 | 2.41 | 1.96 | **S** |
| Price off deals | 2.72 | 1.24 | 2.57 | 1.35 | 248 | .82 | 1.96 | **NS** |
| Point of purchase display | 3.07 | 1.30 | 2.78 | 1.49 | 248 | 1.43 | 1.96 | **NS** |
| Interactive relationships | 3.43 | 1.32 | 2.82 | 1.61 | 248 | 2.95 | 1.96 | **S** |
| Press release | 3.26 | 1.37 | 2.42 | 1.38 | 248 | 4.15 | 1.96 | **S** |
| Press conference | 2.87 | 1.30 | 2.50 | 1.36 | 248 | 1.89 | 1.96 | **NS** |
| Community notices | 3.25 | 1.36 | 2.63 | 1.55 | 248 | 2.96 | 1.96 | **S** |
| Billboards | 3.19 | 1.36 | 2.82 | 1.38 | 248 | 1.86 | 1.96 | NS |
| Sponsored publications | 3.08 | 1.31 | 2.67 | 1.51 | 248 | 2.05 | 1.96 | **S** |
| Sponsored programmes | 3.03 | 1.30 | 2.58 | 1.34 | 248 | 2.28 | 1.96 | **S** |
| Special events | 3.04 | 1.26 | 2.73 | 1.31 | 248 | 1.64 | 1.96 | **NS** |
| News letters | 2.84 | 1.33 | 2.67 | 1.42 | 248 | .88 | 1.96 | **NS** |
| Community development services | 2.85 | 1.33 | 2.65 | 1.39 | 248 | 1.02 | 1.96 | **NS** |
| Customer care services | 3.14 | 1.32 | 2.80 | 1.41 | 248 | 1.72 | 1.96 | **NS** |
| Social interaction programmes | 3.09 | 1.43 | 2.77 | 1.38 | 248 | 1.56 | 1.96 | **NS** |
| Social networks | 3.12 | 1.55 | 2.27 | 1.48 | 248 | 3.74 | 1.96 | **S** |

The t-test analysis presented in table 16 shows that urban and rural SME operators did not differ significantly in their mean ratings of promotion components utilization. This was shown by the fact that the calculated t-values in 13 out of the 22 items in the table were less than the critical t- value of 1.96. Therefore the null hypothesis of no significant difference between the two groups was not rejected.

1. Graduate and non-graduate SME operators in Imo State do not differ significantly in their mean rating of product components utilization.

# Hypothesis 13

**Table: t-test Analysis on the Utilization of Product Components of Marketing Mix as a Result of their Educational qualification.**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Graduate (n=185)** | | | **Non- graduate (n=65)** | | **df** | **t-cal** | **t-crit** | **Decision** |
|  | Mean | SD | Mean | SD |  |  |  |  |
| Product quality | 4.21 | 1.05 | 3.28 | 1.47 | 248 | -5.12 | 1.96 | **S** |
| Product size | 3.21 | 1.00 | 2.91 | 1.06 | 248 | -2.07 | 1.96 | **S** |
| Product packaging | 3.18 | 1.31 | 3.20 | 1.13 | 248 | .12 | 1.96 | **NS** |
| Product brand name | 3.08 | 1.34 | 3.12 | 1.32 | 248 | .22 | 1.96 | **NS** |
| Product brand label | 3.02 | 1.32 | 3.05 | 1.29 | 248 | .13 | 1.96 | **NS** |
| Product physical appearance | 2.99 | 1.37 | 2.85 | 1.38 | 248 | -.75 | 1.96 | **NS** |
| 1.  Productwarranty | 2.79 | 1.43 | 2.91 | 1.37 | 248 | .58 | 1.96 | **NS** |
| Product usage instruction | 2.99 | 1.36 | 3.20 | 1.36 | 248 | 1.07 | 1.96 | **NS** |
| Product expiry date | 2.92 | 1.31 | 2.89 | 1.19 | 248 | -.14 | 1.96 | **NS** |
| Availability of SON  certification | 2.92 | 1.27 | 2.94 | 1.38 | 248 | .08 | 1.96 | **NS** |
| Product design | 2.85 | 1.39 | 2.63 | 1.05 | 248 | -1.18 | 1.96 | **NS** |
| NAFDAC  registration number | 2.97 | 1.63 | 2.83 | 1.42 | 248 | -.63 | 1.96 | **NS** |

The t-test analysis presented in table 17 shows that graduate and non-graduate SME operators did not differ significantly in their mean ratings of product components utilization. This was shown by the fact that the calculated t-values in 10 out of the 12 items in the above table were less than the critical t- value of

1.96. The null hypothesis was, therefore not rejected.

# Hypothesis 14

1. Graduate and non-graduate SME operators in Imo State do not differ significantly in their mean rating of price components utilization.

**Table 18 : t-test Analysis on the Utilization of Price Components of Marketing Mix as a Result of their Educational qualification.**

**Graduate (n=185 )**

**Non-graduate (n=65)**

**df t-**

**cal**

**t- crit**

**Decision**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Mean | SD | Mean | SD |
| Discount structure 3.69 | 1.20 | 3.20 | 1.36 |
| Price list 3.43 | 1.22 | 3.14 | 1.18 |
| Rebates 2.89 | 1.15 | 2.06 | 1.07 |
| Credit facilities 2.90 | 1.19 | 2.94 | 1.22 |
| Low pricing 2.96 | 1.36 | 2.72 | 1.22 |
| Price quotations  3.09 | 1.35 | 2.95 | 1.28 |
| Price bundling 2.94 | 1.23 | 3.05 | 1.19 |
| Coupons 2.99 | 1.28 | 2.38 | 1.17 |

Odd-even

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 189 | -2.72 | 1.96 | **S** |
| 189 | -1.65 | 1.96 | **NS** |
| 189 | 1.04 | 1.96 | **NS** |
| 189 | .24 | 1.96 | **NS** |
| 189 | -1.20 | 1.96 | **NS** |
| 189 | -.69 | 1.96 | **NS** |
| 189 | .63 | 1.96 | **NS** |
| 189 | -2.38 | 1.96 | **S** |
| 189 | .27 | 1.96 | **NS** |
| 189 | -2.19 | 1.96 | **S** |
| 189 | -2.03 | 1.96 | **S** |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| - pricing 2.60 | 1.17 | 2.65 | 1.18 |
| unit  2.88 1.20 2.51 1.15 | | | |
| icing 2.95 | 1.50 | 2.52 | 1.35 |

Multiple Leader pr

pricings

The t-test analysis presented in table 18 shows that graduate and non-graduate SME operators did not differ significantly in their mean ratings of product components utilization as the calculated t-values for 7 out of the 11 items were less than the critical t- value of 1.96.

# Hypothesis 15

1. Graduate and non-graduate SME operators in Imo State do not differ significantly in their mean rating of place components utilization.

**Table 19 : t-test Analysis on the Utilization of Place Components of Marketing Mix as a Result of their Educational qualification.**

**Graduate (n=185)**

**Non-graduate (n=65)**

**df t-cal t-crit Decision**

Mean SD Mean SD

Delivery by road 4.19 1.04 3.69 1.39 248 -3.01 1.96 **S**

Delivery by air 2.74 1.38 2.40 1.37 248 -1.69 1.96 **NS**

Delivery by water 2.37 1.30 2.29 1.32 248 -.40 1.96 **NS**

Long distance delivery 3.13 1.26 2.80 1.35 248 -1.78 1.96 **NS**

After sales service 3.02 1.33 2.91 1.35 248 -.56 1.96 **NS**

Door-to-Door delivery 1.34 2.98 1.41 248 -.52 1.96 **NS**

3.09

Technical advice 2.92 1.39 3.02 1.32 248 .46 1.96 **NS**

Prompt order handling 3.05 1.29 2.66 1.34 248 -2.06 1.96 **S**

Location of

248 -1.48 1.96 **NS**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| establishment | 3.14 | 1.31 | 2.85 | 1.45 |  | | | |
| Storage facilities | 3.05 | 1.35 | 2.69 | 1.55 | 248 | -1.79 | 1.96 | **NS** |

The t-test analysis presented in table 19 shows that graduate and non-graduate SME operators did not differ significantly in their mean ratings of place component utilization. This was shown by the fact that the calculated t-values for 8 out of the 10 items in the table above were less than the critical t- value of 1.96; therefore the null hypothesis was not rejected.

# Hypothesis 16

1. Graduate and non-graduate SME operators in Imo State do not differ significantly in their mean rating of promotion components utilization.

**Table: 20 t-tests Analysis on the Utilization of Promotion Components of Marketing Mix as a Result of their Educational qualification.**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Graduate (n=185)** | | | **Non-graduate (n=65)** | | **df** | **t-cal** | **t-crit** | **Decision** |
|  | Mean | SD | Mean | SD |  |  |  |  |
| Internet adversities | 3.54 | 1.62 | 2.46 | 1.74 | 248 | -4.53 | 1.96 | **S** |
| Print advertising | 3.34 | 1.31 | 3.26 | 1.19 | 248 | -.43 | 1.96 | **NS** |
| Radio advertising | 3.46 | 1.28 | 3.57 | 1.38 | 248 | .55 | 1.96 | **NS** |
| Television advertising | 3.46 | 1.39 | 3.62 | 1.23 | 248 | .80 | 1.96 | **NS** |
| Mobile advertising | 3.19 | 1.35 | 3.52 | 1.26 | 248 | 1.72 | 1.96 | **NS** |
| Cash refund | 2.86 | 1.24 | 2.63 | 1.34 | 248 | -1.25 | 1.96 | **NS** |
| Lucky draws | 2.98 | 1.40 | 2.66 | 1.44 | 248 | -1.56 | 1.96 | **NS** |
| Price off deals | 2.66 | 1.24 | 2.75 | 1.35 | 248 | .52 | 1.96 | **NS** |
| Point of purchase display | 2.96 | 1.35 | 3.11 | 1.34 | 248 | .75 | 1.96 | **NS** |
| Interactive relationships | 3.32 | 1.34 | 3.15 | 1.61 | 248 | -.83 | 1.96 | **NS** |
| Press release | 3.09 | 1.41 | 2.95 | 1.44 | 248 | -.68 | 1.96 | **NS** |
| Press conference | 2.76 | 1.26 | 2.85 | 1.49 | 248 | .47 | 1.96 | **NS** |
| Community notices | 3.25 | 1.38 | 2.69 | 1.52 | 248 | -2.73 | 196 | **S** |
| Billboards | 3.17 | 1.37 | 2.92 | 1.40 | 248 | -1.23 | 196 | **NS** |
| Sponsored publications | 3.02 | 1.34 | 2.86 | 1.46 | 248 | -.81 | 196 | **NS** |
| Sponsored programmes | 3.03 | 1.32 | 2.60 | 1.27 | 248 | -2.29 | 196 | **S** |
| Special events | 2.99 | 1.26 | 2.89 | 1.32 | 248 | -.55 | 196 | **NS** |
| News letters | 2.82 | 1.35 | 2.74 | 1.36 | 248 | .43 | 196 | **NS** |
| Community development services | 2.78 | 1.32 | 2.86 | 1.40 | 248 | .40 | 196 | **NS** |
| Customer care services | 3.18 | 1.28 | 2.72 | 1.48 | 248 | -2.36 | 196 | **S** |
| Social interaction programmes | 3.12 | 1.44 | 2.71 | 1.34 | 248 | -2.04 | 196 | **S** |
| Social networks | 3.02 | 1.53 | 2.60 | 1.66 | 248 | -1.87 | 196 | **NS** |

As shown in the t-test analysis presented in table 20 urban and rural SME operators did not differ significantly in their mean ratings of promotion components utilization as the calculated t-values for 17 out of the 22 items were less than the critical t- value of 1.96. The null hypothesis of no significant difference between the two groups was, therefore, not rejected.

# Summary of the Findings

The findings of the study are as follows:

1. Since the utilization of product components is the central point on which marketing energy focus, SME operators were generally utilizing the product components of marketing mix to a moderate extent.
2. The study revealed that the utilization of price components of marketing mix by small and medium scale business operators was to a moderate extent. Out of eleven price components of marketing mix, only one item (discount structure) was utilized to a great extent by small and medium scale business operators.
3. The study revealed that small and medium scale business operators generally were utilizing place component of marketing mix to a moderate extent. Two items, delivery by water (little extent) and delivery by road (great extent)
4. Successful promotion helps business establishment to spread costs over a large output. The study revealed that Small and Medium Scale business operators generally utilize promotion components of marketing mix to a

moderate extent. Two items, (internet and social networks) were utilized to a very little extent.

1. Male small and medium scale business operators do not differ significantly from their female counterparts in their mean ratings of the utilization of product, price, place and promotion components of marketing mix.
2. Small and medium scale business operators with less than 10 years experience do not differ significantly from small and medium scale business operators with 10 years and above experience in their mean rating of the utilization of product, price, place and promotion components of marketing mix.
3. Urban small and medium scale business operators do not differ significantly from rural small and medium scale business operators in their ratings of the utilization of product, price, place and promotion components of marketing mix.
4. Graduate small and medium scale business operators do not differ significantly from their non- graduate counterparts in their mean ratings of the utilizations of product, price, place and promotion components of marketing mix.

# CHAPTER FIVE

**DISCUSSION, CONCLUSION, AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

This chapter presents the discussion of the findings, conclusions and recommendations of the study. Also presented in this chapter are the implications of the findings and suggestions for further studies.

# Discussion of the Findings

The finding of this study were organized and discussed under the following sub-headings:

1. Utilization of product components of marketing mix by small and medium scale business operators.
2. Utilization of price components of marketing mix by small and medium scale Business operators
3. Utilization of place components of marketing mix by small and medium scale Business operators.
4. Utilization of promotion components of marketing mix by small and medium scale Business operator.

# Utilization of Product Components of Marketing Mix by Small and Medium Scale Business Operators

The result of the analysis presented in Table 1 revealed how small and medium scale business operators rated their utilization of product components of marketing mix. The rated the following product components as not utilized.

Product size, Product packaging, Product brand label, product physical
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appearance, small and medium scale operator‘s also rated Product warranty, Product usage instruction, availability of SON Certification and product design as not utilized.

This finding is not in agreement with the view of Ogundele, and Lawal (2005), Azonu (2008) and Nwoke (2008) that the marketing practices of SMEs should cut across the effective use of the 4Ps of marketing (Product, Price, Place and Promotion)According to Gbadamosi (2008), well packaged product well designed label, product usage instruction attract customers as people always look out for such details when making purchases and therefore, small and medium scale business operators should intentionally ensure that the product components of marketing mix are available and also used. The SME operators need to ensure that their products have the needed features.

Onyema (2008) asserted that small and medium scale entrepreneurs should as a marketing strategy, should ensure that the product physical appearance has the potentials of attracting its users. Ibekwe and Anyanwu (2010) asserted that business enterprises whose products are attracting seem to attract patronage, which also increases the establishment‘s sales volume. Anyadike (2010) observed that the use of products components like brand name by business establishments helps customers in identifying the exact and needed product even in the midst of several related products. Which also helps establishments in identifying and retaining its product users especially in a

competitive market environment? Small and medium scale business operators who therefore intends to survive in a competitive market environment needs to utilize the advantage of product brand name to a great extent in carrying out business activities. Ayobami (2009) asserted that the use of product brand name by business establishments is essential for business growth.

The result of the study also revealed the unavailability of SON Certification and product warranty as products components and thus was not rated as utilized by small and medium scale business operators. This is contrary to the findings of Igwe and Obasi (2009) who asserted that business establishments whose products are certified by standard organization of Nigeria (SON) tend to have more sales turnover, this is because consumers are gradually becoming aware of the benefits of purchasing products that has the approval of SON. The establishment of the standard Organization of Nigeria (SON) has created awareness and education of product authenticity to consumers who has become aware of what to seek in products before purchases can be made. It is therefore important that small and medium scale business operators should ensure that the products they present to the consumers are certified by SON and enable them attract consumers and also carry out successful business activity. Ubah and Nzeako (2010) advocated that entrepreneurs should utilize the marketing strategy of attracting and retaining

consumers using warranty. The use of warranty has increasingly resulted in making customers patronize products of organization as the need may arise.

The study also revealed that male small and medium scale business operators in Imo State did not differ significantly from their female counterparts in their mean ratings of small and medium scale business operator‘s utilization of product components of marketing mix. This implies that gender has no influence on their responses. The most important issue was the SME operators‘ utilization of product components in business activities. Because, small and medium scale business operators do not use packaging as product components to attract customers and meet the needs of customers, they also do not maximize profit as they expect. In the view Obasi (2009) when product components of marketing mix is properly planned, and utilized, establishments tend to attract and satisfy its customers more than when product features are not well planned. Anyanwu (2008) advocated that effective utilization of product components therefore is a great tool towards organization growth.

# Utilization of Price Component of Marketing Mix

The results of the analysis presented in Table 2 indicated that in other to carry out business activities effectively small and medium scale business operators give discounts to customers using various credit facilities to encourage customers to make purchases, make use of price quotation to help customers choose price. According to Maduabuchi (2010) availability of credit

facilities, discount and other pricing components serves as marketing strategy and acts not only as a weapon to contract competitors in small and medium scale business but also ensure survival of enterprise. Obasi (2009), Azu (2009) and Uwakwe (2010) noted that price components should utilized in making customers make purchases, especially in the present competitive market environment in Nigeria. Business establishments should make use of price components to attract patronage as customers choose price that are convenient. It is important to note that the use of price components of marketing mix is profitable marketing strategy that small and medium scale business operators can adopt in carrying out business activities. It was also found that small and medium scale business operators were not effectively utilizing price list which helps customers to clearly see the different products and services. To also attract customers, SMEs business operators were not making use of odd-even pricing which helps sellers in fixing price in such a way that customers are attracted to a product based on the fixer price without further bargains. Also in carrying out business activities using price components of marketing mix, it was found out that small and medium scale business operators were not using multiple unit pricings to attract customers by fixing the prices of a number of products under a reduced price to attract customers. SME business operators were not utilizing the price components of marketing mix by bundling prices of two or more products usually complementary to be sold at a single price. These are contrary

to the news of Morrison (2009), Davis (2007) Bennett (2009) and Moller (2012) that small and medium scale business operators can effectively carry out business activities by using the various price components, odd-even pricing, multiple unit pricing, Leader pricing, price list among others to attract patronage thereby charge the firms competitive position and instil the required marketing philosophy in the establishment. In the view of Low and Tan (2012) the use of price components helps small and business scale business operators to justify the implementation of the pricing policy of the establishment

Ibeziem (2012) and Anyanwu (2013) advocated that the effective use of price components of marketing mix is essential for increased market share of enterprise, the use of various pricing techniques enhances an establishment chance of increased profit maximization. A combination of the various pricing components defines a firms marketing strategy that influence consumers to become loyal to the organizations offering. Organization effectiveness in fixing product price determines the totality of organization performance, turnover, profitability, efficiency among others. It is the aim of an organization to achieve its objectives and meet the needs of its various stakeholders by using different pricing components to attract patronage and thereby increasing Profitability. Small and medium scale business operators cannot carryout business activities effectively without identifying the target customers and fixing prices of product to meet the customers‘ needs. In the view of this, Okoli (2011) asserts that the

planning and implementation of pricing policy suitable for establishments is necessary for effective business activity.

However, small and medium scale business operator‘ non utilization of the price components of marketing mix may be as a result of lack of knowledge of the advantage of the use of the various price components of marketing mix. According to Obasi (2010), Lack of understanding of the importance using pricing Components to fix and attract patronage has affected the progress of several entrepreneurs in the 21st century. It is therefore, important that SME business operators get conversant with the various price components of marketing mix to ensure prices of products are fixed utilizing the various components.

The Study equally revealed that small and medium scale business operators with less than 10 year experience do not differ significantly from small and medium scale business operators with more than 10 years experience in their mean ratings of the utilization of price components of marketing mix. This implies that the length of experience has nothing to do with small and medium scale business operators‘ utilization of price components of marketing mix for effective marketing of product to customers. Therefore price components of marketing mix are indispensable for effective business activity.

# Utilization of Place Components of Marketing Mix

The results of the analysis presented in Table 3 indicates that small and medium scale business operators were utilizing the place components of marketing mix by delivering goods to customers making use of different means of transportation by Land, covering long distance delivery, offering after sales services, making use of door to door delivery, offering technical advice to customers handling customers orders promptly, ensuring that the choice of location of their establishments are conducive and easy to locate and maintaining good storage facilities. This is in line with Osuagwu (2006) Owuaku (2008) Uzor & Obasi (2010) attestations that small and medium scale business enterprise should not be concern with activities of selling goods but should also be involve in distribution by ensuring that goods are made available where they are needed in good condition at the right time using the appropriate means of delivery. This is achieved by identifying the variety of marketing channel efficiencies for marketing and setting up an optimal marketing distribution mix for different category of buyers. Musa and Adamu (2011) also noted that storage facilities, transportation and technical advice are significant determinant of small and medium scale industries and therefore should be utilized in carrying out business activities. In the view of Nwune and Eze (2012), customers enjoy patronizing business establishments that effectively handle the customer‘s order placement to avoid buying what is not ordered for

or needed. Small and medium scale business operators that pay attention to what customers want stands better chances of maintaining good marketing strategy with customers. The use of the various components of place in terms of door to door delivery, long distance delivery and others are relevant and the effective management of the components by small and medium scale business operators determine the success of the operations. However, the study indicates that small and medium scale business operators in Imo State were not utilizing the place component of delivery by sea to ensure that customers who live around river line areas are attended to at the right time and goods delivered promptly. This seems to be contrary to the view of Igwe (2008) and Njoku (2010) attestations that when distribution of goods are properly carried out to customers at different areas with segregation, establishments stands better chance of having wider coverage. At the same time, the researcher is of the view that when small and medium scale business operators extends their business activities to the remote and river line areas of the state, there could be visible and notable increase in the volume of sales as required.

Furthermore, the study shows that small and medium scale business operators in Imo State do not utilize the place component of delivering products by air to the prospective customers who live outside the area. This is not in line with Obiukwu (2007) assertions that to effectively carryout business activities place components of marketing mix should be utilized to achieve effective

marketing of products. Since customers are found everywhere, it is important that different means are used to ensure products get to the place where it is needed. There could be time when products are urgently needed and the fastest means which may be transportation by air is the only available option to ensure the goods get to its users on time.

The study indicates that urban small and medium scale business operators do not differ significantly from rural small and medium scale business operators in their rating of utilization of place components of marketing mix (see Table 5). This means that urban and rural small and medium scale business operators do not effectively utilize place components of marketing mix in carrying out business activities as required. Nzeako (2010) affirms that for effective business activity, it is important that establishment product gets to its users at the right time and condition, the author therefore stated that to achieve this, it is important that place components are utilized in carrying out business activities.

# Utilization of Promotion Components of Marketing Mix

The results of the study presented in table 4 shows that small and medium scale business operators make use of print advertising Radio advertising and Television advertising to create awareness of their products to the public. Small and medium scale business operators also promote their business through mobile advertising, point of purchase display, interactive relationships,

billboards and customer care survives. The findings are in agreement with Ubaka (2006), Amaefule (2009) and Egbula (2010) assertions that for effective promotion of goods and services Business establishments should plan and promote the business activities of the establishment by utilizing the various promotion components. According to them, small and medium scale business operators should find out who the users of their products are and make use of the suitable promotion component to inform them of the available products.

The results of the study are also in agreement with the opinion of Nelson (2009) who noted that utilization radio; television Print advertising among others is very essential components that help establishments in carrying out business activities especially in a competitive market environment. The use of the various promotion components in a competitive atmosphere helps establishments to gain advantage over the existing competitor. Ibeziem (2010) suggest that the use of point of purchase display seems appropriate and suitable in a competitive environment. Buyers get attracted to display and events and most times are attracted to products that have display activities and other forms of promotional activities. The researcher therefore thinks that small and medium scale business operators will benefit greatly when they utilize the various promotion components in carrying out their business activities.

However, the study also indicates that small and medium scale business operators do not make use of internet advertising, cash refund, Lucky draws,

and price of deals to attract customers to patronize their products. SME operators also do not utilize press release, press conference, community notices, sponsored publications, sponsored programmes special events, newsletters in promoting their business. They were also not making use of social interactive programmes, community development services and social networks in promoting the business activities of their enterprise. This was not in line with Steven (2010) Michael and Clement (2012) Strawbert, Smart and Taylor (2012) attestations that inability to make use of appropriate promotional tools as a market strategy affects the business activities of establishments.

This is because people get attracted to goods and services when the awareness of such products is created. Also the study indicated that small and medium scale business operators do not make use of internet and social network to promote their business. This was not in line with Robins (2011) Edward (2012) Louis and Kleen (2013) assertions that e-marketing is gradually taking over the business activities of establishments in the 21st century. Business firms that intends to make impact and maximize profit should be actively be involved in making use of internet, social networks and other e-marketing strategies in carrying out business activities. Ubaka 2012, Okereke (2013) and Uchendu (2013) also attested that internet advertising is an essential tool required in promoting business activities of small and medium scale enterprises in the current competitive environment.

The study also indicates that higher institution graduate of small and medium scale business operators did not differ significantly from non graduates (non degree holders) in their mean rating on the utilization of promotion components of marketing mix in carrying out business activities (see Table 6). This means that educational background has no influence in small and medium scale business operators‘ use of promotion components to carry out business activities. Smart (2011) noted that effective use of promotion components of marketing mix help small and medium scale business entrepreneurs to create marketing opportunities. Use promotional practice in terms of advertising, personal selling, sales promotion, publicity and public relations to achieve the establishments goals.

# Conclusions

From the findings of this study, it can be seen that small and medium scale business operators are not making appropriate use of the marketing mix components in carrying out their business activities. Marketing mix components, when properly utilized will create the required atmosphere for effective functioning of small and medium scale business activities in Imo State and beyond. Increase the performance of small and medium scale business operators towards economic development. Small and medium scale business operators‘ inability to effectively make use of marketing mix components of product, price, place and promotion to carry out business activities has made it

difficult for most small and medium scale business operators to survive and make impact in a competitive environment. Consequently, small and medium scale business operators no utilization of marketing mix components can be attributed to certain factors. These factors include: lack of adequate training or unaware of the benefits of the effective use of marketing mix components, unwilling attitude of the small and medium scale business operators to meet the needs of their customers. It is therefore believed that effective utilization of promotion mix components in carrying out business activities can yield more results if greater emphasis is laid by training institutions, concerned ministries and government to help SMEs carry out business effectively. Concrete efforts should be made by small and medium scale business operators to improve on their knowledge and understanding of the benefits of using marketing mix components in carrying out business activities.

# Implications of the Study

The findings of this study have some important implications. The implication of each finding as it relates to small and medium scale business operator, business education and ministry of commerce and industry are highlighted below:

1. The study revealed the ineffectiveness of small and medium scale business operators in the use of product components of marketing to carry out business activities. This has some implications for SME operator,

business Education teachers and Ministry of commerce and industry for small and medium scale operators, it may be that they are not exposed in the use of various product components or may be due to their unwillingness to make use of product components or lack of knowledge of the benefit of using the product components of marketing mix to promote business activities. This has resulted to poor marketing strategy that was affected the business activities and growth of small and medium scale enterprises and the economy as a whole. Also business education teachers should while teaching marketing courses should teach and make more emphasis on the benefits of the utilization of product component of marketing mix to promote business activities. Ministries and concerned NGO‘S should from time to time organize serious seminars and training to create awareness and emphasis the use of marketing when all these are achieved it will bridge the gap between what is learnt in the classroom with what is obtained in the business world.

1. The study revealed that small and medium scale business operators need to improve on their utilization of price components of marketing mix to carry out business activates. This has some implication for small and medium scale business operators in that small and medium scale enterprises being a business enterprise that occupy important and strategic position in the economic and development of the society cannot survive in a competitive environment if they do not make use of the advantage of pricing

components of marketing mix to promote business activates. The SME operators are not well exposed to the pricing components and so do not utilize it to promote their business activities. Business education teachers should teach the various components well and the ministries of commerce and industries, government and concerned individuals should organizing seminars and training to help enlighten SME operators on the benefits of the use of the component in a competitive marketing environment.

1. The study equally revealed that small and medium scale business operators were making use of place components of marketing mix by delivery by road, offering after sales services, Long distance delivery, and door to door delivery but were ineffective on the use of other means of delivery, locating establishment in strategic places, were ineffective in prompt order Handling. This implies that small and medium scale business operators do not understand the benefits of using place components of marketing mix in promoting business activities. Therefore, Ministry of commerce and industry should organize trainings and seminars from time to time to make emphasis on the benefits of the use of place components to promote business activities.
2. The study also revealed that small and medium scale business operators were not effectively using some components of promotion components of marketing mix to promote their business activities especially in this

technological era such company like internet marketing, social networks among others.

**Recommendations**

On the basis of the above findings and conclusion, the following recommendations were made:

1. Small and medium scale business operators should be dynamic and committed to the role of marketing mix components to the growth of business establishments. This will help keep them up-to-date with current trends in the marketing field.
2. Government in conjunction with Association of small and medium scale industries should organize development trainings for SME business operators as a way of updating their knowledge and skill on promoting business activities. This will empower Small and Medium Scale business operators effectively.
3. Training institutions that prepare business teachers should be up to date with the newest approach and strategies in marketing strategies so as to produce skilled business operators needed in the business world of the future.

**Limitations of the Study**

The results of this study are not to be taken as conclusive. The study is bound to have some limitations such as:

1. The small and medium scale business operators used in generalization are small and medium scale business operators in Imo State. Larger samples which may include small and medium scale business in the South East are likely to give better results.
2. There is the possibility of small and medium scale business operators who may not have enough time to supply the necessary information needed in the questionnaire and so might have given it to a staff who is a novice to rate.
3. Although, the statistical calculations were computer based, the possibility of human error in feeding in the data into computer cannot be over looked.
4. Again, there is also possibility of human error in the statistical calculations.

**Suggestions for further Research**

In view of the fact that the present study cannot be said to be exhaustive, it is suggested that further studies be undertaken in the following areas:

1. Utilization of marketing mix components by small and medium scale business operators in South Eastern Nigeria.
2. Management competencies requires by small and medium scale business operator.
3. Assessment of marketing strategies of Entrepreneurs.
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Dear Sir/Madam

# APPENDICES

**Appendix A LETTER OF TRANSMITTAL**

Department of Vocational Education Nnamdi Azikiwe University

Awka Anambra State

2nd July, 2014.

# REQUEST FOR COMPLETION OF QUESTIONNAIRE

The researcher is a Ph.D student from the above Institution, carrying out a study on the extent of utilization of marketing mix components by small and medium scale enterprises in Imo State.

You are requested to complete the attached questionnaire as deemed appropriate. The recommendations to be made at the end of the study will emanate from your views.

This research work is an academic work and information provided will be treated in confidence and used for academic purposes only. Kindly assist the researcher‘s efforts by sincerely completing the questionnaire.

Thank you for your anticipated co-operation.

Yours faithfully,

*Signed*

# Akarahu Charity .U. (Researcher)

**Appendix B**

# QUESTIONNAIRE ON EXTENT OF UTILIZATION OF MARKETING MIX COMPONENTS BY SMALL AND MEDIUM SCALE BUSINESS OPERATORS.

## Instruction (s):

**SECTION A:** Personal Data: Please tick in one of the options below as applicable.

1. Sex: (a) Male (b) Female
2. Years of experience: (a) 1-10 years
3. Location of business: (a) Urban
4. Above 10years

(b) Rural

1. Educational Qualification (a) OND, NCE, HND, B.Sc.,

(b) FSLC/WAEC

# SECTION B

1. **Utilization of Product Components by Small and Medium Scale Business Operators**

## Instruction (s):

Listed below are items of product components utilized by Small and medium scale business operators to attract customers‘ patronage. As a small or medium scale business operator, kindly indicate by ticking ( ) in the appropriate column the extent your organization utilizes each of the items below to attract customer patronage.

# Use the following codes:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Very Great Extent | = | VGE |
| Great Extent | = | GE |
| Moderate Extent | = | ME |
| Little Extent | = | LE |
| Very Little Extent | = | VLE |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **S/N** | **Items of Product Components** | **VGE** | **GE** | **ME** | **LE** | **VLE** |
| 1. | Product quality |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2. | product size |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3. | Product packaging |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4. | Product brand name |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5. | Product brand label |  |  |  |  |  |
| 6. | Product physical appearance |  |  |  |  |  |
| 7. | product warranty |  |  |  |  |  |
| 8. | Product usage instruction |  |  |  |  |  |
| 9. | Product expiry date |  |  |  |  |  |
| 10. | Availability of SON certification |  |  |  |  |  |
| 11. | Product design |  |  |  |  |  |
| 12. | NAFDAC registration number. |  |  |  |  |  |

1. **Utilization of Pricing Components by Small and Medium Scale Business Operators**

## Instruction (s):

Listed below are items of pricing components utilized by Small and medium scale business operators to attract customers‘ patronage. As a small or medium scale business operator, kindly indicate by ticking ( ) in the appropriate column the extent your organization utilizes each of the items below to attract customer patronage.

# Use the following codes:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Very Great Extent | = | VGE |
| Great Extent | = | GE |
| Moderate Extent | = | ME |
| Little Extent | = | LE |
| Very Little Extent | = | VLE |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **S/N** | **Items of Pricing Components** | **VGE** | **GE** | **ME** | **LE** | **VLE** |
| 13. | Discount structure |  |  |  |  |  |
| 14. | Price list |  |  |  |  |  |
| 15. | Rebates |  |  |  |  |  |
| 16. | Credit facilities |  |  |  |  |  |
| 17. | Low pricing |  |  |  |  |  |
| 18. | Price quotations |  |  |  |  |  |
| 19. | Price bundling |  |  |  |  |  |
| 20. | Coupons |  |  |  |  |  |
| 21. | Odd-even- pricing |  |  |  |  |  |
| 22. | Multiple unit pricing |  |  |  |  |  |
| 23. | Leader pricing |  |  |  |  |  |

1. **Utilization of Place Components by Small and Medium Scale Business Operators.**

## Instruction (s):

Listed below are items of place components utilized by Small and medium scale business operators to attract customers‘ patronage. As a small or medium scale business operator, kindly indicate by ticking ( ) in the appropriate column the extent your organization utilizes each of the items below to attract customer patronage.

# Use the following codes:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Very Great Extent | = | VGE |
| Great Extent | = | GE |
| Moderate Extent | = | ME |
| Little Extent | = | LE |
| Very Little Extent | = | VLE |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **S/N** | **Items on Place Components** | **VGE** | **GE** | **ME** | **LE** | **VLE** |
| 24 | Delivery by road |  |  |  |  |  |
| 25 | Delivery by air |  |  |  |  |  |
| 26 | Delivery by water |  |  |  |  |  |
| 27 | Long distance delivery |  |  |  |  |  |
| 28 | After sales service |  |  |  |  |  |
| 29 | Door-to-door delivery |  |  |  |  |  |
| 30 | Technical advice |  |  |  |  |  |
| 31 | Prompt order handling |  |  |  |  |  |
| 32 | Location of establishment |  |  |  |  |  |
| 33 | Storage facilities |  |  |  |  |  |

1. **Utilization of Promotion Components by Small and Medium Scale Business Operators**

## Instruction (s):

Listed below are items of promotion components utilized by Small and medium scale business operators to attract customers‘ patronage. As a small or medium scale business operator, kindly indicate by ticking ( ) in the appropriate column the extent your organization utilizes each of the items below to attract customer patronage.

# Use the following codes:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Very Great Extent | = | VGE |
| Great Extent | = | GE |
| Moderate Extent | = | ME |
| Little Extent | = | LE |
| Very Little Extent | = | VLE |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **S/N** | **Items of Promotion Components** | **VGE** | **GE** | **ME** | **LE** | **VLE** |
| 34 | Internet advertising |  |  |  |  |  |
| 35 | Print advertising |  |  |  |  |  |
| 36 | Radio advertising |  |  |  |  |  |
| 37 | Television advertising |  |  |  |  |  |
| 38 | Mobile advertising |  |  |  |  |  |
| 39 | Cash refund |  |  |  |  |  |
| 40 | Lucky draws |  |  |  |  |  |
| 41 | Price off deals |  |  |  |  |  |
| 42 | Point of purchase display |  |  |  |  |  |
| 43 | Interactive relationships |  |  |  |  |  |
| 44 | Press release |  |  |  |  |  |
| 45 | Press conference |  |  |  |  |  |
| 46 | Community notices |  |  |  |  |  |
| 47 | Billboards |  |  |  |  |  |
| 48 | Sponsored publications |  |  |  |  |  |
| 49 | Sponsored Programmes |  |  |  |  |  |
| 50 | Special events |  |  |  |  |  |
| 51 | News letters |  |  |  |  |  |
| 52 | Community development services |  |  |  |  |  |
| 53 | Customer care services |  |  |  |  |  |
| 54 | Social interaction programmes |  |  |  |  |  |
| 55 | Social networks |  |  |  |  |  |

**APPENDIX C**

# Population Distribution of Respondents by senatorial zones

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Zones** | **No of Functional**  **registered SMEs** | **No of Owners** |
| Owerri | 160 | 160 |
| Okigwe | 50 | 50 |
| Orlu | 40 | 40 |
| Total | 250 | 250 |

**APPENDIX D**

**Detailed Analysis of Test- Retest Reliability Analysis Index For Marketing Mix Components.**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| item 1 | item 2 | item 3 | item 4 | item 5 | item 6 | item 7 | item 8 | item 9 | item1 0 | item1 1 | item1 2 | item1 3 | item1 4 | item1 5 | item1 6 | item1 7 | item1 8 | item1 9 | item2 0 |
| 1 | 5 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 5 | 2 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 4 |
| 1 | 5 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 |
| 1 | 5 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 5 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 3 | 5 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 4 | 1 | 2 |
| 1 | 5 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 5 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 5 | 5 | 3 | 4 | 1 | 5 | 3 | 1 | 5 |
| 1 | 5 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 5 | 4 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 4 |
| 1 | 3 | 5 | 1 | 5 | 2 | 5 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 4 |
| 1 | 5 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 4 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 4 |
| 1 | 5 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 5 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 1 | 5 | 1 | 4 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 5 |
| 1 | 5 | 4 | 1 | 4 | 5 | 5 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 1 | 5 | 5 | 1 | 4 |
| 1 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 5 |
| 1 | 1 | 5 | 1 | 5 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 |
| 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 4 |
| 1 | 5 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 5 | 2 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 5 |
| 1 | 5 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 3 |
| 1 | 5 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 5 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 3 | 5 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 4 | 1 | 3 |
| 1 | 5 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 5 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 5 | 5 | 3 | 4 | 1 | 5 | 3 | 1 | 5 |
| 1 | 5 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 5 | 4 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 3 |
| 1 | 3 | 5 | 1 | 5 | 2 | 5 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 4 |
| 1 | 5 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 4 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 |
| 1 | 5 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 5 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 1 | 5 | 1 | 4 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 4 |
| 1 | 5 | 4 | 1 | 4 | 5 | 5 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 1 | 5 | 5 | 1 | 2 |
| 1 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 2 |
| 1 | 1 | 5 | 1 | 5 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 4 |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1 | 5 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 5 | 2 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 5 |
| 1 | 5 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 |
| 1 | 5 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 5 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 3 | 5 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 4 | 1 | 4 |
| 1 | 5 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 5 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 5 | 5 | 3 | 4 | 1 | 5 | 3 | 1 | 3 |
| 1 | 5 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 5 | 4 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 1 | 3 | 5 | 1 | 5 | 2 | 5 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 |
| 1 | 5 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 4 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 1 | 5 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 5 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 1 | 5 | 1 | 4 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 1 | 5 | 4 | 1 | 4 | 5 | 5 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 1 | 5 | 5 | 1 | 5 |
| 1 | 5 | 4 | 1 | 4 | 5 | 5 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 1 | 5 | 5 | 1 | 5 |
| 1 | 5 | 4 | 1 | 4 | 5 | 5 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 1 | 5 | 5 | 1 | 3 |
| 1 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 2 |
| 1 | 1 | 5 | 1 | 5 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 |
| 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 |
| 1 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 5 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 |
| 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 |
| 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 |
| 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 |
| 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 |
| 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 |
| 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 |
| 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 |
| 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |

**APPENDIX E**

Reliability of Instrument

The coefficients of Reliability for subsections of the instrument

* Product Component of the Marketing (Items 1-12) = 0.98.
* Price Component of the Marketing Mix (items 13-23) = 0.99.
* Place Component of the Marketing Mix (items 24-33) = 0.98.
* Promotion Component of the Marketing Mix (items 34-55) 0.98.

The overall coefficient of reliability of the entire instrument = 0.98.

Details of Analysis are Shown in Tables Below: QUESTION 1

**Correlations**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | | Product quality(Test) | Product  quality(Pre- Test) |
|  | Pearson Correlation | 1 | 1.000\*\* |
| Product quality(Test) | Sig. (2-tailed) |  | .000 |
|  | N | 20 | 20 |
|  | Pearson Correlation | 1.000\*\* | 1 |
| Product quality(Pre-Test) | Sig. (2-tailed) | .000 |  |
|  | N | 20 | 20 |

\*\*. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

QUESTION 2

**Correlations**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | | Product size(Test) | Product size(Pre-Test) |
|  | Pearson Correlation | 1 | 1.000\*\* |
| Product size(Test) | Sig. (2-tailed) |  | .000 |
|  | N | 20 | 20 |
|  | Pearson Correlation | 1.000\*\* | 1 |
| Product size(Pre-Test) | Sig. (2-tailed) | .000 |  |
|  | N | 20 | 20 |

\*\*. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Correlations** | | | |
|  | | Product packaging(Test) | Product packaging(Pre- Test) |
|  | Pearson Correlation | 1 | 1.000\*\* |
| Product packaging(Test) | Sig. (2-tailed) |  | .000 |
|  | N | 20 | 20 |
|  | Pearson Correlation | 1.000\*\* | 1 |
| Product packaging(Pre-Test) | Sig. (2-tailed) | .000 |  |
|  | N | 20 | 20 |
| \*\*. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed). | | | |

QUESTION 4

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Correlations** | | | |
|  | | Product brand name(Test) | Product brand name(Pre-Test) |
|  | Pearson Correlation | 1 | .937\*\* |
| Product brand name(Test) | Sig. (2-tailed) |  | .000 |
|  | N | 20 | 20 |
|  | Pearson Correlation | .937\*\* | 1 |
| Product brand name(Pre-  Test) | Sig. (2-tailed) | .000 |  |
|  | N | 20 | 20 |
| \*\*. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed). | | | |

QUESTION 5

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Correlations** | | | |
|  | | Product brand label(Test) | Product brand label(Pre-Test) |
|  | Pearson Correlation | 1 | .979\*\* |
| Product brand label(Test) | Sig. (2-tailed) |  | .000 |
|  | N | 20 | 20 |
|  | Pearson Correlation | .979\*\* | 1 |
| Product brand label(Pre-  Test) | Sig. (2-tailed) | .000 |  |
|  | N | 20 | 20 |
| \*\*. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed). | | | |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Correlations** | | | |
|  | | Product physical appearance(Tes  t) | Product physical appearance(Pre  -Test) |
|  | Pearson Correlation | 1 | .981\*\* |
| Product physical  appearance(Test) | Sig. (2-tailed) |  | .000 |
|  | N | 20 | 20 |
|  | Pearson Correlation | .981\*\* | 1 |
| Product physical  appearance(Pre-Test) | Sig. (2-tailed) | .000 |  |
|  | N | 20 | 20 |
| \*\*. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed). | | | |

QUESTION 7

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Correlations** | | | |
|  | | Product warranty(Test) | Product warranty(Pre- Test) |
|  | Pearson Correlation | 1 | .990\*\* |
| Product warranty(Test) | Sig. (2-tailed) |  | .000 |
|  | N | 20 | 20 |
|  | Pearson Correlation | .990\*\* | 1 |
| Product warranty(Pre-Test) | Sig. (2-tailed) | .000 |  |
|  | N | 20 | 20 |
| \*\*. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed). | | | |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Correlations** | | | |
|  | | Product usage instruction(Test) | Product usage instruction(Pre- Test) |
|  | Pearson Correlation | 1 | .987\*\* |
| Product usage  instruction(Test) | Sig. (2-tailed) |  | .000 |
|  | N | 20 | 20 |
|  | Pearson Correlation | .987\*\* | 1 |
| Product usage  instruction(Pre-Test) | Sig. (2-tailed) | .000 |  |
|  | N | 20 | 20 |
| \*\*. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed). | | | |

QUESTION 9

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Correlations** | | | |
|  | | Product expiry date(Test) | Product expiry date(Pre-Test) |
|  | Pearson Correlation | 1 | .981\*\* |
| Product expiry date(Test) | Sig. (2-tailed) |  | .000 |
|  | N | 20 | 20 |
|  | Pearson Correlation | .981\*\* | 1 |
| Product expiry date(Pre-  Test) | Sig. (2-tailed) | .000 |  |
|  | N | 20 | 20 |
| \*\*. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed). | | | |

QUESTION 10

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Correlations** | | | |
|  | | Availability of SON  certification(Tes  t) | Availability of SON  certification(Pre-  Test) |
|  | Pearson Correlation | 1 | .991\*\* |
| Availability of SON  certification(Test) | Sig. (2-tailed) |  | .000 |
|  | N | 20 | 20 |
|  | Pearson Correlation | .991\*\* | 1 |
| Availability of SON  certification(Pre-Test) | Sig. (2-tailed) | .000 |  |
|  | N | 20 | 20 |
| \*\*. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed). | | | |

QUESTION 11

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Correlations** | | | |
|  | | Product design(Test) | Product  design(Pre- Test) |
|  | Pearson Correlation | 1 | .987\*\* |
| Product design(Test) | Sig. (2-tailed) |  | .000 |
|  | N | 20 | 20 |
|  | Pearson Correlation | .987\*\* | 1 |
| Product design(Pre-Test) | Sig. (2-tailed) | .000 |  |
|  | N | 20 | 20 |
| \*\*. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed). | | | |

QUESTION 12

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Correlations** | | | |
|  | | NAFDAC  registration number(Test) | NAFDAC  registration number(Pre-  Test) |
|  | Pearson Correlation | 1 | 1.000\*\* |
| NAFDAC registration  number(Test) | Sig. (2-tailed) |  | .000 |
|  | N | 20 | 20 |
|  | Pearson Correlation | 1.000\*\* | 1 |
| NAFDAC registration  number(Pre-Test) | Sig. (2-tailed) | .000 |  |
|  | N | 20 | 20 |
| \*\*. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed). | | | |

QUESTION 13

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Correlations** | | | |
|  | | Discount structure(Test) | Discount  structure(Pre- Test) |
|  | Pearson Correlation | 1 | 1.000\*\* |
| Discount structure(Test) | Sig. (2-tailed) |  | .000 |
|  | N | 20 | 20 |
|  | Pearson Correlation | 1.000\*\* | 1 |
| Discount structure(Pre-Test) | Sig. (2-tailed) | .000 |  |
|  | N | 20 | 20 |
| \*\*. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed). | | | |

QUESTION 14

**Correlations**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | | Price list(Test) | Price list(Pre- Test) |
|  | Pearson Correlation | 1 | 1.000\*\* |
| Price list(Test) | Sig. (2-tailed) |  | .000 |
|  | N | 20 | 20 |
|  | Pearson Correlation | 1.000\*\* | 1 |
| Price list(Pre-Test) | Sig. (2-tailed) | .000 |  |
|  | N | 20 | 20 |

\*\*. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

QUESTION 15

**Correlations**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | | Rebates(Test) | Rebates(Pre- Test) |
|  | Pearson Correlation | 1 | 1.000\*\* |
| Rebates(Test) | Sig. (2-tailed) |  | .000 |
|  | N | 19 | 19 |
|  | Pearson Correlation | 1.000\*\* | 1 |
| Rebates(Pre-Test) | Sig. (2-tailed) | .000 |  |
|  | N | 19 | 20 |

\*\*. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

QUESTION 16

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Correlations** | | | |
|  | | Credit facilities(Test) | Credit  facilities(Pre- Test) |
|  | Pearson Correlation | 1 | 1.000\*\* |
| Credit facilities(Test) | Sig. (2-tailed) |  | .000 |
|  | N | 20 | 19 |
|  | Pearson Correlation | 1.000\*\* | 1 |
| Credit facilities(Pre-Test) | Sig. (2-tailed) | .000 |  |
|  | N | 19 | 19 |
| \*\*. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed). | | | |

QUESTION 17

**Correlations**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | | Low pricing(Test) | Low pricing(Pre- Test) |
|  | Pearson Correlation | 1 | 1.000\*\* |
| Low pricing(Test) | Sig. (2-tailed) |  | .000 |
|  | N | 20 | 20 |
|  | Pearson Correlation | 1.000\*\* | 1 |
| Low pricing(Pre-Test) | Sig. (2-tailed) | .000 |  |
|  | N | 20 | 20 |

\*\*. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

QUESTION 18

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Correlations** | | | |
|  | | Price quotations(Test) | Price quotations(Pre- Test) |
|  | Pearson Correlation | 1 | 1.000\*\* |
| Price quotations(Test) | Sig. (2-tailed) |  | .000 |
|  | N | 20 | 20 |
|  | Pearson Correlation | 1.000\*\* | 1 |
| Price quotations(Pre-Test) | Sig. (2-tailed) | .000 |  |
|  | N | 20 | 20 |
| \*\*. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed). | | | |

QUESTION 19

**Correlations**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | | Price bundling(Test) | Price bundling(Pre- Test) |
|  | Pearson Correlation | 1 | 1.000\*\* |
| Price bundling(Test) | Sig. (2-tailed) |  | .000 |
|  | N | 20 | 20 |
|  | Pearson Correlation | 1.000\*\* | 1 |
| Price bundling(Pre-Test) | Sig. (2-tailed) | .000 |  |
|  | N | 20 | 20 |

\*\*. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

QUESTION 20

**Correlations**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | | Coupons(Test) | Coupons(Pre-Test) |
|  | Pearson Correlation | 1 | .986\*\* |
| Coupons(Test) | Sig. (2-tailed) |  | .000 |
|  | N | 20 | 20 |
|  | Pearson Correlation | .986\*\* | 1 |
| Coupons(Pre-Test) | Sig. (2-tailed) | .000 |  |
|  | N | 20 | 20 |

\*\*. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

QUESTION 21

**Correlations**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | | Odd-even- pricing(Test) | Odd-even- pricing(Pre-Test) |
|  | Pearson Correlation | 1 | 1.000\*\* |
| Odd-even- pricing(Test) | Sig. (2-tailed) |  | .000 |
|  | N | 20 | 20 |
|  | Pearson Correlation | 1.000\*\* | 1 |
| Odd-even- pricing(Pre-Test) | Sig. (2-tailed) | .000 |  |
|  | N | 20 | 20 |

\*\*. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

QUESTION 22

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Correlations** | | | |
|  | | Multiple unit pricings(Test) | Multiple unit pricings(Pre-Test) |
|  | Pearson Correlation | 1 | .981\*\* |
| Multiple unit pricings(Test) | Sig. (2-tailed) |  | .000 |
|  | N | 20 | 20 |
|  | Pearson Correlation | .981\*\* | 1 |
| Multiple unit pricings(Pre-  Test) | Sig. (2-tailed) | .000 |  |
|  | N | 20 | 20 |
| \*\*. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed). | | | |

**Correlations**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | | Leader pricing(Test) | Leader pricing(Pre- Test) |
|  | Pearson Correlation | 1 | 1.000\*\* |
| Leader pricing(Test) | Sig. (2-tailed) |  | .000 |
|  | N | 20 | 20 |
|  | Pearson Correlation | 1.000\*\* | 1 |
| Leader pricing(Pre-Test) | Sig. (2-tailed) | .000 |  |
|  | N | 20 | 20 |

\*\*. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

QUESTION 24

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Correlations** | | | |
|  | | Delivery by road(Test) | Delivery by road(Pre-Test) |
|  | Pearson Correlation | 1 | 1.000\*\* |
| Delivery by road(Test) | Sig. (2-tailed) |  | .000 |
|  | N | 20 | 20 |
|  | Pearson Correlation | 1.000\*\* | 1 |
| Delivery by road(Pre-Test) | Sig. (2-tailed) | .000 |  |
|  | N | 20 | 20 |
| \*\*. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed). | | | |

QUESTION 25

**Correlations**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | | Delivery by air(Test) | Delivery by air(Pre-Test) |
|  | Pearson Correlation | 1 | .989\*\* |
| Delivery by air(Test) | Sig. (2-tailed) |  | .000 |
|  | N | 20 | 20 |
|  | Pearson Correlation | .989\*\* | 1 |
| Delivery by air(Pre-Test) | Sig. (2-tailed) | .000 |  |
|  | N | 20 | 20 |

\*\*. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Correlations** | | | |
|  | | Delivery by water(Test) | Delivery by water(Pre-Test) |
|  | Pearson Correlation | 1 | 1.000\*\* |
| Delivery by water(Test) | Sig. (2-tailed) |  | .000 |
|  | N | 20 | 20 |
|  | Pearson Correlation | 1.000\*\* | 1 |
| Delivery by water(Pre-Test) | Sig. (2-tailed) | .000 |  |
|  | N | 20 | 20 |
| \*\*. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed). | | | |

QUESTION 27

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Correlations** | | | |
|  | | Long distance delivery(Test) | Long distance  delivery(Pre- Test) |
|  | Pearson Correlation | 1 | .991\*\* |
| Long distance delivery(Test) | Sig. (2-tailed) |  | .000 |
|  | N | 20 | 20 |
|  | Pearson Correlation | .991\*\* | 1 |
| Long distance delivery(Pre-  Test) | Sig. (2-tailed) | .000 |  |
|  | N | 20 | 20 |
| \*\*. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed). | | | |

QUESTION 28

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Correlations** | | | |
|  | | After sales service(Test) | After sales  service(Pre- Test) |
|  | Pearson Correlation | 1 | .991\*\* |
| After sales service(Test) | Sig. (2-tailed) |  | .000 |
|  | N | 20 | 20 |
|  | Pearson Correlation | .991\*\* | 1 |
| After sales service(Pre-Test) | Sig. (2-tailed) | .000 |  |
|  | N | 20 | 20 |
| \*\*. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed). | | | |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Correlations** | | | |
|  | | Door-to-Door delivery(Test) | Door-to-Door delivery(Pre- Test) |
|  | Pearson Correlation | 1 | .990\*\* |
| Door-to-Door delivery(Test) | Sig. (2-tailed) |  | .000 |
|  | N | 20 | 20 |
|  | Pearson Correlation | .990\*\* | 1 |
| Door-to-Door delivery(Pre-  Test) | Sig. (2-tailed) | .000 |  |
|  | N | 20 | 20 |
| \*\*. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed). | | | |

QUESTION 30

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Correlations** | | | |
|  | | Technical advice(Test) | Technical advice(Pre- Test) |
|  | Pearson Correlation | 1 | .981\*\* |
| Technical advice(Test) | Sig. (2-tailed) |  | .000 |
|  | N | 20 | 20 |
|  | Pearson Correlation | .981\*\* | 1 |
| Technical advice(Pre-Test) | Sig. (2-tailed) | .000 |  |
|  | N | 20 | 20 |
| \*\*. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed). | | | |

QUESTION 31

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Correlations** | | | |
|  | | Prompt order handling(Test) | Prompt order handling(Pre- Test) |
|  | Pearson Correlation | 1 | .989\*\* |
| Prompt order handling(Test) | Sig. (2-tailed) |  | .000 |
|  | N | 20 | 20 |
|  | Pearson Correlation | .989\*\* | 1 |
| Prompt order handling(Pre-  Test) | Sig. (2-tailed) | .000 |  |
|  | N | 20 | 20 |
| \*\*. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed). | | | |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Correlations** | | | |
|  | | Location of establishment(T est) | Location of establishment(P re-Test) |
|  | Pearson Correlation | 1 | .986\*\* |
| Location of  establishment(Test) | Sig. (2-tailed) |  | .000 |
|  | N | 20 | 20 |
|  | Pearson Correlation | .986\*\* | 1 |
| Location of  establishment(Pre-Test) | Sig. (2-tailed) | .000 |  |
|  | N | 20 | 20 |
| \*\*. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed). | | | |

QUESTION 33

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Correlations** | | | |
|  | | Storage facilities(Test) | Storage facilities(Pre- Test) |
|  | Pearson Correlation | 1 | .952\*\* |
| Storage facilities(Test) | Sig. (2-tailed) |  | .000 |
|  | N | 20 | 20 |
|  | Pearson Correlation | .952\*\* | 1 |
| Storage facilities(Pre-Test) | Sig. (2-tailed) | .000 |  |
|  | N | 20 | 20 |
| \*\*. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed). | | | |

QUESTION 34

**Correlations**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | | Internet adversities(Test) | Internet adversities(Pre-Test) |
|  | Pearson Correlation | 1 | 1.000\*\* |
| Internet adversities(Test) | Sig. (2-tailed) |  | .000 |
|  | N | 20 | 19 |
|  | Pearson Correlation | 1.000\*\* | 1 |
| Internet adversities(Pre-  Test) | Sig. (2-tailed) | .000 |  |
|  | N | 19 | 19 |

\*\*. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Correlations** | | | |
|  | | Print advertising(Test  ) | Print advertising(Pre- Test) |
|  | Pearson Correlation | 1 | 1.000\*\* |
| Print advertising(Test) | Sig. (2-tailed) |  | .000 |
|  | N | 20 | 19 |
|  | Pearson Correlation | 1.000\*\* | 1 |
| Print advertising(Pre-Test) | Sig. (2-tailed) | .000 |  |
|  | N | 19 | 19 |
| \*\*. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed). | | | |

QUESTION 36

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Correlations** | | | |
|  | | Radio advertising(Test) | Radio advertising(Pre-  Test) |
|  | Pearson Correlation | 1 | 1.000\*\* |
| Radio advertising(Test) | Sig. (2-tailed) |  | .000 |
|  | N | 20 | 19 |
|  | Pearson Correlation | 1.000\*\* | 1 |
| Radio advertising(Pre-Test) | Sig. (2-tailed) | .000 |  |
|  | N | 19 | 19 |
| \*\*. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed). | | | |

QUESTION 37

**Correlations**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | | Television advertising(Test) | Television  advertising(Pre- Test) |
|  | Pearson Correlation | 1 | 1.000\*\* |
| Television advertising(Test) | Sig. (2-tailed) |  | .000 |
|  | N | 20 | 19 |
|  | Pearson Correlation | 1.000\*\* | 1 |
| Television advertising(Pre-  Test) | Sig. (2-tailed) | .000 |  |
|  | N | 19 | 19 |

\*\*. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

QUESTION 38

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Correlations** | | | |
|  | | Mobile advertising(Test) | Mobile  advertising(Pre- Test) |
|  | Pearson Correlation | 1 | 1.000\*\* |
| Mobile advertising(Test) | Sig. (2-tailed) |  | .000 |
|  | N | 20 | 19 |
|  | Pearson Correlation | 1.000\*\* | 1 |
| Mobile advertising(Pre-Test) | Sig. (2-tailed) | .000 |  |
|  | N | 19 | 19 |
| \*\*. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed). | | | |

QUESTION 39

**Correlations**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | | Cash refund(Test) | Cash  refund(Pre- Test) |
|  | Pearson Correlation | 1 | 1.000\*\* |
| Cash refund(Test) | Sig. (2-tailed) |  | .000 |
|  | N | 20 | 19 |
|  | Pearson Correlation | 1.000\*\* | 1 |
| Cash refund(Pre-Test) | Sig. (2-tailed) | .000 |  |
|  | N | 19 | 19 |

\*\*. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

QUESTION 40

**Correlations**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | | Lucky draws(Test) | Lucky draws(Pre-Test) |
|  | Pearson Correlation | 1 | 1.000\*\* |
| Lucky draws(Test) | Sig. (2-tailed) |  | .000 |
|  | N | 20 | 19 |
|  | Pearson Correlation | 1.000\*\* | 1 |
| Lucky draws(Pre-Test) | Sig. (2-tailed) | .000 |  |
|  | N | 19 | 19 |

\*\*. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

QUESTION 41

**Correlations**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | | Price off deals(Test) | Price off deals(Pre-Test) |
|  | Pearson Correlation | 1 | 1.000\*\* |
| Price off deals(Test) | Sig. (2-tailed) |  | .000 |
|  | N | 20 | 19 |
|  | Pearson Correlation | 1.000\*\* | 1 |
| Price off deals(Pre-Test) | Sig. (2-tailed) | .000 |  |
|  | N | 19 | 19 |

\*\*. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

QUESTION 42

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Correlations** | | | |
|  | | Point of purchase display(Test) | Point of purchase display(Pre-  Test) |
|  | Pearson Correlation | 1 | 1.000\*\* |
| Point of purchase  display(Test) | Sig. (2-tailed) |  | .000 |
|  | N | 20 | 19 |
|  | Pearson Correlation | 1.000\*\* | 1 |
| Point of purchase  display(Pre-Test) | Sig. (2-tailed) | .000 |  |
|  | N | 19 | 19 |
| \*\*. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed). | | | |

QUESTION 43

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Correlations** | | | |
|  | | Interactive relationships(Te st) | Interactive relationships(Pr e-Test) |
|  | Pearson Correlation | 1 | .845\*\* |
| Interactive  relationships(Test) | Sig. (2-tailed) |  | .000 |
|  | N | 20 | 19 |
|  | Pearson Correlation | .845\*\* | 1 |
| Interactive relationships(Pre-  Test) | Sig. (2-tailed) | .000 |  |
|  | N | 19 | 19 |
| \*\*. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed). | | | |

QUESTION 44

**Correlations**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | | Press release(Test) | Press release(Pre- Test) |
|  | Pearson Correlation | 1 | 1.000\*\* |
| Press release(Test) | Sig. (2-tailed) |  | .000 |
|  | N | 20 | 19 |
|  | Pearson Correlation | 1.000\*\* | 1 |
| Press release(Pre-Test) | Sig. (2-tailed) | .000 |  |
|  | N | 19 | 19 |

\*\*. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

QUESTION 45

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Correlations** | | | |
|  | | Press conference(Test  ) | Press conference(Pre- Test) |
|  | Pearson Correlation | 1 | 1.000\*\* |
| Press conference(Test) | Sig. (2-tailed) |  | .000 |
|  | N | 20 | 18 |
|  | Pearson Correlation | 1.000\*\* | 1 |
| Press conference(Pre-Test) | Sig. (2-tailed) | .000 |  |
|  | N | 18 | 18 |
| \*\*. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed). | | | |

QUESTION 46

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Correlations** | | | |
|  | | Community notices(Test) | Community notices(Pre- Test) |
|  | Pearson Correlation | 1 | 1.000\*\* |
| Community notices(Test) | Sig. (2-tailed) |  | .000 |
|  | N | 20 | 18 |
|  | Pearson Correlation | 1.000\*\* | 1 |
| Community notices(Pre-  Test) | Sig. (2-tailed) | .000 |  |
|  | N | 18 | 18 |
| \*\*. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed). | | | |

QUESTION 47

**Correlations**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | | Billboards(Test) | Billboards(Pre- Test) |
|  | Pearson Correlation | 1 | 1.000\*\* |
| Billboards(Test) | Sig. (2-tailed) |  | .000 |
|  | N | 20 | 20 |
|  | Pearson Correlation | 1.000\*\* | 1 |
| Billboards(Pre-Test) | Sig. (2-tailed) | .000 |  |
|  | N | 20 | 20 |

\*\*. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

QUESTION 48

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Correlations** | | | |
|  | | Sponsored  publications(Tes t) | Sponsored publications(Pre  -Test) |
|  | Pearson Correlation | 1 | 1.000\*\* |
| Sponsored  publications(Test) | Sig. (2-tailed) |  | .000 |
|  | N | 20 | 19 |
|  | Pearson Correlation | 1.000\*\* | 1 |
| Sponsored publications(Pre-  Test) | Sig. (2-tailed) | .000 |  |
|  | N | 19 | 19 |
| \*\*. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed). | | | |

QUESTION 49

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Correlations** | | | |
|  | | Sponsored  programmes(Te st) | Sponsored  programmes(Pr e-Test) |
|  | Pearson Correlation | 1 | .747\*\* |
| Sponsored  programmes(Test) | Sig. (2-tailed) |  | .000 |
|  | N | 20 | 20 |
|  | Pearson Correlation | .747\*\* | 1 |
| Sponsored  programmes(Pre-Test) | Sig. (2-tailed) | .000 |  |
|  | N | 20 | 20 |
| \*\*. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed). | | | |

**Correlations**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | | Special events(Test) | Special events(Pre- Test) |
|  | Pearson Correlation | 1 | 1.000\*\* |
| Special events(Test) | Sig. (2-tailed) |  | .000 |
|  | N | 20 | 20 |
|  | Pearson Correlation | 1.000\*\* | 1 |
| Special events(Pre-Test) | Sig. (2-tailed) | .000 |  |
|  | N | 20 | 20 |

\*\*. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

QUESTON 51

**Correlations**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | | News letters(Test) | News letters(Pre-Test) |
|  | Pearson Correlation | 1 | .992\*\* |
| News letters(Test) | Sig. (2-tailed) |  | .000 |
|  | N | 19 | 19 |
|  | Pearson Correlation | .992\*\* | 1 |
| News letters(Pre-Test) | Sig. (2-tailed) | .000 |  |
|  | N | 19 | 19 |

\*\*. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

QUESTION 52

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Correlations** | | | |
|  | | Community development services(Test) | Community development services(Pre-  Test) |
|  | Pearson Correlation | 1 | .991\*\* |
| Community development  services(Test) | Sig. (2-tailed) |  | .000 |
|  | N | 20 | 20 |
|  | Pearson Correlation | .991\*\* | 1 |
| Community development  services(Pre-Test) | Sig. (2-tailed) | .000 |  |
|  | N | 20 | 20 |
| \*\*. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed). | | | |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Correlations** | | | |
|  | | Customer care services(Test) | Customer care services(Pre- Test) |
|  | Pearson Correlation | 1 | 1.000\*\* |
| Customer care  services(Test) | Sig. (2-tailed) |  | .000 |
|  | N | 19 | 19 |
|  | Pearson Correlation | 1.000\*\* | 1 |
| Customer care services(Pre-  Test) | Sig. (2-tailed) | .000 |  |
|  | N | 19 | 20 |
| \*\*. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed). | | | |

QUESTION 54

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Correlations** | | | |
|  | | Social interaction programmes(Te  st) | Social interaction programmes(Pr  e-Test) |
|  | Pearson Correlation | 1 | 1.000\*\* |
| Social interaction  programmes(Test) | Sig. (2-tailed) |  | .000 |
|  | N | 20 | 20 |
|  | Pearson Correlation | 1.000\*\* | 1 |
| Social interaction  programmes(Pre-Test) | Sig. (2-tailed) | .000 |  |
|  | N | 20 | 20 |
| \*\*. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed). | | | |

QUESTION 55

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Correlations** | | | |
|  | | Social networks(Test) | Social networks (Pre-Test) |
|  | Pearson Correlation | 1 | 1.000\*\* |
| Social networks(Test) | Sig. (2-tailed) |  | .000 |
|  | N | 20 | 20 |
|  | Pearson Correlation | 1.000\*\* | 1 |
| Social networks (Pre-Test) | Sig. (2-tailed) | .000 |  |
|  | N | 20 | 20 |
| \*\*. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed). | | | |

# APPENDIX F COMPUTATIONS OF RESEARCH QUESTIONS AND HYPOTHESES

SPSS OUTPUT

**Research Question one**

**Descriptive Statistics**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | N | Mean | Std. Deviation |
| Product quality | 250 | 3.97 | 1.24 |
| Product size | 250 | 3.13 | 1.02 |
| Product packaging | 250 | 3.18 | 1.26 |
| Product brand name | 250 | 3.09 | 1.33 |
| Product brand label | 250 | 3.03 | 1.31 |
| Product physical appearance | 250 | 2.96 | 1.37 |
| Product warranty | 250 | 2.82 | 1.41 |
| Product usage instruction | 250 | 3.04 | 1.36 |
| Product expiry date | 250 | 2.91 | 1.28 |
| Availability of SON certification | 250 | 2.93 | 1.30 |
| Product design | 250 | 2.80 | 1.32 |
| NAFDAC registration number | 250 | 2.94 | 1.57 |
| Valid N (listwise) | 250 |  |  |

**Frequencies Frequency Table**

**Product quality**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
| Very little extent | 14 | 5.6 | 5.6 | 5.6 |
| Little extent | 24 | 9.6 | 9.6 | 15.2 |
| Moderate extent | 40 | 16.0 | 16.0 | 31.2 |
| Valid |  |  |  |  |
| Great extent | 50 | 20.0 | 20.0 | 51.2 |
| Very great extent | 122 | 48.8 | 48.8 | 100.0 |
| Total | 250 | 100.0 | 100.0 |  |

**Product size**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|  | Very little extent | 11 | 4.4 | 4.4 | 4.4 |
|  | Little extent | 62 | 24.8 | 24.8 | 29.2 |
|  | Moderate extent | 81 | 32.4 | 32.4 | 61.6 |
| Valid | Great extent | 75 | 30.0 | 30.0 | 91.6 |
|  | Very great extent | 21 | 8.4 | 8.4 | 100.0 |
|  | Total | 250 | 100.0 | 100.0 |  |

**Product packaging**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|  | Very little extent | 28 | 11.2 | 11.2 | 11.2 |
|  | Little extent | 51 | 20.4 | 20.4 | 31.6 |
|  | Moderate extent | 63 | 25.2 | 25.2 | 56.8 |
| Valid | Great extent | 63 | 25.2 | 25.2 | 82.0 |
|  | Very great extent | 45 | 18.0 | 18.0 | 100.0 |
|  | Total | 250 | 100.0 | 100.0 |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Product brand name** | | | | | |
|  | | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|  | Very little extent | 33 | 13.2 | 13.2 | 13.2 |
|  | Little extent | 63 | 25.2 | 25.2 | 38.4 |
|  | Moderate extent | 50 | 20.0 | 20.0 | 58.4 |
| Valid | Great extent | 56 | 22.4 | 22.4 | 80.8 |
|  | Very great extent | 48 | 19.2 | 19.2 | 100.0 |
|  | Total | 250 | 100.0 | 100.0 |  |

**Product brand label**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|  | Very little extent | 37 | 14.8 | 14.8 | 14.8 |
|  | Little extent | 53 | 21.2 | 21.2 | 36.0 |
|  | Moderate extent | 72 | 28.8 | 28.8 | 64.8 |
| Valid | Great extent | 42 | 16.8 | 16.8 | 81.6 |
|  | Very great extent | 46 | 18.4 | 18.4 | 100.0 |
|  | Total | 250 | 100.0 | 100.0 |  |

**Product physical appearance**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|  | Very little extent | 42 | 16.8 | 16.8 | 16.8 |
|  | Little extent | 66 | 26.4 | 26.4 | 43.2 |
|  | Moderate extent | 50 | 20.0 | 20.0 | 63.2 |
| Valid | Great extent | 45 | 18.0 | 18.0 | 81.2 |
|  | Very great extent | 47 | 18.8 | 18.8 | 100.0 |
|  | Total | 250 | 100.0 | 100.0 |  |

**Product warranty**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|  | Very little extent | 61 | 24.4 | 24.4 | 24.4 |
|  | Little extent | 47 | 18.8 | 18.8 | 43.2 |
|  | Moderate extent | 62 | 24.8 | 24.8 | 68.0 |
| Valid | Great extent | 36 | 14.4 | 14.4 | 82.4 |
|  | Very great extent | 44 | 17.6 | 17.6 | 100.0 |
|  | Total | 250 | 100.0 | 100.0 |  |

**Product usage instruction**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|  | Very little extent | 42 | 16.8 | 16.8 | 16.8 |
|  | Little extent | 53 | 21.2 | 21.2 | 38.0 |
|  | Moderate extent | 54 | 21.6 | 21.6 | 59.6 |
| Valid | Great extent | 54 | 21.6 | 21.6 | 81.2 |
|  | Very great extent | 47 | 18.8 | 18.8 | 100.0 |
|  | Total | 250 | 100.0 | 100.0 |  |

**Product expiry date**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|  | Very little extent | 38 | 15.2 | 15.2 | 15.2 |
|  | Little extent | 63 | 25.2 | 25.2 | 40.4 |
|  | Moderate extent | 71 | 28.4 | 28.4 | 68.8 |
| Valid | Great extent | 39 | 15.6 | 15.6 | 84.4 |
|  | Very great extent | 39 | 15.6 | 15.6 | 100.0 |
|  | Total | 250 | 100.0 | 100.0 |  |

**Availability of SON certification**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|  | Very little extent | 43 | 17.2 | 17.2 | 17.2 |
|  | Little extent | 56 | 22.4 | 22.4 | 39.6 |
|  | Moderate extent | 62 | 24.8 | 24.8 | 64.4 |
| Valid | Great extent | 54 | 21.6 | 21.6 | 86.0 |
|  | Very great extent | 35 | 14.0 | 14.0 | 100.0 |
|  | Total | 250 | 100.0 | 100.0 |  |

**Product design**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|  | Very little extent | 47 | 18.8 | 18.8 | 18.8 |
|  | Little extent | 69 | 27.6 | 27.6 | 46.4 |
|  | Moderate extent | 58 | 23.2 | 23.2 | 69.6 |
| Valid | Great extent | 40 | 16.0 | 16.0 | 85.6 |
|  | Very great extent | 36 | 14.4 | 14.4 | 100.0 |
|  | Total | 250 | 100.0 | 100.0 |  |

**NAFDAC registration number**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|  | Very little extent | 65 | 26.0 | 26.0 | 26.0 |
|  | Little extent | 52 | 20.8 | 20.8 | 46.8 |
|  | Moderate extent | 37 | 14.8 | 14.8 | 61.6 |
| Valid | Great extent | 26 | 10.4 | 10.4 | 72.0 |
|  | Very great extent | 70 | 28.0 | 28.0 | 100.0 |
|  | Total | 250 | 100.0 | 100.0 |  |

**Research question two**

**Descriptive Statistics**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | N | Mean | Std. Deviation |
| Discount structure | 250 | 3.56 | 1.26 |
| Price list | 250 | 3.35 | 1.21 |
| Rebates | 250 | 2.94 | 1.13 |
| Credit facilities | 250 | 2.91 | 1.20 |
| Low pricing | 250 | 2.90 | 1.35 |
| Price quotations | 250 | 3.05 | 1.33 |
| Price bundling | 250 | 2.96 | 1.22 |
| Coupons | 250 | 2.84 | 1.28 |
| Odd-even- pricing | 250 | 2.61 | 1.17 |
| Multiple unit pricings | 250 | 2.78 | 1.19 |
| Leader pricing | 250 | 2.84 | 1.47 |
| Valid N (listwise) | 250 |  |  |

**Frequencies**

**Statistics**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | | Discou nt structu re | Pric e list | Rebat es | Credit faciliti es | Low pricin g | Price quotatio ns | Price bundli ng | Coupo ns | Odd- even  -  pricin g | Multipl e unit pricin gs | Lead er pricin g |
|  | Valid | 250 | 250 | 250 | 250 | 250 | 250 | 250 | 250 | 250 | 250 | 250 |
| N | Missin g | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

**Frequency Table**

**Discount structure**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|  | Very little extent | 20 | 8.0 | 8.0 | 8.0 |
|  | Little extent | 29 | 11.6 | 11.6 | 19.6 |
|  | Moderate extent | 69 | 27.6 | 27.6 | 47.2 |
| Valid | Great extent | 55 | 22.0 | 22.0 | 69.2 |
|  | Very great extent | 77 | 30.8 | 30.8 | 100.0 |
|  | Total | 250 | 100.0 | 100.0 |  |

**Price list**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|  | Very little extent | 14 | 5.6 | 5.6 | 5.6 |
|  | Little extent | 57 | 22.8 | 22.8 | 28.4 |
|  | Moderate extent | 62 | 24.8 | 24.8 | 53.2 |
| Valid | Great extent | 61 | 24.4 | 24.4 | 77.6 |
|  | Very great extent | 56 | 22.4 | 22.4 | 100.0 |
|  | Total | 250 | 100.0 | 100.0 |  |

**Rebates**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|  | Very little extent | 28 | 11.2 | 11.2 | 11.2 |
|  | Little extent | 61 | 24.4 | 24.4 | 35.6 |
|  | Moderate extent | 82 | 32.8 | 32.8 | 68.4 |
| Valid | Great extent | 57 | 22.8 | 22.8 | 91.2 |
|  | Very great extent | 22 | 8.8 | 8.8 | 100.0 |
|  | Total | 250 | 100.0 | 100.0 |  |

**Credit facilities**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|  | Very little extent | 35 | 14.0 | 14.0 | 14.0 |
|  | Little extent | 55 | 22.0 | 22.0 | 36.0 |
|  | Moderate extent | 89 | 35.6 | 35.6 | 71.6 |
| Valid | Great extent | 40 | 16.0 | 16.0 | 87.6 |
|  | Very great extent | 31 | 12.4 | 12.4 | 100.0 |
|  | Total | 250 | 100.0 | 100.0 |  |

**Low pricing**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|  | Very little extent | 48 | 19.2 | 19.2 | 19.2 |
|  | Little extent | 58 | 23.2 | 23.2 | 42.4 |
|  | Moderate extent | 56 | 22.4 | 22.4 | 64.8 |
| Valid | Great extent | 48 | 19.2 | 19.2 | 84.0 |
|  | Very great extent | 40 | 16.0 | 16.0 | 100.0 |
|  | Total | 250 | 100.0 | 100.0 |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Price quotations** | | | | | |
|  | | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|  | Very little extent | 36 | 14.4 | 14.4 | 14.4 |
|  | Little extent | 61 | 24.4 | 24.4 | 38.8 |
|  | Moderate extent | 52 | 20.8 | 20.8 | 59.6 |
| Valid | Great extent | 56 | 22.4 | 22.4 | 82.0 |
|  | Very great extent | 45 | 18.0 | 18.0 | 100.0 |
|  | Total | 250 | 100.0 | 100.0 |  |

**Price bundling**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|  | Very little extent | 38 | 15.2 | 15.2 | 15.2 |
|  | Little extent | 44 | 17.6 | 17.6 | 32.8 |
|  | Moderate extent | 88 | 35.2 | 35.2 | 68.0 |
| Valid | Great extent | 49 | 19.6 | 19.6 | 87.6 |
|  | Very great extent | 31 | 12.4 | 12.4 | 100.0 |
|  | Total | 250 | 100.0 | 100.0 |  |

**Coupons**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|  | Very little extent | 47 | 18.8 | 18.8 | 18.8 |
|  | Little extent | 59 | 23.6 | 23.6 | 42.4 |
|  | Moderate extent | 59 | 23.6 | 23.6 | 66.0 |
| Valid | Great extent | 58 | 23.2 | 23.2 | 89.2 |
|  | Very great extent | 27 | 10.8 | 10.8 | 100.0 |
|  | Total | 250 | 100.0 | 100.0 |  |

**Odd-even- pricing**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|  | Very little extent | 55 | 22.0 | 22.0 | 22.0 |
|  | Little extent | 59 | 23.6 | 23.6 | 45.6 |
|  | Moderate extent | 77 | 30.8 | 30.8 | 76.4 |
| Valid | Great extent | 46 | 18.4 | 18.4 | 94.8 |
|  | Very great extent | 13 | 5.2 | 5.2 | 100.0 |
|  | Total | 250 | 100.0 | 100.0 |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Multiple unit pricings** | | | | | |
|  | | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|  | Very little extent | 42 | 16.8 | 16.8 | 16.8 |
|  | Little extent | 61 | 24.4 | 24.4 | 41.2 |
|  | Moderate extent | 79 | 31.6 | 31.6 | 72.8 |
| Valid | Great extent | 45 | 18.0 | 18.0 | 90.8 |
|  | Very great extent | 23 | 9.2 | 9.2 | 100.0 |
|  | Total | 250 | 100.0 | 100.0 |  |

**Leader pricing**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|  | Very little extent | 65 | 26.0 | 26.0 | 26.0 |
|  | Little extent | 45 | 18.0 | 18.0 | 44.0 |
|  | Moderate extent | 57 | 22.8 | 22.8 | 66.8 |
| Valid | Great extent | 31 | 12.4 | 12.4 | 79.2 |
|  | Very great extent | 52 | 20.8 | 20.8 | 100.0 |
|  | Total | 250 | 100.0 | 100.0 |  |

**Research question three**

**Descriptive Statistics**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | N | Mean | Std. Deviation |
| Delivery by road | 250 | 4.06 | 1.16 |
| Delivery by air | 250 | 2.65 | 1.38 |
| Delivery by water | 250 | 2.35 | 1.30 |
| Long distance delivery | 250 | 3.04 | 1.29 |
| After sales service | 250 | 2.99 | 1.33 |
| Door-to-Door delivery | 250 | 3.06 | 1.36 |
| Technical advice | 250 | 2.95 | 1.37 |
| Prompt order handling | 250 | 2.95 | 1.31 |
| Location of establishment | 250 | 3.06 | 1.35 |
| Storage facilities | 250 | 2.96 | 1.41 |
| Valid N (listwise) | 250 |  |  |

**Frequencies**

**Statistics**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | | Delive ry by road | Delive ry by air | Delive ry by water | Long distanc e deliver  y | After sales servic e | Door- to- Door delive  ry | Technic al advice | Promp t order handli ng | Location of establishm ent | Storag e faciliti es |
|  | Valid | 250 | 250 | 250 | 250 | 250 | 250 | 250 | 250 | 250 | 250 |
| N | Missin g | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

**Frequency Table**

**Delivery by road**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|  | Very little extent | 15 | 6.0 | 6.0 | 6.0 |
|  | Little extent | 13 | 5.2 | 5.2 | 11.2 |
|  | Moderate extent | 32 | 12.8 | 12.8 | 24.0 |
| Valid | Great extent | 72 | 28.8 | 28.8 | 52.8 |
|  | Very great extent | 118 | 47.2 | 47.2 | 100.0 |
|  | Total | 250 | 100.0 | 100.0 |  |

**Delivery by air**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|  | Very little extent | 75 | 30.0 | 30.0 | 30.0 |
|  | Little extent | 42 | 16.8 | 16.8 | 46.8 |
|  | Moderate extent | 58 | 23.2 | 23.2 | 70.0 |
| Valid | Great extent | 46 | 18.4 | 18.4 | 88.4 |
|  | Very great extent | 29 | 11.6 | 11.6 | 100.0 |
|  | Total | 250 | 100.0 | 100.0 |  |

**Delivery by water**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|  | Very little extent | 89 | 35.6 | 35.6 | 35.6 |
|  | Little extent | 55 | 22.0 | 22.0 | 57.6 |
|  | Moderate extent | 59 | 23.6 | 23.6 | 81.2 |
| Valid | Great extent | 24 | 9.6 | 9.6 | 90.8 |
|  | Very great extent | 23 | 9.2 | 9.2 | 100.0 |
|  | Total | 250 | 100.0 | 100.0 |  |

**Long distance delivery**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|  | Very little extent | 39 | 15.6 | 15.6 | 15.6 |
|  | Little extent | 46 | 18.4 | 18.4 | 34.0 |
|  | Moderate extent | 68 | 27.2 | 27.2 | 61.2 |
| Valid | Great extent | 59 | 23.6 | 23.6 | 84.8 |
|  | Very great extent | 38 | 15.2 | 15.2 | 100.0 |
|  | Total | 250 | 100.0 | 100.0 |  |

**After sales service**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|  | Very little extent | 40 | 16.0 | 16.0 | 16.0 |
|  | Little extent | 61 | 24.4 | 24.4 | 40.4 |
|  | Moderate extent | 53 | 21.2 | 21.2 | 61.6 |
| Valid | Great extent | 54 | 21.6 | 21.6 | 83.2 |
|  | Very great extent | 42 | 16.8 | 16.8 | 100.0 |
|  | Total | 250 | 100.0 | 100.0 |  |

**Door-to-Door delivery**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|  | Very little extent | 42 | 16.8 | 16.8 | 16.8 |
|  | Little extent | 49 | 19.6 | 19.6 | 36.4 |
|  | Moderate extent | 58 | 23.2 | 23.2 | 59.6 |
| Valid | Great extent | 54 | 21.6 | 21.6 | 81.2 |
|  | Very great extent | 47 | 18.8 | 18.8 | 100.0 |
|  | Total | 250 | 100.0 | 100.0 |  |

**Technical advice**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|  | Very little extent | 56 | 22.4 | 22.4 | 22.4 |
|  | Little extent | 33 | 13.2 | 13.2 | 35.6 |
|  | Moderate extent | 68 | 27.2 | 27.2 | 62.8 |
| Valid | Great extent | 54 | 21.6 | 21.6 | 84.4 |
|  | Very great extent | 39 | 15.6 | 15.6 | 100.0 |
|  | Total | 250 | 100.0 | 100.0 |  |

**Prompt order handling**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|  | Very little extent | 46 | 18.4 | 18.4 | 18.4 |
|  | Little extent | 47 | 18.8 | 18.8 | 37.2 |
|  | Moderate extent | 68 | 27.2 | 27.2 | 64.4 |
| Valid | Great extent | 52 | 20.8 | 20.8 | 85.2 |
|  | Very great extent | 37 | 14.8 | 14.8 | 100.0 |
|  | Total | 250 | 100.0 | 100.0 |  |

**Location of establishment**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|  | Very little extent | 43 | 17.2 | 17.2 | 17.2 |
|  | Little extent | 44 | 17.6 | 17.6 | 34.8 |
|  | Moderate extent | 66 | 26.4 | 26.4 | 61.2 |
| Valid | Great extent | 49 | 19.6 | 19.6 | 80.8 |
|  | Very great extent | 48 | 19.2 | 19.2 | 100.0 |
|  | Total | 250 | 100.0 | 100.0 |  |

**Storage facilities**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|  | Very little extent | 56 | 22.4 | 22.4 | 22.4 |
|  | Little extent | 42 | 16.8 | 16.8 | 39.2 |
|  | Moderate extent | 50 | 20.0 | 20.0 | 59.2 |
| Valid | Great extent | 60 | 24.0 | 24.0 | 83.2 |
|  | Very great extent | 42 | 16.8 | 16.8 | 100.0 |
|  | Total | 250 | 100.0 | 100.0 |  |

**Research question four**

**Descriptive Statistics**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | N | Mean | Std. Deviation |
| Internet adversities | 250 | 3.26 | 1.71 |
| Print advertising | 250 | 3.32 | 1.28 |
| Radio advertising | 250 | 3.49 | 1.31 |
| Television advertising | 250 | 3.50 | 1.35 |
| Mobile advertising | 250 | 3.28 | 1.33 |
| Cash refund | 250 | 2.80 | 1.27 |
| Lucky draws | 250 | 2.90 | 1.41 |
| Price off deals | 250 | 2.68 | 1.26 |
| Point of purchase display | 250 | 3.00 | 1.35 |
| Interactive relationships | 250 | 3.28 | 1.42 |
| Press release | 250 | 3.06 | 1.41 |
| Press conference | 250 | 2.78 | 1.32 |
| Community notices | 250 | 3.10 | 1.43 |
| Billboards | 250 | 3.10 | 1.38 |
| Sponsored publications | 250 | 2.98 | 1.37 |
| Sponsored programmes | 250 | 2.92 | 1.32 |
| Special events | 250 | 2.97 | 1.28 |
| News letters | 250 | 2.80 | 1.35 |
| Community development services | 250 | 2.80 | 1.34 |
| Customer care services | 250 | 3.06 | 1.35 |
| Social interaction programmes | 250 | 3.02 | 1.43 |
| Social networks | 250 | 2.91 | 1.57 |
| Valid N (listwise) | 250 |  |  |

**Frequency Table**

**Internet adversities**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|  | Very little extent | 76 | 30.4 | 30.4 | 30.4 |
|  | Little extent | 14 | 5.6 | 5.6 | 36.0 |
|  | Moderate extent | 29 | 11.6 | 11.6 | 47.6 |
| Valid | Great extent | 31 | 12.4 | 12.4 | 60.0 |
|  | Very great extent | 100 | 40.0 | 40.0 | 100.0 |
|  | Total | 250 | 100.0 | 100.0 |  |

**Print advertising**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|  | Very little extent | 28 | 11.2 | 11.2 | 11.2 |
|  | Little extent | 44 | 17.6 | 17.6 | 28.8 |
|  | Moderate extent | 47 | 18.8 | 18.8 | 47.6 |
| Valid | Great extent | 82 | 32.8 | 32.8 | 80.4 |
|  | Very great extent | 49 | 19.6 | 19.6 | 100.0 |
|  | Total | 250 | 100.0 | 100.0 |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Radio advertising** | | | | | |
|  | | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|  | Very little extent | 30 | 12.0 | 12.0 | 12.0 |
|  | Little extent | 21 | 8.4 | 8.4 | 20.4 |
|  | Moderate extent | 65 | 26.0 | 26.0 | 46.4 |
| Valid | Great extent | 64 | 25.6 | 25.6 | 72.0 |
|  | Very great extent | 70 | 28.0 | 28.0 | 100.0 |
|  | Total | 250 | 100.0 | 100.0 |  |

**Television advertising**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|  | Very little extent | 26 | 10.4 | 10.4 | 10.4 |
|  | Little extent | 39 | 15.6 | 15.6 | 26.0 |
|  | Moderate extent | 47 | 18.8 | 18.8 | 44.8 |
| Valid | Great extent | 60 | 24.0 | 24.0 | 68.8 |
|  | Very great extent | 78 | 31.2 | 31.2 | 100.0 |
|  | Total | 250 | 100.0 | 100.0 |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Mobile advertising** | | | | | |
|  | | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|  | Very little extent | 31 | 12.4 | 12.4 | 12.4 |
|  | Little extent | 42 | 16.8 | 16.8 | 29.2 |
|  | Moderate extent | 64 | 25.6 | 25.6 | 54.8 |
| Valid | Great extent | 52 | 20.8 | 20.8 | 75.6 |
|  | Very great extent | 61 | 24.4 | 24.4 | 100.0 |
|  | Total | 250 | 100.0 | 100.0 |  |

**Cash refund**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|  | Very little extent | 51 | 20.4 | 20.4 | 20.4 |
|  | Little extent | 50 | 20.0 | 20.0 | 40.4 |
|  | Moderate extent | 74 | 29.6 | 29.6 | 70.0 |
| Valid | Great extent | 48 | 19.2 | 19.2 | 89.2 |
|  | Very great extent | 27 | 10.8 | 10.8 | 100.0 |
|  | Total | 250 | 100.0 | 100.0 |  |

**Lucky draws**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|  | Very little extent | 62 | 24.8 | 24.8 | 24.8 |
|  | Little extent | 37 | 14.8 | 14.8 | 39.6 |
|  | Moderate extent | 56 | 22.4 | 22.4 | 62.0 |
| Valid | Great extent | 55 | 22.0 | 22.0 | 84.0 |
|  | Very great extent | 40 | 16.0 | 16.0 | 100.0 |
|  | Total | 250 | 100.0 | 100.0 |  |

**Price off deals**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|  | Very little extent | 58 | 23.2 | 23.2 | 23.2 |
|  | Little extent | 55 | 22.0 | 22.0 | 45.2 |
|  | Moderate extent | 67 | 26.8 | 26.8 | 72.0 |
| Valid | Great extent | 48 | 19.2 | 19.2 | 91.2 |
|  | Very great extent | 22 | 8.8 | 8.8 | 100.0 |
|  | Total | 250 | 100.0 | 100.0 |  |

**Point of purchase display**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|  | Very little extent | 52 | 20.8 | 20.8 | 20.8 |
|  | Little extent | 34 | 13.6 | 13.6 | 34.4 |
|  | Moderate extent | 62 | 24.8 | 24.8 | 59.2 |
| Valid | Great extent | 66 | 26.4 | 26.4 | 85.6 |
|  | Very great extent | 36 | 14.4 | 14.4 | 100.0 |
|  | Total | 250 | 100.0 | 100.0 |  |

**Interactive relationships**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|  | Very little extent | 42 | 16.8 | 16.8 | 16.8 |
|  | Little extent | 35 | 14.0 | 14.0 | 30.8 |
|  | Moderate extent | 48 | 19.2 | 19.2 | 50.0 |
| Valid | Great extent | 61 | 24.4 | 24.4 | 74.4 |
|  | Very great extent | 64 | 25.6 | 25.6 | 100.0 |
|  | Total | 250 | 100.0 | 100.0 |  |

**Press release**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|  | Very little extent | 53 | 21.2 | 21.2 | 21.2 |
|  | Little extent | 32 | 12.8 | 12.8 | 34.0 |
|  | Moderate extent | 64 | 25.6 | 25.6 | 59.6 |
| Valid | Great extent | 50 | 20.0 | 20.0 | 79.6 |
|  | Very great extent | 51 | 20.4 | 20.4 | 100.0 |
|  | Total | 250 | 100.0 | 100.0 |  |

**Press conference**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|  | Very little extent | 57 | 22.8 | 22.8 | 22.8 |
|  | Little extent | 50 | 20.0 | 20.0 | 42.8 |
|  | Moderate extent | 64 | 25.6 | 25.6 | 68.4 |
| Valid | Great extent | 49 | 19.6 | 19.6 | 88.0 |
|  | Very great extent | 30 | 12.0 | 12.0 | 100.0 |
|  | Total | 250 | 100.0 | 100.0 |  |

**Community notices**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|  | Very little extent | 49 | 19.6 | 19.6 | 19.6 |
|  | Little extent | 41 | 16.4 | 16.4 | 36.0 |
|  | Moderate extent | 51 | 20.4 | 20.4 | 56.4 |
| Valid | Great extent | 53 | 21.2 | 21.2 | 77.6 |
|  | Very great extent | 56 | 22.4 | 22.4 | 100.0 |
|  | Total | 250 | 100.0 | 100.0 |  |

**Billboards**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|  | Very little extent | 46 | 18.4 | 18.4 | 18.4 |
|  | Little extent | 35 | 14.0 | 14.0 | 32.4 |
|  | Moderate extent | 67 | 26.8 | 26.8 | 59.2 |
| Valid | Great extent | 51 | 20.4 | 20.4 | 79.6 |
|  | Very great extent | 51 | 20.4 | 20.4 | 100.0 |
|  | Total | 250 | 100.0 | 100.0 |  |

**Sponsored publications**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|  | Very little extent | 51 | 20.4 | 20.4 | 20.4 |
|  | Little extent | 42 | 16.8 | 16.8 | 37.2 |
|  | Moderate extent | 59 | 23.6 | 23.6 | 60.8 |
| Valid | Great extent | 57 | 22.8 | 22.8 | 83.6 |
|  | Very great extent | 41 | 16.4 | 16.4 | 100.0 |
|  | Total | 250 | 100.0 | 100.0 |  |

**Sponsored programmes**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|  | Very little extent | 50 | 20.0 | 20.0 | 20.0 |
|  | Little extent | 44 | 17.6 | 17.6 | 37.6 |
|  | Moderate extent | 66 | 26.4 | 26.4 | 64.0 |
| Valid | Great extent | 56 | 22.4 | 22.4 | 86.4 |
|  | Very great extent | 34 | 13.6 | 13.6 | 100.0 |
|  | Total | 250 | 100.0 | 100.0 |  |

**Special events**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|  | Very little extent | 41 | 16.4 | 16.4 | 16.4 |
|  | Little extent | 54 | 21.6 | 21.6 | 38.0 |
|  | Moderate extent | 57 | 22.8 | 22.8 | 60.8 |
| Valid | Great extent | 68 | 27.2 | 27.2 | 88.0 |
|  | Very great extent | 30 | 12.0 | 12.0 | 100.0 |
|  | Total | 250 | 100.0 | 100.0 |  |

**News letters**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|  | Very little extent | 57 | 22.8 | 22.8 | 22.8 |
|  | Little extent | 52 | 20.8 | 20.8 | 43.6 |
|  | Moderate extent | 60 | 24.0 | 24.0 | 67.6 |
| Valid | Great extent | 46 | 18.4 | 18.4 | 86.0 |
|  | Very great extent | 35 | 14.0 | 14.0 | 100.0 |
|  | Total | 250 | 100.0 | 100.0 |  |

**Community development services**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|  | Very little extent | 55 | 22.0 | 22.0 | 22.0 |
|  | Little extent | 53 | 21.2 | 21.2 | 43.2 |
|  | Moderate extent | 63 | 25.2 | 25.2 | 68.4 |
| Valid | Great extent | 44 | 17.6 | 17.6 | 86.0 |
|  | Very great extent | 35 | 14.0 | 14.0 | 100.0 |
|  | Total | 250 | 100.0 | 100.0 |  |

**Customer care services**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|  | Very little extent | 46 | 18.4 | 18.4 | 18.4 |
|  | Little extent | 42 | 16.8 | 16.8 | 35.2 |
|  | Moderate extent | 53 | 21.2 | 21.2 | 56.4 |
| Valid | Great extent | 69 | 27.6 | 27.6 | 84.0 |
|  | Very great extent | 40 | 16.0 | 16.0 | 100.0 |
|  | Total | 250 | 100.0 | 100.0 |  |

**Social interaction programmes**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|  | Very little extent | 56 | 22.4 | 22.4 | 22.4 |
|  | Little extent | 34 | 13.6 | 13.6 | 36.0 |
|  | Moderate extent | 59 | 23.6 | 23.6 | 59.6 |
| Valid | Great extent | 52 | 20.8 | 20.8 | 80.4 |
|  | Very great extent | 49 | 19.6 | 19.6 | 100.0 |
|  | Total | 250 | 100.0 | 100.0 |  |

**Social networks**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|  | Very little extent | 71 | 28.4 | 28.4 | 28.4 |
|  | Little extent | 43 | 17.2 | 17.2 | 45.6 |
|  | Moderate extent | 37 | 14.8 | 14.8 | 60.4 |
| Valid | Great extent | 35 | 14.0 | 14.0 | 74.4 |
|  | Very great extent | 64 | 25.6 | 25.6 | 100.0 |
|  | Total | 250 | 100.0 | 100.0 |  |

**T-Test**

**Group Statistics**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Sex | N | Mean | Std. Deviation | Std. Error Mean |
| Product quality | Male | 80 | 4.03 | 1.25 | .14004 |
| Female | 170 | 3.94 | 1.24 | .09502 |
| Product size | Male | 80 | 2.90 | .89 | .10000 |
| Female | 170 | 3.24 | 1.06 | .08156 |
| Product packaging | Male | 80 | 3.04 | 1.32 | .14717 |
| Female | 170 | 3.25 | 1.24 | .09479 |
| Product brand name | Male | 80 | 2.79 | 1.33 | .14851 |
| Female | 170 | 3.24 | 1.31 | .10057 |
| Product brand label | Male | 80 | 2.66 | 1.32 | .14771 |
| Female | 170 | 3.20 | 1.27 | .09752 |
| Product physical  appearance | Male | 80 | 2.83 | 1.41 | .15789 |
| Female | 170 | 3.02 | 1.35 | .10336 |
| Product warranty | Male | 80 | 2.70 | 1.48 | .16535 |
| Female | 170 | 2.88 | 1.38 | .10560 |
| Product usage instruction | Male | 80 | 2.75 | 1.35 | .15147 |
| Female | 170 | 3.18 | 1.35 | .10343 |
| Product expiry date | Male | 80 | 2.80 | 1.52 | .17007 |
| Female | 170 | 2.96 | 1.15 | .08826 |
| Availability of SON  certification | Male | 80 | 2.59 | 1.39 | .15579 |
| Female | 170 | 3.09 | 1.23 | .09397 |
| Product design | Male | 80 | 2.38 | 1.24 | .13822 |
| Female | 170 | 2.99 | 1.31 | .10029 |
| NAFDAC registration number | Male | 80 | 2.41 | 1.38 | .15477 |
| Female | 170 | 3.18 | 1.60 | .12281 |

**Independent Samples Test**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | | Levene's Test for Equality of Variances | | t-test for Equality of Means | | | | | | |
| F | Sig. | t | df | Sig. (2-  tailed) | Mean Difference | Std. Error Difference | 95% Confidence Interval of the Difference | |
| Lower | Upper |
|  | Equal variances assumed | .152 | .697 | .50 | 248 | .619 | .08382 | .16857 | -.24819 | .41583 |
| Product quality | Equal variances not  assumed |  |  | .50 | 153.297 | .621 | .08382 | .16924 | -.25052 | .41816 |
|  | Equal variances  assumed | 8.098 | .005 | -2.48 | 248 | .014 | -.34118 | .13730 | -.61159 | -.07076 |
| Product size | Equal variances not  assumed |  |  | -2.64 | 181.513 | .009 | -.34118 | .12904 | -.59579 | -.08656 |
|  | Equal variances  assumed | .631 | .428 | -1.26 | 248 | .209 | -.21544 | .17111 | -.55246 | .12158 |
| Product packaging | Equal variances not  assumed |  |  | -1.23 | 146.360 | .220 | -.21544 | .17505 | -.56140 | .13052 |
|  | Equal  variances assumed | .040 | .842 | -2.51 | 248 | .013 | -.44779 | .17852 | -.79941 | -.09618 |
| Product brand  name | Equal variances not  assumed |  |  | -2.50 | 153.029 | .014 | -.44779 | .17936 | -.80213 | -.09346 |
|  | Equal variances  assumed | .401 | .527 | -3.08 | 248 | .002 | -.53750 | .17456 | -.88131 | -.19369 |
| Product brand label | Equal variances not  assumed |  |  | -3.04 | 149.588 | .003 | -.53750 | .17699 | -.88723 | -.18777 |

Product physical appearance

Product warranty

Product usage instruction

Product expiry date

Availability of SON certification

Product design

Equal variances assumed Equal variances not assumed Equal variances assumed Equal variances not assumed Equal variances assumed Equal variances not assumed Equal variances assumed Equal variances not assumed Equal variances assumed Equal variances not assumed Equal variances assumed Equal variances not assumed

2.018

1.142

.007

23.05
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.000

.016

.749

-1.04

-1.02

-.92

-.90

-2.36

-2.36

-.95

-.86

-2.88

-2.75

-3.55

-3.63

248

148.477

248

145.290

248

154.178

248

123.106

248

138.376

248

162.966

.300

.309

.357

.370

.019

.020

.344

.392

.004

.007

.000

.000

-.19265

-.19265

-.17647

-.17647
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-.43235

-.16471

-.16471

-.50074

-.50074

-.61912

-.61912

.18555

.18871
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.19620

.18311

.18341

.17360

.19161

.17370
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.17427

.17078

-.55811

-.56556

-.55305

-.56424

-.79300
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|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Equal variances  assumed | 7.638 | .006 | -3.70 | 248 | .000 | -.76985 | .20819 | -1.17989 | -.35981 |
| NAFDAC  registration number | Equal variances not  assumed | -3.90 | 177.007 | .000 | -.76985 | .19758 | -1.15976 | -.37994 |

**T-Test**

**Group Statistics**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Sex | N | Mean | Std. Deviation | Std. Error Mean |
|  | Male | 80  170  80  170  80  170  80  170  80  170  80  170  80  170  80  170  80  170  80  170  80  170 | 3.45  3.61  3.01  3.51  2.59  3.10  2.75  2.98  2.58  3.05  2.71  3.21  2.48  3.19  2.40  3.04  2.43  2.70  2.39  2.97  2.38  3.06 | 1.36  1.21  1.23  1.18  1.08  1.12  1.19  1.20  1.27  1.37  1.25  1.34  1.22  1.15  1.20  1.27  1.11  1.19  1.14  1.17  1.37  1.47 | .15189  .09260  .13721  .09034  .12025  .08576  .13253  .09196  .14206  .10481  .14029  .10259  .13661  .08802  .1338  .0971  .12424  .09096  .12765  .09003  .15342  .11247 |
| Discount structure |  |
|  | Female |
|  | Male |
| Price list |  |
|  | Female |
|  | Male |
| Rebates |  |
|  | Female |
|  | Male |
| Credit facilities |  |
|  | Female |
|  | Male |
| Low pricing |  |
|  | Female |
|  | Male |
| Price quotations |  |
|  | Female |
|  | Male |
| Price bundling |  |
|  | Female |
|  | Male |
| Coupons |  |
|  | Female |
|  | Male |
| Odd-even- pricing |  |
|  | Female |
|  | Male |
| Multiple unit pricings |  |
|  | Female |
|  | Male |
| Leader pricing |  |
|  | Female |

**Independent Samples Test**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Levene's Test for Equality of Variances | | t-test for Equality of Means | | | | | |
| F | Sig. | t | df | Sig. (2- | Mean Difference | Std. Error Difference | 95% Confidence Interval of the Difference |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | |  |  |  |  | tailed) |  |  | Lower | Upper |
|  | Equal variances  assumed | 2.709 | .101 | -.95 | 248 | .344 | -.16176 | .17050 | -.49757 | .17404 |
| Discount  structure | Equal variances not  assumed |  |  | -.91 | 139.630 | .365 | -.16176 | .17789 | -.51347 | .18994 |
|  | Equal variances  assumed | .027 | .869 | -3.08 | 248 | .002 | -.49926 | .16186 | -.81807 | -.18046 |
| Price list | Equal variances not  assumed |  |  | -3.04 | 149.228 | .003 | -.49926 | .16428 | -.82388 | -.17465 |
|  | Equal  variances assumed | .021 | .884 | -3.42 | 248 | .001 | -.51250 | .14979 | -.80752 | -.21748 |
| Rebates | Equal variances not  assumed |  |  | -3.47 | 160.402 | .001 | -.51250 | .14770 | -.80418 | -.22082 |
|  | Equal  variances assumed | .516 | .473 | -1.43 | 248 | .153 | -.23235 | .16197 | -.55137 | .08667 |
| Credit  facilities | Equal variances not  assumed |  |  | -1.44 | 156.434 | .152 | -.23235 | .16131 | -.55097 | .08627 |
|  | Equal variances  assumed | .291 | .590 | -2.60 | 248 | .010 | -.47206 | .18124 | -.82903 | -.11509 |
| Low pricing | Equal variances not  assumed |  |  | -2.67 | 165.492 | .008 | -.47206 | .17654 | -.82063 | -.12349 |
|  | Equal  variances assumed | 1.083 | .299 | -2.81 | 248 | .005 | -.49926 | .17786 | -.84957 | -.14896 |
| Price  quotations | Equal variances not  assumed |  |  | -2.87 | 164.140 | .005 | -.49926 | .17380 | -.84244 | -.15609 |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Equal variances  assumed | 1.522 | .218 | -4.53 | 248 | .000 | -.71912 | .15888 | - 1.03204 | -.40620 |
| Price  bundling | Equal variances not  assumed |  |  | -4.42 | 146.412 | .000 | -.71912 | .16251 | - 1.04029 | -.39794 |
|  | Equal  variances assumed | .239 | .625 | -3.80 | 248 | .000 | -.6412 | .1687 | -.9734 | -.3089 |
| Coupons | Equal variances not  assumed |  |  | -3.88 | 162.907 | .000 | -.6412 | .1653 | -.9676 | -.3147 |
|  | Equal variances  assumed | .933 | .335 | -1.74 | 248 | .082 | -.27500 | .15764 | -.58548 | .03548 |
| Odd-even-  pricing | Equal variances not  assumed |  |  | -1.79 | 164.320 | .076 | -.27500 | .15398 | -.57903 | .02903 |
|  | Equal variances  assumed | .349 | .555 | -3.70 | 248 | .000 | -.58309 | .15778 | -.89384 | -.27234 |
| Multiple unit  pricings | Equal variances not  assumed |  |  | -3.73 | 158.768 | .000 | -.58309 | .15621 | -.89160 | -.27458 |
|  | Equal  variances assumed | .553 | .458 | -3.51 | 248 | .001 | -.68382 | .19484 | - 1.06758 | -.30007 |
| Leader  pricing | Equal variances not  assumed |  |  | -3.59 | 164.519 | .000 | -.68382 | .19023 | - 1.05942 | -.30823 |

**T-Test**

**Group Statistics**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Sex | N | Mean | Std. Deviation | Std. Error Mean |
| Delivery by road | Male | 80 | 3.89 | 1.31 | .14669 |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Female | 170 | 4.14 | 1.08 | .08273 |
| Delivery by air | Male | 80 | 2.36 | 1.21 | .13576 |
|  | Female | 170 | 2.78 | 1.43 | .10989 |
| Delivery by water | Male | 80 | 1.98 | 1.12 | .12576 |
|  | Female | 170 | 2.52 | 1.34 | .10293 |
| Long distance delivery | Male | 80 | 2.91 | 1.45 | .16226 |
|  | Female | 170 | 3.11 | 1.20 | .09217 |
| After sales service | Male | 80 | 2.60 | 1.35 | .15053 |
|  | Female | 170 | 3.17 | 1.29 | .09908 |
| Door-to-Door delivery | Male | 80 | 2.89 | 1.48 | .16496 |
|  | Female | 170 | 3.14 | 1.29 | .09918 |
| Technical advice | Male | 80 | 2.58 | 1.36 | .15176 |
|  | Female | 170 | 3.12 | 1.34 | .10293 |
| Prompt order handling | Male | 80 | 2.59 | 1.31 | .14636 |
|  | Female | 170 | 3.12 | 1.29 | .09866 |
| Location of establishment | Male | 80 | 2.54 | 1.33 | .14878 |
|  | Female | 170 | 3.31 | 1.30 | .09944 |
| Storage facilities | Male | 80 | 2.54 | 1.36 | .15193 |
| Female | 170 | 3.16 | 1.39 | .10664 |

**Independent Samples Test**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | | Levene's Test for Equality of  Variances | | t-test for Equality of Means | | | | | | |
| F | Sig. | t | df | Sig. (2-  tailed) | Mean Difference | Std. Error Difference | 95% Confidence Interval of the Difference | |
| Lower | Upper |
|  | Equal variances  assumed | 2.957 | .087 | -1.62 | 248 | .107 | -.25368 | .15701 | -.56293 | .05557 |
| Delivery by  road | Equal variances not  assumed |  |  | -1.51 | 131.046 | .134 | -.25368 | .16841 | -.58682 | .07947 |
|  | Equal variances  assumed | 5.727 | .017 | -2.27 | 248 | .024 | -.41985 | .18534 | -.78489 | -.05481 |
| Delivery by air | Equal variances not  assumed |  |  | -2.40 | 180.260 | .017 | -.41985 | .17466 | -.76450 | -.07520 |
|  | Equal  variances assumed | 6.427 | .012 | -3.17 | 248 | .002 | -.54853 | .17312 | -.88951 | -.20755 |
| Delivery by  water | Equal variances not  assumed |  |  | -3.38 | 182.105 | .001 | -.54853 | .16251 | -.86918 | -.22788 |
|  | Equal  variances assumed | 6.568 | .011 | -1.11 | 248 | .269 | -.19338 | .17443 | -.53694 | .15017 |
| Long distance  delivery | Equal variances not  assumed |  |  | -1.04 | 131.800 | .302 | -.19338 | .18661 | -.56252 | .17576 |
|  | Equal variances  assumed | .942 | .333 | -3.21 | 248 | .001 | -.57059 | .17754 | -.92027 | -.22091 |
| After sales  service | Equal variances not  assumed |  |  | -3.17 | 149.196 | .002 | -.57059 | .18021 | -.92668 | -.21450 |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Equal variances  assumed | 5.107 | .025 | -1.38 | 248 | .168 | -.25368 | .18356 | -.61522 | .10787 |
| Door-to-Door  delivery | Equal variances not  assumed |  |  | -1.32 | 138.006 | .190 | -.25368 | .19248 | -.63428 | .12692 |
|  | Equal  variances assumed | 1.787 | .183 | -3.00 | 248 | .003 | -.54853 | .18262 | -.90822 | -.18884 |
| Technical  advice | Equal variances not  assumed |  |  | -2.99 | 153.249 | .003 | -.54853 | .18337 | -.91079 | -.18627 |
|  | Equal variances  assumed | .190 | .663 | -3.02 | 248 | .003 | -.53015 | .17539 | -.87560 | -.18469 |
| Prompt order  handling | Equal variances not  assumed |  |  | -3.00 | 152.394 | .003 | -.53015 | .17651 | -.87887 | -.18143 |
|  | Equal variances  assumed | .444 | .506 | -4.33 | 248 | .000 | -.76838 | .17728 | -1.11754 | -.41923 |
| Location of  establishment | Equal variances not  assumed |  |  | -4.29 | 151.243 | .000 | -.76838 | .17895 | -1.12194 | -.41482 |
|  | Equal  variances assumed | .023 | .878 | -3.32 | 248 | .001 | -.62132 | .18716 | -.98996 | -.25269 |
| Storage  facilities | Equal variances not  assumed |  |  | -3.35 | 158.076 | .001 | -.62132 | .18562 | -.98794 | -.25471 |

**T-Test**

**Group Statistics**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Sex | N | Mean | Std. Deviation | Std. Error Mean |
| Internet adversities | Male | 80 | 2.78 | 1.69 | .18908 |
| Female | 170 | 3.49 | 1.68 | .12905 |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Print advertising Radio advertising Television advertising Mobile advertising Cash refund  Lucky draws Price off deals  Point of purchase display  Interactive relationships  Press release  Press conference  Community notices  Billboards  Sponsored publications  Sponsored programmes  Special events  News letters  Community development services  Customer care services  Social interaction programmes  Social networks | Male Female Male Female Male Female Male Female Male Female Male Female  Male Female Male Female Male Female Male Female Male Female Male Female Male Female Male Female Male Female Male Female Male Female Male Female Male Female Male Female Male  Female | 80 | 2.98 | 1.24 | .13891 |
| 170 | 3.48 | 1.27 | .09738 |
| 80 | 3.08 | 1.42 | .15889 |
| 170 | 3.69 | 1.20 | .09225 |
| 80 | 3.18 | 1.40 | .15688 |
| 170 | 3.65 | 1.30 | .09952 |
| 80 | 2.95 | 1.43 | .16000 |
| 170 | 3.44 | 1.26 | .09654 |
| 80 | 2.41 | 1.33 | .14851 |
| 170 | 2.98 | 1.20 | .09196 |
| 80 | 2.69 | 1.35 | .15052 |
| 170 | 2.99 | 1.44 | .11022 |
| 80 | 2.33 | 1.27 | .14206 |
| 170 | 2.85 | 1.23 | .09427 |
| 80 | 2.69 | 1.40 | .15670 |
| 170 | 3.15 | 1.30 | .09966 |
| 80 | 2.73 | 1.58 | .17698 |
| 170 | 3.54 | 1.26 | .09626 |
| 80 | 2.65 | 1.30 | .14572 |
| 170 | 3.25 | 1.43 | .10936 |
| 80 | 2.50 | 1.27 | .14231 |
| 170 | 2.91 | 1.33 | .10179 |
| 80 | 2.75 | 1.34 | .14937 |
| 170 | 3.27 | 1.45 | .11125 |
| 80 | 2.91 | 1.42 | .15930 |
| 170 | 3.19 | 1.35 | .10330 |
| 80 | 2.68 | 1.28 | .14317 |
| 170 | 3.12 | 1.39 | .10659 |
| 80 | 2.41 | 1.17 | .13035 |
| 170 | 3.16 | 1.33 | .10162 |
| 80 | 2.60 | 1.20 | .13383 |
| 170 | 3.14 | 1.28 | .09812 |
| 80 | 2.46 | 1.29 | .14446 |
| 170 | 2.96 | 1.36 | .10399 |
| 80 | 2.49 | 1.21 | .13547 |
| 170 | 2.95 | 1.38 | .10548 |
| 80 | 2.66 | 1.39 | .15503 |
| 170 | 3.25 | 1.30 | .09936 |
| 80 | 2.54 | 1.37 | .15297 |
| 170 | 3.24 | 1.40 | .10735 |
| 80 | 2.44 | 1.45 | .16191 |
| 170 | 3.14 | 1.58 | .12147 |

**Independent Samples Test**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | | Levene's Test for Equality of Variances | | t-test for Equality of Means | | | | | | |
| F | Sig. | t | df | Sig. (2-  tailed) | Mean Difference | Std. Error Difference | 95% Confidence Interval of the Difference | |
| Lower | Upper |
| Internet adversities | Equal variances assumed | .103 | .748 | -3.12 | 248 | .002 | -.71324 | .22850 | -1.16329 | -.26318 |
| Equal  variances not assumed |  |  | -3.12 | 154.112 | .002 | -.71324 | .22892 | -1.16547 | -.26100 |
|  | Equal  variances assumed | .637 | .425 | -2.97 | 248 | .003 | -.50735 | .17098 | -.84411 | -.17060 |
| Print advertising | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Equal  variances not assumed |  |  | -2.99 | 157.902 | .003 | -.50735 | .16964 | -.84242 | -.17229 |
|  | Equal  variances assumed | 2.593 | .109 | -3.54 | 248 | .000 | -.61324 | .17305 | -.95408 | -.27239 |
| Radio advertising | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Equal  variances not assumed |  |  | -3.34 | 134.110 | .001 | -.61324 | .18372 | -.97661 | -.24986 |
| Television advertising | Equal  variances assumed | 2.710 | .101 | -2.65 | 248 | .009 | -.47794 | .18061 | -.83366 | -.12222 |
| Equal  variances not assumed |  |  | -2.57 | 144.434 | .011 | -.47794 | .18578 | -.84515 | -.11073 |
| Mobile advertising | Equal  variances assumed | 1.135 | .288 | -2.72 | 248 | .007 | -.48529 | .17844 | -.83675 | -.13384 |
| Equal  variances not assumed |  |  | -2.60 | 138.419 | .010 | -.48529 | .18687 | -.85479 | -.11580 |
|  | Equal  variances assumed | 4.498 | .035 | -3.39 | 248 | .001 | -.56985 | .16834 | -.90142 | -.23829 |
| Cash refund |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Equal  variances not assumed |  |  | -3.26 | 141.471 | .001 | -.56985 | .17467 | -.91516 | -.22454 |

Lucky draws

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Equal |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| variances | .290 | .591 | -1.61 | 248 | .110 | -.30662 | .19100 | -.68281 | .06957 |
| assumed |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Equal |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| variances |  |  | -1.64 | 164.340 | .102 | -.30662 | .18656 | -.67498 | .06174 |
| not assumed |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Equal |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| variances | .878 | .350 | -3.13 | 248 | .002 | -.52794 | .16846 | -.85974 | -.19614 |
| assumed |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Equal |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| variances |  |  | -3.10 | 150.272 | .002 | -.52794 | .17050 | -.86482 | -.19106 |
| not assumed |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Equal |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| variances | 1.613 | .205 | -2.54 | 248 | .012 | -.45956 | .18070 | -.81546 | -.10366 |
| assumed |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Equal |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| variances |  |  | -2.47 | 144.757 | .014 | -.45956 | .18570 | -.82660 | -.09252 |
| not assumed |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Equal |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| variances | 17.464 | .000 | -4.40 | 248 | .000 | -.81618 | .18549 | -1.18150 | -.45085 |
| assumed |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Equal |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| variances |  |  | -4.05 | 127.443 | .000 | -.81618 | .20146 | -1.21482 | -.41753 |
| not assumed |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Equal |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| variances | 1.147 | .285 | -3.17 | 248 | .002 | -.59706 | .18820 | -.96772 | -.22639 |
| assumed |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Equal |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| variances |  |  | -3.28 | 168.125 | .001 | -.59706 | .18219 | -.95674 | -.23738 |
| not assumed |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Equal |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| variances | .000 | .991 | -2.32 | 248 | .021 | -.41176 | .17763 | -.76162 | -.06191 |
| assumed |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Equal |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| variances |  |  | -2.35 | 160.830 | .020 | -.41176 | .17497 | -.75730 | -.06623 |
| not assumed |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Equal |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| variances | 2.188 | .140 | -2.71 | 248 | .007 | -.52059 | .19185 | -.89845 | -.14273 |
| assumed |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Equal |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| variances |  |  | -2.80 | 166.941 | .006 | -.52059 | .18624 | -.88828 | -.15290 |
| not assumed |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Price off deals

Point of purchase display

Interactive relationships

Press release

Press conference

Community notices

Billboards

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Equal |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| variances | .070 | .792 | -1.51 | 248 | .131 | -.28162 | .18605 | -.64805 | .08482 |
| assumed |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Equal |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| variances |  |  | -1.48 | 147.239 | .140 | -.28162 | .18987 | -.65683 | .09360 |
| not assumed |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Equal |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| variances | 1.271 | .261 | -2.44 | 248 | .015 | -.44853 | .18384 | -.81061 | -.08645 |
| assumed |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Equal |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| variances |  |  | -2.51 | 166.876 | .013 | -.44853 | .17849 | -.80092 | -.09613 |
| not assumed |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Equal |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| variances | 1.636 | .202 | -4.31 | 248 | .000 | -.74632 | .17307 | -1.08720 | -.40545 |
| assumed |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Equal |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| variances |  |  | -4.52 | 174.144 | .000 | -.74632 | .16529 | -1.07254 | -.42010 |
| not assumed |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Equal |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| variances | .005 | .942 | -3.18 | 248 | .002 | -.54118 | .16998 | -.87597 | -.20638 |
| assumed |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Equal |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| variances |  |  | -3.26 | 164.534 | .001 | -.54118 | .16595 | -.86884 | -.21351 |
| not assumed |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Equal |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| variances | .366 | .546 | -2.74 | 248 | .007 | -.49632 | .18113 | -.85306 | -.13958 |
| assumed |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Equal |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| variances |  |  | -2.79 | 161.788 | .006 | -.49632 | .17800 | -.84782 | -.14483 |
| not assumed |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Equal |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| variances | 1.386 | .240 | -2.59 | 248 | .010 | -.46544 | .17969 | -.81935 | -.11153 |
| assumed |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Equal |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| variances |  |  | -2.71 | 173.931 | .007 | -.46544 | .17169 | -.80431 | -.12658 |
| not assumed |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Equal |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| variances | 1.406 | .237 | -3.25 | 248 | .001 | -.58456 | .17967 | -.93843 | -.23069 |
| assumed |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Equal |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| variances |  |  | -3.17 | 145.737 | .002 | -.58456 | .18413 | -.94847 | -.22064 |
| not assumed |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Sponsored publications

Sponsored programmes

Special events

News letters

Community development services

Customer care services

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Social interaction programmes | Equal variances  assumed | .032 | .857 | -3.73 | 248 | .000 | -.70368 | .18843 | -1.07480 | -.33256 |
| Equal variances  not assumed |  |  | -3.77 | 158.059 | .000 | -.70368 | .18688 | -1.07278 | -.33457 |
|  | Equal variances  assumed | 3.008 | .084 | -3.34 | 248 | .001 | -.69779 | .20905 | -1.10953 | -.28606 |
| Social networks |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Equal  variances not assumed |  |  | -3.45 | 168.059 | .001 | -.69779 | .20241 | -1.09739 | -.29820 |

**T-Test**

**Group Statistics**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Years of  Experience | N | Mean | Std. Deviation | Std. Error  Mean |
| Product quality | Inexperienced | 138 | 3.95 | 1.22 | .10353 |
| Experienced | 112 | 3.99 | 1.28 | .12066 |
| Product size | Inexperienced | 138 | 3.12 | 1.04 | .08852 |
| Experienced | 112 | 3.15 | 1.01 | .09509 |
| Product packaging | Inexperienced | 138 | 3.01 | 1.25 | .10638 |
| Experienced | 112 | 3.39 | 1.25 | .11855 |
| Product brand name | Inexperienced | 138 | 3.14 | 1.39 | .11841 |
| Experienced | 112 | 3.03 | 1.26 | .11862 |
| Product brand label | Inexperienced | 138 | 3.01 | 1.31 | .11125 |
| Experienced | 112 | 3.04 | 1.32 | .12453 |
| Product physical  appearance | Inexperienced | 138 | 3.09 | 1.39 | .11793 |
| Experienced | 112 | 2.79 | 1.34 | .12629 |
| Product warranty | Inexperienced | 138 | 2.87 | 1.38 | .11719 |
| Experienced | 112 | 2.76 | 1.45 | .13734 |
| Product usage instruction | Inexperienced | 138 | 2.97 | 1.36 | .11543 |
| Experienced | 112 | 3.13 | 1.37 | .12966 |
| Product expiry date | Inexperienced | 138 | 2.96 | 1.31 | .11166 |
| Experienced | 112 | 2.86 | 1.24 | .11753 |
| Availability of SON  certification | Inexperienced | 138 | 2.86 | 1.33 | .11293 |
| Experienced | 112 | 3.02 | 1.27 | .11965 |
| Product design | Inexperienced | 138 | 2.86 | 1.36 | .11554 |
| Experienced | 112 | 2.71 | 1.26 | .11927 |
| NAFDAC registration number | Inexperienced | 138 | 2.86 | 1.53 | .13018 |
| Experienced | 112 | 3.03 | 1.63 | .15402 |

**Independent Samples Test**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | | Levene's Test for Equality of  Variances | | t-test for Equality of Means | | | | | | |
| F | Sig. | t | df | Sig. (2-  tailed) | Mean Difference | Std. Error Difference | 95% Confidence Interval of the Difference | |
| Lower | Upper |
|  | Equal  variances assumed | .329 | .567 | -.26 | 248 | .792 | -.04180 | .15818 | -.35335 | .26975 |
| Product  quality | Equal variances not  assumed |  |  | -.26 | 232.503 | .793 | -.04180 | .15899 | -.35504 | .27144 |
|  | Equal  variances assumed | .001 | .981 | -.27 | 248 | .784 | -.03584 | .13036 | -.29260 | .22092 |
| Product  size | Equal variances not  assumed |  |  | -.28 | 240.440 | .783 | -.03584 | .12992 | -.29177 | .22008 |
|  | Equal variances  assumed | .620 | .432 | -2.38 | 248 | .018 | -.37836 | .15922 | -.69196 | -.06477 |
| Product  packaging | Equal variances not  assumed |  |  | -2.38 | 237.154 | .018 | -.37836 | .15928 | -.69216 | -.06457 |
| Product brand name | Equal variances  assumed | 3.400 | .066 | .70 | 248 | .486 | .11814 | .16941 | -.21552 | .45180 |
| Equal variances not  assumed |  |  | .70 | 245.186 | .482 | .11814 | .16761 | -.21199 | .44828 |
| Product brand label | Equal  variances assumed | .011 | .915 | -.18 | 248 | .857 | -.03015 | .16683 | -.35874 | .29844 |

Product physical appearance

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Equal variances not  assumed | |  | -.18 | 236.716 | .857 | -.03015 | .16698 | -.35910 | .29880 |
| Equal  variances .047 assumed | | .828 | 1.69 | 248 | .093 | .29231 | .17344 | -.04929 | .63392 |
| Equal  variances not assumed  Equal | |  | 1.69 | 240.701 | .092 | .29231 | .17279 | -.04807 | .63269 |
| variances 1.384 assumed | | .241 | .62 | 248 | .538 | .11064 | .17952 | -.24295 | .46422 |
| Equal  variances not assumed  Equal | |  | .61 | 231.886 | .541 | .11064 | .18054 | -.24508 | .46635 |
| variances .007 assumed | | .935 | -.94 | 248 | .348 | -.16291 | .17338 | -.50439 | .17856 |
| Equal  variances not assumed  Equal | |  | -.94 | 236.371 | .349 | -.16291 | .17359 | -.50490 | .17907 |
| variances .147 assumed | | .702 | .61 | 248 | .543 | .09938 | .16302 | -.22170 | .42045 |
| Equal  variances not assumed  Equal | |  | .61 | 242.048 | .540 | .09938 | .16212 | -.21996 | .41872 |
| variances 4.385 assumed | | .037 | -.98 | 248 | .326 | -.16278 | .16532 | -.48840 | .16283 |
| Equal  variances not | |  | -.99 | 241.546 | .323 | -.16278 | .16452 | -.48687 | .16130 |
| assumed  Equal variances | .616 | .433 | .88 | 248 | .377 | .14803 | .16732 | -.18152 | .47758 |
| assumed |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Product warranty

Product usage instruction

Product expiry date

Availability of SON certification

Product design

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Equal |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| variances  not |  |  | .89 | 243.406 | .374 | .14803 | .16606 | -.17906 | .47513 |
| assumed |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Equal |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | variances | .905 | .343 | -.82 | 248 | .412 | -.16447 | .20033 | -.55903 | .23009 |
| NAFDAC | assumed |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| registration | Equal |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| number | variances  not |  |  | -.82 | 230.802 | .416 | -.16447 | .20167 | -.56181 | .23287 |
|  | assumed |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

**T-Test**

**Group Statistics**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Years of Experience | N | Mean | Std. Deviation | Std. Error Mean |
|  | Inexperienced | 138  112  138  112  138  112  138  112  138  112  138  112  138  112  138  112  138  112  138  112  138  112 | 3.57  3.55  3.20  3.54  2.92  2.96  2.71  3.15  2.76  3.06  2.88  3.27  2.88  3.07  2.89  2.77  2.63  2.59  2.79  2.78  2.70  3.02 | 1.28  1.24  1.20  1.21  1.23  1.00  1.11  1.26  1.29  1.41  1.29  1.36  1.22  1.21  1.32  1.23  1.07  1.28  1.18  1.21  1.37  1.57 | .10883  .11683  .10190  .11481  .10442  .09440  .09438  .11913  .11008  .13320  .10955  .12809  .10411  .11395  .1121  .1162  .09088  .12136  .10049  .11465  .11664  .14845 |
| Discount structure |  |
|  | Experienced |
|  | Inexperienced |
| Price list |  |
|  | Experienced |
|  | Inexperienced |
| Rebates |  |
|  | Experienced |
|  | Inexperienced |
| Credit facilities |  |
|  | Experienced |
|  | Inexperienced |
| Low pricing |  |
|  | Experienced |
|  | Inexperienced |
| Price quotations |  |
|  | Experienced |
|  | Inexperienced |
| Price bundling |  |
|  | Experienced |
|  | Inexperienced |
| Coupons |  |
|  | Experienced |
|  | Inexperienced |
| Odd-even- pricing |  |
|  | Experienced |
|  | Inexperienced |
| Multiple unit pricings |  |
|  | Experienced |
|  | Inexperienced |
| Leader pricing |  |
|  | Experienced |

**Independent Samples Test**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Levene's Test for Equality of  Variances | | t-test for Equality of Means | | | | | | |
| F | Sig. | t | df | Sig. (2-  tailed) | Mean Difference | Std. Error Difference | 95% Confidence Interval of the Difference | |
| Lower | Upper |
| Equal |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| variances | .177 | .675 | .07 | 248 | .942 | .01165 | .16022 | -.30392 | .32721 |
| Discount assumed |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| structure Equal |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| variances not |  |  | .07 | 240.498 | .942 | .01165 | .15966 | -.30287 | .32616 |
| assumed |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Equal |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| variances | .004 | .947 | -2.17 | 248 | .031 | -.33282 | .15327 | -.63469 | -.03094 |
| assumed |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Price list |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Equal |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| variances not |  |  | -2.17 | 236.076 | .031 | -.33282 | .15351 | -.63523 | -.03040 |
| assumed |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Equal |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| variances | 7.758 | .006 | -.24 | 248 | .807 | -.03507 | .14377 | -.31823 | .24809 |
| assumed |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Rebates |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Equal |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| variances not |  |  | -.25 | 247.995 | .803 | -.03507 | .14076 | -.31230 | .24217 |
| assumed |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Equal |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| variances | 2.306 | .130 | -2.94 | 248 | .004 | -.44164 | .14997 | -.73701 | -.14627 |
| Credit assumed |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| facilities Equal |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| variances not |  |  | -2.91 | 222.921 | .004 | -.44164 | .15198 | -.74114 | -.14214 |
| assumed |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Equal |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| variances | .676 | .412 | -1.76 | 248 | .079 | -.30163 | .17125 | -.63893 | .03567 |
| assumed |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Low pricing |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Equal |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| variances not |  |  | -1.75 | 228.172 | .082 | -.30163 | .17280 | -.64212 | .03886 |
| assumed |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Equal |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Price  variances  quotations | .828 | .364 | -2.33 | 248 | .020 | -.39105 | .16764 | -.72122 | -.06087 |
| assumed |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Equal |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | variances not |  |  | -2.32 | 232.146 | .021 | -.39105 | .16855 | -.72312 | -.05897 |
|  | assumed |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Equal |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | variances | .966 | .327 | -1.26 | 248 | .209 | -.19462 | .15457 | -.49906 | .10983 |
| Price | assumed |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| bundling | Equal |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | variances not |  |  | -1.26 | 238.822 | .209 | -.19462 | .15435 | -.49867 | .10944 |
|  | assumed |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Equal |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | variances | .157 | .692 | .76 | 248 | .448 | .1234 | .1626 | -.1968 | .4437 |
|  | assumed |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Coupons |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Equal |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | variances not |  |  | .76 | 243.079 | .445 | .1234 | .1614 | -.1946 | .4415 |
|  | assumed |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Equal |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | variances | 8.401 | .004 | .28 | 248 | .782 | .04115 | .14875 | -.25183 | .33413 |
| Odd-even- | assumed |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| pricing | Equal |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | variances not |  |  | .27 | 215.492 | .786 | .04115 | .15162 | -.25770 | .33999 |
|  | assumed |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Equal |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Multiple | variances | .097 | .756 | .09 | 248 | .932 | .01307 | .15202 | -.28634 | .31248 |
|  | assumed |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| unit |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Equal |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| pricings | variances not |  |  | .09 | 234.783 | .932 | .01307 | .15246 | -.28729 | .31343 |
|  | assumed |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Equal |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | variances | 3.196 | .075 | -1.73 | 248 | .085 | -.32220 | .18613 | -.68880 | .04439 |
| Leader | assumed |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| pricing | Equal |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | variances not |  |  | -1.71 | 221.853 | .089 | -.32220 | .18879 | -.69426 | .04985 |
|  | assumed |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

**T-Test**

**Group Statistics**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Years of Experience | N | Mean | Std. Deviation | Std. Error Mean |
|  | Inexperienced | 138  112  138  112  138  112  138  112  138  112  138  112  138  112  138  112  138  112  138  112 | 4.16  3.94  2.53  2.79  2.21  2.52  2.89  3.23  2.92  3.07  3.01  3.13  2.80  3.13  2.82  3.11  3.00  3.13  2.93  2.99 | 1.08  1.25  1.37  1.38  1.27  1.32  1.27  1.29  1.39  1.26  1.39  1.32  1.36  1.36  1.30  1.32  1.36  1.35  1.40  1.42 | .09156  .11850  .11690  .13005  .10809  .12491  .10772  .12231  .11820  .11947  .11794  .12500  .11598  .12841  .11089  .12450  .11545  .12778  .11960  .13393 |
| Delivery by road |  |
|  | Experienced |
|  | Inexperienced |
| Delivery by air |  |
|  | Experienced |
|  | Inexperienced |
| Delivery by water |  |
|  | Experienced |
|  | Inexperienced |
| Long distance delivery |  |
|  | Experienced |
|  | Inexperienced |
| After sales service |  |
|  | Experienced |
|  | Inexperienced |
| Door-to-Door delivery |  |
|  | Experienced |
|  | Inexperienced |
| Technical advice |  |
|  | Experienced |
|  | Inexperienced |
| Prompt order handling |  |
|  | Experienced |
|  | Inexperienced |
| Location of establishment |  |
|  | Experienced |
|  | Inexperienced |
| Storage facilities |  |
|  | Experienced |

**Independent Samples Test**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Levene's Test for Equality of  Variances | | t-test for Equality of Means | | | | | | |
| F | Sig. | t | df | Sig. (2-  tailed) | Mean Difference | Std. Error Difference | 95% Confidence Interval of the  Difference | |
| Lower | Upper |
| Equal |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| variances | 2.781 | .097 | 1.51 | 248 | .133 | .22192 | .14739 | -.06837 | .51221 |
| Delivery by assumed |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| road Equal |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| variances not |  |  | 1.48 | 219.667 | .140 | .22192 | .14975 | -.07321 | .51705 |
| assumed |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Equal |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| variances | .120 | .729 | -1.52 | 248 | .130 | -.26566 | .17483 | -.61001 | .07869 |
| assumed |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Delivery by air |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Equal |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| variances not |  |  | -1.52 | 237.314 | .130 | -.26566 | .17487 | -.61016 | .07885 |
| assumed |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Equal |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| variances | .694 | .406 | -1.87 | 248 | .063 | -.30771 | .16449 | -.63170 | .01627 |
| Delivery by assumed |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| water Equal |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| variances not |  |  | -1.86 | 233.435 | .064 | -.30771 | .16519 | -.63316 | .01773 |
| assumed |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Equal |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| variances | .377 | .540 | -2.10 | 248 | .037 | -.34084 | .16259 | -.66108 | -.02060 |
| Long distance assumed |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| delivery Equal |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| variances not |  |  | -2.09 | 235.288 | .038 | -.34084 | .16298 | -.66192 | -.01976 |
| assumed |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Equal |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| variances | 2.514 | .114 | -.89 | 248 | .374 | -.15114 | .16970 | -.48538 | .18310 |
| After sales assumed |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| service Equal |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| variances not |  |  | -.90 | 244.698 | .369 | -.15114 | .16805 | -.48216 | .17988 |
| assumed |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Equal |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Door-to-Door  variances  delivery | .040 | .841 | -.68 | 248 | .496 | -.11775 | .17269 | -.45788 | .22237 |
| assumed |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Equal variances not  assumed |  |  | -.69 | 241.521 | .494 | -.11775 | .17186 | -.45629 | .22078 |
| Technical advice | Equal variances  assumed | .019 | .892 | -1.95 | 248 | .053 | -.33683 | .17308 | -.67772 | .00407 |
| Equal variances not  assumed |  |  | -1.95 | 237.770 | .053 | -.33683 | .17303 | -.67770 | .00405 |
| Prompt order handling | Equal variances  assumed | .004 | .951 | -1.73 | 248 | .085 | -.28830 | .16653 | -.61629 | .03969 |
| Equal variances not  assumed |  |  | -1.73 | 236.415 | .085 | -.28830 | .16673 | -.61676 | .04016 |
| Location of establishment | Equal variances  assumed | .082 | .775 | -.78 | 248 | .438 | -.13393 | .17226 | -.47322 | .20536 |
| Equal variances not  assumed |  |  | -.78 | 237.800 | .438 | -.13393 | .17221 | -.47319 | .20533 |
| Storage facilities | Equal variances  assumed | .023 | .880 | -.31 | 248 | .754 | -.05629 | .17939 | -.40961 | .29703 |
| Equal variances not  assumed |  |  | -.31 | 236.674 | .754 | -.05629 | .17955 | -.41002 | .29744 |

**T-Test**

**Group Statistics**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Years of  Experience | N | Mean | Std. Deviation | Std. Error  Mean |
| Internet adversities | Inexperienced | 138 | 3.29 | 1.77 | .15053 |
| Experienced | 112 | 3.22 | 1.65 | .15623 |
| Print advertising | Inexperienced | 138 | 3.18 | 1.24 | .10551 |
| Experienced | 112 | 3.49 | 1.32 | .12427 |
| Radio advertising | Inexperienced | 138 | 3.38 | 1.43 | .12178 |
| Experienced | 112 | 3.63 | 1.12 | .10612 |
| Television advertising | Inexperienced | 138 | 3.39 | 1.39 | .11792 |
| Experienced | 112 | 3.63 | 1.29 | .12231 |
| Mobile advertising | Inexperienced | 138 | 3.21 | 1.43 | .12146 |
| Experienced | 112 | 3.37 | 1.21 | .11415 |
| Cash refund | Inexperienced | 138 | 2.75 | 1.32 | .11270 |
| Experienced | 112 | 2.87 | 1.20 | .11309 |
| Lucky draws | Inexperienced | 138 | 2.64 | 1.32 | .11210 |
| Experienced | 112 | 3.21 | 1.47 | .13902 |
| Price off deals | Inexperienced | 138 | 2.70 | 1.28 | .10905 |
| Experienced | 112 | 2.66 | 1.25 | .11800 |
| Point of purchase display | Inexperienced | 138 | 2.90 | 1.34 | .11374 |
| Experienced | 112 | 3.13 | 1.36 | .12818 |
| Interactive relationships | Inexperienced | 138 | 3.17 | 1.48 | .12635 |
| Experienced | 112 | 3.41 | 1.33 | .12528 |
| Press release | Inexperienced | 138 | 2.89 | 1.40 | .11892 |
| Experienced | 112 | 3.26 | 1.41 | .13348 |
| Press conference | Inexperienced | 138 | 2.70 | 1.30 | .11059 |
| Experienced | 112 | 2.88 | 1.35 | .12731 |
| Community notices | Inexperienced | 138 | 2.91 | 1.41 | .11990 |
| Experienced | 112 | 3.35 | 1.43 | .13525 |
| Billboards | Inexperienced | 138 | 3.06 | 1.37 | .11626 |
| Experienced | 112 | 3.16 | 1.39 | .13154 |
| Sponsored publications | Inexperienced | 138 | 2.81 | 1.29 | .11008 |
| Experienced | 112 | 3.19 | 1.44 | .13574 |
| Sponsored programmes | Inexperienced | 138 | 2.83 | 1.29 | .11010 |
| Experienced | 112 | 3.03 | 1.35 | .12776 |
| Special events | Inexperienced | 138 | 2.83 | 1.23 | .10468 |
| Experienced | 112 | 3.13 | 1.32 | .12459 |
| News letters | Inexperienced | 138 | 2.86 | 1.41 | .12019 |
| Experienced | 112 | 2.73 | 1.28 | .12098 |
| Community development  services | Inexperienced | 138 | 2.84 | 1.28 | .10897 |
| Experienced | 112 | 2.76 | 1.42 | .13378 |
| Customer care services | Inexperienced | 138 | 3.03 | 1.36 | .11588 |
| Experienced | 112 | 3.10 | 1.34 | .12681 |
| Social interaction  programmes | Inexperienced | 138 | 2.93 | 1.37 | .11691 |
| Experienced | 112 | 3.12 | 1.49 | .14052 |
| Social networks | Inexperienced | 138 | 2.72 | 1.48 | .12587 |
| Experienced | 112 | 3.14 | 1.66 | .15681 |

**Independent Samples Test**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | | Levene's Test for Equality of  Variances | | t-test for Equality of Means | | | | | | |
| F | Sig. | t | df | Sig. (2-  tailed) | Mean Difference | Std. Error Difference | 95% Confidence Interval of the Difference | |
| Lower | Upper |
| Internet adversities | Equal variances  assumed | 3.124 | .078 | .31 | 248 | .761 | .06664 | .21847 | -.36366 | .49694 |
| Equal variances not  assumed |  |  | .31 | 243.048 | .759 | .06664 | .21695 | -.36070 | .49398 |
| Print advertising | Equal variances  assumed | .923 | .338 | -1.91 | 248 | .057 | -.30991 | .16202 | -.62901 | .00919 |
| Equal  variances not assumed |  |  | -1.90 | 231.320 | .059 | -.30991 | .16302 | -.63111 | .01128 |
| Radio advertising | Equal variances  assumed | 11.141 | .001 | -1.55 | 248 | .122 | -.25712 | .16559 | -.58325 | .06902 |
| Equal variances not  assumed |  |  | -1.59 | 247.743 | .113 | -.25712 | .16153 | -.57527 | .06103 |
| Television advertising | Equal variances  assumed | 2.119 | .147 | -1.42 | 248 | .157 | -.24262 | .17110 | -.57962 | .09437 |
| Equal variances not  assumed |  |  | -1.43 | 243.083 | .155 | -.24262 | .16990 | -.57728 | .09203 |
| Mobile advertising | Equal variances  assumed | 7.796 | .006 | -.92 | 248 | .359 | -.15593 | .16958 | -.48992 | .17807 |
| Equal variances not  assumed |  |  | -.94 | 247.540 | .350 | -.15593 | .16668 | -.48422 | .17237 |
| Cash refund | Equal variances  assumed | 4.320 | .039 | -.74 | 248 | .459 | -.11969 | .16134 | -.43747 | .19808 |

Lucky draws

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Equal |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| variances not |  |  | -.75 | 245.094 | .454 | -.11969 | .15966 | -.43417 | .19478 |
| assumed |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Equal |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| variances | 1.827 | .178 | -3.17 | 248 | .002 | -.56043 | .17654 | -.90815 | -.21271 |
| assumed |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Equal |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| variances not |  |  | -3.14 | 225.155 | .002 | -.56043 | .17859 | -.91235 | -.20851 |
| assumed |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Equal |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| variances | .008 | .929 | .26 | 248 | .794 | .04218 | .16110 | -.27512 | .35948 |
| assumed |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Equal |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| variances not |  |  | .26 | 239.827 | .793 | .04218 | .16067 | -.27433 | .35869 |
| assumed |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Equal |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| variances | .003 | .956 | -1.32 | 248 | .187 | -.22645 | .17109 | -.56343 | .11053 |
| assumed |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Equal |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| variances not |  |  | -1.32 | 236.048 | .188 | -.22645 | .17137 | -.56405 | .11115 |
| assumed |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Equal |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| variances | 3.788 | .053 | -1.32 | 248 | .190 | -.23680 | .18003 | -.59138 | .11778 |
| assumed |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Equal |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| variances not |  |  | -1.33 | 245.697 | .184 | -.23680 | .17793 | -.58726 | .11366 |
| assumed |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Equal |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| variances | .162 | .688 | -2.06 | 248 | .041 | -.36762 | .17856 | -.71931 | -.01593 |
| assumed |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Equal |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| variances not |  |  | -2.06 | 236.449 | .041 | -.36762 | .17877 | -.71981 | -.01544 |
| assumed |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Equal |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| variances | .064 | .800 | -1.12 | 248 | .263 | -.18828 | .16799 | -.51915 | .14260 |
| assumed |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Equal |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| variances not |  |  | -1.12 | 233.841 | .265 | -.18828 | .16863 | -.52051 | .14396 |
| assumed |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Equal |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| variances | .036 | .850 | -2.45 | 248 | .015 | -.44242 | .18044 | -.79781 | -.08703 |
| assumed |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Price off deals

Point of purchase display

Interactive relationships

Press release

Press conference

Community notices

Billboards

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Equal |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| variances not |  |  | -2.45 | 235.947 | .015 | -.44242 | .18074 | -.79849 | -.08634 |
| assumed |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Equal |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| variances | .003 | .955 | -.59 | 248 | .558 | -.10274 | .17520 | -.44782 | .24233 |
| assumed |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Equal |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| variances not |  |  | -.59 | 235.646 | .559 | -.10274 | .17555 | -.44860 | .24311 |
| assumed |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Equal |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| variances | 1.738 | .189 | -2.17 | 248 | .031 | -.37591 | .17286 | -.71638 | -.03544 |
| assumed |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Equal |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| variances not |  |  | -2.15 | 225.863 | .033 | -.37591 | .17477 | -.72029 | -.03153 |
| assumed |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Equal |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| variances | .007 | .935 | -1.15 | 248 | .250 | -.19345 | .16787 | -.52409 | .13719 |
| assumed |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Equal |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| variances not |  |  | -1.15 | 232.977 | .253 | -.19345 | .16865 | -.52573 | .13883 |
| assumed |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Equal |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| variances | 1.126 | .290 | -1.86 | 248 | .064 | -.30060 | .16155 | -.61878 | .01759 |
| assumed |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Equal |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| variances not |  |  | -1.85 | 230.114 | .066 | -.30060 | .16273 | -.62123 | .02004 |
| assumed |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Equal |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| variances | 1.289 | .257 | .71 | 248 | .476 | .12293 | .17228 | -.21639 | .46225 |
| assumed |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Equal |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| variances not |  |  | .72 | 244.925 | .472 | .12293 | .17053 | -.21297 | .45883 |
| assumed |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Equal |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| variances | 3.014 | .084 | .48 | 248 | .633 | .08165 | .17074 | -.25464 | .41794 |
| assumed |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Equal |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| variances not |  |  | .47 | 226.406 | .637 | .08165 | .17254 | -.25834 | .42164 |
| assumed |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Equal |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| variances | .820 | .366 | -.40 | 248 | .688 | -.06923 | .17204 | -.40807 | .26962 |
| assumed |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Sponsored publications

Sponsored programmes

Special events

News letters

Community development services

Customer care services

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Equal variances not  assumed |  |  | -.40 | 238.844 | .687 | -.06923 | .17178 | -.40763 | .26918 |
| Social interaction programmes | Equal variances  assumed | 1.176 | .279 | -1.00 | 248 | .318 | -.18129 | .18129 | -.53835 | .17577 |
| Equal variances not  assumed |  |  | -.99 | 228.965 | .322 | -.18129 | .18280 | -.54147 | .17889 |
| Social networks | Equal variances  assumed | 5.438 | .020 | -2.10 | 248 | .036 | -.41822 | .19868 | -.80954 | -.02690 |
| Equal variances not  assumed |  |  | -2.08 | 224.577 | .039 | -.41822 | .20108 | -.81447 | -.02197 |

**T-Test**

**Group Statistics**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Location of business | N | Mean | Std.  Deviation | Std. Error  Mean |
| Product quality | Urban | 190 | 4.21 | 1.08 | .07845 |
| Rural | 60 | 3.22 | 1.42 | .18272 |
| Product size | Urban | 190 | 3.24 | .96 | .06938 |
| Rural | 60 | 2.78 | 1.15 | .14861 |
| Product packaging | Urban | 190 | 3.28 | 1.25 | .09058 |
| Rural | 60 | 2.87 | 1.27 | .16376 |
| Product brand name | Urban | 190 | 3.12 | 1.35 | .09791 |
| Rural | 60 | 3.00 | 1.28 | .16468 |
| Product brand label | Urban | 190 | 3.14 | 1.33 | .09622 |
| Rural | 60 | 2.68 | 1.20 | .15494 |
| Product physical  appearance | Urban | 190 | 3.03 | 1.37 | .09926 |
| Rural | 60 | 2.72 | 1.35 | .17481 |
| Product warranty | Urban | 190 | 2.95 | 1.42 | .10268 |
| Rural | 60 | 2.40 | 1.32 | .17008 |
| Product usage  instruction | Urban | 190 | 3.10 | 1.39 | .10056 |
| Rural | 60 | 2.87 | 1.28 | .16548 |
| Product expiry date | Urban | 190 | 2.99 | 1.30 | .09395 |
| Rural | 60 | 2.65 | 1.20 | .15555 |
| Availability of SON  certification | Urban | 190 | 3.01 | 1.31 | .09469 |
| Rural | 60 | 2.67 | 1.26 | .16237 |
| Product design | Urban | 190 | 2.81 | 1.33 | .09632 |
| Rural | 60 | 2.75 | 1.28 | .16575 |
| NAFDAC registration number | Urban | 190 | 3.01 | 1.61 | .11645 |
| Rural | 60 | 2.72 | 1.46 | .18880 |

**Independent Samples Test**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Levene's Test for Equality of  Variances | | t-test for Equality of Means | | | | | | |
| F | Sig. | t | df | Sig. (2-  tailed) | Mean Difference | Std. Error Difference | 95% Confidence Interval of the Difference | |
| Lower | Upper |
| Equal |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| variances | 15.323 | .000 | 5.71 | 248 | .000 | .98860 | .17318 | .64750 | 1.32969 |
| assumed |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Product quality |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Equal |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| variances not |  |  | 4.97 | 82 | .000 | .98860 | .19884 | .59302 | 1.38417 |
| assumed |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Equal |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| variances | 4.905 | .028 | 3.08 | 248 | .002 | .45877 | .14899 | .16532 | .75223 |
| assumed |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Product size |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Equal |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| variances not |  |  | 2.80 | 86 | .006 | .45877 | .16401 | .13274 | .78480 |
| assumed |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Equal |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| variances | .358 | .550 | 2.25 | 248 | .025 | .41754 | .18561 | .05198 | .78311 |
| Product assumed |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| packaging Equal |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| variances not |  |  | 2.23 | 98 | .028 | .41754 | .18714 | .04615 | .78893 |
| assumed |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Equal |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| variances | .006 | .936 | .61 | 248 | .540 | .12105 | .19730 | -.26754 | .50965 |
| Product brand assumed |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| name Equal |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| variances not |  |  | .63 | 104 | .529 | .12105 | .19158 | -.25886 | .50097 |
| assumed |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Equal |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| variances | .638 | .425 | 2.36 | 248 | .019 | .45351 | .19212 | .07511 | .83191 |
| Product brand assumed |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| label Equal |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| variances not |  |  | 2.49 | 108 | .014 | .45351 | .18238 | .09200 | .81502 |
| assumed |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Product Equal |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| physical variances | .009 | .924 | 1.56 | 248 | .120 | .31491 | .20212 | -.08318 | .71300 |
| appearance assumed |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Product warranty  Product usage instruction  Product expiry date  Availability of SON  certification  Product design  NAFDAC  registration number | Equal variances not assumed Equal variances assumed Equal variances not assumed Equal variances assumed Equal variances not assumed Equal variances assumed Equal variances not assumed Equal variances assumed Equal variances not assumed Equal variances assumed Equal variances not assumed Equal variances assumed  Equal variances not  assumed |  |  | 1.57 | 100 | .120 | .31491 | .20103 | -.08393 | .71375 |
| .619 | .432 | 2.68 | 248 | .008 | .55263 | .20623 | .14645 | .95882 |
|  |  | 2.78 | 105 | .006 | .55263 | .19867 | .15873 | .94653 |
| .910 | .341 | 1.16 | 248 | .248 | .23333 | .20169 | -.16391 | .63058 |
|  |  | 1.21 | 106 | .231 | .23333 | .19363 | -.15056 | .61723 |
| .025 | .874 | 1.83 | 248 | .069 | .34474 | .18869 | -.02691 | .71638 |
|  |  | 1.90 | 106 | .061 | .34474 | .18172 | -.01556 | .70503 |
| .000 | .992 | 1.79 | 248 | .074 | .34386 | .19164 | -.03358 | .72130 |
|  |  | 1.83 | 102 | .070 | .34386 | .18797 | -.02896 | .71668 |
| .004 | .950 | .31 | 248 | .757 | .06053 | .19509 | -.32372 | .44478 |
|  |  | .32 | 102 | .753 | .06053 | .19170 | -.31972 | .44077 |
| 1.609 | .206 | 1.24 | 248 | .216 | .28860 | .23285 | -.17003 | .74722 |
|  |  | 1.30 | 108 | .196 | .28860 | .22183 | -.15112 | .72831 |

**T-Test**

**Group Statistics**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Location of business | N | Mean | Std. Deviation | Std. Error Mean |
|  | Urban | 190  60  190  60  190  60  190  60  190  60  190  60  190  60  190  60  190  60  190  60  190  60 | 3.66  3.25  3.44  3.08  2.91  3.02  2.94  2.80  2.99  2.60  3.14  2.78  2.98  2.92  2.93  2.53  2.64  2.53  2.87  2.52  2.97  2.42 | 1.19  1.41  1.18  1.29  1.14  1.11  1.16  1.33  1.35  1.34  1.35  1.25  1.20  1.28  1.23  1.37  1.14  1.26  1.16  1.27  1.45  1.46 | .08651  .18199  .08554  .16688  .08234  .14359  .08383  .17107  .09759  .17337  .09765  .16137  .08702  .16518  .0896  .1770  .08276  .16203  .08405  .16380  .10513  .18910 |
| Discount structure |  |
|  | Rural |
|  | Urban |
| Price list |  |
|  | Rural |
|  | Urban |
| Rebates |  |
|  | Rural |
|  | Urban |
| Credit facilities |  |
|  | Rural |
|  | Urban |
| Low pricing |  |
|  | Rural |
|  | Urban |
| Price quotations |  |
|  | Rural |
|  | Urban |
| Price bundling |  |
|  | Rural |
|  | Urban |
| Coupons |  |
|  | Rural |
|  | Urban |
| Odd-even- pricing |  |
|  | Rural |
|  | Urban |
| Multiple unit pricings |  |
|  | Rural |
|  | Urban |
| Leader pricing |  |
|  | Rural |

**Independent Samples Test**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | | Levene's Test for Equality of Variances | | t-test for Equality of Means | | | | | | |
| F | Sig. | t | df | Sig. (2-  tailed) | Mean Difference | Std. Error Difference | 95% Confidence  Interval of the Difference | |
| Lower | Upper |
|  | Equal variances  assumed | 5.399 | .021 | 2.21 | 248 | .028 | .40789 | .18475 | .04401 | .77178 |
| Discount  structure | Equal variances not  assumed |  |  | 2.02 | 87.285 | .046 | .40789 | .20151 | .00739 | .80840 |
|  | Equal variances  assumed | .590 | .443 | 1.98 | 248 | .049 | .35351 | .17875 | .00145 | .70557 |
| Price list | Equal variances not  assumed |  |  | 1.89 | 92.091 | .063 | .35351 | .18752 | -.01892 | .72594 |
|  | Equal variances  assumed | .757 | .385 | -.63 | 248 | .526 | -.10614 | .16728 | -.43562 | .22334 |
| Rebates | Equal variances not  assumed |  |  | -.64 | 100.785 | .523 | -.10614 | .16552 | -.43450 | .22222 |
|  | Equal  variances assumed | 3.838 | .051 | .80 | 248 | .424 | .14211 | .17742 | -.20733 | .49154 |
| Credit  facilities | Equal variances not  assumed |  |  | .75 | 89.134 | .458 | .14211 | .19051 | -.23642 | .52063 |
|  | Equal variances  assumed | .230 | .632 | 1.96 | 248 | .052 | .38947 | .19912 | -.00271 | .78166 |
| Low  pricing | Equal variances not  assumed |  |  | 1.96 | 99.202 | .053 | .38947 | .19895 | -.00527 | .78422 |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Equal variances  assumed | 1.323 | .251 | 1.80 | 248 | .073 | .35351 | .19604 | -.03261 | .73963 |
| Price  quotations | Equal variances not  assumed |  |  | 1.87 | 105.699 | .064 | .35351 | .18862 | -.02046 | .72747 |
|  | Equal  variances assumed | 1.478 | .225 | .35 | 248 | .730 | .06228 | .18051 | -.29325 | .41782 |
| Price  bundling | Equal variances not  assumed |  |  | .33 | 94.033 | .739 | .06228 | .18670 | -.30841 | .43297 |
|  | Equal variances  assumed | 1.870 | .173 | 2.12 | 248 | .035 | .3982 | .1878 | .0283 | .7682 |
| Coupons | Equal variances not  assumed |  |  | 2.01 | 91.212 | .048 | .3982 | .1984 | .0042 | .7923 |
| Odd- even- pricing | Equal variances  assumed | 1.590 | .209 | .60 | 248 | .550 | .10351 | .17311 | -.23744 | .44445 |
| Equal variances not  assumed |  |  | .57 | 91.849 | .571 | .10351 | .18194 | -.25784 | .46486 |
| Multiple unit pricings | Equal  variances assumed | 3.166 | .076 | 2.00 | 248 | .046 | .35175 | .17560 | .00591 | .69760 |
| Equal variances not  assumed |  |  | 1.91 | 92.167 | .059 | .35175 | .18411 | -.01390 | .71740 |
|  | Equal variances  assumed | .132 | .716 | 2.59 | 248 | .010 | .55702 | .21514 | .13327 | .98076 |
| Leader  pricing | Equal variances not  assumed |  |  | 2.57 | 98.179 | .012 | .55702 | .21636 | .12768 | .98636 |

**T-Test**

**Group Statistics**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Location of business | N | Mean | Std.  Deviation | Std. Error Mean |
|  | Urban | 190  60  190  60  190  60  190  60  190  60  190  60  190  60  190  60  190  60  190  60 | 4.18  3.68  2.91  1.82  2.50  1.87  3.12  2.82  3.07  2.73  3.11  2.90  3.05  2.63  3.01  2.77  3.18  2.67  3.05  2.68 | 1.08  1.32  1.33  1.20  1.31  1.16  1.23  1.44  1.35  1.27  1.34  1.40  1.33  1.44  1.30  1.36  1.33  1.37  1.35  1.56 | .07861  .17056  .09637  .15494  .09491  .14932  .08916  .18639  .09761  .16445  .09740  .18055  .09681  .18559  .09425  .17526  .09623  .17734  .09796  .20097 |
| Delivery by road |  |
|  | Rural |
|  | Urban |
| Delivery by air |  |
|  | Rural |
|  | Urban |
| Delivery by water |  |
|  | Rural |
|  | Urban |
| Long distance delivery |  |
|  | Rural |
|  | Urban |
| After sales service |  |
|  | Rural |
|  | Urban |
| Door-to-Door delivery |  |
|  | Rural |
|  | Urban |
| Technical advice |  |
|  | Rural |
|  | Urban |
| Prompt order handling |  |
|  | Rural |
| Location of | Urban |
| establishment | Rural |
|  | Urban |
| Storage facilities |  |
|  | Rural |

**Independent Samples Test**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | | Levene's Test for Equality of  Variances | | t-test for Equality of Means | | | | | | |
| F | Sig. | t | df | Sig. (2-  tailed) | Mean Difference | Std. Error Difference | 95% Confidence Interval of the Difference | |
| Lower | Upper |
|  | Equal variances assumed | 6.583 | .011 | 2.92 | 248 | .004 | .49561 | .16950 | .16177 | .82945 |
| Delivery by  road | Equal variances not  assumed |  |  | 2.64 | 85.524 | .010 | .49561 | .18781 | .12224 | .86899 |
|  | Equal variances  assumed | 2.260 | .134 | 5.69 | 248 | .000 | 1.09386 | .19236 | .71499 | 1.47273 |
| Delivery by  air | Equal variances not  assumed |  |  | 5.99 | 108.411 | .000 | 1.09386 | .18246 | .73220 | 1.45552 |
|  | Equal variances  assumed | 1.868 | .173 | 3.36 | 248 | .001 | .63333 | .18864 | .26179 | 1.00488 |
| Delivery by  water | Equal variances not  assumed |  |  | 3.58 | 110.666 | .001 | .63333 | .17694 | .28271 | .98395 |
| Long distance delivery | Equal  variances assumed | 4.644 | .032 | 1.57 | 248 | .117 | .29912 | .19004 | -.07518 | .67343 |
| Equal variances not  assumed |  |  | 1.45 | 87.656 | .151 | .29912 | .20662 | -.11151 | .70975 |
|  | Equal variances  assumed | .057 | .812 | 1.70 | 248 | .090 | .33509 | .19677 | -.05246 | .72263 |
| After sales  service | Equal variances not  assumed |  |  | 1.75 | 103.867 | .083 | .33509 | .19123 | -.04414 | .71432 |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Equal variances  assumed | .234 | .629 | 1.05 | 248 | .296 | .21053 | .20082 | -.18501 | .60606 |
| Door-to-Door  delivery | Equal variances not  assumed |  |  | 1.03 | 95.805 | .307 | .21053 | .20515 | -.19670 | .61775 |
|  | Equal  variances assumed | 3.059 | .082 | 2.06 | 248 | .041 | .41404 | .20136 | .01745 | .81062 |
| Technical  advice | Equal variances not  assumed |  |  | 1.98 | 93.321 | .051 | .41404 | .20933 | -.00162 | .82970 |
|  | Equal variances  assumed | 1.272 | .261 | 1.23 | 248 | .221 | .23860 | .19448 | -.14445 | .62164 |
| Prompt order  handling | Equal variances not  assumed |  |  | 1.20 | 95.566 | .233 | .23860 | .19899 | -.15643 | .63362 |
|  | Equal variances  assumed | .432 | .512 | 2.61 | 248 | .010 | .51754 | .19812 | .12733 | .90776 |
| Location of  establishment | Equal variances not  assumed |  |  | 2.57 | 96.256 | .012 | .51754 | .20177 | .11705 | .91804 |
|  | Equal  variances assumed | 4.865 | .028 | 1.98 | 248 | .051 | .36404 | .20764 | -.04492 | .77299 |
| Storage  facilities | Equal variances not  assumed |  |  | 1.63 | 88.798 | .107 | .36404 | .22358 | -.08022 | .80829 |

**T-Test**

**Group Statistics**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Location of business | N | Mean | Std.  Deviation | Std. Error  Mean |
| Internet adversities | Urban | 190 | 3.60 | 1.59 | .11557 |
| Rural | 60 | 2.18 | 1.65 | .21325 |
| Print advertising | Urban | 190 | 3.45 | 1.27 | .09185 |
| Rural | 60 | 2.92 | 1.25 | .16172 |
| Radio advertising | Urban | 190 | 3.54 | 1.23 | .08911 |
| Rural | 60 | 3.33 | 1.53 | .19696 |
| Television advertising | Urban | 190 | 3.54 | 1.36 | .09889 |
| Rural | 60 | 3.37 | 1.30 | .16802 |
| Mobile advertising | Urban | 190 | 3.26 | 1.34 | .09685 |
| Rural | 60 | 3.33 | 1.34 | .17250 |
| Cash refund | Urban | 190 | 2.81 | 1.25 | .09076 |
| Rural | 60 | 2.78 | 1.33 | .17155 |
| Lucky draws | Urban | 190 | 3.02 | 1.38 | .10026 |
| Rural | 60 | 2.52 | 1.46 | .18790 |
| Price off deals | Urban | 190 | 2.72 | 1.24 | .08990 |
| Rural | 60 | 2.57 | 1.35 | .17364 |
| Point of purchase display | Urban | 190 | 3.07 | 1.30 | .09412 |
| Rural | 60 | 2.78 | 1.49 | .19177 |
| Interactive relationships | Urban | 190 | 3.43 | 1.32 | .09593 |
| Rural | 60 | 2.82 | 1.61 | .20788 |
| Press release | Urban | 190 | 3.26 | 1.37 | .09906 |
| Rural | 60 | 2.42 | 1.38 | .17833 |
| Press conference | Urban | 190 | 2.87 | 1.30 | .09436 |
| Rural | 60 | 2.50 | 1.36 | .17547 |
| Community notices | Urban | 190 | 3.25 | 1.36 | .09899 |
| Rural | 60 | 2.63 | 1.55 | .20024 |
| Billboards | Urban | 190 | 3.19 | 1.36 | .09898 |
| Rural | 60 | 2.82 | 1.38 | .17865 |
| Sponsored publications | Urban | 190 | 3.08 | 1.31 | .09496 |
| Rural | 60 | 2.67 | 1.51 | .19552 |
| Sponsored programmes | Urban | 190 | 3.03 | 1.30 | .09423 |
| Rural | 60 | 2.58 | 1.34 | .17352 |
| Special events | Urban | 190 | 3.04 | 1.26 | .09135 |
| Rural | 60 | 2.73 | 1.31 | .16952 |
| News letters | Urban | 190 | 2.84 | 1.33 | .09662 |
| Rural | 60 | 2.67 | 1.42 | .18360 |
| Community development  services | Urban | 190 | 2.85 | 1.33 | .09613 |
| Rural | 60 | 2.65 | 1.39 | .17918 |
| Customer care services | Urban | 190 | 3.14 | 1.32 | .09603 |
| Rural | 60 | 2.80 | 1.41 | .18226 |
| Social interaction  programmes | Urban | 190 | 3.09 | 1.43 | .10399 |
| Rural | 60 | 2.77 | 1.38 | .17845 |
| Social networks | Urban | 190 | 3.12 | 1.55 | .11237 |
| Rural | 60 | 2.27 | 1.48 | .19144 |

**Independent Samples Test**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | | Levene's Test for Equality of  Variances | | t-test for Equality of Means | | | | | | |
| F | Sig. | t | df | Sig. (2-  tailed) | Mean Difference | Std. Error Difference | 95% Confidence Interval of the Difference | |
| Lower | Upper |
|  | Equal variances assumed | .328 | .568 | 5.95 | 248 | .000 | 1.41667 | .23800 | .94790 | 1.88543 |
| Internet  adversities | Equal variances not  assumed |  |  | 5.84 | 96.155 | .000 | 1.41667 | .24255 | .93522 | 1.89812 |
|  | Equal variances  assumed | .261 | .610 | 2.84 | 248 | .005 | .53070 | .18702 | .16234 | .89906 |
| Print  advertising | Equal variances not  assumed |  |  | 2.85 | 99.959 | .005 | .53070 | .18599 | .16171 | .89969 |
|  | Equal variances  assumed | 8.798 | .003 | 1.08 | 248 | .281 | .20877 | .19329 | -.17192 | .58947 |
| Radio  advertising | Equal variances not  assumed |  |  | .97 | 84.520 | .337 | .20877 | .21618 | -.22110 | .63864 |
|  | Equal  variances assumed | 1.169 | .281 | .88 | 248 | .381 | .17544 | .19972 | -.21793 | .56881 |
| Television  advertising | Equal variances not  assumed |  |  | .90 | 103.094 | .370 | .17544 | .19496 | -.21121 | .56209 |
|  | Equal variances  assumed | .158 | .691 | -.35 | 248 | .723 | -.07018 | .19774 | -.45963 | .31928 |
| Mobile  advertising | Equal variances not  assumed |  |  | -.35 | 98.991 | .724 | -.07018 | .19783 | -.46271 | .32236 |

Cash refund

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1.801 | .181 | .12 | 248 | .907 | .02193 | .18807 | -.34848 | .39234 |
|  |  | .11 | 94.341 | .910 | .02193 | .19408 | -.36340 | .40726 |
| 3.023 | .083 | 2.41 | 248 | .017 | .49912 | .20729 | .09085 | .90740 |
|  |  | 2.34 | 94.974 | .021 | .49912 | .21297 | .07632 | .92193 |
| 1.681 | .196 | .82 | 248 | .411 | .15439 | .18735 | -.21462 | .52339 |
|  |  | .79 | 92.787 | .432 | .15439 | .19553 | -.23391 | .54268 |
| 6.770 | .010 | 1.43 | 248 | .153 | .28509 | .19910 | -.10706 | .67723 |
|  |  | 1.33 | 89.232 | .185 | .28509 | .21362 | -.13936 | .70953 |
| 10.830 | .001 | 2.95 | 248 | .003 | .60965 | .20676 | .20242 | 1.01688 |
|  |  | 2.66 | 85.592 | .009 | .60965 | .22895 | .15448 | 1.06482 |
| .822 | .365 | 4.15 | 248 | .000 | .84123 | .20277 | .44187 | 1.24059 |
|  |  | 4.12 | 98.108 | .000 | .84123 | .20400 | .43640 | 1.24605 |

Lucky draws

Price off deals

Point of purchase display

Interactive relationships

Press release

Equal variances assumed Equal variances not assumed Equal variances assumed Equal variances not assumed Equal variances assumed Equal variances not assumed Equal variances assumed Equal variances not assumed Equal variances assumed Equal variances not assumed Equal variances assumed Equal variances not assumed

Press conference

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1.438 | .232 | 1.89 | 248 | .060 | .36842 | .19470 | -.01506 | .75190 |
|  |  | 1.85 | 95.558 | .068 | .36842 | .19923 | -.02708 | .76392 |
| 4.348 | .038 | 2.96 | 248 | .003 | .61930 | .20896 | .20773 | 1.03087 |
|  |  | 2.77 | 89.690 | .007 | .61930 | .22337 | .17552 | 1.06308 |
| .421 | .517 | 1.86 | 248 | .063 | .37807 | .20273 | -.02122 | .77736 |
|  |  | 1.85 | 97.899 | .067 | .37807 | .20424 | -.02724 | .78338 |
| 7.581 | .006 | 2.05 | 248 | .042 | .41228 | .20150 | .01542 | .80914 |
|  |  | 1.90 | 88.577 | .061 | .41228 | .21736 | -.01965 | .84421 |
| 1.664 | .198 | 2.28 | 248 | .023 | .44298 | .19396 | .06096 | .82501 |
|  |  | 2.24 | 96.318 | .027 | .44298 | .19745 | .05106 | .83491 |
| 1.068 | .302 | 1.64 | 248 | .102 | .30877 | .18840 | -.06229 | .67984 |
|  |  | 1.60 | 95.719 | .112 | .30877 | .19257 | -.07349 | .69103 |

Community notices

Billboards

Sponsored publications

Sponsored programmes

Special events

Equal variances assumed Equal variances not assumed Equal variances assumed Equal variances not assumed Equal variances assumed Equal variances not assumed Equal variances assumed Equal variances not assumed Equal variances assumed Equal variances not assumed Equal variances assumed Equal variances not assumed

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Equal variances  assumed | 1.426 | .234 | .88 | 248 | .382 | .17544 | .20050 | -.21945 | .57033 |
| News letters | Equal variances not  assumed |  |  | .85 | 93.957 | .400 | .17544 | .20748 | -.23651 | .58739 |
| Community development services | Equal  variances assumed | 1.516 | .219 | 1.02 | 248 | .308 | .20263 | .19848 | -.18830 | .59356 |
| Equal variances not  assumed |  |  | 1.00 | 95.390 | .322 | .20263 | .20334 | -.20102 | .60629 |
| Customer care services | Equal variances  assumed | 1.280 | .259 | 1.72 | 248 | .087 | .34211 | .19921 | -.05024 | .73445 |
| Equal variances not  assumed |  |  | 1.66 | 94.041 | .100 | .34211 | .20602 | -.06694 | .75115 |
| Social interaction programmes | Equal variances  assumed | .014 | .904 | 1.56 | 248 | .120 | .32807 | .21049 | -.08650 | .74264 |
| Equal variances not  assumed |  |  | 1.59 | 102.191 | .115 | .32807 | .20654 | -.08159 | .73773 |
|  | Equal  variances assumed | .426 | .515 | 3.74 | 248 | .000 | .84912 | .22709 | .40185 | 1.29639 |
| Social  networks | Equal variances not  assumed |  |  | 3.83 | 102.851 | .000 | .84912 | .22198 | .40887 | 1.28938 |

**T-Test**

**Group Statistics**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Educational Qualification | N | Mean | Std.  Deviation | Std. Error Mean |
|  | Non-graduate | 65  185  65  185  65  185  65  185  65  185  65  185  65  185  65  185  65  185  65  185  65  185  65  185 | 3.28  4.21  2.91  3.21  3.20  3.18  3.12  3.08  3.05  3.02  2.85  2.99  2.91  2.79  3.20  2.99  2.89  2.92  2.94  2.92  2.63  2.85  2.83  2.97 | 1.47  1.05  1.06  1.00  1.13  1.31  1.32  1.34  1.29  1.32  1.38  1.37  1.37  1.43  1.36  1.36  1.19  1.31  1.38  1.27  1.05  1.39  1.42  1.63 | .18280  .07718  .13105  .07368  .14074  .09621  .16336  .09843  .16027  .09694  .17157  .10038  .16945  .10493  .16871  .10023  .14729  .09662  .17108  .09371  .13077  .10242  .17619  .11959 |
| Product quality |  |
|  | Graduate |
|  | Non-graduate |
| Product size |  |
|  | Graduate |
|  | Non-graduate |
| Product packaging |  |
|  | Graduate |
|  | Non-graduate |
| Product brand name |  |
|  | Graduate |
|  | Non-graduate |
| Product brand label |  |
|  | Graduate |
| Product physical | Non-graduate |
| appearance | Graduate |
|  | Non-graduate |
| Product warranty |  |
|  | Graduate |
| Product usage | Non-graduate |
| instruction | Graduate |
|  | Non-graduate |
| Product expiry date |  |
|  | Graduate |
| Availability of SON | Non-graduate |
| certification | Graduate |
|  | Non-graduate |
| Product design |  |
|  | Graduate |
| NAFDAC registration | Non-graduate |
| number | Graduate |

**Independent Samples Test**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | | Levene's Test for Equality of  Variances | | t-test for Equality of Means | | | | | | |
| F | Sig. | t | df | Sig. (2-  tailed) | Mean Difference | Std. Error Difference | 95% Confidence Interval of the Difference | |
| Lower | Upper |
|  | Equal variances  assumed | 24.793 | .000 | -5.52 | 248 | .000 | -.93389 | .16927 | -1.26728 | -.60049 |
| Product  quality | Equal variances not  assumed |  |  | -4.71 | 87.880 | .000 | -.93389 | .19843 | -1.32823 | -.53954 |
|  | Equal variances  assumed | .423 | .516 | -2.07 | 248 | .040 | -.30312 | .14656 | -.59178 | -.01446 |
| Product  size | Equal variances not  assumed |  |  | -2.02 | 107.127 | .046 | -.30312 | .15034 | -.60115 | -.00509 |
|  | Equal  variances assumed | 1.884 | .171 | .12 | 248 | .906 | .02162 | .18255 | -.33792 | .38116 |
| Product  packaging | Equal variances not  assumed |  |  | .13 | 128.070 | .899 | .02162 | .17048 | -.31571 | .35895 |
| Product brand name | Equal  variances assumed | .011 | .918 | .22 | 248 | .827 | .04200 | .19223 | -.33662 | .42061 |
| Equal variances not  assumed |  |  | .22 | 113.692 | .826 | .04200 | .19072 | -.33583 | .41982 |
|  | Equal variances  assumed | .007 | .935 | .13 | 248 | .897 | .02453 | .18915 | -.34801 | .39707 |
| Product  brand label | Equal variances not  assumed |  |  | .13 | 114.085 | .896 | .02453 | .18731 | -.34653 | .39559 |

Product physical appearance

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| .077 | .782 | -.75 | 248 | .453 | -.14844 | .19753 | -.53750 | .24062 |
|  |  | -.75 | 110.796 | .457 | -.14844 | .19878 | -.54235 | .24547 |
| .385 | .536 | .58 | 248 | .561 | .11850 | .20355 | -.28240 | .51940 |
|  |  | .59 | 116.532 | .553 | .11850 | .19931 | -.27623 | .51324 |
| .130 | .718 | 1.07 | 248 | .284 | .21081 | .19645 | -.17612 | .59774 |
|  |  | 1.07 | 112.289 | .285 | .21081 | .19623 | -.17799 | .59961 |
| 1.126 | .290 | -.14 | 248 | .886 | -.02661 | .18495 | -.39088 | .33766 |
|  |  | -.15 | 123.011 | .880 | -.02661 | .17615 | -.37529 | .32207 |
| 2.844 | .093 | .08 | 248 | .940 | .01414 | .18780 | -.35574 | .38401 |
|  |  | .07 | 104.885 | .942 | .01414 | .19506 | -.37264 | .40092 |
| 8.217 | .005 | -1.18 | 248 | .240 | -.22328 | .18946 | -.59645 | .14988 |
|  |  | -1.34 | 147.315 | .181 | -.22328 | .16610 | -.55154 | .10497 |

Product warranty

Product usage instruction

Product expiry date

Availability of SON certification

Product design

Equal variances assumed Equal variances not assumed Equal variances assumed Equal variances not assumed Equal variances assumed Equal variances not assumed Equal variances assumed Equal variances not assumed Equal variances assumed Equal variances not assumed Equal variances assumed Equal variances not assumed

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Equal |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | variances | 3.601 | .059 | -.63 | 248 | .532 | -.14220 | .22724 | -.58978 | .30537 |
| NAFDAC | assumed |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| registration | Equal |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| number | variances  not |  |  | -.67 | 127.171 | .505 | -.14220 | .21295 | -.56358 | .27917 |
|  | assumed |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

**T-Test**

**Group Statistics**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Educational Qualification | N | Mean | Std. Deviation | Std. Error Mean |
|  | Non-graduate | 65  185  65  185  65  185  65  185  65  185  65  185  65  185  65  185  65  185  65  185  65  185 | 3.20  3.69  3.14  3.43  3.06  2.89  2.94  2.90  2.72  2.96  2.95  3.09  3.05  2.94  2.38  2.99  2.65  2.60  2.51  2.88  2.52  2.95 | 1.36  1.20  1.18  1.22  1.07  1.15  1.22  1.19  1.22  1.39  1.28  1.35  1.19  1.23  1.17  1.28  1.18  1.17  1.15  1.20  1.35  1.50 | .16871  .08804  .14689  .08960  .13315  .08429  .15172  .08757  .15113  .10250  .15877  .09915  .14779  .09024  .1449  .0940  .14615  .08577  .14231  .08796  .16714  .11009 |
| Discount structure |  |
|  | Graduate |
|  | Non-graduate |
| Price list |  |
|  | Graduate |
|  | Non-graduate |
| Rebates |  |
|  | Graduate |
|  | Non-graduate |
| Credit facilities |  |
|  | Graduate |
|  | Non-graduate |
| Low pricing |  |
|  | Graduate |
|  | Non-graduate |
| Price quotations |  |
|  | Graduate |
|  | Non-graduate |
| Price bundling |  |
|  | Graduate |
|  | Non-graduate |
| Coupons |  |
|  | Graduate |
|  | Non-graduate |
| Odd-even- pricing |  |
|  | Graduate |
|  | Non-graduate |
| Multiple unit pricings |  |
|  | Graduate |
|  | Non-graduate |
| Leader pricing |  |
|  | Graduate |

**Independent Samples Test**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | | Levene's Test for Equality of  Variances | | t-test for Equality of Means | | | | | | |
| F | Sig. | t | df | Sig. (2-  tailed) | Mean Difference | Std. Error Difference | 95% Confidence Interval of the Difference | |
| Lower | Upper |
|  | Equal variances  assumed | 2.898 | .090 | -2.72 | 248 | .007 | -.48649 | .17900 | -.83904 | -.13393 |
| Discount  structure | Equal variances not  assumed |  |  | -2.56 | 100.996 | .012 | -.48649 | .19029 | -.86398 | -.10899 |
|  | Equal variances  assumed | 1.482 | .225 | -1.65 | 248 | .099 | -.28857 | .17445 | -.63215 | .05502 |
| Price list | Equal variances not  assumed |  |  | -1.68 | 114.951 | .096 | -.28857 | .17206 | -.62938 | .05225 |
|  | Equal  variances assumed | 2.078 | .151 | 1.04 | 248 | .298 | .16965 | .16265 | -.15071 | .49001 |
| Rebates | Equal variances not  assumed |  |  | 1.08 | 118.927 | .284 | .16965 | .15759 | -.14239 | .48169 |
|  | Equal variances  assumed | .320 | .572 | .24 | 248 | .812 | .04116 | .17295 | -.29947 | .38180 |
| Credit  facilities | Equal variances not  assumed |  |  | .23 | 109.522 | .815 | .04116 | .17518 | -.30601 | .38834 |
|  | Equal variances  assumed | 2.515 | .114 | -1.20 | 248 | .231 | -.23368 | .19480 | -.61736 | .15000 |
| Low  pricing | Equal variances not  assumed |  |  | -1.28 | 127.072 | .203 | -.23368 | .18261 | -.59503 | .12767 |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Equal variances  assumed | 3.759 | .054 | -.69 | 248 | .490 | -.13264 | .19194 | -.51068 | .24540 |
| Price  quotations | Equal variances not  assumed |  |  | -.71 | 117.438 | .480 | -.13264 | .18718 | -.50333 | .23805 |
|  | Equal  variances assumed | .393 | .531 | .63 | 248 | .528 | .11102 | .17566 | -.23496 | .45700 |
| Price  bundling | Equal variances not  assumed |  |  | .64 | 115.060 | .523 | .11102 | .17316 | -.23198 | .45402 |
|  | Equal variances  assumed | .409 | .523 | -3.38 | 248 | .001 | -.6100 | .1804 | -.9654 | -.2546 |
| Coupons | Equal variances not  assumed |  |  | -3.53 | 121.720 | .001 | -.6100 | .1728 | -.9520 | -.2680 |
| Odd- even- pricing | Equal variances  assumed | .024 | .876 | .27 | 248 | .785 | .04615 | .16864 | -.28600 | .37831 |
| Equal variances not  assumed |  |  | .27 | 111.087 | .786 | .04615 | .16946 | -.28964 | .38195 |
| Multiple unit pricings | Equal  variances assumed | .073 | .787 | -2.19 | 248 | .030 | -.37339 | .17071 | -.70962 | -.03716 |
| Equal variances not  assumed |  |  | -2.23 | 116.340 | .028 | -.37339 | .16730 | -.70474 | -.04204 |
|  | Equal variances  assumed | .897 | .345 | -2.03 | 248 | .043 | -.42827 | .21054 | -.84295 | -.01360 |
| Leader  pricing | Equal variances not  assumed |  |  | -2.14 | 123.493 | .034 | -.42827 | .20014 | -.82443 | -.03212 |

**T-Test**

**Group Statistics**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Educational Qualification | N | Mean | Std.  Deviation | Std. Error Mean |
|  | Non-graduate | 65  185  65  185  65  185  65  185  65  185  65  185  65  185  65  185  65  185  65  185 | 3.69  4.19  2.40  2.74  2.29  2.37  2.80  3.13  2.91  3.02  2.98  3.09  3.02  2.92  2.66  3.05  2.85  3.14  2.69  3.05 | 1.39  1.04  1.37  1.38  1.32  1.30  1.35  1.26  1.35  1.33  1.41  1.34  1.32  1.39  1.34  1.29  1.45  1.31  1.55  1.35 | .17254  .07672  .16956  .10111  .16368  .09528  .16727  .09244  .16802  .09770  .17471  .09855  .16334  .10211  .16594  .09521  .17978  .09660  .19231  .09898 |
| Delivery by road |  |
|  | Graduate |
|  | Non-graduate |
| Delivery by air |  |
|  | Graduate |
|  | Non-graduate |
| Delivery by water |  |
|  | Graduate |
|  | Non-graduate |
| Long distance delivery |  |
|  | Graduate |
|  | Non-graduate |
| After sales service |  |
|  | Graduate |
|  | Non-graduate |
| Door-to-Door delivery |  |
|  | Graduate |
|  | Non-graduate |
| Technical advice |  |
|  | Graduate |
|  | Non-graduate |
| Prompt order handling |  |
|  | Graduate |
| Location of | Non-graduate |
| establishment | Graduate |
|  | Non-graduate |
| Storage facilities |  |
|  | Graduate |

**Independent Samples Test**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | | Levene's Test for Equality of  Variances | | t-test for Equality of Means | | | | | | |
| F | Sig. | t | df | Sig. (2-  tailed) | Mean Difference | Std. Error Difference | 95% Confidence Interval of the Difference | |
| Lower | Upper |
|  | Equal  variances assumed | 11.683 | .001 | -3.01 | 248 | .003 | -.49688 | .16486 | -.82159 | -.17217 |
| Delivery by  road | Equal variances not  assumed |  |  | -2.63 | 90.580 | .010 | -.49688 | .18883 | -.87200 | -.12177 |
|  | Equal  variances assumed | .075 | .785 | -1.69 | 248 | .092 | -.33514 | .19799 | -.72510 | .05483 |
| Delivery by  air | Equal variances not  assumed |  |  | -1.70 | 112.657 | .092 | -.33514 | .19742 | -.72627 | .05600 |
|  | Equal variances  assumed | .168 | .683 | -.40 | 248 | .689 | -.07526 | .18774 | -.44503 | .29451 |
| Delivery by  water | Equal variances not  assumed |  |  | -.40 | 110.315 | .692 | -.07526 | .18939 | -.45057 | .30005 |
| Long distance delivery | Equal variances  assumed | .739 | .391 | -1.78 | 248 | .076 | -.32973 | .18478 | -.69367 | .03421 |
| Equal variances not  assumed |  |  | -1.73 | 105.634 | .087 | -.32973 | .19112 | -.70866 | .04920 |
| After sales service | Equal  variances assumed | 1.203 | .274 | -.56 | 248 | .574 | -.10852 | .19258 | -.48782 | .27077 |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Equal variances not  assumed |  |  | -.56 | 110.215 | .578 | -.10852 | .19437 | -.49370 | .27666 |
|  | Equal  variances assumed | .414 | .520 | -.52 | 248 | .603 | -.10187 | .19586 | -.48763 | .28389 |
| Door-to-Door  delivery | Equal variances not  assumed |  |  | -.51 | 107.424 | .613 | -.10187 | .20059 | -.49951 | .29576 |
|  | Equal variances  assumed | 1.157 | .283 | .46 | 248 | .645 | .09106 | .19763 | -.29819 | .48031 |
| Technical  advice | Equal variances not  assumed |  |  | .47 | 117.557 | .637 | .09106 | .19263 | -.29041 | .47253 |
|  | Equal variances  assumed | 1.285 | .258 | -2.06 | 248 | .041 | -.38711 | .18834 | -.75805 | -.01617 |
| Prompt order  handling | Equal variances not  assumed |  |  | -2.02 | 108.964 | .045 | -.38711 | .19132 | -.76629 | -.00793 |
|  | Equal  variances assumed | 1.539 | .216 | -1.48 | 248 | .139 | -.28898 | .19468 | -.67241 | .09445 |
| Location of  establishment | Equal variances not  assumed |  |  | -1.42 | 103.290 | .160 | -.28898 | .20409 | -.69374 | .11577 |
|  | Equal variances  assumed | 7.333 | .007 | -1.79 | 248 | .075 | -.36175 | .20212 | -.75983 | .03634 |
| Storage  facilities | Equal variances not  assumed |  |  | -1.67 | 99.957 | .098 | -.36175 | .21628 | -.79085 | .06736 |

**T-Test**

**Group Statistics**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Educational  Qualification | N | Mean | Std.  Deviation | Std. Error  Mean |
| Internet adversities | Non-graduate | 65 | 2.46 | 1.74 | .21604 |
| Graduate | 185 | 3.54 | 1.62 | .11899 |
| Print advertising | Non-graduate | 65 | 3.26 | 1.19 | .14754 |
| Graduate | 185 | 3.34 | 1.31 | .09658 |
| Radio advertising | Non-graduate | 65 | 3.57 | 1.38 | .17121 |
| Graduate | 185 | 3.46 | 1.28 | .09419 |
| Television advertising | Non-graduate | 65 | 3.62 | 1.23 | .15300 |
| Graduate | 185 | 3.46 | 1.39 | .10197 |
| Mobile advertising | Non-graduate | 65 | 3.52 | 1.26 | .15675 |
| Graduate | 185 | 3.19 | 1.35 | .09920 |
| Cash refund | Non-graduate | 65 | 2.63 | 1.34 | .16637 |
| Graduate | 185 | 2.86 | 1.24 | .09107 |
| Lucky draws | Non-graduate | 65 | 2.66 | 1.44 | .17850 |
| Graduate | 185 | 2.98 | 1.40 | .10283 |
| Price off deals | Non-graduate | 65 | 2.75 | 1.35 | .16703 |
| Graduate | 185 | 2.66 | 1.24 | .09095 |
| Point of purchase  display | Non-graduate | 65 | 3.11 | 1.34 | .16572 |
| Graduate | 185 | 2.96 | 1.35 | .09946 |
| Interactive relationships | Non-graduate | 65 | 3.15 | 1.61 | .20004 |
| Graduate | 185 | 3.32 | 1.34 | .09884 |
| Press release | Non-graduate | 65 | 2.95 | 1.44 | .17871 |
| Graduate | 185 | 3.09 | 1.41 | .10333 |
| Press conference | Non-graduate | 65 | 2.85 | 1.49 | .18506 |
| Graduate | 185 | 2.76 | 1.26 | .09263 |
| Community notices | Non-graduate | 65 | 2.69 | 1.52 | .18852 |
| Graduate | 185 | 3.25 | 1.38 | .10119 |
| Billboards | Non-graduate | 65 | 2.92 | 1.40 | .17308 |
| Graduate | 185 | 3.17 | 1.37 | .10050 |
| Sponsored publications | Non-graduate | 65 | 2.86 | 1.46 | .18065 |
| Graduate | 185 | 3.02 | 1.34 | .09845 |
| Sponsored programmes | Non-graduate | 65 | 2.60 | 1.27 | .15781 |
| Graduate | 185 | 3.03 | 1.32 | .09723 |
| Special events | Non-graduate | 65 | 2.89 | 1.32 | .16426 |
| Graduate | 185 | 2.99 | 1.26 | .09278 |
| News letters | Non-graduate | 65 | 2.74 | 1.36 | .16882 |
| Graduate | 185 | 2.82 | 1.35 | .09952 |
| Community  development services | Non-graduate | 65 | 2.86 | 1.40 | .17387 |
| Graduate | 185 | 2.78 | 1.32 | .09716 |
| Customer care services | Non-graduate | 65 | 2.72 | 1.48 | .18411 |
| Graduate | 185 | 3.18 | 1.28 | .09436 |
| Social interaction  programmes | Non-graduate | 65 | 2.71 | 1.34 | .16659 |
| Graduate | 185 | 3.12 | 1.44 | .10595 |
| Social networks | Non-graduate | 65 | 2.60 | 1.66 | .20545 |
| Graduate | 185 | 3.02 | 1.53 | .11264 |

**Independent Samples Test**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | | Levene's Test for Equality of Variances | | t-test for Equality of Means | | | | | | |
| F | Sig. | t | df | Sig. (2-  tailed) | Mean Differen ce | Std. Error Differenc e | 95% Confidence Interval of the  Difference | |
| Lower | Upper |
| Internet adversities | Equal variances  assumed | 2.832 | .094 | -4.53 | 248 | .000 | - 1.07900 | .23807 | -1.54790 | -.61010 |
| Equal variances not assumed |  |  | -4.37 | 105.347 | .000 | - 1.07900 | .24664 | -1.56802 | -.58999 |
| Print advertising | Equal variances assumed | .644 | .423 | -.43 | 248 | .670 | -.07900 | .18496 | -.44330 | .28530 |
|  | Equal  variances not assumed |  |  | -.45 | 122.766 | .655 | -.07900 | .17634 | -.42807 | .27006 |
| Radio advertising | Equal variances  assumed | .147 | .702 | .55 | 248 | .580 | .10437 | .18852 | -.26694 | .47568 |
| Equal  variances not assumed |  |  | .53 | 105.254 | .594 | .10437 | .19541 | -.28308 | .49181 |
| Television advertising | Equal variances  assumed | 3.994 | .047 | .80 | 248 | .424 | .15593 | .19451 | -.22718 | .53903 |
| Equal variances  not assumed |  |  | .85 | 124.909 | .398 | .15593 | .18387 | -.20798 | .51983 |
| Mobile advertising | Equal variances  assumed | .057 | .812 | 1.72 | 248 | .087 | .32848 | .19145 | -.04859 | .70555 |
| Equal variances  not assumed |  |  | 1.77 | 118.899 | .079 | .32848 | .18551 | -.03884 | .69580 |
| Cash refund | Equal variances  assumed | 3.516 | .062 | -1.25 | 248 | .211 | -.22869 | .18254 | -.58822 | .13084 |
| Equal variances  not assumed |  |  | -1.21 | 104.833 | .231 | -.22869 | .18966 | -.60476 | .14738 |
| Lucky draws | Equal  variances assumed | 1.390 | .240 | -1.56 | 248 | .120 | -.31684 | .20318 | -.71703 | .08335 |
| Equal variances  not assumed |  |  | -1.54 | 109.333 | .127 | -.31684 | .20600 | -.72512 | .09144 |
| Price off deals | Equal  variances assumed | 1.227 | .269 | .52 | 248 | .606 | .09439 | .18257 | -.26520 | .45397 |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Equal  variances not assumed |  |  | .50 | 104.381 | .621 | .09439 | .19019 | -.28274 | .47152 |
| Point of purchase display | Equal variances  assumed | .023 | .879 | .75 | 248 | .455 | .14553 | .19444 | -.23743 | .52849 |
| Equal variances  not assumed |  |  | .75 | 113.297 | .453 | .14553 | .19328 | -.23737 | .52843 |
|  | Equal variances  assumed | 8.426 | .004 | -.83 | 248 | .405 | -.17048 | .20453 | -.57331 | .23236 |
| Interactive  relationships |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Equal variances  not assumed |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | -.76 | 97.052 | .447 | -.17048 | .22312 | -.61331 | .27236 |
|  | Equal variances  assumed | .364 | .547 | -.68 | 248 | .499 | -.13805 | .20397 | -.53979 | .26370 |
| Press release |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Equal variances  not assumed |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | -.67 | 109.679 | .505 | -.13805 | .20643 | -.54716 | .27107 |
|  | Equal variances  assumed | 6.416 | .012 | .47 | 248 | .640 | .08940 | .19086 | -.28651 | .46530 |
| Press  conference |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Equal  variances not assumed |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | .43 | 97.947 | .667 | .08940 | .20694 | -.32128 | .50007 |
|  | Equal variances  assumed | 2.444 | .119 | -2.73 | 248 | .007 | -.55634 | .20400 | -.95813 | -.15456 |
| Community  notices |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Equal  variances not assumed |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | -2.60 | 103.212 | .011 | -.55634 | .21396 | -.98067 | -.13201 |
|  | Equal variances  assumed | .107 | .744 | -1.23 | 248 | .218 | -.24449 | .19816 | -.63479 | .14580 |
| Billboards |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Equal  variances not assumed |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | -1.22 | 110.080 | .224 | -.24449 | .20014 | -.64112 | .15213 |
|  | Equal  variances assumed | 1.700 | .194 | -.81 | 248 | .419 | -.16008 | .19758 | -.54923 | .22906 |
| Sponsored  publications |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Equal variances  not assumed |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | -.78 | 104.456 | .438 | -.16008 | .20573 | -.56803 | .24787 |
|  | Equal variances  assumed | .165 | .685 | -2.29 | 248 | .023 | -.43243 | .18884 | -.80437 | -.06049 |
| Sponsored  programmes |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Equal  variances not assumed |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | -2.33 | 115.998 | .021 | -.43243 | .18536 | -.79956 | -.06531 |
|  | Equal variances  assumed | .565 | .453 | -.55 | 248 | .579 | -.10229 | .18431 | -.46531 | .26073 |
| Special events |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Equal variances  not assumed |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | -.54 | 107.538 | .589 | -.10229 | .18865 | -.47625 | .27167 |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| News letters | Equal  variances assumed | .147 | .702 | -.43 | 248 | .671 | -.08316 | .19545 | -.46810 | .30178 |
| Equal variances  not assumed |  |  | -.42 | 111.525 | .672 | -.08316 | .19596 | -.47146 | .30514 |
| Community development services | Equal variances  assumed | .486 | .486 | .40 | 248 | .688 | .07775 | .19360 | -.30356 | .45907 |
| Equal variances  not assumed |  |  | .39 | 106.599 | .697 | .07775 | .19917 | -.31710 | .47261 |
| Customer care services | Equal variances  assumed | 6.264 | .013 | -2.36 | 248 | .019 | -.45530 | .19296 | -.83534 | -.07526 |
| Equal variances  not assumed |  |  | -2.20 | 99.649 | .030 | -.45530 | .20689 | -.86578 | -.04482 |
| Social interaction programmes | Equal variances  assumed | .388 | .534 | -2.04 | 248 | .042 | -.41663 | .20424 | -.81889 | -.01437 |
| Equal variances  not assumed |  |  | -2.11 | 119.453 | .037 | -.41663 | .19743 | -.80754 | -.02572 |
| Social networks | Equal  variances assumed | 3.475 | .063 | -1.87 | 248 | .063 | -.42162 | .22567 | -.86610 | .02286 |
| Equal variances  not assumed |  |  | -1.80 | 104.960 | .075 | -.42162 | .23431 | -.88621 | .04297 |

# Appendix G Demographic Data of the Respondents

**Demographic Data of the Respondents by Percentage.**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **S/N** | **Variable** | **Number** | **Percentage (%)** |
| 1. | **Gender**  Male | 80 | 32 |
| Female | | 170 68 | |
|  | | **250** | **100** |
| 2 **Experience**  Experienced (above 10 years) | | 112 | 44.8 |
| Inexperienced (less than 10 years) | | 138 | 55.2 |
|  | | **250** | **100** |
| 3 **Location**  Urban | | 190 | 76 |
| Rural 60 24 | | | |
|  |  | **250** | **100** |
| 4 | **Academic Qualification**  Graduates | 185 | 74 |
|  | Non graduates | 65 | 26 |
|  |  | **250** | **100** |

The data in Table 2 show that under gender there were 80 (32 percent) males and 170 females (68 percent). Under years of experience, above 10 years were 112 (44.8 percent) while below 10 years were 138 (55.2 percent). Under location, urban recorded 190 (76 percent) while rural were 60 (24 percent). Under academic qualification, higher institution graduates were 185 (74 percent) while non higher institution graduates were 65 (26 percent).