

The effect of sales promotion on post-promotion brand preference: A meta-analysis

Devon DelVecchio^{a,*}, David H. Henard^{b,1}, Traci H. Freling^{c,2}

^a Richard T. Farmer School of Business, Miami University in Oxford, Ohio 45056, United States

^b College of Management, North Carolina State University in Raleigh, North Carolina 27695-7229, United States

^c Gatton College of Business and Economics, University of Kentucky in Lexington, Kentucky 40506, United States

Accepted 18 October 2005

Abstract

The benefit of sales promotions is that they induce choice. However, this benefit may be offset by undermining preference for the brand when it is no longer promoted. Despite the fact that sales promotions have long been employed in marketing practice and researched academically, a clear understanding of the impact of sales promotion on post-promotion brand preference continues to evade brand managers and marketing scholars alike. This manuscript attempts to provide insight on the effects of sales promotions on brand preference by integrating results from 51 studies on the subject. Our meta-analysis suggests that, on average, sales promotions do not affect post-promotion brand preference. However, depending upon characteristic of the sales promotion and the promoted product, promotions can either increase or decrease preference for a brand. The empirical results provide insights for crafting promotion strategy and for understanding the process by which promotions influence brand preference.

© 2006 New York University. Published by Elsevier Inc. All rights reserved.

Keywords: Sales promotion; Post-promotion brand preference; Meta-analysis

Introduction

Sales promotions are typically viewed as temporary incentives that encourage the trial of a product or service (Kotler 1988; Webster 1971). Not surprisingly, most research on their use explores the effect of promotions at the time in which they are offered (Blattberg and Neslin 1989; Leone and Srinivasan 1996). Relatively less attention has been devoted to investigating the consequences of sales promotions for brand preference after the promotion has ended. Furthermore, scholastic opinion on whether promotions help or hinder a brand in subsequent choice periods is mixed. Some researchers assert that sales promotions can undermine brand preference. Aaker (1996, p. 187) states that promotions have the potential to

damage brand equity by focusing the consumer's attention too heavily on price. Similarly, Keller (1998) warns of a number of disadvantages of sales promotions such as decreased brand loyalty, increased brand switching, decreased quality perceptions and increased price sensitivity. Conversely, other researchers contend that sales promotions can increase brand preference (e.g., Davis et al. 1992; Rothschild and Gaidis 1981). Thus, the extant literature is unclear as to whether sales promotions detract from or enhance brand preference.

Despite the widespread use of promotions in marketing practice and the equivocal research findings, there has been no systematic attempt to integrate extant research to determine the nature of the relationship between the use of sales promotions and brand preference once the promotion is rescinded. To address this, we conduct a meta-analysis to evaluate the results of previously published research that links the use of sales promotion to indicators of post-promotion brand preference. In addition to examining the central tendency of association between sales promotion

* Corresponding author. Tel.: +1 513 529 9364.

E-mail addresses: delvecds@muohio.edu (D. DelVecchio), dhhenard@ncsu.edu (D.H. Henard), traci.freling@uky.edu (T.H. Freling).

¹ Tel.: +1 919 515 8945.

² Tel.: +1 859 257 2257.

and brand preference, we also identify conditions that might moderate this relationship. In the following section, we review the relevant literature and define our analytical domain. We then describe our methodology and provide a detailed presentation of our results. We conclude with a discussion of the implications emanating from this research.

The research domain

Researchers have investigated several aspects of consumers' responses to sales promotions. Inquiry has primarily focused on whether, and by how much, promotions increase choice at the time of the promotion (Goodman and Moody 1970; Massy and Frank 1965). Related research investigated the ability of variables such as promotion type (Schneider and Currim 1991) and promotion value (Leone and Srinivasan 1996) to moderate the relationship between promotion and choice. While relatively fewer studies have been conducted, researchers have also examined if sales promotions have an impact that extends beyond the time they are offered. In so doing, rationale has been forwarded both to predict that promotions will decrease preference for a brand and that they will increase preference for a brand. Making prediction even more difficult, the mechanisms associated with a positive post-promotion effect and those associated with a negative effect may operate simultaneously (Blattberg and Neslin 1989).

Promotions may increase post-promotion preference via purchase reinforcement (Blattberg and Neslin 1989; Pauwels et al. 2002). For existing brand users, promotion reinforcement occurs by reminding existing customers to buy the brand thereby buttressing their preference for it. For non-users, promotions may induce trial thereby bolstering attitudes and the likelihood of repurchase. The case that sales promotions will decrease post-promotion brand preference has been summarized from a behavioral standpoint as the promotion usage effect (Blattberg and Neslin 1989). Consumers may make negative attributions about the brand as they look for explanations as to why the brand needs to promote. Promotion usage effects may also arise by shaping consumers' behavior toward buying promoted products (Rothschild 1987). Given the widespread availability of promotions, this is likely to result in the selection of a competing brand that is promoted when the previously chosen brand rescinds its promotion.

Econometric studies of promotions indicate that they may also undermine brand preference by lowering consumers' price expectations. Literature suggests that consumers evaluate prices relative to their expectations (Lattin and Bucklin 1989; Papatla and Krishnamurthi 1996). A price that is higher than expected decreases the probability that a brand will be chosen. Price expectations, in turn, appear to be a function of previously observed prices (e.g., Rajendram and Tellis 1994). Thus, by lowering the price that consumers observe for a product, a price promotion may lower price expectations and, in turn, future brand choice.

Assessing changes in brand preference

Researchers have identified two outcomes that indicate a change in brand preference following a sales promotion: brand perceptions and choice probability. Studies measuring consumers' *brand perceptions* typically gauge shifts in subjects' overall "liking" for the brand (e.g., Davis et al. 1992; Tybout and Scott 1983) or perceptions of brand quality (e.g., Dawar and Sarvary 1997; Low and Lichtenstein 1993; Raghuram 2004) following exposure to a sales promotion. *Choice probability*, the second measure of post-promotion preference, is often assessed directly via pre- and post-promotion brand choice (e.g., Motes 1987; Kahn and Louie 1990; Scott 1976). Choice probability has also been measured indirectly via promotion-induced shifts in price sensitivity (Kopalle et al. 1999; Srinivasan et al. 2000) and promotion-induced changes in brand loyalty (Bhattacharya et al. 1996; Gedenk and Neslin 1999).

Results of studies assessing brand perceptions after a promotion are equivocal across, and sometimes within, research studies. For instance, across four frequently purchased consumer non-durable brands and four perceptual measures of brand preference, Davis et al. (1992) report five instances of statistically significant increases in consumers' brand perceptions after a period of promotions and no instances in which perceptions decreased. Similarly, measures of brand choice are associated with a variety of effects. Kalwani et al. (1990) report a negative effect of promotion on the post-promotion purchase probability for instant coffee. Conversely, Lattin and Bucklin (1989) find a positive effect of promotion in the same product category. Kopalle et al. (1999) find that promotions impair brand preference by leading to a marginally significant increase in price sensitivity whereas Srinivasan et al. (2000) report increased price sensitivity for three brands, decreased price sensitivity for two, and null results for three others. Bhattacharya et al. (1996) report that sales promotions do not affect brand loyalty, while Gedenk and Neslin (1999) find significant negative effects on loyalty. Thus, both measures of post-promotion brand preference are associated with equivocal results that make a detailed study of their conclusions appropriate.

Peripheral research

Before summarizing the results via meta-analysis, we need to clearly delineate our domain of inquiry by identifying several types of promotion-centric studies that are not included in our research domain. Given our interest in the effect of sales promotions after the period in which they are offered, studies that focus on issues at time of the promotion such as maximizing immediate response to the promotion (e.g., Krishnamurthi and Raj 1988) and decomposing this response into promotional gain, brand switching, category expansion, and stockpiling (e.g., Gupta 1988; van Heerde et al. 2003) are outside of our domain. There are also six types of studies that consider forward-looking consumer behaviors or evaluations

in response to a sales promotion that fall outside the scope of our research.

First, we exclude studies that are indicative of stockpiling. For instance, studies of the effect of promotions on purchase timing or quantity for a brand likely reflect a stockpiling effect (e.g., Cotton and Babb 1978; Slonim and Garbarino 1999). Stockpiling leads to lower aggregate or per consumer sales for a brand following a sales promotion by taking consumers out of the market due to greater on-promotion purchase quantities (i.e., consumers who bought the promoted product are now “buying” quantity = zero after stockpiling during the promotion). It is important to consider the effect of promotions on consumer stockpiling to understand the profitability of promotions. However, increased stockpiling presents a relatively benign threat to the promoted brand in that it does not decrease the likelihood that a consumer chooses the brand when making a purchase in the product category again (i.e., is not indicative of a change in preference). Furthermore, promotion-induced stockpiling decreases consumers’ opportunities to switch to competing brands and may lead to repeat purchases of the chosen brand, and/or increase overall category consumption (see Ailawadi et al. (2005) for a test of such benefits).

Second, we seek to examine the impact of sales promotion on brand preference rather than judge the plausibility of such an effect. We consequently exclude studies that use simulated data to demonstrate the plausibility that sales promotions affect brand preference (e.g., Neslin and Shoemaker 1989). Third, our interest is on brand-level relationships. Thus, we exclude articles that infer the optimum level of sales promotion for a store across a set of brands (e.g., Blattberg and Levin 1987; Suri and Zufryden 1995). Fourth, the central issue in this manuscript is the impact of (a) offering versus not offering a sales promotion or (b) offering more frequent versus less frequent promotions. Articles that contrast different types of promotions to assess post-promotion preference but do not allow for a comparison to a strategy of not promoting or promoting less frequently are also excluded (e.g., Krishna 1994).

Fifth, we also omit much of the data derived from research focusing on price expectations or internal reference prices. Although lower price expectations following exposure to a promotion can affect future choice, we exclude several of the studies on price expectations for two reasons. First, as would be expected, the dependent variable in many of these studies is the price expectation for a brand (e.g., Bearden et al. 1992; Jacobson and Obermiller 1990). Without linking a consumer’s price expectations to future choice, a change in price expectations does not necessarily affect preference for the brand. Second, most studies measuring price expectations do not specify whether these expectations are changing in response to promotions or changes in regular prices. As such, the unique impact of promotions on brand preference is difficult to extricate from effects relating to other price changes. However, studies on price expectations that account for the specific effect of sales promotion on price expectations and

future choice are included in our analyses (e.g., Kalwani et al. 1990). Finally, we eliminated studies in which the author(s) used the same data set to produce a related article. In such cases, rather than having one data set receive undue weight, we included the data from the article that we deemed most central to the issue of post-promotion brand preference and excluded any others from analysis.

In sum, this meta-analysis includes only studies that explore the impact of sales promotions on brand preference after the period in which the promotion is offered by measuring brand perceptions or choice probability or its derivative measures (e.g., price sensitivity). Each study allows for the comparison of brand preference across conditions of (a) offering versus not offering a promotion (e.g., an experimental versus a control condition in lab experiments) or (b) offering more versus less frequent promotions (e.g., a correlation-based measure of promotion frequency and purchase probability when not promoted in models of scanner data). Given this demarcation of our research domain, we now turn to the development of the data set that emerges within this set of boundaries and to our method of analyses.

Methodology

To identify the population of studies for this analysis we conducted key word searches of electronic databases using terms such as “promotions,” “brand choice,” and “deal retraction.” We then studied the reference sections of those identified studies in search of additional empirical studies. Finally, we conducted a manual search of leading journals in which articles addressing sales promotions and brand choice are most likely to be found (e.g., *Journal of Marketing*, *Journal of Marketing Research*, *Journal of Retailing*, *International Journal of Research in Marketing*, and *Marketing Science*). We identified 51 suitable empirical studies through the database development process. These studies are noted in Table 1.

After reviewing and coding each study, it became clear that a variety of both dependent variables and metrics were reported across the studies. To make the outcome variables comparable while retaining the greatest number of studies in our database, we used the point-biserial correlation as our effect size given that most of the other reported measures could be converted to it (see Glass et al. 1981; Hunter et al. 1982). From this we retained a total of 132 observations from 42 of the 51 studies. Our inclusion rate is generally consistent with previous meta-analyses (see e.g., Compeau and Grewal 1999; Krishna et al. 2002). One of the principal investigators and a graduate student independently coded the data in each article. Coding consistency between the two was 94%. The few discrepancies were rectified through discussion and subsequent re-coding.

Consistent with the analytical approach advocated by Glass et al. (1981) and employed in other meta-analyses (e.g., Henard and Szymanski 2001; Krishna et al. 2002),

Table 1

Meta-analysis study population

Bawa and Shoemaker (1987)	Lawrence (1969)
Bhattacharya et al. (1996)	Litvack et al. (1985)
Boulding et al. (1994)	Low and Lichtenstein (1993)
Brown (1974)	Macé and Neslin (2004)
Charlton and Ehernberg (1976)	Mazursky et al. (1987)
Darke and Chung (2005)	Mela et al. (1997)
Davis et al. (1992)	Mela et al. (1998)
Dawar and Sarvary (1997)	Motes (1987)
Dawes (2004)	Neslin and Shoemaker (1989)
Dekimpe et al. (1999)	Ortmeyer et al. (1991)
Dodson et al. (1978)	Papatla (1993)
Doob et al. (1969)	Papatla and Krishnamurthi (1996)
Ehrenberg and England (1990)	Pauwels et al. (2002)
Foekens et al. (1999)	Raghubir (2004)
Gedenk and Neslin (1999)	Raghubir and Corfman (1999)
Guadagni and Little (1983)	Scott (1976)
Jedidi et al. (1999)	Scott and Tybout (1979)
Jones and Zufryden (1981)	Scott and Yalch (1980)
Kahn and Louie (1990)	Shankar and Krishnamurthi (1996)
Kalwani et al. (1990)	Shoemaker and Shoaf (1977)
Kalwani and Yim (1992)	Srinivasan et al. (2000)
Karande and Kumar (1995)	Srinivasan et al. (2004)
Kopalle et al. (1999)	Suri et al. (2000)
Krishna (1991)	Tybout and Scott (1983)
Kumar and Pereira (1995)	Zenor et al. (1998)
Lattin and Bucklin (1989)	

we captured correlations at the observation level rather than at the aggregated study level. A study level approach entails averaging the effect sizes within each published study to arrive at a data population where n equals the number of studies contained in the articles. We employed an observation level approach wherein each effect size reported within a study is included in the analysis. For instance, a study that reports results for a brand loyal and a brand switching segment contributes two effect sizes. Thus, the central tendency of association across all studies is calculated using the full population of correlations available. Capturing data at the observation level also enhances our ability to test the impact of moderating variables that might influence the reported relationships (Matt and Cook 1994).

We began our analysis of the correlations between sales promotions and indicators of brand preference by estimating the mean association across the studies retained in the analysis. We used the classical analytical approach advocated by Hunter and Schmidt (1990) and Hunter et al. (1982). Given the variation in correlation results across studies, any attempt to base conclusions solely on a summary of results could be biased by statistical artifacts, measurement method factors, or research context factors (Assmus et al. 1984; Hunter et al. 1982). Therefore, rather than analyze the simple correlation means across studies, we took a weighted average in which each model-level correlation was corrected for the number of persons in that study to attenuate sampling error across studies. This frequency-weighted average appropriately gives relatively greater emphasis to studies with larger populations.

In addition to capturing the direct relationship between sales promotion and post-promotion brand preference reported in the literature, we also assess variables that might moderate this relationship. While a growing body of research focuses on whether sales promotions impact brand preference in future periods, the moderators of such an effect have received relatively less attention. Fortunately, research on consumer responses to sales promotions at the time they are offered provides a framework for identifying factors that might moderate the effect of promotion on brand preference. Specifically, three categories of variables are shown to affect consumer responses at the time of a promotion (and thus may affect post-promotion responses as well). The first such category involves *promotion characteristics* (e.g., Berkowitz and Walton 1980; Chen et al. 1998). Since promotions are typically defined in terms of their type and value (Della Bitta et al. 1981), we consider the potential for the promotion type (e.g., coupon, premium offer) and value (as a percentage of the value of the promoted product) to moderate the effect of promotions on post-promotion brand preference.

The second type of variables that affect consumer reactions to sales promotions at the time of the promotion are those related to the product. *Product characteristics* include factors such as frequency of purchase, whether the product is a search or experience good, the price level of the category, the price level of the brand within category, national/private label, and the popularity of the brand. We are able to evaluate the role of brand type (fictitious versus actual), product category type (packaged goods versus other), inter-purchase time, and number of products in the category. The inter-purchase time reflects the time between successive purchases in studies of brand choice and between exposure to the promotion and product evaluation in studies of brand perceptions. Finally, responses to promotions differ as a function of *consumer characteristics* (Blattberg et al. 1978; Montgomery 1971). While several consumer characteristics may influence reactions to promotions, the data available in the studies examined here allow us to assess only the role of one such characteristic. Specifically, we test whether the consumer is typically loyal to the focal brand or is (potentially) switching to the brand.

Testing for the potential moderating role of characteristics relating to the promotion, the product, and the consumer is consistent with previous meta-analyses on sales promotion effects (e.g., Biswas et al. 1993; Krishna et al. 2002). Also in accordance with these studies, we consider the potential for *study method characteristics* to affect post-promotion brand preference. This allows any effects of method to be accounted for when interpreting the more managerially and theoretically interesting effects of the choice environment. Specifically, we examined researchers' decisions regarding the dependent variable used to capture the promotion-brand preference relationship, the number of purchase occasions tracked in the study, and whether data was collected in lab or field. Thus, in total, we examine four categories of potential moderating factors: promotion characteristics, product

Table 2
Moderator variables coded in the analysis

	Levels	Description
Promotion characteristics		
Promotion type	Announced price cut	Includes shelf tags, end-of-aisle displays, and advertised specials
	Coupon	In-store or mailed coupons
	Premium offer	Another good is included free or offered at a discount
	Unannounced price reduction	A temporary discount appears as a decrease in the regular price
	<i>Unspecified</i>	
Promotion value	Less than 20%, $\geq 20\%$, <i>unspecified</i>	Value as a percentage of the base product price
Product characteristics		
Brand type	Actual, <i>fictitious</i>	Did the study employ real brands or fictitious/unnamed brands?
Product type	Packaged good, <i>other</i>	“Other” includes durables and services
Inter-purchase time	Less than/equal to 36 days, >36 days	Time between successive purchases or between exposure to the promotion and brand evaluation
Number of competing products	Less than/equal to 2, >2 , <i>unspecified</i>	Number of products in the choice/evaluation set
Consumer characteristics		
Segment	Brand loyal	Consumers were identified as being loyal to a brand
	Brand switcher	Consumers were identified as being prone to switch brands
	<i>Unspecified</i>	
Methodological characteristics		
Dependent variable	Choice	DV is brand choice (0, 1) or choice probability
	<i>Perception</i>	DV is brand evaluation
Number of purchases tracked	9 or less, more than 9	Average number of category purchases for each consumer
Type of data	Lab, <i>field</i>	Was the data based on lab experiment or field study?

Note: For each characteristic, the default value appears in italics.

characteristics, consumer characteristics, and methodological characteristics. Table 2 illustrates the moderating variables included in our analysis. For the continuous variables (promotion value, inter-purchase time, number of competing products, and number of purchases tracked) levels were created via a median split.

A limiting factor in the selection of a potential moderator is the amount of data necessary for the variable to be included in the analysis. A variable was deemed appropriate for inclusion in the analysis if it was specified in at least two articles and constituted at least 5% of the 132 total data points. These criteria are consistent with meta-analyses on similar topics (e.g., Krishna et al. 2002). In some instances, insufficient detail was provided in the original article by which to classify cases. We include “unspecified” as a variable level to account for such cases. We deviate from this classification when a study did not report whether the data included more or less than ten purchase occasions. In such a case we inferred the number of purchases based on the length of time covered in the data collection period. Of the extant studies that indicate the time between category purchases, the mean inter-purchase time is 36 days. Thus, for ten or more purchases to have occurred in a typical product category, the study would need to cover 360 days.

While a casual review of the extant research focused on the effect of sales promotions on post-promotion brand preference gives managers and researchers a mixed message, the impact of each potential moderating variable (see Table 2) is somewhat more straightforward. Consideration of the mechanisms that drive post-promotion brand preference (i.e., the promotion usage effect, purchase reinforcement, and price

expectations) allows propositions to be forwarded. Table 3 provides a summary of the proposed impact of each potential moderator. Theories on the effects of promotions are not highly pertinent to the decisions regarding the methodological characteristics of study. Thus, we limit our propositions to relate to promotion, brand, and consumer characteristics.

Results

Across studies, the mean correlation between the use of sales promotion and post-promotion brand preference is $-.020$ ($t = -.87$, $p > .10$). On average, sales promotions do not statistically affect brand preference after the promotional period has ended. However, promotions may still affect brand preference (either positively or negatively) in certain conditions. Thus, in addition to identifying the relative effect size between promotions and future brand preference, we sought to ascertain why the strength of the relationship varies across empirical studies. We partitioned the variance in effect size into variance attributable to sampling error and remaining variance. This partitioning provides a methodological foundation for determining if the variance in correlations across studies is a function of statistical artifacts or due to other methodological or contextual factors. The variance attributable to sampling error was negligible (i.e., $<5\%$) and indicates that a search for moderating variables is appropriate and that any statistically significant moderators are unlikely to be significant because of chance (Hunter and Schmidt 1990). We tested for the impact of moderator variables using dummy-variable regression by regressing our correlations

Table 3
Proposed effects of the moderator variables on post-promotion brand preference

	Proposed relationship	Rationale
Promotion characteristics		
P1: coupon usage	+	Coupons require more effort to redeem than point-of-sale discounts. Promotions that are more difficult to redeem mitigate the extent to which purchase is attributed to promotion
P2: unannounced price cuts	–	May be viewed as permanent price reductions leading to lower price expectations and, in turn, lower choice probability once the discount is retracted
P3: point-of-purchase sign/ad	–	Easy to take advantage of and thus easier to attribute purchase to the deal. Price focus may lead to lower price expectations
P4: premium offer	+	Less price focus may insulate against lower price expectations
P5: deeper promotions	–	Purchase is more likely to be attributed to the promotion if the discount is large/powerful
Product characteristics		
P6: fictitious brands	–	Consumers have less well formed beliefs regarding new stimuli. Less firmly held beliefs are more susceptible to change thereby increasing any negative effect of promotions on brand preference
P7: packaged goods	+	Frequent exposure to promotions may decrease sensitivity to promotions and/or decrease the likelihood of making brand-level attributions for the use of promotion (i.e., promotion is a category norm and thus not an indictment of the brand)
P8: longer inter-purchase time	+	Longer time between purchases allows time for brand evaluations or price expectations to regress toward baseline beliefs thereby mitigating any negative effect of promotions
P9: smaller choice set	–	Smaller sets should increase attention to any one brand's promotion thereby heightening any negative response to promotions
Consumer characteristics		
P10: brand switching segment	–	Less loyal consumers may have less firmly held quality beliefs that are less resistant to change in response to promotion

against the potential environmental and methodological moderating variables listed in Table 2.

Overall, the moderating variables account for nearly half of the variance we observed in the correlations between promotion and brand preference ($R^2 = .475$, adjusted $R^2 = .402$). To more clearly understand the source of the variance in post-promotion brand preference we report the effects of each of the four types of independent variables we specified as moderators (promotion, product, consumer, and methodological characteristics) in Table 4. As indicated, none of the consumer or method characteristics significantly affect brand preference while both promotion and product characteristics appear to shape post-promotion brand preference.

Regarding characteristics of the promotion, both the value and type of sales promotion have a significant effect on post-promotion brand preference. Post-promotion brand preference is undermined by promotions that are 20% or more of the product value (standardized $\beta = -.352$, $t = -2.79$, $p < .05$). With respect to the type of promotion being offered, preference is significantly reduced when the promotion is an unannounced price reduction, as when a temporary decrease in the everyday retail price is offered (standardized $\beta = -.249$, $t = -2.12$, $p < .05$). Relative to other promotions, post-promotion preference is higher when the discount is in the form of a coupon (standardized $\beta = .219$, $t = 1.99$, $p < .05$) or a premium (standardized $\beta = .225$, $t = 1.70$, $p < .10$). In fact, coupons are associated with a mean correlation ($r = .121$) that reflects an increase in post-promotion preference that is positive and statistically significant ($p < .10$).

Three of the product characteristics have a significant moderating effect on the degree to which a promotion impacts

brand preference. Promotions have a more positive effect on brand preference when competing against a larger set of products (standardized $\beta = .383$, $t = 4.18$, $p < .01$). Post-promotion preference is lower when consumers are exposed to fictitious brands ($r = -.165$) than when exposed to actual brands ($r = .029$, standardized $\beta = .563$, $t = 4.00$, $p < .01$). Preference for a brand is also lower following a promotion for a durable or service ($r = -.110$) than for a packaged good ($r = .001$, standardized $\beta = .285$, $t = 1.92$, $p < .10$). The inter-purchase time in the category in which the brand competes did not affect post-promotion preference.

Discussion

Our results suggest that, on average, sales promotions have neither a positive nor a negative effect on brand preference beyond the promotion period. While the overall mean effect is not statistically significant, this does not suggest that sales promotions do not affect brand preference. Consistent with the notion that multiple mechanisms may affect post-promotion preferences (e.g., purchase reinforcement can bolster post-promotion brand preference while the promotion usage effect weakens preference), sales promotions may either undermine or augment brand preference depending on the promotion and the characteristics of the product being promoted. We believe the conditional nature of our findings provides valuable insights for both brand managers and scholars.

Brand managers spend more money on sales promotions than they do on advertising expenditures. As managers

Table 4
Regression analysis—the effect of sales promotions on brand preference

	Levels	Frequency	Mean <i>r</i>	Standardized β	<i>t</i> -Value
Promotion characteristics					
Promotion type	POP sign/ad	36	-.051	.062	.41
	Coupon	16	.121	.219	1.99**
	Premium	9	-.007	.225	1.70*
	Unannounced price cut	11	-.358	-.249	-2.12**
	<i>Unspecified</i>	47	.040		
Promotion value	Less than 20%	30	.028	-.048	-.48
	More than 20%	40	-.162	-.352	-2.79**
	<i>Unspecified</i>	62	.030		
Product characteristics					
Brand type	Actual	97	.029	.563	4.00**
	<i>Fictitious</i>	35	-.165		
Product type	Packaged good	107	.001	.285	1.92*
	<i>Other</i>	25	-.110		
Inter-purchase time	36 days or less	65	-.041	-.056	-.47
	<i>More than 36 days</i>	67	-.003		
Number of competing products	2 or less	27	-.149	-.016	-.11
	More than 2	30	.117	.383	4.18**
	<i>Unspecified</i>	75	-.029		
Consumer characteristics					
Segment	Switching	16	-.017	-.116	-1.50
	Loyal	16	-.027	-.082	-1.00
	<i>Unspecified</i>	102	-.018		
Method characteristics					
Dependent variable	Choice	96	-.014	.004	.27
	<i>Perception</i>	36	-.027		
Number of purchases tracked	9 or less	67	-.052	-.083	-.78
	<i>More than 9</i>	65	.012		
Type of data	Lab	68	-.058	-.157	-1.04
	<i>Field</i>	64	.023		

Note: For each characteristic, the default value appears in italics.

* $p < .10$.

** $p < .05$.

engage in promotion activity they can protect their brands against negative effects by carefully selecting the type and value of the sales promotion they offer. We found the use of an unannounced price cut to be particularly detrimental to brand preference. Thus, managers are urged to offer promotions that are clearly temporary in nature. Post-promotion brand preference was relatively more favorable when the sales promotion was a coupon or premium. In fact, consistent with the findings of Macé and Neslin (2004), our results suggest that a coupon offer may lead to an *increase* in post-promotion preference. In addition, large promotions (>20% of the product's value) were found to have a detrimental effect on brand preference across the studies in our database. Thus, managers must balance the tradeoff between the immediate boost in sales afforded by larger promotions and the longer-term risk at which they place their brand by offering high-value promotions.

Our results suggest that managers must also consider the characteristics of their product to assess the potential for a sales promotion to diminish brand preference. We found that sales promotions were more harmful to brands with which consumers are unfamiliar than for those with which

they are familiar. In the meta-analysis, lack of familiarity with a brand arose due to the use of hypothetical brands in the choice stimuli. However, this result is likely to apply to brands that are new or relatively unknown. Therefore, managers of new or less dominant brands may look to entice trial through means other than promotions (e.g., Kroger's promise that their store brand products are "as good as the national brand or your money back").

Our results indicate that brand managers should also be mindful of the size of the product category in which they compete since the negative effect of promotion is greater in categories with relatively few competitors. Given a small array of competitors, the actions (i.e., discounts) offered by any one brand are likely to be noticed by consumers. Thus, brands in product categories such as processed cheese, diapers, and canned vegetables in which there are relatively few national competitors may be placed at greater risk via sales promotions. The effect of small category size may also arise if brands are promoted in stores with limited variety (e.g., convenient stores). Finally, promotions by durables and services were associated with more negative effects on brand preference than were packaged goods. This

result may reflect consumers' acceptance of promotions as a competitive norm for frequently purchased non-durables. Such a belief may mitigate negative attributions regarding a packaged-good brand when a promotion is available.

In addition to testing whether sales promotions affect brand preference, researchers have questioned how such an effect would occur. The "promotion usage effect" holds that promotion-induced preference reduction is driven by consumers' attributions regarding promotions. Our findings fit well with an attribution-based explanation of the relationship between sales promotions and brand preference. For instance, coupons require a relatively high level of effort on the part of consumers who wish to take advantage of them. A consumer must locate, cut, carry, and present the coupon at the time of purchase to redeem it. As the effort needed to redeem a given promotion increases, the likelihood that the consumer attributes his or her brand choice to the promotion decreases. Under these circumstances, the consumer is likely to conclude that, "if I am going to this effort, I must like the brand" (e.g., Dodson et al. 1978). Also consistent with an attribution-based effect of promotions, post-promotion preference is inversely related to the value of the promotion value. This finding supports Neslin's (2002, p. 13) claim that "overly powerful promotions can overshadow the bene-

fits of the brand and undermine brand preference." The fact that promotions appear particularly likely to overshadow the benefits of the brand when the brand is fictitious (and thus the benefits of the brand are not well known) also supports an attribution-based account of post-promotion preference.

Readers should bear in mind that the results of our analysis are subject to the limitations inherent in the meta-analysis technique. Most noteworthy is that any meta-analysis is constrained by the data that is available in published studies. In certain instances, we were unable to translate existing empirical results into a metric that allowed for inclusion in our analysis. While we could not include these studies in our final database, their importance to the research question at hand should not be ignored. Therefore, we briefly summarize some of the excluded studies in Table 5. As shown, these studies most often report null and/or negative results. Positive effects of promotion on preference are reported only by Dekimpe et al. (1999) and Foekens et al. (1999).

Our analysis of moderating variables is limited by the description of the promotion environment supplied in the original studies. As a result, some variables of theoretic and practical importance are not included in our analysis. For instance, while we distinguish between actual and fictitious brands, more direct measures of brand familiarity or popular-

Table 5
Qualitative review of studies not included in the empirical analysis

Study	Summary	Findings
Dekimpe et al. (1999)	Tested the effect of promotions on the evolution of brand/category sales over 113 weeks for thirteen brands in four categories	Find no longer-run effects of promotions on sales for ten brands, negative effects for two brands, and positive effects for one brand
Foekens et al. (1999)	Estimated price elasticities for three brands of a frequently purchased non-durable (FPND) product	For the most heavily promoted brand, more recent and more valuable promotions increased consumer price sensitivity. There was no effect of promotion on price-elasticity for the other two brands in the study
Jedidi et al. (1999)	Estimated price and promotion elasticities for four FPND brands	Promotions increase promotion and price sensitivity. These effects are driven more by promotion depth than promotion frequency
Karande and Kumar (1995)	Estimated promotional price elasticities for three brands each of soup, ketchup, and yogurt	More frequent promotion increases consumer sensitivity to promotions (i.e., consumers learn to wait for promotions)
Macé and Neslin (2004)	Modeled post-promotion sales in ten FPND product categories	Products associated with negative effects on post-promotion sales are higher-priced, frequently promoted, mature, and higher-share. Promotions of greater depth increase post-promotion sales dips while the use of coupons helps eliminate the negative post-promotion effect
Mazursky et al. (1987)	Examined panel data on satisfaction and repurchase intentions for margarine, coffee, toilet paper, macaroni, and paper towels	Satisfaction with the chosen brand was lower following promotion-induced brand switching than intrinsically motivated brand switching in three of five categories (no difference in two categories). In four of five categories, a point-of-sale price reduction was associated with lower repurchase intentions. Coupons did not affect repurchase intentions
Mela et al. (1997)	Modeled consumer response to promotion and advertising over an 8 year period for a FPND good	Price promotions increase the price sensitivity of both loyal and non-loyal consumers. Frequent use of promotions also trains non-loyal consumers to wait for promotions by the brand
Neslin and Shoemaker (1989)	Examined the effectiveness of a coupon campaign for a personal care product	Scanner data reveals a spike in sales at the time of the promotion with "no discernable drop after the promotion" (p. 378)
Papatla (1993)	Modeled consumer loyalty for brands of laundry detergent	Loyalty built through brand purchase was greater for brands that were on-deal the least

ity such as market share are desirable. Similarly, consumers' level of expertise both in terms of brand knowledge (e.g., Raghuram and Corfman 1999) and persuasion knowledge are likely to influence the extent to which promotions alter their reactions to promotions. While our results provide useful insights, opportunity exists for studies to broaden the scope of study by testing a wider array of moderating variables. Whereas we study the effect of promotion on preference, some managers might be more interested in profits. Thus, future research should address the effect of promotion on future profitability and whether any decrease in profitability is offset by immediate returns at the time of the promotion.

Despite these limitations, the results offer important insights to both practitioners and researchers. Researchers' interest in post-promotion brand preference has centered on the question of if there is an effect of promotion on preference once the promotion is removed. Our results offer a nuanced answer to this question. On average, promotions do not affect brand preference. However, promotions can either build (specifically via the use of coupons) or detract from longer-term brand preference. The delineation of the product characteristics that are associated with negative post-promotion effects on brand preference informs managers to be advised of the risk at which they place their brands when offering sales promotions. Understanding the effect of promotion characteristics on post-promotion brand preference allows managers to select a form (i.e., coupon, premium) and value (i.e., less than 20% of the product value) of promotion that minimizes risk.

Acknowledgements

The authors would like to thank Coeditors Dhruv Grewal and Michael Levy and three anonymous reviewers for their insightful comments. We would also like to thank the authors of the studies that provided the foundation for our work and make special mention of Scott Neslin, whose research on sales promotions proved invaluable to us.

References

- Aaker, David A. (1996). *Building Strong Brands*. New York: The Free Press.
- Ailawadi, Kusum L., Karen Gedenk, Christian Lutzky and Scott A. Neslin (2005). "The Benefits of Promotion-Induced Stockpiling," *Working Paper*, Hanover, NH: Tuck School of Business, Dartmouth University.
- Assmus, Gert, John U. Farley and Donald R. Lehmann (1984). "How Advertising Affects Sales: Meta-Analysis of Econometric Results," *Journal of Marketing Research*, 21, 65–74.
- Bawa, Kapil and Robert W. Shoemaker (1987). "The Effects of a Direct Mail Coupon on Brand Choice Behavior," *Journal of Marketing Research*, 24, 370–376.
- Bearden, William O., Ajit Kaicker, Melinda Smith de Borrero and Joel E. Urbany (1992). "Examining Alternative Measures of Internal Reference Prices," John F. Sherry and Brian Sternthal (Eds.), *Advances in Consumer Research*: 19, Ann Arbor, MI: Association for Consumer Research, 629–635.
- Berkowitz, Eric N. and John R. Walton (1980). "Contextual Influences on Consumer Price Responses: An Experimental Analysis," *Journal of Marketing Research*, 17, 349–358.
- Bhattacharya, C.B., Peter S. Fader, Leonard M. Lodish and Wayne S. DeSarbo (1996). "The Relationship Between the Marketing Mix and Share of Category Requirements," *Marketing Letters*, 7 (1), 5–18.
- Biswas, Abhijit, Elizabeth J. Wilson and Jane W. Licata (1993). "Reference Pricing Studies in Marketing: A Synthesis of Research Results," *Journal of Business Research*, 27 (3), 239–256.
- Blattberg, Robert C., Thomas Buesing, Peter Peacock and Subrata Sen (1978). "Identifying the Deal Prone Segment," *Journal of Marketing Research*, 15, 369–377.
- Blattberg, Robert C. and Alan Levin (1987). "Modeling the Effectiveness and Profitability of Trade Promotions," *Marketing Science*, 6, 124–146.
- Blattberg, Robert C. and Scott A. Neslin (1989). "Sales Promotion: The Long and the Short of It," *Marketing Letters*, 1, 81–97.
- Boulding, William, Eunkyoo Lee and Richard Staelin (1994). "Mastering the Mix: Do Advertising, Promotion, and Sales Force Activities Lead to Differentiation?," *Journal of Marketing Research*, 31, 159–172.
- Brown, Robert George (1974). "Sales Response to Promotions and Advertising," *Journal of Advertising Research*, 14, 33–39.
- Charlton, P. and A.S.C. Ehernberg (1976). "An Experiment in Brand Choice," *Journal of Marketing Research*, 13, 152–160.
- Chen, Shih-Fen S., Kent B. Monroe and Yung-Chien Lou (1998). "The Effects of Framing Price Promotion Messages on Consumers' Perceptions and Purchase Intentions: Research Perspectives on Retail Pricing," *Journal of Retailing*, 74, 353–372.
- Compeau, Larry D. and Dhruv Grewal (1999). "Comparative Price Advertising: An Integrative Review," *Journal of Public Policy and Marketing*, 17 (2), 257–273.
- Cotton, B.C. and Emerson M. Babb (1978). "Consumer Response to Promotional Deals," *Journal of Marketing*, 42, 109–113.
- Darke, Peter R. and Cindy M.Y. Chung (2005). "Effects of Pricing and Promotion on Consumer Perceptions: It Depends on How You Frame It," *Journal of Retailing*, 81 (1), 35–47.
- Davis, Scott J., Jeffrey Inman and Leigh McAlister (1992). "Promotion has a Negative Effect on Brand Evaluations—Or Does It? Additional Disconfirming Evidence," *Journal of Marketing Research*, 29, 143–148.
- Dawar, Niraj and Miklos Sarvary (1997). "The Signaling Impact of Low Introductory Price on Perceived Quality and Trial," *Marketing Letters*, 8, 251–259.
- Dawes, John (2004). "Assessing the Impact of a Very Successful Price Promotion on Brand, Category, and Competitor Sales," *Journal of Product and Brand Management*, 13 (5), 303–314.
- Dekimpe, Marnik G., Dominique Hanssens and Jorge M. Silva-Risso (1999). "Long-Run Effects of Price Promotions in Scanner Markets," *Journal of Econometrics*, 89 (1/2), 269–291.
- Della, Bitta, J. Albert, Kent B. Monroe and John M. McGinnis (1981). "Consumer Perceptions of Comparative Price Advertisements," *Journal of Marketing Research*, 18, 416–427.
- Dodson, Joe A., Alice M. Tybout and Brian Sternthal (1978). "Impact of Deals and Deal Retraction on Brand Switching," *Journal of Marketing Research*, 15, 72–81.
- Doob, Anthony N., Merrill J. Carlsmith, Jonathan L. Freedman, Thomas K. Landauer and Tom Soleng (1969). "Effect of Initial Selling Price on Subsequent Sales," *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 11 (4), 345–350.
- Ehrenberg, A.S.C. and L.R. England (1990). "Generalising A Pricing Effect," *Journal of Industrial Economics*, 39, 47–68.
- Foekens, Eijte, Peter S.H. Leeflang and Dick R. Wittink (1999). "Varying Parameter Models to Accommodate Dynamic Promotion Effects," *Journal of Econometrics*, 89 (1/2), 249–268.
- Gedenk, Karen and Scott A. Neslin (1999). "The Role of Retail Promotion in Determining Future Brand Loyalty: Its Effect on Purchase Event Feedback," *Journal of Retailing*, 75 (4), 433–459.

- Glass, Gene V., Barry McGaw and Mary Lee Smith (1981). *Meta-Analysis in Social Research*. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications.
- Goodman, David A. and Kavin W. Moody (1970). "Determining Optimum Price Promotion Quantities," *Journal of Marketing*, 34, 31–39.
- Guadagni, Peter M. and John D.C. Little (1983). "A Logit Model of Brand Choice Calibrated on Scanner Data," *Marketing Science*, 2, 203–238.
- Gupta, Sunil (1988). "Impact of Sales Promotion on When, What, and How Much to Buy," *Journal of Marketing Research*, 25, 342–355.
- Henard, David H. and David M. Szymanski (2001). "Why Some New Products Are More Successful Than Others," *Journal of Marketing Research*, 38, 362–375.
- Hunter, John E. and Frank L. Schmidt (1990). *Methods of Meta-Analysis: Correcting Error and Bias in Research Findings*. London: Sage Publications.
- Hunter, John E., Frank L. Schmidt and Gregg B. Jackson (1982). *Meta-Analysis: Cumulating Research Findings Across Studies*. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications.
- Jacobson, Robert and Carl Obermiller (1990). "The Formation of Expected Future Price: A Reference-Price for Forward-Looking Consumers," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 16, 420–432.
- Jedidi, Kamel, Carl F. Mela and Sunil Gupta (1999). "Managing Advertising and Promotion for Long-Run Profitability," *Management Science*, 18 (1), 1–22.
- Jones, J. Morgan and Fred S. Zufryden (1981). "Relating Deal Purchases and Consumer Characteristics to Repeat Purchase Probability," *Journal of the Marketing Research Society*, 23 (2), 84–99.
- Kahn, Barbara E. and Therese A. Louie (1990). "Effects of Retraction of Price Promotions on Brand Choice Behavior for Variety-Seeking and Last Purchase-Loyal Consumers," *Journal of Marketing Research*, 27, 279–289.
- Kalwani, Manohar U., Chi Kin Yim, Heikki J. Rinne and Yoshi Sugita (1990). "A Price Expectations Model of Customer Brand Choice," *Journal of Marketing Research*, 27, 251–262.
- Kalwani, Manohar U. and Chi Kin Yim (1992). "Consumer Price and Promotion Expectations: An Experimental Study," *Journal of Marketing Research*, 29, 90–100.
- Karande, Kiran W. and V. Kumar (1995). "The Effect of Brand Characteristics and Retailer Policies on Response to Retail Price Promotions: Implications for Retailers," *Journal of Retailing*, 71 (3), 249–278.
- Keller, Kevin Lane (1998). *Strategic Brand Management*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Kopalle, Praveen, Carl F. Mela and Lawrence Marsh (1999). "The Dynamic effect of Discounting on Sales: Empirical Analysis and Normative Pricing Implications," *Marketing Science*, 18 (3), 317–332.
- Kotler, Phillip (1988). *Marketing Management: Analysis, Planning, Implementation and Control*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Krishna, Aradhna (1991). "Effect of Dealing Patterns on Consumer Perceptions of Deal Frequency and Willingness to Pay," *Journal of Marketing Research*, 28, 441–451.
- Krishna, Aradhna (1994). "The Effect of Deal Knowledge on Consumer Purchase Behavior," *Journal of Marketing Research*, 31, 76–91.
- Krishna, Aradhna, Richard Briesch, Donald R. Lehman and Hong Yuan (2002). "A Meta-Analysis of the Impact of Price Presentation on Perceived Savings," *Journal of Retailing*, 78, 101–118.
- Krishnamurthi, Lakshman and S.P. Raj (1988). "A Model of Brand Choice and Purchase Quantity Price Sensitivities," *Marketing Science*, 7, 1–20.
- Kumar, V. and Arun Pereira (1995). "Explaining the Variation in Short-Term Sales Response to Retail Price Promotions," *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 23 (3), 155–169.
- Lattin, James M. and Randolph E. Bucklin (1989). "Reference Effects of Price and Promotion on Brand Choice Behavior," *Journal of Marketing Research*, 26, 299–310.
- Lawrence, Raymond J. (1969). "Patterns of Buying Behavior: Time for a New Approach?," *Journal of Marketing Research*, 6, 137–144.
- Leone, Robert P. and Srin S. Srinivasan (1996). "Coupon Face Value: Its Impact on Coupon Redemptions, Brand Sales, and Brand Profitability," *Journal of Retailing*, 72 (3), 273–289.
- Litvack, David S., Roger J. Calantone and Paul R. Warshaw (1985). "An Examination of Short-Term Retail Grocery Price Effects," *Journal of Retailing*, 61, 9–25.
- Low, George S. and Donald R. Lichtenstein (1993). "The Effect of Double Deals on Consumer Attitudes," *Journal of Retailing*, 69, 453–466.
- Macé, Sandrine and Scott A. Neslin (2004). "The Determinants of Pre- and Postpromotion Dips in Sales of Frequently Purchased Goods," *Journal of Marketing Research*, 41, 339–350.
- Massy, William F. and Ronald E. Frank (1965). "Short Term Price and Dealing Effects in Selected Market Segments," *Journal of Marketing Research*, 2, 246–258.
- Matt, George E. and Thomas D. Cook (1994). "Threats to the Validity of Research Synthesis," in *The Handbook of Research Synthesis*, Harris Cooper and Larry V. Hedges eds. New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 503–520.
- Mazursky, David, Priscilla A. LaBarbera and Al Aiello (1987). "When Customers Switch Brands," *Psychology and Marketing*, 4, 17–30.
- Mela, Carl F., Sunil Gupta and Donald R. Lehmann (1997). "The Long-Term Impact of Promotion and Advertising on Consumer Brand Choice," *Journal of Marketing Research*, 34, 248–261.
- Mela, Carl F., Kamel Jedidi and Douglas Bowman (1998). "The Impact of Promotions on Consumer Stockpiling Behavior," *Journal of Marketing Research*, 35, 250–262.
- Montgomery, David B. (1971). "Consumer Characteristics Associated With Dealing: An Empirical Example," *Journal of Marketing Research*, 8, 118–120.
- Motes, William (1987). "Replication of Pricing Effects on Brand Choice Behaviour," *European Journal of Marketing*, 21 (1), 14–25.
- Neslin, Scott A. (2002). *Sales Promotion*. Cambridge, MA: Marketing Science Institute.
- Neslin, Scott A. and Robert W. Shoemaker (1989). "An Alternative Explanation for Lower Repeat Purchase Rates After Promotion Purchases," *Journal of Marketing Research*, 26, 205–213.
- Ortmeyer, Gwen, James M. Lattin and David B. Montgomery (1991). "Individual Differences in Response to Consumer Promotions," *International Journal of Research in Marketing*, 8, 169–186.
- Papatla, Purushottam (1993). "Brand Inequalities in the Loyalty Effects of Purchases," *Marketing Letters*, 4 (4), 361–368.
- Papatla, Purushottam and Lakshman Krishnamurthi (1996). "Measuring the Dynamic Effects of Promotions on Brand Choice," *Journal of Marketing Research*, 33, 20–35.
- Pauwels, Koen, Dominique M. Hanssens and S. Siddarth (2002). "The Long-Term Effects of Price Promotions on Category Incidence, Brand Choice, and Purchase Quantity," *Journal of Marketing Research*, 39, 421–439.
- Raghubir, Priya (2004). "Coupons in Context: Discounting Prices or Decreasing Profits?," *Journal of Retailing*, 80, 1–12.
- Raghubir, Priya and Kim Corfman (1999). "When Do Price Promotions Affect Pretrial Brand Evaluations," *Journal of Marketing Research*, 36, 211–222.
- Rajendram, K.N. and Gerard J. Tellis (1994). "Contextual and Temporal Components of Reference Price," *Journal of Marketing*, 58, 22–34.
- Rothschild, Michael L. (1987). "A Behavioral View of Promotions Effects on Brand Loyalty," Melanie Walendorf and Paul Anderson (Eds.), *Advances in Consumer Research: 14*, Provo, UT: Association for Consumer Research, 119–120.
- Rothschild, Michael L. and William C. Gaidis (1981). "Behavioral Learning Theory: Its Relevance to Marketing and Promotions," *Journal of Marketing*, 45, 70–78.
- Schneider, Linda G. and Imran S. Currim (1991). "Consumer Purchase Behaviors Associated with Active and Passive Deal-Prone-ness," *International Journal of Research in Marketing*, 8, 205–222.
- Scott, Carol A. (1976). "Effects of Trial and Incentives on Repeat Purchase Behavior," *Journal of Marketing Research*, 13, 263–269.
- Scott, Carol A. and Alice M. Tybout (1979). "Extending the Self-Perception Explanation: The Effect of Cue Salience on Behavior," William Wilkie (Ed.), *Advances in Consumer Research: 6*, Ann Arbor, MI: Association for Consumer Research, 50–54.

- Scott, Carol A. and Richard F. Yalch (1980). "Consumer Response to Initial Product Trial: A Bayesian Analysis," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 7, 32–41.
- Shankar, Venkatesh and Lakshman Krishnamurthi (1996). "Relating Price Sensitivity to Retailer Promotional Variables and Pricing Policy: An Empirical Analysis," *Journal of Retailing*, 72 (3), 249–272.
- Shoemaker, Robert W. and F. Robert Shoaf (1977). "Repeat Rates of Deal Purchases," *Journal of Advertising Research*, 17, 47–53.
- Slonim, Robert and Ellen Garbarino (1999). "The Effect of Price History on Demand as Mediated by Perceived Price Expensiveness," *Journal of Business Research*, 1–14.
- Srinivasan, Shuba, Peter T.L. Popkowski Leszczyc and Frank M. Bass (2000). "Market Share Response and Competitive Interaction: The Impact of Temporary, Evolving, and Structural Changes in Prices," *International Journal of Research in Marketing*, 17, 281–305.
- Srinivasan, Shuba, Koen Pauwels, Dominique M. Hanssens and Marnik G. Dekimpe (2004). "Do Promotions Benefit Manufacturers, Retailers, or Both?," *Management Science*, 50, 617–629.
- Suri, Jajneesh, Rajesh V. Manchanda and Chiranjeev S. Kohli (2000). "Brand Evaluations: A Comparison Between Fixed Price and Discounted Price Offers," *Journal of Product and Brand Management*, 9 (3), 193–204.
- Suri, Jajneesh and Fred S. Zufryden (1995). "Tackling the Retailer Decision Maze: Which Brands to Discount, How Much, When and Why?," *Marketing Science*, 14 (3), 271–299.
- Tybout, Alice M. and Carol A. Scott (1983). "Availability of Well-Defined Internal Knowledge and the Attitude Formation Process: Information Aggregation Versus Self-Perception," *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 44 (3), 474–491.
- van Heerde, Harald J., Sachin Gupta and Dick R. Wittink (2003). "Is 75% of the Sales Promotion Bump Due to Brand Switching? No, Only 33% Is," *Journal of Marketing Research*, 40, 481–491.
- Webster, Frederick E. (1971). *Marketing Communication: Modern Promotional Strategy*. New York: Ronald Press Company.
- Zenor, Michael J., Bart J. Bronnenberg and Leigh McAlister (1998). "The Impact of Marketing Policy on Promotional Price Elasticities and Baseline Sales," *Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services*, 5 (1), 25–32.