

INTERACTIVE MEDIA NON-MONETARY SALES PROMOTION AND TELECOMMUNICATION OPERATORS' BRAND EQUITY AMONG CIVIL SERVANTS IN WESTERN NIGERIA

Prof. Kolade Ajilore (PhD)

Department of Mass Communication, Babcock University, Ilishan Remo, Ogun State,
Nigeria. Email Address: Ajilorek@babcock.edu.ng +2348055134044

Oluwafisayo O. Ogunwemimo (PhD)

Lecturer in the Department of Mass Communication, Babcock University, Ilishan Remo,
Ogun State, Nigeria Email Address: Alaof@babcock.edu.ng +2348062823307
(Corresponding Author)

Taiwo A. Ogunwemimo

Data Analyst/Research Consultant, a PhD student in Babcock University, Ilishan Remo,
Ogun State. Email Address: Dbjclan@gmail.com 08035889678

Abstract

The relationship between sales promotion and various indicators of brand equity has been well studied. However, little is known about the direction and strength of this association when an intervening variable such as interactive media is brought into the equation. The study therefore tested this association in the Nigerian Telecommunication sector where four mobile telecommunication service providers use shades of non-monetary sales promotion on media such as SMS and Facebook to jostle for respectable market share. A total of seven hundred and seventy five civil servants were surveyed in two Western states of Nigeria to determine their awareness, perceived brand quality, brand association and brand loyalty to each of the four telecommunication service marketers as a result of their non-monetary sales promotions. Results revealed that non-monetary sales promotion significantly influenced telecommunication operators brand awareness ($R^2 = 0.304$, $p < 0.05$), perceived brand quality ($R^2 = 0.218$, $p < 0.05$), brand association ($R^2 = 0.237$, $p < 0.05$) and brand loyalty ($R^2 = 0.163$, $p < 0.05$). The study demonstrates that non-monetary sales promotion executed on interactive media is effective in building and maintaining brand equity.

Keyword: Non-monetary sales promotion, Brand Equity, Telecommunication Operators,

INTRODUCTION

The liberalization of the Nigerian telecommunication sector in 2003 marked the termination of government monopolistic stranglehold and eventually ushered in four mobile telecommunication service providers – MTN, Globacom, Airtel and Etisalat (now 9mobile) into the industry. Naturally, the deregulation presaged a competitive marketing battle for the hearts and wallets of the Nigerian market, reputed to be the largest in Africa (Adeleke and Aminu, 2012). True to expectations, these telecommunication companies immediately committed intellectual and financial resources to creatively formulate marketing strategies to enliven customers experience with their individual brands and towards ultimately building brand equities. All conceivable marketing elements – product conceptualization, pricing, media visibility via advertising and non-advertising format, sales promotions were deployed in ways that animated the market. Statistics from industry regulator, the National Communication Commission, shows that the Nigerian GSM telecommunication market was

as at 2016 shared in the following proportion among the four service providers: MTN- 39%, Glo-24%, Airtel-21% and Etisalat- 15%. The battle for customers transcended the traditional mass media as these telecommunication service providers embraced the digital platform to presumably further enhance customers' engagement with their brands. One of the marketing communication instruments that is being employed on the digital interactive platform by the four telecomm marketers is sales promotion.

Sales promotion has proven a handy tool for most marketers (Shimp, 2008). The inherent capacity of sales promotion to induce larger and more frequent consumption of product has enhanced its attraction among marketers. The practice of multiple sim subscription across telecomm providers by Nigerian customers (Adeleke & Aminu, 2012) and the seamless opportunity offered customers to effortlessly migrate from one brand to another while still retaining same pin code means that telecomm marketers cannot complacently treat their customers as captives. Sales promotion programmes are therefore designed to either defensively preclude competition from encroaching into their market or to offensively bait competitors' customers.

Purpose

A number of studies with mixed findings have been conducted on the relationship between non-monetary sales promotions and brand equity. While Sinha and Smith (2000), Yoo, Donthu and Lee (2000), Chandon, Wansink and Laurent (2000), Palazon-Vidal and Delgado-Ballester (2005), Alvarez and Vazquez-Casielles (2005), Lowe and Barnes (2012), Koksall and Spahiu (2014), Ramezani and Heidarzadeh (2014), Dangaiso (2014) and Salelaw and Amanpreet (2016) all concluded based on empirical evidence that non-monetary sales promotions has positive effects on dimensions of brand equity such as brand awareness, brand association, brand loyalty and perceived value, scholars such as Campbell and Diamond (1990), Ragbubir and Celly (2011), Abdul, Salman and Olota (2014) and Mendex, Bendixen, Abrath and Yurova (2015) postulated based on the results of their studies that non-monetary sales promotions might hurt a brand by impacting negatively on its perceived value. Even the study by Buil, Chernatony and Martinez (2010) that found a positive association between these two variables cautioned that the association was not significant.

In spite of the preponderance of findings suggesting a positive relationship, little is known about what the pattern and strength of the relationship would be sequel to the introduction of an intervening variable such as an interacting platform of delivery. That is, the purpose of this study was to determine the impact of non-monetary sales promotions programmes delivered by mobile telecommunication service marketers through interactive media such as SMS and Facebook on their brand equity.

Research Hypotheses

To test the association between non-monetary sales promotion on interactive media and brand equity of the telecommunication service providers in Nigeria, the following hypotheses were constructed:

- Ho₁ Non-monetary sales promotion typology significantly influences brand awareness of telecommunication operators on interactive media.
- Ho₂ Non-monetary sales promotion typology significantly influences perceived brand quality of telecommunication operators on interactive media.
- Ho₃ Non-monetary sales promotion typology significantly influences brand association of

telecommunication operators on interactive media.

Ho₄ Non-monetary sales promotion typology significantly influences brand loyalty of telecommunication operators on interactive media.

Non-Monetary Sales Promotion

Non-monetary sales promotions are promotions used to attract consumers to purchase a product which comes in form of additional gift other than what the consumers will pay for. The extra value can either be in tangible or intangible form. Yi and Yoo (2011) observe that promotions of this nature portend lasting effect on brand performance as consumers will not only focus on the value they are paying for, rather, their attention will be on the extra value and what they can make out of it. Yi and Yoo (2011), Lowe and Barnes (2012) and Mohammed and Kambiz (2014) in defense of non-monetary promotions opine that stimulation of positive attitude towards the brand can be achieved using this tool because it invokes a feeling of gain instead of loss in consumers as they get more than they would when there is no promotional activity. Aaker (1991) and Kotler (2006) assert that non-monetary promotions are relationship-based meaning the incentive must enhance the value of the brand and it is expected reflect consumers' needs and not an abstract gift. Pauler and Dick (2006) noted that a major challenge with non-monetary promotion is that sometimes, the reward may not be instantaneous which on its own may seem to consumers as deception. An example, if telecommunication operators encouraged subscribers to recharge a minimum of N200 airtime in order to stand a chance to go to United Emirate or win an airplane, this offer seem unreal.

Brand Equity

Several scholars and professions have grappled with the challenge of developing a universal definition for brand equity however, it depends on the perspective that each takes it from (Wood, 2000). The total value of a brand as a separable asset when it is sold, or included on a balance sheet; a measure of the strength of consumers' attachment to a brand; or a description of the associations and beliefs the consumer has about the brand encapsulates the concept of brand equity. Pullig (2008) elucidates that brand equity is the value of the brand in the marketplace meaning that a brand with high equity is one with a very high value.

Defining brand equity will not be grounded without considering the perspectives of Keller (1993) and Aaker (1991) who are regarded as authorities in this field. While Aaker (1991) defines brand equity as "a set of brand assets and liabilities linked to a brand, its name and symbol, which add to or subtract from the value provided by a product or service to a firm and/or to that firm's customers" (p. 15).

Keller (1993) views brand equity in terms of the marketing effects uniquely attributable to the brand for example, when certain outcomes result from the marketing of a product or service because of its brand name that would not occur if the same product or service did not have that name. To broaden the scope of the discussion, Aaker (1991) proposed the four dimensions of brand equity as brand awareness, brand perceived quality, brand association and ultimately brand loyalty (Baalbaki, 2012). On the other hand, Keller (1993) advanced two perspectives that enhances the concept of brand equity: financial and consumer-based brand equity (CBBE). Another angle to brand equity, put forward by King and Grace (2009) is the employee based brand equity (EBBE) which means "the disparity consequence that brand knowledge has on employees' response to their work environment" (p. 30). In all, be it financial, CBBE or EBBE which all points to brand equity, the unifying argument is that it is determined by consumers' confidence in, attitude and response to a brand and its offering.

Keller (2003) asserts that Strong brand equity leads to opportunities for successful brand extensions, resilience against competitors' promotional efforts, and the creation of barriers to competitive entry.

Research Area and Participants' Description

The study was conducted in Lagos and Ogun states, Nigeria. Lagos was the federal capital of Nigeria for decades and considered to be the commercial nerve centre of the country. By this metropolitan profile, it is host to one of the two international sea ports in the country, head offices to many multi-national and non-governmental companies and an economy that is the largest in the country. Ogun state shares a contiguous boundary with Lagos state and has consequently benefitted a spill-over effect from the economic buoyancy of Lagos state.

Civil servants constitute the single largest group of formal employees in Nigeria. This category of working class citizens pre-dominate the Nigerian middle class level. Their level of education, economic status and residence give them a cosmopolitan outlook and consequently make them heavy subscribers to the variety of promotional services provided by the telecommunication service providers. For this study, state civil servants became the focus. The Lagos state Civil Service Commission (2015) put the population of the state's civil servants at 10,596 while the Ogun state Civil Service Commission (2015) puts the population of its civil servants at 6,565.

METHODS

Procedure

The study employed multi-stage sampling technique to obtain a study sample from the population. Sample size was determined by using for each stage Saunders, Lewis and Thornhill (2009) formular. The formular yielded 463 and 417 sample sizes for Lagos and Ogun states respectively. In the first stage, simple random sampling technique was used to select two states (Lagos and Ogun states) from the six states that constitute Western Nigeria. Western Nigeria was purposively selected for this study because this region hosts the telecommunication operators in the country. In the second stage, systematic sampling technique was employed in proportionally picking five of the 28 ministries in Lagos state and four out of the 20 ministries in Ogun state. The contribution of each ministry was proportional to its quantitative size in the study population of the ministry selected. To this end, Lagos State representation were Ministry of Energy and Mineral Resources (N-233: n-52), Ministry of Housing (N-263: n-59), Ministry of Science and Technology (N-262: n-59), Ministry of Works and Infrastructure (N-1185: n-266) and Lagos State Sport Commission (N-120: n-27) to pull up a sample size of 463 respondents. Ogun State had Ministry of Culture & Tourism (N-146: n-51), Ministry of Health (N-905: n-308), ministry of rural Development (N-85: n-29) and Ministry of Youth and Sport (N-85: n-29) to produce a final sample size of 417 respondents.

A self-administered questionnaire was developed and validated using the inputs of experts, the research objectives and the outcome of operationalization of constructs. Reliability test carried out using Cronbach Alpha coefficient revealed values of 0.797 for non-monetary sales promotion, 0.797 for brand awareness, 0.754 for perceived brand quality, 0.769 for brand association, 0.827 for brand loyalty and 0.930 for the total scale. The list of staff of each ministry made available was converted to sampling frames. Respondents were selected from these lists using simple random sampling without replacement. Simple linear regression analyses were used to test the influence of the independent variable on the dependent variable. A total of eight hundred and eighty (880) copies of questionnaire were administered to the research participants. While 822 copies, constituting 93.4%, were retrieved, data

cleaning eventually produced 775 (88%) useful copies. These were used for the analysis.

Analysis

To be able to measure the pattern of relation between the independent variable and the dependent variable via the intervening variable, the relationship between the intervening variable and indicators of the dependent variable had to be first established. These are presented in tables one through to five.

Table 1: Awareness of Non-Monetary Sales Promotion Typology on Interactive Media

STATEMENT	VH	H	L	VL	NA	Mean	SD	Average Mean
Sweepstake								
GSM service providers inform subscribers to send in codes in order to qualify for free gifts through SMS	200 (25.8)	300 (38.7)	170 (21.9)	50 (6.5)	41 (5.3)	3.75	1.08	3.50 (SD=1.20)
GSM service providers through Facebook give information to subscribers to send in codes in order to qualify for free gifts	148 (19.1)	217 (28.0)	194 (25.0)	173 (9.4)	121 (15.6)	3.26	1.32	
Premium								
GSM service providers send information to customers about free tickets to reward clients' patronage through SMS	167 (21.5)	295 (38.1)	168 (21.7)	54 (7.0)	80 (10.3)	3.54	1.21	3.27 (SD=1.26)
I know that GSM service providers send information about free tickets to reward clients' patronage on Facebook	95 (12.3)	208 (26.8)	206 (26.6)	96 (12.4)	151 (19.5)	3.00	1.31	
Free Gifts								
Telecommunication operators send information about free gifts to subscribers through SMS	239 (30.8)	320 (41.3)	108 (13.9)	61 (7.9)	35 (4.5)	3.87	1.08	Mean 3.15 (SD=1.3) 3.45 (SD=1.22)
Telecommunication operators send information about rewarding customers with company gifts through SMS	197 (25.4)	298 (38.5)	131 (16.9)	62 (8.0)	74 (9.5)	3.63	1.22	
I am aware that telecommunication operators send information about free gifts to subscribers on Facebook	110 (14.2)	261 (33.7)	203 (26.2)	82 (10.6)	106 (13.7)	3.25	1.24	
I know that telecommunication operators send information about rewarding customers with company gifts on Facebook	118 (15.2)	211 (27.2)	166 (21.4)	115 (14.8)	150 (19.4)	3.04	1.36	
Buy-one-get-one free								
Telecommunication operators send information about 'Buy one, get one free' offers through SMS	241 (31.1)	319 (41.2)	123 (15.9)	38 (4.9)	34 (4.4)	3.92	1.04	3.60 (SD=1.17)
Telecommunication operators provide information about 'Buy one, get one free' offers on Facebook	130 (16.8)	257 (33.2)	166 (21.4)	87 (11.2)	113 (14.6)	3.27	1.29	
Total Scale Average Weighted Mean								3.45 (SD=1.22)

KEY: VH=Very High, H=High, L=Low, VL=Very Low, NA=Not at all

Decision Rule if mean is 1.49 =Not at all; 1.5 to 2.49 = Very Low; 2.5 to 3.49 =Low; 3.5 to 4.49 = High; 4.5 to 5 = Very High

Table 1 shows that respondents' awareness level of non-monetary sales promotion was averagely low (Total Scale Average Weighted Mean =3.45, SD=1.22) as techniques such as sweepstake, premium, Free gift and Buy-one-get-one free were tested. By implication, this suggests that the study participants had a low level of awareness of the non-monetary sales

promotion typology used by telecommunication operators on interactive media. Furthermore, in Table 1, the Buy-one-get-one free subscale depicts that civil servants in Lagos and Ogun states had an averagely high level of awareness of telecommunication operators' Buy-one-get-one free (average mean =3.60, SD=1.17) promotion on interactive media. Civil servants in Lagos and Ogun state had high awareness of Buy-one-get-one free sales promotion on SMS (mean=3.92, SD= 1.04); however, they had low awareness of Buy-one-get-one free sales promotion on Facebook (average mean= 3.27, SD=1.29). This implies that civil servants' level of awareness of Buy-one-get-one free sales promotion on SMS was higher than Facebook. In addition, the Sweepstake subscale reveals that respondents had an averagely high level of awareness of telecommunication operators Sweepstakes promotion on interactive media (mean=3.50, SD=1.20). Moreover, the study participants had high awareness of Sweepstakes sales promotion on SMS (mean=3.75, SD=1.08) than Sweepstakes sales promotion of telecommunication operators on Facebook (mean= 3.26, SD=1.32).

While state civil servants had averagely high awareness of Free Gifts sales promotion on SMS (mean= 3.75, SD=1.15), they had low awareness of Free Gifts sales promotion on Facebook (mean=3.15, SD=1.3). Finally, Premium subscale on Table 1 depicts that civil servants had an averagely low level of awareness of telecommunication operators Premium promotion on interactive media (mean=3.27, SD=1.26). In addition, the study participants had high awareness of Premium sales promotion on SMS (mean=3.54, SD=1.21) than Premium sales promotion of telecommunication operators on Facebook (mean= 3.00, SD=1.31).

Table 2: Brand Awareness of Telecommunication Operators on Interactive Media

STATEMENT	VH	H	L	VL	NA	Mean	SD	Average Mean
Recognition								
Telecommunication operators send information about various data bundles through SMS	304 (39.2)	338 (43.6)	63 (8.1)	22 (2.8)	21 (2.7)	4.18	0.91	Mean 4.12 (S D=0.92) 3.77 (SD=1.10)
Telecommunication operators' send information about different caller tune services through SMS	300 (38.7)	310 (40.0)	75 (9.7)	30 (3.9)	29 (3.7)	4.10	1.00	
Telecommunication operators promote their call rates through SMS	234 (30.2)	387 (49.9)	76 (9.8)	26 (3.4)	15 (1.9)	4.08	0.86	
Telecommunication operators' post various data bundle details on their Facebook page	200 (25.8)	316 (40.8)	114 (14.7)	55 (7.1)	57 (7.4)	3.74	1.16	
Telecommunication operators promote their call rates on Facebook	174 (22.5)	201 (25.9)	188 (24.3)	70 (9.0)	110 (14.2)	3.35	1.33	
I am aware of telecommunication operators' callertune services through their Facebook page	123 (15.9)	214 (27.6)	194 (25.0)	84 (10.8)	125 (16.1)	3.17	1.31	Mean 3.42 (S D=1.27)
Recall								
I can recollect telecommunication operators' International Services such as roaming SMS	289 (37.3)	298 (38.5)	75 (9.7)	41 (5.3)	43 (5.5)	4.00	1.11	Mean 3.92 (S D=1.12) 3.68 (SD=1.21)
I can recollect telecommunication operators value added services SMS about Music+, Airtel Entertainment store and MyMTN App.	234 (30.2)	308 (39.7)	112 (14.5)	43 (5.5)	51 (6.6)	3.84	1.13	
I remember seeing GSM operators' value added services post on Facebook	157 (20.3)	284 (36.6)	128 (16.5)	82 (10.6)	93 (12.0)	3.44	1.28	

I come across GSM operators' post and updates about International services on Facebook.	162 (20.9)	266 (34.3)	140 (18.1)	66 (8.5)	108 (13.9)	3.42	1.32	
---	---------------	---------------	---------------	-------------	---------------	------	------	--

Total Scale Average Weighted Mean

3.73
(SD=1.14)

KEY: VH=Very High, H=High, L=Low, VL=Very Low, NA=Not at all

Decision Rule if mean is 1.49 =Not at all; 1.5 to 2.49 = Very Low; 2.5 to 3.49 =Low; 3.5 to 4.49 = High; 4.5 to 5 = Very High

Table 2 shows that state civil servants' awareness level of telecommunication operators on interactive media was averagely high (Total Scale Average Weighted Mean =3.73, SD=1.14); their brand awareness was measured in terms of brand recognition and brand recall. This suggests that respondents are generally aware of telecommunication operators on interactive media. In addition, the table reveals that the study participants' brand recognition of telecommunication operators' on interactive media was averagely high (average mean =3.77, SD=1.10). This implies that state civil servants' ability to identify telecommunication operators on interactive media was averagely high. While respondents awareness level of telecommunication operators on SMS was averagely high (average mean =4.12, SD=0.92) than Facebook (mean=3.42, SD=1.27). This indicates that civil servants' brand recognition was higher on SMS as an interactive medium than Facebook. Furthermore, the brand recall subscale in Table 2 shows that the study participants' ability to recall telecommunication operators on interactive media was averagely high (mean=3.68, SD=1.21). This suggests that state civil servants in Lagos and Ogun states were able to remember telecommunication operators with or without assistance. In addition, respondents' ability to remember telecommunication operators' brands on interactive media was averagely high through SMS (mean=3.92, SD=1.12); however, state civil servants' ability to recall telecommunication operators through Facebook was averagely low (mean=3.43, SD=1.30).

Table 3: Perceived Brand Quality of Telecommunication Operators on Interactive Media

STATEMENT	VH	H	L	VL	NA	Mean	SD	Average Mean
Telecommunication operators that notify subscribers about data bundle through SMS have better services	201 (25.9)	288 (37.2)	118 (15.2)	52 (6.7)	81 (10.5)	3.64	1.25	3.60 (SD=1.20)
Telecommunication operators that promise discount through SMS indicate they have reliable SMS service	171 (22.1)	303 (39.1)	146 (18.8)	56 (7.2)	61 (7.9)	3.63	1.16	
Telecommunication operators that inform subscribers about value-added services such as caller tune through SMS are good	164 (21.2)	298 (38.5)	157 (20.3)	54 (7.0)	64 (8.3)	3.60	1.16	
Telecommunication operators that notify subscribers about their call tariffs through SMS are the best	167 (21.5)	308 (39.7)	124 (16.0)	71 (9.2)	71 (9.2)	3.58	1.21	
Telecommunication operators that respond to subscriber' complaint through SMS are reliable	157 (20.3)	318 (41.0)	137 (17.7)	47 (6.1)	81 (10.5)	3.57	1.21	
Discount posts of telecommunication operators on Facebook signify that they have quality Internet service	197 (25.4)	215 (27.7)	151 (19.5)	74 (9.5)	102 (13.2)	3.45	1.35	3.28
Telecommunication operators that notify subscribers about data bundle on Facebook have better services	139 (17.9)	265 (34.2)	171 (22.1)	69 (8.9)	99 (12.8)	3.37	1.26	Mean=3.44 (SD=1.25)
Telecommunication operators that inform subscribers about value-added services	136 (17.5)	243 (31.4)	180 (23.2)	75 (9.7)	108 (13.9)	3.30	1.29	

such as caller tune on Facebook are good							
Telecommunication operators that notify subscribers about their call tariffs on Facebook are the best	116 (15.0)	202 (26.1)	222 (28.6)	88 (11.4)	109 (14.1)	3.17	1.26
Telecommunication operators that respond to subscribers' complaint on Facebook are reliable	126 (16.3)	202 (26.1)	186 (24.0)	68 (8.8)	159 (20.5)	3.09	1.38

KEY: VH=Very High, H=High, L=Low, VL=Very Low, NA=Not at all
Decision Rule if mean is 1.49 =Not at all; 1.5 to 2.49 = Very Low; 2.5 to 3.49 =Low; 3.5 to 4.49 = High; 4.5 to 5 = Very High

Table 3 measures respondents' perceived brand quality of telecommunication operators; the Table depicts that telecommunication operators brand quality as perceived by state civil servants is averagely low (Total Scale Average Weighted Mean =3.44, SD=1.25) on interactive media. This depicts that respondents' assessment of telecommunication operators' quality was averagely low. In addition, further analysis on Table 3 reveals that respondents perceived quality of telecommunication operators' brand on SMS was averagely high (mean= 3.60, SD=1.20). Nevertheless, telecommunication operators' brand quality as perceived by state civil servants in Lagos and Ogun states was averagely low (mean= 3.28, SD=1.31). By implication, telecommunication operators' brand quality was perceived by state civil servants on SMS than Facebook.

Table 4: Brand Association of Telecommunication Operators on Interactive Media

STATEMENT	VH	H	L	VL	NA	Mean	SD	Average Mean
Attribute								
Telecommunication operators' SMS inspires confidence	122 (15.7)	352 (45.4)	172 (22.2)	52 (6.7)	53 (6.8)	3.58	1.06	3.46 (SD=1.18)
Telecommunication operators' messages help in my purchase decision	166 (21.4)	272 (35.1)	156 (20.1)	91 (11.7)	58 (7.5)	3.53	1.19	
Facebook posts and adverts of telecommunication operators make me confident of their quality	199 (25.7)	211 (27.2)	195 (25.2)	68 (8.8)	91 (11.7)	3.47	1.29	
Telecommunication operators' SMS indicate that they are reliable	121 (15.6)	269 (34.7)	247 (31.9)	57 (7.4)	63 (8.1)	3.43	1.10	
Telecommunication operators' SMS is sophisticated	135 (17.4)	248 (32.0)	201 (25.9)	64 (8.3)	83 (10.7)	3.39	1.21	
Telecommunication operators' posts on Facebook shows they are classy	139 (17.9)	255 (32.9)	204 (26.3)	60 (7.7)	96 (12.4)	3.37	1.24	
Attitude								
Telecommunication operators' messages are disturbing	237 (30.6)	258 (33.3)	126 (16.3)	81 (10.5)	52 (6.7)	3.73	1.21	3.44 (SD=1.24)
I get angry when I receive telecommunication operators' messages on SMS	195 (25.2)	224 (28.9)	171 (22.1)	92 (11.9)	80 (10.3)	3.48	1.28	
I look forward to receiving telecommunication operators' messages on Facebook	166 (21.4)	223 (28.8)	170 (21.9)	109 (14.1)	75 (9.7)	3.40	1.26	
I am interested in telecommunication operators' SMS	133 (17.2)	267 (34.5)	154 (19.9)	130 (16.8)	70 (9.0)	3.35	1.22	
Telecommunication operators' Facebook posts and adverts indicate that they are reliable	137 (17.7)	205 (26.5)	220 (28.4)	99 (12.8)	96 (12.4)	3.25	1.25	
Total Scale Average Weighted Mean								3.45 (SD=1.21)

KEY: VH=Very High, H=High, L=Low, VL=Very Low, NA=Not at all

Decision Rule if mean is 1.49 =Not at all; 1.5 to 2.49 = Very Low; 2.5 to 3.49 =Low; 3.5 to 4.49 = High; 4.5 to 5 = Very High

Table 4 illustrates that telecommunication operators' brand association on interactive media was averagely low (Total Scale Average Weighted Mean =3.45, SD=1.21). This implies that the level of telecommunication operators on interactive media is averagely low as indicated by civil servants in Lagos and Ogun states. The table further depicts that telecommunication operators' brand attribute on interactive media as indicated by the study participants was averagely low (average mean =3.46, SD=1.18). This suggest that telecommunication operators need to find ways of using the interactive media to increase their respondents' knowledge of the brands' attributes. Further analysis as shown on Table 4 depicts that state civil servants' brand attitude to telecommunication operators on interactive media was also averagely low (mean=3.44, SD=1.24).

Table 5: Brand Loyalty to Telecommunication Operators on Interactive Media

STATEMENT	VH	H	L	VL	NA	Mean	SD	Average Mean
I don't care about free SMS plans promised by other telecommunication operators, I only patronize my brand.	186 (24.0)	286 (36.9)	127 (16.4)	74 (9.5)	92 (11.9)	3.52	1.29	3.29 (SD=1.28)
I recommend my telecommunication operator to friends and family because of their SMS	137 (17.7)	264 (34.1)	189 (24.4)	89 (11.5)	82 (10.6)	3.37	1.22	
Due to my telecommunication operator's SMS, I prefer it to other brands.	136 (17.5)	273 (35.2)	178 (23.0)	91 (11.7)	88 (11.4)	3.36	1.23	
I encourage people to patronize my telecommunication operator because of their Facebook posts	142 (18.3)	190 (24.5)	212 (27.4)	107 (13.8)	115 (14.8)	3.18	1.30	
I prefer my telecommunication operator's network to others because of their Facebook post	180 (23.2)	153 (19.7)	178 (23.0)	123 (15.9)	131 (16.9)	3.17	1.40	
I patronize telecommunication operators because of their promotion	132 (17.0)	181 (23.4)	212 (27.4)	136 (17.5)	100 (12.9)	3.14	1.27	

KEY: VH=Very High, H=High, L=Low, VL=Very Low, NA=Not at all

Decision Rule if mean is 1.49 =Not at all; 1.5 to 2.49 = Very Low; 2.5 to 3.49 =Low; 3.5 to 4.49 = High; 4.5 to 5 = Very High

Table 5 shows that the study participants' loyalty to telecommunication operators on interactive media was averagely low (average mean = 3.29; SD= 1.28). This suggests that state civil servants' brand loyalty to telecommunication operators on interactive media is low which implies that they are not keen on their telecommunication operator. Their low level of brand loyalty is not limited to purchase, rather it extend to their unwillingness to recommend their telecommunication operators to friends and family as shown on the second item under the brand loyalty scale (mean=3.37, SD=1.22).

RESULTS

Test of Hypotheses

Decision Rule

The pre-set level of significance for this study is 0.05. With the hypotheses, it is presumed that there is a relationship between the variables being considered. If the P-value which indicates the significance or the probability value exceeds the pre-set level of significance

which is $P > 0.05$, the hypothesis stated in alternative form will be rejected. However, if the P-value is less than or equal to 0.05, the hypothesis will be accepted.

Hypothesis One: Non-monetary sales promotion typology significantly influences brand awareness of telecommunication operators on interactive media.

Table 6.1: Model Summary for the Influence of Non-monetary sales promotion typology on brand awareness of telecommunication operators on interactive media.

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	00.551 ^a	0.304	0.303	4.99196

a. Predictors: (Constant), **Non-Monetary Sales Promotion Typology**

Table 6.2: Simple Linear Regression showing the Influence of Non-Monetary sales promotion typology on brand awareness of telecommunication operators on interactive media

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
	(Constant)	17.395	0.970		17.928	0.000
1	Non-Monetary Sales Promotion Typology	0.513	0.030	0.551	17.148	0.000

a. Dependent Variable: Brand Awareness

Table 6.2 indicates that non-monetary sales promotion typology significantly influences brand awareness of telecommunication operators on interactive media ($p < 0.05$). As shown on Table 6.2, there is a moderate positive significant correlation coefficient ($r = 0.551$) and positive slope ($B = 0.513$) which are statistically significant ($p < 0.05$) as assessed by a t test ($T = 17.148$). By implication, this means that an increase in non-monetary sales promotion typology will result to an increase in telecommunication operators' brand awareness. From this, it can be inferred that the tactical combination of non-monetary sales promotion typology techniques (sweepstake, premium, free gift and buy-one-get-one free) to target the interest of specific consumer groups in a well-planned manner will lead to an increase in telecommunication operators' brand awareness. Furthermore, a result of this nature may be possible if telecommunication operators are mindful of the choice of the specific non-monetary sales promotion typology technique to be used in order to persuade specific groups of customers, the awareness of the brands will be on the increase.

However, an inappropriate usage of non-monetary sales promotion typology on interactive media to incentivize specific consumer groups may lead to a reduction in telecommunication operators' brand awareness. Furthermore, the model in Table 6.1 illustrates that monetary sales promotion typology could explain 30.4 percent ($R^2 = 0.304$) of variation of influence on telecommunication operators' brand awareness. The model accounts for a significant amount of telecommunication operators' brand awareness variance ($F(1, 673) = 294.037$, $p < 0.05$). Therefore, this hypothesis is accepted.

Hypothesis Two: Non-monetary sales promotion typology significantly influences perceived brand quality of telecommunication operators on interactive media.

Table 7.1: Model Summary for the Influence of Non-monetary sales promotion typology on brand awareness of telecommunication operators on interactive media.

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	0.467 ^a	0.218	0.217	6.11242

a. Predictors: (Constant), **Non-Monetary Sales Promotion Typology**

Table 7.2: Simple Linear Regression showing the influence of Non-Monetary sales promotion typology on perceived brand quality of telecommunication operators on interactive media

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta	
	(Constant)	14.922	1.210		0.000
1	Non-Monetary Sales Promotion Typology	0.506	0.037	0.467	0.000

a. Dependent Variable: Perceived Brand Quality

Table 7.2 illustrates that non-monetary sales promotion typology significantly influences telecommunication operators' perceived brand quality. The model in Table 4.1.2.6a shows that non-monetary sales promotion typology could explain 21.8 percent ($R^2=0.218$) of variation of influence on telecommunication operators' perceived brand quality. The model accounts for a significant amount of telecommunication operators' perceived brand quality variance ($F(1, 658) = 183.766, p < 0.05$). Furthermore, Table 7.2 depicts a moderate positive significant correlation coefficient ($r = 0.467$) and positive slope ($B = 0.506$) which are statistically significant ($p < 0.05$) as assessed by a t test ($T = 13.556$). This suggests that an increase in non-monetary sales promotion typology will result to a proportionate increase in telecommunication operators' perceived brand quality. This is to say that the appropriate integration of non-monetary sales promotion typology techniques on interactive media for precise groups of customers within a given situation that warrants its necessity will lead to an increase in telecommunication operators' perceived brand quality. In the same vein, if the non-monetary sales promotion typology techniques are inappropriately used, there may be a decrease in the telecommunication operators' brand perceived quality based on the subscribers' response to the telecommunication typology used. In essence, the hypothesis is accepted.

Hypothesis Three: Non-monetary sales promotion typology significantly influences brand association of telecommunication operators on interactive media

Table 8.1: Model Summary for the Influence of Non-monetary sales promotion typology on brand association of telecommunication operators on interactive media.

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	0.487 ^a	0.237	0.236	6.18955

a. Predictors: (Constant), **Non-Monetary Sales Promotion Typology**

Table 8.2: Simple Linear Regression showing the influence of Non-Monetary sales promotion typology on brand association of telecommunication operators on interactive media.

Model			Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
			B	Std. Error	Beta		
	(Constant)		17.872	1.244		14.367	0.000
1	Non-Monetary Promotion Typology	Sales	0.530	0.038	0.487	13.811	0.000

a. Dependent Variable: Brand Association

Table 8.2 reveals that non-monetary sales promotion typology significantly influences telecommunication operators' brand association on interactive media ($p < 0.05$). In addition, Table 8.2 indicates a moderate positive significant correlation coefficient ($r = 0.530$) and positive slope ($B = 0.487$) which are statistically significant ($p < 0.05$) as assessed by a t test ($T = 13.811$). This suggest that an increase in the usage of the suitable monetary sales promotion typology will lead to an increase in telecommunication operator' brand association. This may be possible given that as telecommunication operators' tactically combine basic monetary sales promotion typology (such as sweepstake, premium, company gift and buy-one-get-one free), consumers will be aware of the brand features, benefit, attribute which will in turn determine their attitude to telecommunication operators, thus, their brand association will proportionally increase. However, should non-monetary sales promotion typology are inappropriately used, telecommunication operators' brand association may also decrease. Also, the model on Table 8.1 reveals that non-monetary sales promotion typology could explain 23.7 percent ($R^2 = 0.237$) of variation of influence on telecommunication operators' brand association. The model accounts for a significant amount of telecommunication operators' brand association variance ($F(1, 614) = 190.753$, $p < 0.05$). Therefore, the hypothesis is accepted.

Hypothesis four: Non-monetary sales promotion typology significantly influences brand loyalty of telecommunication operators on interactive media

Table 9.1: Model Summary for the Influence of Non-monetary sales promotion typology on brand loyalty of telecommunication operators on interactive media.

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	0.404 ^a	0.163	0.162	4.48670

a. Predictors: (Constant), **Non-Monetary Sales Promotion Typology**

Table 9.2: Simple Linear Regression showing the influence of Non-Monetary sales promotion typology on brand loyalty of telecommunication operators on interactive media.

Model			Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
			B	Std. Error	Beta		
	(Constant)		7.458	0.850		8.770	0.000
1	Non-Monetary Promotion Typology	Sales	0.307	0.026	0.404	11.720	0.000

a. Dependent Variable: Brand Loyalty

The model on Table 9.2 depicts that non-monetary sales promotion typology significantly influences brand loyalty of telecommunication operators on interactive media ($p < 0.05$). In addition, Table 9.2 shows that a moderate positive significant correlation coefficient ($r = 0.404$) and positive slope ($B = 0.307$) which are statistically significant ($p < 0.05$) as assessed by a t test ($T = 6.504$). This result indicates that an increase in telecommunication operators' integration of non-monetary sale promotion typology on interactive media to target the need of specific target audience such as the civil servant will lead to an increase in customers' brand loyalty to telecommunication operators. In the same vein, if there is a wrong application of the non-monetary sales promotion typology tools such as sweepstake, premium, company gift and buy-one-get-one free, there is a propensity that subscribers will not be loyal to telecommunication operators rather, their patronage will be dependent on the promotions alone which will affect their loyalty. Table 9.1 shows that monetary sales promotion typology could explain 16.3 percent ($R^2 = 0.163$) of variation of influence on telecommunication operators' brand loyalty. The model on Table 9.2 accounts for a significant amount of telecommunication operators' brand loyalty variance ($F(1, 704) = 137.367$, $p < 0.05$). Hence, the hypothesis that non-monetary sales promotion program significantly influences telecommunication operators' brand loyalty is hereby accepted.

Discussion of Findings

The study revealed that non-monetary sales promotions programme leads to increase in Nigeria telecommunication operators brand awareness as indicated on Table 6.2 which showed a positive correlation coefficient ($\beta = 0.551$) and positive slope ($B = 0.513$) as it could explain 3D percent ($P < 0.05$). These findings are consistent with that of Koksai and Spahiu (2014) that concluded that non-monetary sales promotions helped in creating brand awareness for telecommunication operators in Istanbul.

Furthermore, the study shows that non-monetary sales promotions programme significantly influences telecommunication operators perceived brand quality as shown in table 7.1 where non-monetary sales promotion could explain 21.8 percent ($R^2 = 0.218$) of variation of influence on telecommunication operations perceived brand quality and the P-value is less than 0.05 ($P < 0.05B$). These results are in tandem with that of Alvarez and Vazquez-Casielles (2005), Sinha and Smith (2000), and Lowe and Barnes (2012), that all concluded that non-monetary sales promotions increase the perceived value of a brand.

In the same vein, findings as in studies conducted by Yoo et.al (2000), Palazon-Vidal and Delgado-Ballester (2005) and Chadon et.al (2000) revealed that non-monetary sales promotion might help evoke favorable associations for the brand. Table 8.2 indicates a moderate positive significant correlation coefficient ($\beta = 0.530$) and positive slope ($B = 0.487$) as assessed by a t-test ($T = 13.811$).

However, the results of Table 9.2 that a moderate positive significant correlation coefficient ($\beta = 0.404$) and positive slope ($B = 0.307$) which are statistically significant ($P < 6.504$) existed between non-monetary sales promotions and brand loyalty was inconsistent with the findings and conclusion of Abdul, Salman and Olota (2014) that sales promotions does not lead to brand loyalty.

Conclusion and Recommendation

This study concludes that non-monetary sales promotions using execution tactics such as bonus packs, samples, premiums and sweepstakes have positive but moderate influences on all the dimensions of brand equity. It lends credence to the beliefs among a section of marketing scholars that if strategically planned and executed, non-monetary sales promotions programme could enhance brand equity. On the strength of this, the researchers recommend

the integration of non- monetary sales promotion into the marketing communication plan of GSM telecommunication operators in Nigeria.

REFERENCES

- Aaker, D. (1991) *Managing Brand Equity*. Capitalizing on the Value of a Brand Name. New York: Free Press.
- Abdul, F. A., Salman, A. & Olota, O. O. (2014). Impact of Customer Satisfaction on Mobile Telecommunication Service Provider. *JORIND* 12 (2) December 2014. www.ajol.info/journals/jorind
- Alv  rez-Alv  rez, B., & V  zquez-Casielles, R. (2005). Consumer evaluations of sales promotion: The effect on brand choice. *European Journal of Marketing*, 39(1/2), 54–70.
- Baalbaki, S. S. (2012). *Consumer Perception of Brand Equity Measurement: A New Scale* (Dy3octoral Thesis). Texas; University Of North Texas. https://digital.library.unt.edu/ark:/67531/metadc115043/m2/1/high_res_d/dissertation.pdf
- Buil, I. M., Eva; de Chernatony, Leslie (2013). The Influence of Brand Equity on Consumer Responses. *Journal of Consumer Marketing* 30(1): 62-74.
- Campbell, L., & Diamond, W. (1990). Framing and sales promotions: The characteristics of a “good deal.” *The Journal of Consumer Marketing*, 7(4), 25–31.
- Chandon, P., Wansink B. & Laurent, G. (2000). A benefit congruency framework of sales promotion effectiveness. *Illinois: Journal of Marketing*, 64(October):65–81. <http://www.hec.fr/var/corporate/storage/original/application/8b4262191ef318e84e12c42917872d6a.pdf>
- Dangaiso, T. (2014). The Effects of Sales Promotion Strategies on Company Performance: A Case of Telone Zimbabwe, Bachelor’s Degree). Midlands State University. <http://ir.msu.ac.zw:8080/jspui/bitstream/11408/486/3/final%20dissertation%20dangaiso.pdf>
- Delgado-Ballester, E., & Munuera-Alem  n, J. L. (2005). Does brand trust matter to brand equity? *Journal of Product & Brand Management*, 14(3), 187–196.
- King, C. & Grace, D. (2009). Employee Based Brand Equity: A Third Perspective. *Services Marketing Quarterly*, 30, 122-147.
- Koksal, Y. & Spahiu, O. (2014). The efficiency of monetary and non-monetary sales promotions on brand preference: a case of Albanian GSM companies. *Istanbul University Journal of the School of Business Administration*. Vol. 43 Issue 2, p319.
- Kotler, P. (2006). *Marketing Management*. New Jersey: Person Education.
- Lowe, B., & Barnes, B.R. (2012). Consumer perceptions of monetary and non-monetary introductory promotions for new products. *Journal of Marketing Management*, 28, 5-6, 629.
- Mohammad, R. R. & Kambiz, H. (2014). The Impact of Monetary and Non-Monetary Promotions On Brand Equity In Industrial Market (Case Study: "Iranpotk" Company). Iran: *International Journal of Research In Social Sciences*. http://ijsk.org/uploads/3/1/1/7/3117743/1_brand_equity.pdf
- Mendex, M., Bendixen, M., Abratt, R. & Yurova, Y. (2015). Sales Promotion and Brand Loyalty: Some New Insights. USA; *International Journal of Education and Social Science* Vol. 2 No. 1 <http://www.ijessnet.com/international-journal-of-education-and-social-science/>

- National Communication Commission (2016). Retrieved from www.ncc.gov.ng on September 20, 2016 February. Oyeniyi, O. (2011). Sales Promotion and Consumer Loyalty: A Study of Nigerian Telecommunication Industry. *Journal of Competitiveness*.
- Palazón-Vidal, & Delgado-Ballester, M. (2005). Sales promotions effects on consumer-based brand equity. Spain; *International Journal of Market Research* Vol. 47 Issue 2.
- Pullig, C. (2008). What is Brand Equity and What Does the Branding Concept Mean to You? Texas: *Keller Center Research Report*. http://www.baylor.edu/business_new/kellercenter/doc.php/194253.pdf.
- Raghubir, P. & Celly, K.S. (2011). Promoting Promotions: Does Showcasing Free Gifts Backfire? *Journal of Business Research*, 64, 55–58.
- Ramezani, M. & Heidarzadeh, K. (2014). The Impact of Monetary and Non-Monetary Promotions on Brand Equity in Industrial Market. Iran: *International Journal of Research in Social Sciences*. http://ijsk.org/uploads/3/1/1/7/3117743/1_brand_equity.pdf.
- Salelaw, G. T. & Amanpree, H. (2016). The Impact of Sales Promotion on Brand Equity: The Case of Brewery Industry. Patiala: *Journal of Marketing and Consumer Research*. www.iiste.org ISSN 2422-8451, Vol. 22, 201.
- Sinha, I. & Smith, M.F. (2000). Consumers' attitudes of promotional framing of price. *Psychology and Marketing*, 17, 257-275.
- Somesh, K. S. & Priyanka, V. (2015). A Study of Non-Monetary Sales Promotion and Reward. India: IRACST – *International Journal of Commerce, Business and Management (IJCBM)*, ISSN: 2319–2828 Vol. 4, No.2, <http://www.iracst.org/ijcbm/papers/vol4no22015/19vol4no2.pdf>
- Vidal, M. P. & Ballester, E. D. (2005). Sales promotions effect on consumer based brand equity, *International Journal of Market Research*. Vol. 47 Issue 2 pp.179-204.
- Wang, J. (2015). The relationship between brand association and brand equity in the brand relationship management. China: *International Research Journal of Arts and social Science* Vol. 4(1) pp. 1-6, <http://www.interesjournals.org/IRJASS>.
- Wood, L. (2000). Brands and brand equity: definition and management. UK: MCB University Press. Retrieved from <http://www.emerald-library.com>.
- Yi, Y. & Yoo, J. (2011). The long-term effects of sales promotions on brand attitude across monetary and non-monetary promotions. *Psychol. Mark.*, 28: 879–896. doi:10.1002/mar.20416
- Yoo, B., Donthu, N., & Lee, S. (2000). An examination of selected marketing mix elements and brand equity. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 28(2), 195–211.
- Zeithaml, V. A. (1988). Consumer Perceptions of Price, Quality, and Value: A Means-End Model and Synthesis of Evidence. *Journal of Marketing*, 52(3), 2-22.