

Original Research Article

Varying Consumer Brand Loyalty Push to Promotion Mix: A Gendered Perspective

Dr. Swapnil Singh¹, Dr. Uma Shankar Singh^{2*}

¹Faculty of Administrative Sciences and Economics, Tishk International University, Erbil, Kurdistan

²Faculty of Administrative Sciences and Economics, Tishk International University, Erbil, Kurdistan

***Corresponding Author**

Dr. Uma Shankar Singh

Article History

Received: 03.05.2021

Accepted: 08.06.2021

Published: 15.06.2021

Abstract: The brand loyalty refers to the customer's connection towards a particular brand and also the commitment to remain loyal towards it without getting influenced by situational factors and resisting brand switching action. There are substantial differences between male and female shoppers in terms of their attitude towards brand loyalty and shopping patterns. It is to be noted that male and female shoppers differ in their respective shopping styles and patterns. The current study is based on a mix of quantitative and qualitative research methods. The research design adopted for the study is descriptive where the analysis of gender-based choices and brand loyalty is done which results in giving a push to promotion mix activities in Kurdistan. The sampling technique adopted for the study is simple random sampling which surveyed 216 respondents. The result analysis is done through one sample t-test and one-way Anova with the alpha value of .01 with medium effect. All the dimensions are measured on 5-point Likert scale. The three scopes of the study are well outlined as conceptual scope (promotion mix, brand loyalty), industrial scope (gender-based marketing), and geographical scope (Kurdistan). Study formulated the research problem as to verify the variance in brand loyalty and how far it pushes the promotion mix activities specifically based on gender differences. To reach the solution for this problem, research has been done through three objectives cited to know the importance of gender in determining consumer brand loyalty. It can be observed that difference in one's gender has shown very insignificant agreement on responses for brand loyalty or while evaluating similarity and dissimilarity. In response towards promotion mix activity has come up with a highly varying opinion by two genders, and third objective as the assessment of male/female understanding of brand loyalty is clear in with a very high variance in the opinion of respondents. All the three hypothesis formulated have a strong acceptance of concept with a very high variance and insignificant opinion with one way Anova test.

Keywords: Brand, brand loyalty, gender, promotion mix, shopping.

INTRODUCTION

Marketing behaviors of a company are determined on evolving, maintaining and improving consumer's loyalty regarding its products and services (Giovanis & Anthanasopoulou 2014; Dick & Basu, 1994). Today's business world has lot of challenges and the ever-increasing competition makes the concept of brand loyalty gain much more importance (Gartner, 2014; Leahy, 2008). Branding allows companies to create valuable long-term associations with their clients. The brand name and image create a greater customer value which in turn gratifies and helps to retain the loyal consumers (Aaker, 1991; De Chernatony & McDonald, 1992; Broyles et al., 2011; Blackston & Lebar, 2015). The data on aspects defining the conception of brand loyalty amid consumers becomes a significant matter (Jensen & Hansen, 2006). Therefore, it is important to apply the right mix of marketing and promotion strategies to analyze the variance of brand loyalty in today's competitive market. The purpose of this research is to assess the variance in brand loyalty and promotion mix from a gendered perspective. The study is conducted through online survey questionnaire administered to the respondents in the emerging markets of Kurdistan region.

Copyright © 2021 The Author(s): This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (CC BY-NC 4.0) which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium for non-commercial use provided the original author and source are credited.

The brand loyalty refers to the customer's connection towards a particular brand and also the commitment to remain loyal towards it without getting influenced by situational factors and resisting brand switching action (Oliver, 1999). There is no dearth of literature available on the factors which affect and influence brand loyalty of the customers (Ball et al., 2004). There are several advantages of creating the brand loyalty as it is observed that retaining the loyal customers is comparatively easier than creating the new customers (Aaker, 1991). The importance of brand loyalty has enforced the marketers to constantly look for ways to influence and maintain the loyalty of the consumers.

The effect of promotion mix on brand loyalty has also been observed and discussed by Krishnamurthy (2009) where he explains how the promotional activities are employed to create a brand in the existing market. The effect of the consumer's gender on the purchasing behaviour has also been an important concern for different brands and has been a well-researched issue (Pease & Pease, 2001; Bakewell & Mitchell, 2006; Sohail, 2013). Numerous studies have examined the effect of gender in different aspects of marketing such as price promotions (Mazumdar & Papatla, 1995), information through messaging (Meyers-Levy & Sternthal, 1991).

There are substantial differences between male and female shoppers in terms of their attitude towards brand loyalty and shopping patterns. It is to be noted that male and female shoppers differ in their respective shopping styles and patterns (Das, 2014). It was observed in some studies that some promotional activities such as a reward is appreciated by one gender but it may not hold true for the other gender. Thereby, suggesting difference in responses on the basis of one's gender (Eagly & Crowley 1986; Fisher & Dube, 2005; Kleck et al., 1976). Therefore, it is seen that the role of gender identity and the development of self through one's social capital and socialization plays an important role while deciding the psychology behind the shopping behaviors of any specific gender (Singh, 2020).

LITERATURE REVIEW

The current literature available on promotion mix, brand loyalty and the relationship between these two along with the effect of one's gender identity emphasizes the role of psychological stimulation through advertisements. The recent literature findings show that brand loyalty of men and women can be influenced by different agents. As discussed by Melnyk (2009) that male and female loyalties are different in nature. It was found out that female consumers were more loyal to several aspects such individual service providers as compared to group of people. The male and female customer loyalty also differs in terms of social interaction and information gaining motives (Nobel et al., 2006). It was noted by Kivetz & Simonson (2003) that a women's decision to go for a loyalty program is influenced much more by the unique fit of the program than a male customer's decision for the same. The female customers were portrayed as more social as compare to male shoppers by many earlier theories (Cross & Madson 1997; Markus & Kitayama, 1991). Whereas, recent studies support the evidence of male customer's communal interdependence (Baumeister & Sommer 1997; Melnyk et al., 2009).

As elaborated by Bhandari (2012) that sales promotion is one of the instruments that is utilized to attract customer and the purpose is to distinguish the sales promotion's effect on customer buying behavior. Wierenga, B. (2010) discusses that sales promotion are accomplished and familiar marketing events for those whose aim to have effect on customer's behavior. Owusu & Poku (2013) mentions that the promotional activities have influenced market because it is more worldly-wise and raises the number of companies which are utilizing them to assure their endurance in today's competitive market. Mendez et al., (2014) elaborates the objective of sales promotion which determines what the seller aspires to reach with sales promotion, the objective although should determine the target of consumers for the promotion and particularly the respond that is desirable. Odunlami & Ogunsiji (2011) mentions that the competent implementation of sale promotional instrument results in increase of volume of sales and constantly enhance profits. Faruqi & Alam (2009) observes that there has been appreciable interest in the sales promotional effect through several dimensions such as the price perception of consumers, brand option, changing the brand behavior, rating the equity brand, effect on perception of brand etc.

A theoretical model has been developed by Raju et al., (1990) to elaborate on how the differences in customer loyalty leads to differences in the volume and frequency of promotions presented by the brands. The model was taken forward by Agarwal (1996) to assimilate pricing by retailers and analyze the consequences of promotional decisions. Alternative research found out that the steady promotional plan depends disparagingly on brand strength (Jing & Wen, 2008). Ansari & Hasanholipor (2012) explains that sales promotion usually acts on immediate behavior foundation instead of effecting on knowingness and mental attitude. It was noted by Akbar & Majidazar (2012) that one of the important goals of applying the plan of promotion is to raise sale volume and attain a high level of profit, hence by ranging the tools of promotion from the most affecting to the less effective one, a qualified procedure for right usage of each one of the tool was discussed.

Two different schools of belief are thus generated from the influence of promotion mix on brand loyalty. The 'positivity school of thought' proposes that sales endorsements and brand loyalty has a positive relation (Palazon-Vidal

& Delgado- Ballester, 2005). Whereas, the majority consider that non-monetary campaigns lead beyond and towards the brand loyalty than financial promotions since they augment favorable links to the brand. Therefore, the brand awareness of the customers because of promotional mix should focus on the brand image being superior to its competitors (DelVecchio et al., 2006). As discussed by Singh & Singh (2020) that Brand loyalty implies to some marketing profits like cost decline, profit creation and positive word of mouth.

Odunlami & Ogunsiji (2011) opines that sales promotion is one of the options which is utilized by the firm to over communicate with specific targeted market and it is unique because it offers extra and special incentive for each action. Richard & Zhang (2014) say that the online sales promotion should intend to cut the perceived risk of consumers through offering proper information to accelerate more consumers and by serving them utilizing the system of shopping in the right way, particularly the system of online payment, reducing their risk immediately affects consumer's buying attitude and their purpose. Manuere et al., (2012) discusses that price deals are mostly planned to boost trial use of the new products or new customers for developing products. Ansari & Hasanholipor (2012) mentions that there are three major characteristics of sales promotion i.e. promotion of consumer, promotion of retailer and promotion of trade. Sadeh et. al., (2012) says that in this competitive environment, marketing and specially promotional instruments and programs are crucial factors for being successful in the market.

RESEARCH PROBLEM

Today's competitive markets have imposed a new challenge on brands to gain and maintain the customer's loyalty towards them. When the similar products are offered by different brands, it becomes challenging to maintain the brand loyalty and thus appropriate promotion mix activities are needed to maintain such loyalty by Singh and Mishra, (2015). Consumer loyalty towards brand has always been an object of interest in both the academic and business worlds. The academic researchers have shown the differences in the cognitive activities and behaviors of female and male consumers. These gender differences are visible in the extensive usage of gender as a subdivision in marketing tradition. Therefore, this study has observed the research problem to verify the variance in brand loyalty and how far it pushes the promotion mix activities specifically based on gender differences.

RESEARCH OBJECTIVES

- To know the importance of gender in determining consumer brand loyalty
- To evaluate similarity and dissimilarity in response towards promotion mix activity.
- To assess male/female understanding of brand loyalty.

RESEARCH HYPOTHESIS

H1: Gender is a strong determinant in keeping loyalty with brand.

H2: Male/Female act differently towards promotion mix.

H3: Male/Female have different orientation towards brand loyalty.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The current study is based on a mix of quantitative and qualitative research methods. The quantitative data collection is done through online survey questionnaire and the qualitative data assortment through the analysis of extensive literature review on these subjects. The secondary sources included various research articles, published books, websites, reports, and etc. (Singh, 2019). The research design adopted for the study is descriptive where the analysis of gender-based choices and brand loyalty is done which results in giving a push to promotion mix activities in Kurdistan by Sahin and Singh, (2017). The sampling technique adopted for the study is simple random sampling which surveyed 216 respondents. The result analysis is done through one sample t-test, correlation and regression with the alpha value of .01 with medium effect. The survey instrument implemented for data collection consists of two segments i.e. demography (gender, age, marital status, education and family income), whereas, the second segment talks about promotion mix (Advertising, Promotion, Public Relation and Personal Selling) along with Brand loyalty by Sherwani and Singh, (2015). All the dimensions are measured on 5-point Likert scale. The statistical tests for evaluation of concepts applied are reliability analysis, frequency and percentage analysis, one sample t-test and correlation and regression. The three scopes of the study are well outlined as conceptual scope (promotion mix, brand loyalty), industrial scope (gender-based marketing), and geographical scope (Kurdistan).

DATA ANALYSIS

Table-1: Reliability Statistics

Variables	Cronbach's Alpha	No. of Items
Advertising	.676	4
Sales Promotion	.651	4
Public Relation	.601	4
Personal Selling	.424	4
Promotion Mix	.821	16
Brand Loyalty	.897	5
Overall	.843	21

Interpretation: The table 1 shows the reliability value for variables which are used for forming questionnaire for measuring the concept. Overall reliability for 21 items is .843 and is highly acceptable for this study by Singh and Bradosti, (2015). Promotion Mix and Brand Loyalty have got reliability of .821 on 16 items and .897 on 5 item respectively. Variables of Promotion Mix are not having very high reliability, still it is in accepted range as they are higher than .6. Only Personal Selling has a comparatively low reliability of .424 on 4 items.

Table-2: Demography Frequency and Percentage Analysis

Items	Parameters	Frequency	Percentage
GENDER	Male	109	50.5
	Female	107	49.5
AGE	18 years – 25 years	134	62.0
	26 years – 35 years	54	25.0
	36 years – 45 years	22	10.2
	46 years – 55 years	6	2.8
MARITAL STATUS	Single	128	59.3
	Married	88	40.7
QUALIFICATION	Secondary	23	10.6
	Intermediate	56	25.9
	Graduate	92	42.6
	Post graduate	45	20.8
FAMILY INCOME	UP TO \$ 1000	55	25.5
	\$ 1001 \$ 2000	72	33.3
	\$ 2001 \$ 3000	50	23.1
	\$ 3001 \$ 4000	30	13.9
	\$ 4001 and more	9	4.2
Total		216	100

Interpretation: The Table 2 shows demography analysis. It demonstrates that out of 216 respondents, 50.5% were male and 49.5% were female respondents. The highest percentage of respondents were from the age group 18-25 years of age i.e. 62%. It is to be noted that 59.3% of the sampled respondents were single while 40.7% were married. About 42.6% of the respondents were graduates by Bradosti and Singh, (2015). It can also be seen from the table 1 that 33.3% of the respondents have monthly family income between \$1000- \$2000.

Table-3: Items Frequency and Percentage Analysis

Items	Parameters	Frequency	Percentage
Advertising on TV makes me to buy it	Strongly Disagree	43	19.9
	Disagree	25	11.6
	Neutral	61	28.2
	Agree	65	30.1
	Strongly Agree	22	10.2
Advertising on radio makes me to buy it	Strongly Disagree	56	25.9
	Disagree	80	37.0
	Neutral	57	26.4
	Agree	13	6.0
	Strongly Agree	10	4.6
Advertising in newspapers and magazines makes me to buy it	Strongly Disagree	37	17.1
	Disagree	56	25.9
	Neutral	61	28.2
	Agree	42	19.4
	Strongly Agree	20	9.3

Items	Parameters	Frequency	Percentage
Advertising on the internet makes me to buy	Strongly Disagree	18	8.3
	Disagree	38	17.6
	Neutral	59	27.3
	Agree	71	32.9
	Strongly Agree	30	13.9
Presenting promotional gifts makes me to buy it	Strongly Disagree	13	6.0
	Disagree	32	14.8
	Neutral	61	28.2
	Agree	70	32.4
	Strongly Agree	40	18.5
Providing special discounts makes me to buy it	Strongly Disagree	15	6.9
	Disagree	22	10.2
	Neutral	45	20.8
	Agree	77	35.6
	Strongly Agree	57	26.4
Offering special discounts different occasions make to buy it	Strongly Disagree	16	7.4
	Disagree	21	9.7
	Neutral	48	22.2
	Agree	79	36.6
	Strongly Agree	52	24.1
Promoting through ownership of sports team makes me to buy it	Strongly Disagree	42	19.4
	Disagree	49	22.7
	Neutral	48	22.2
	Agree	52	24.1
	Strongly Agree	25	11.6
Exposure to mass media interviews newspapers make buy it	Strongly Disagree	23	10.6
	Disagree	57	26.4
	Neutral	83	38.4
	Agree	47	21.8
	Strongly Agree	6	2.8
Social activities like charity makes me to buy it	Strongly Disagree	12	5.6
	Disagree	32	14.8
	Neutral	57	26.4
	Agree	65	30.1
	Strongly Agree	50	23.1
Strong positive image in mass media makes me to buy it	Strongly Disagree	15	6.9
	Disagree	35	16.2
	Neutral	88	40.7
	Agree	64	29.6
	Strongly Agree	26	13.5
Information about product through agents makes me to buy it	Strongly Disagree	14	6.5
	Disagree	29	13.4
	Neutral	62	28.7
	Agree	90	41.7
	Strongly Agree	21	9.7
Tele marketing makes me to buy it	Strongly Disagree	61	28.2
	Disagree	54	25.0
	Neutral	48	22.2
	Agree	36	16.7
	Strongly Agree	17	7.9
Marketing by email makes me to buy it	Strongly Disagree	81	37.5
	Disagree	53	24.5
	Neutral	49	22.7
	Agree	23	10.6
	Strongly Agree	10	4.6
Introduced by other customer makes me to buy it	Strongly Disagree	18	8.3
	Disagree	33	15.3
	Neutral	57	26.4
	Agree	80	37.0
	Strongly Agree	28	13.0
Direct sales people make me to buy it	Strongly Disagree	27	12.5
	Disagree	47	21.8
	Neutral	78	36.1

Items	Parameters	Frequency	Percentage
I Love the KOTON brand for apparels	Agree	41	19.0
	Strongly Agree	23	10.6
	Strongly Disagree	30	13.9
	Disagree	19	8.8
	Neutral	49	22.7
I love only KOTON brand for apparels	Agree	83	38.4
	Strongly Agree	35	16.2
	Strongly Disagree	31	14.4
	Disagree	19	8.8
	Neutral	80	37.0
I love to buy KOTON in the near future	Agree	56	25.9
	Strongly Agree	30	13.9
	Strongly Disagree	37	17.1
	Disagree	21	9.7
	Neutral	68	31.5
I would actively search for KOTON to buy it	Agree	68	31.5
	Strongly Agree	22	10.2
	Strongly Disagree	30	13.9
	Disagree	42	19.4
	Neutral	74	34.3
I love to buy other products of KOTON	Agree	48	22.2
	Strongly Agree	22	10.2
	Strongly Disagree	31	14.4
	Disagree	21	9.7
	Neutral	56	25.9
Total		216	100

Interpretation: The table shows the frequency and percentage analysis with 21 items. Table 3 represents that out of 216 sample respondents selected for the study, most of the respondents agree with the listed items (the highest percentage being 38.4%) by Singh and Bradosti, (2015). However, many of them were neutral also with the highest percentage being 40.7% for the same.

Table-4: One Sample T-test for Items

	Test Value = 4					
	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
					Lower	Upper
Q1 Advertising on TV makes me to buy it	-11.626	215	.000	-1.009	-1.18	-.84
Q2 Advertising on radio makes me to buy it	-24.152	215	.000	-1.736	-1.88	-1.59
Q3 Advertising in newspapers and magazines makes me to buy it	-14.832	215	.000	-1.222	-1.38	-1.06
Q4 Advertising on the internet makes me to buy it	-9.381	215	.000	-.736	-.89	-.58
Q5 Presenting promotional gifts makes me to buy it	-7.463	215	.000	-.574	-.73	-.42
Q6 Providing special discounts makes me to buy it	-4.454	215	.000	-.356	-.51	-.20
Q7 Offering special discounts different occasions make to buy it	-5.006	215	.000	-.398	-.55	-.24
Q8 Promoting through ownership of sports team makes me to buy it	-12.907	215	.000	-1.144	-1.32	-.97
Q9 Exposure to mass media interviews newspapers make buy it	-17.856	215	.000	-1.204	-1.34	-1.07
Q10 social activities like charity makes me to buy it	-6.269	215	.000	-.495	-.65	-.34
Q11 strong positive image in mass media makes me to buy it	-12.962	215	.000	-.875	-1.01	-.74
Q12 Information about product through agents makes me to buy it	-9.217	215	.000	-.653	-.79	-.51
Q13 Tele marketing makes me to buy it	-17.172	215	.000	-1.491	-1.66	-1.32
Q14 Marketing by email makes me to buy it	-22.237	215	.000	-1.796	-1.96	-1.64
Q15 Introduced by other customer makes me to buy it	-8.944	215	.000	-.690	-.84	-.54
Q16 Direct sales people make me to buy it	-13.543	215	.000	-1.065	-1.22	-.91
Q17 I Love the KOTON brand for soft drink	-7.721	215	.000	-.657	-.83	-.49
Q18 I love the only KOTON brand for soft drink	-10.202	215	.000	-.838	-1.00	-.68
Q19 I love to buy KOTON in the near future	-11.036	215	.000	-.921	-1.09	-.76
Q20 I would actively search for KOTON to buy it	-13.072	215	.000	-1.046	-1.20	-.89
Q21 I love to buy other products of KOTON	-8.424	215	.000	-.722	-.89	-.55

Interpretation: One sample T-test is performed on twenty-one items for the purpose of testing the approval of items for the study is presented in the table 4. These items got tested with the test value 4 getting agree and strongly agree responses for each item. The result shows that all the items are highly significant with .000 significance value. It also shows that responses are highly significant and opinions are close to each other. All items are well qualified to go for the study and next level of statistical tests and analysis.

Table-5: One Sample T-test for Variables

	Test Value = 4					
	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
					Lower	Upper
Advertising	-20.618	215	.000	-1.176	-1.29	-1.06
Sales Promotion	-10.862	215	.000	-.618	-.73	-.51
Public Relation	-16.758	215	.000	-.807	-.90	-.71
Personal Selling	-25.733	215	.000	-1.260	-1.36	-1.16
Promotion Mix	-23.613	215	.000	-.965	-1.05	-.88
Brand Loyalty	-11.943	215	.000	-.837	-.98	-.70

Interpretation: In the procedure of statistical strengthening technique, both dimensions and all four variables got tested for one sample T-test with the test value 4 by Sherwani and Singh, (2015). The key idea was to test if variables and dimensions formed on the given items are showing the significant outcome. It is observed that all the four variables (Advertising, Sales Promotion, Public Relation, and Personal Selling) are highly significant with the value of .000. While the two dimensions; Promotion Mix and Brand Loyalty are also highly significant on the test value 4 as it is shown in table 5. So, all four variables and two dimensions are considered for further analysis.

Table-6: One Way Anova for Items with Gender as Factor

ANOVA						
		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Q1 Advertising on TV makes me to buy it	Between Groups	.485	1	.485	.327	.568
	Within Groups	317.441	214	1.483		
	Total	317.926	215			
Q2 Advertising on radio makes me to buy it	Between Groups	.111	1	.111	.115	.735
	Within Groups	206.037	214	.963		
	Total	206.148	215			
Q3 Advertising in newspapers and magazines makes me to buy it	Between Groups	.121	1	.121	.084	.773
	Within Groups	310.027	214	1.449		
	Total	310.148	215			
Q4 Advertising on the internet makes me to buy it	Between Groups	.534	1	.534	.411	.522
	Within Groups	277.684	214	1.298		
	Total	278.218	215			
Q5 Presenting promotional gifts makes me to buy it	Between Groups	2.826	1	2.826	2.219	.138
	Within Groups	272.508	214	1.273		
	Total	275.333	215			
Q6 Providing special discounts makes me to buy it	Between Groups	2.589	1	2.589	1.844	.176
	Within Groups	300.518	214	1.404		
	Total	303.106	215			
Q7 Offering special discounts different occasions make to buy it	Between Groups	.644	1	.644	.480	.489
	Within Groups	287.282	214	1.342		
	Total	287.926	215			
Q8 Promoting through ownership of sports team makes me to buy it	Between Groups	15.177	1	15.177	9.503	.002
	Within Groups	341.782	214	1.597		
	Total	356.958	215			
Q9 Exposure to mass media interviews newspapers make buy it	Between Groups	.475	1	.475	.496	.482
	Within Groups	204.840	214	.957		
	Total	205.315	215			
Q10 Social activities like charity makes me to buy it	Between Groups	1.570	1	1.570	1.151	.284
	Within Groups	291.869	214	1.364		
	Total	293.440	215			
Q11 Strong positive image in mass media makes me to buy it	Between Groups	13.403	1	13.403	13.981	.000
	Within Groups	205.148	214	.959		
	Total	218.551	215			

Q12 Information about product through agents makes me to buy it	Between Groups	1.124	1	1.124	1.128	.289
	Within Groups	213.247	214	.996		
	Total	214.370	215			
Q13 Tele marketing makes me to buy it	Between Groups	5.057	1	5.057	3.497	.063
	Within Groups	309.443	214	1.446		
	Total	314.500	215			
Q14 Marketing by email makes me to buy it	Between Groups	1.599	1	1.599	1.180	.279
	Within Groups	289.938	214	1.355		
	Total	291.537	215			
Q15 Introduced by other customer makes me to buy it	Between Groups	.765	1	.765	.549	.460
	Within Groups	298.193	214	1.393		
	Total	298.958	215			
Q16 Direct sales people make me to buy it	Between Groups	.372	1	.372	.270	.604
	Within Groups	294.957	214	1.378		
	Total	295.329	215			
Q17 I Love the KOTON brand for soft drink	Between Groups	6.093	1	6.093	4.043	.046
	Within Groups	322.499	214	1.507		
	Total	328.593	215			
Q18 I love the only KOTON brand for soft drink	Between Groups	.798	1	.798	.544	.462
	Within Groups	314.017	214	1.467		
	Total	314.815	215			
Q19 I love to buy KOTON in the near future	Between Groups	9.219	1	9.219	5.675	.018
	Within Groups	347.651	214	1.625		
	Total	356.870	215			
Q20 I would actively search for KOTON to buy it	Between Groups	2.826	1	2.826	1.973	.162
	Within Groups	306.508	214	1.432		
	Total	309.333	215			
Q21 I love to buy other products of KOTON	Between Groups	.293	1	.293	.168	.682
	Within Groups	372.702	214	1.742		
	Total	372.995	215			

Interpretation: The table illustrates One-way ANOVA displaying the significant impact of Gender on the above mentioned twenty-one items. The study was conducted on 216 respondents on the basis of data collected through structured questionnaire. We can observe that only four items have significance value less than or equal to 0.05 and therefore, reflects that mostly (seventeen items) have higher than 0.05 significant value. The above table 6 therefore, proves that there is insignificant difference of opinion on the basis of one's gender on these items.

Table-7: One Way Anova for Variables with Gender as Factor

ANOVA		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Advertising	Between Groups	.000	1	.000	.000	.987
	Within Groups	129.180	214	.604		
	Total	129.180	215			
Sales Promotion	Between Groups	.002	1	.002	.004	.951
	Within Groups	137.340	214	.642		
	Total	137.343	215			
Public Relation	Between Groups	1.746	1	1.746	3.594	.059
	Within Groups	103.944	214	.486		
	Total	105.690	215			
Personal Selling	Between Groups	.257	1	.257	.544	.462
	Within Groups	101.238	214	.473		
	Total	101.495	215			
Promotion Mix	Between Groups	.045	1	.045	.145	.704
	Within Groups	66.996	214	.313		
	Total	67.042	215			
Brand Loyalty	Between Groups	2.973	1	2.973	2.667	.104
	Within Groups	238.492	214	1.114		
	Total	241.465	215			

Interpretation: The table illustrates One-way ANOVA displaying the significant impact of Gender on the above mentioned six variables. The study was conducted on 216 respondents on the basis of data collected through structured questionnaire. We can observe that only one variable has significance value less than or equal to 0.05 and therefore, reflects that mostly (five variables) have higher than 0.05 significant value. The above table 7 therefore, proves that there is insignificant difference of opinion on the basis of one's gender on these variables.

FINDINGS AND CONCLUSION

The study is an attempt to analyze the variance in consumer's brand loyalty and how it gives an impetus to promotion mix activities when perceived from a gendered perspective in the Kurdistan region. The study sampled 216 respondents through simple random sampling technique and administered them structured survey questionnaire to gather their responses. The respondents included both genders (50.5% were male respondents and 49.5% were female respondents). The highest percentage of respondents were from the age group 18-25 years of age i.e. 62%. It is to be noted that 59.3% of the sampled respondents were single while 40.7% were married. About 42.6% of the respondents were graduates. It is also visible that 33.3% of the respondents have monthly family income between \$1000- \$2000. The results of the study have implications for various brands and their gender-based marketing strategies and policies. As is tested in the data analysis section that overall reliability for all twenty-one items is highly reliable. One sample T-test is performed on twenty-one items for the purpose of checking the acceptance of items and the outcome shows all items are highly significant with .000 significance value. It shows that responses are highly significant and opinions are close to each other. In the process of statistical strengthening procedure, both dimensions and all four variables got tested for one sample T-test with the test value. It is observed that four variables (Advertising, Sales Promotion, Public Relation, and Personal Selling) are highly significant with the value of .000. Two dimensions; Promotion Mix and Brand Loyalty are also highly significant on the test value 4. The study also uses One-way ANOVA displaying the significant impact of Gender on the twenty-one items which proves that there is insignificant difference of opinion on the basis of one's gender on these items as well as variables.

Conclusion of the research is drawn from the detailed findings explained above. The study formulated the research problem as to verify the variance in brand loyalty and how far it pushes the promotion mix activities specifically based on gender differences. To reach the solution for this problem research has been done through three objectives i.e. to know the importance of gender in determining consumer brand loyalty which has shown a high importance as different genders showed very insignificant agreement on responses for brand loyalty. The second objective was to evaluate similarity and dissimilarity in response towards promotion mix activity also resulted in a highly varying opinion by two genders. The third objective of the assessment of male/female understanding of brand loyalty is very clear in this discussion with a very high variance in the opinion of the respondents. The three hypotheses formulated were that whether the gender is a strong determinant in keeping loyalty with brand which resulted in strong acceptance of the concept with a very high variance and insignificant difference in opinions. The second hypothesis of whether male and female act differently towards promotion mix also got accepted with the varying opinion in the one-way Anova test. The third and the last hypothesis which is also the key for this study about understanding male and female orientation towards brand loyalty shows that both genders are different in choosing their brands and keeping loyalty towards the brands.

REFERENCES

- Aaker, D.A. (1991). *Managing Brand Equity: Capitalizing on the Value of a Brand Name*, New York: Free Press.
- Agrawal, D. (1996). Effect of brand loyalty on advertising and trade promotions: a game theoretic analysis with empirical evidence, *Marketing Science*, 15 (1), 86–108.
- Akbar, B. & Majidazar, M. (2012). Evaluation of effectiveness of sales promotional tools on sales volume (a case study: Iran tractor manufacturing complex (ITMC)), *Middle East Journal of Scientific Research*, 11 (4) 470-480.
- Ansari, S. & Hasanholipor, T. (2012). Effect of sales promotion on consumer behavior based on culture, *African Journal of Business Management*, 6(1), 98-102.
- Bakewell, C. & Mitchell, V.W. (2006). Male versus female consumer decision making styles, *Journal of Business Research*, 59 (12), 1297–1300.
- Ball, D., Simões Coelho, P. & Machás, A. (2004). The role of communication and trust in explaining customer loyalty: an extension to the ECSI model, *European Journal of Marketing*, 38 (9–10), 1272–1293.
- Baumeister, R. F., & Sommer, K. L. (1997). What do men want? Gender differences and two spheres of belongingness: Comment on Cross and Madson. *Psychological Bulletin*, 122(1), 38–44.
- Bhandari, P. (2012). A Study on Impact of Sales Promotional Activities on Customer Buying Behaviour with Special Reference to Rathi Build Mart, Raipur, *International Journal of Science and Research*, 3(5), 300-304.
- Blackston, M. & Lebar, E. (2015). Constructing consumer-brand relationships to better market and build businesses, in Fournier, S., Breazeale, M.J. & Avery, J. (Eds.). *Strong Brands, Strong Relationships*, Routledge, New York, NY.

- Bradosti H., & Singh, U.S. (2015). Public awareness of financial market in Iraqi Kurdistan. *European Journal of Business and Management*, 7(10), 300-308.
- Cross, S. E., & Madson, L. (1997). Models of the self: Self-construals and gender. *Psychological Bulletin*, 122(1), 5–37.
- Das, G. (2014). Impacts of retail brand personality and self-congruity on store loyalty: the moderating role of gender, *Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services*, 21(2), 130–138.
- De Chernatony, L. & McDonald, M. (1992). *Creating Powerful Brands: The Strategic Route to Success in Consumer, Industrial and Service Markets*. Butterworth-Heinemann.
- DelVecchio, D., Henard, D.H. & Freling, T.H. (2006). The effect of sales promotion on
- Dick, A.S. & Basu, K. (1994). Customer loyalty: toward an integrated conceptual framework? *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 22 (2), 99–113.
- Eagly, A. H., & Crowley, M. (1986). Gender and helping behavior: A meta-analytic review of the social psychological literature. *Psychological Bulletin*, 100(3), 283–308.
- Faruqui, F. & Alam, S. (2009). Effect of sales promotion on consumers brand preference: A case study of laundry detergent Dhaka city consumers, *ASA University Review*, 3(2) 57-64.
- Fisher, R., & Dubé, L. (2005). Gender differences in responses to emotional advertising: A social desirability perspective. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 31(4), 850–858.
- Gartner, W.C. (2014). Brand equity in a tourism destination, *Place Branding and Public Diplomacy*, 10 (2), 108–116.
- Giovanis, A.N. & Athanasopoulou, P. (2014). Gaining customer loyalty in the e-tailing marketplace: the role of e-service quality, e-satisfaction and e-trust, *International Journal of Technology Marketing*, 9(3), 288–304.
- Jensen, J.M. & Hansen, T. (2006). An empirical examination of brand loyalty, *Journal of Product and Brand Management*, 15 (7), 442–449.
- Jing, B. & Wen, Z. (2008). Finitely loyal customers, switchers and equilibrium price promotion, *Journal of Economics and Management Strategy*, 17 (3), 683–707.
- Kivetz, R., & Simonson, I. (2003). The idiosyncratic fit heuristic: Effort advantage as a determinant of consumer response to loyalty programs. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 40(4), 454–467.
- Kleck, R. E., Vaughan, R. C., Cartwright-Smith, J., Vaughan, K. B., Colby, C. Z., & Lanzetta, J. T. (1976). Effects of being observed on expressive, subjective and physiological responses to painful stimuli. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 34(6), 1211–1218.
- Krishnamurthy, S. (2009). Case: Mozilla vs. Godzilla—the launch of the Mozilla Firefox Browser, *Journal of Interactive Marketing*, 23 (3), 259–271.
- Leahy, R. (2008). Brand loyalty in fast moving consumer good markets: the role of bonds, *Journal of Business and Management*, 3 (1), 7–19.
- Manuere, F. et. al. (2012). Sales Promotion as a critical component of a small business marketing strategy, *Interdisciplinary Journal of Contemporary Research Business*, 4(6), 1157-1200.
- Markus, H. R., & Kitayama, S. (1991). Culture and the self: Implications for cognition, emotion, and motivation. *Psychological Review*, 98, 224–253.
- Mazumdar, T. & Papatla, P. (1995). Gender difference in price and promotion response, *Pricing Strategy and Practice*, 3 (1), 21–33.
- Melnyk, V., van Osselaer, S. M. J., & Bijmolt, T. H. (2009). Are women more loyal customers than men? Gender differences in loyalty to firms and individual service providers. *Journal of Marketing*, 73(4), 82–96.
- Mendez, M. et. al., (2015). Sales Promotion and Brand Loyalty: Some New Insights, *International Journal of Education and Social Science*, 2(1), 103-117.
- Meyers-Levy, J. & Sternthal, B. (1991). Gender differences in the use of message cues and judgments, *Journal of Marketing Research*, 28 (1), 84–96.
- Noble, S. M., Griffith, D. A., & Adjei, M. T. (2006). Drivers of local merchant loyalty: Understanding the influence of gender and shopping motives. *Journal of Retailing*, 82(3), 177–188.
- Odunlami, I. B. & Ogunsiji, O. (2011). Effect of Sales Promotion as a Tool on Organizational Performance (A case Study of Sunshine Plastic Company), *Journal of Emerging Trends in Economics and Management Sciences*, 2(1) 9-13.
- Oliver, R.L. (1999). Whence consumer loyalty?, *Journal of Marketing*, 63 (4), 33–44.
- Owusu, M. & Poku, K. (2013). Investigation into Consumer Response to Sales Promotional Activities: The Case of Unilever Ghana Limited. *International Review of Management and Marketing*, 3(4), 134-145.
- Palazón-Vidal, M. & Delgado-Ballester, E. (2005). Sales promotions effects on consumer-based brand equity, *International Journal of Market Research*, 47 (2), 179–204.
- Pease, A. & Pease, B. (2001). *Why Men Don't Listen and Women Can't Read Maps: How We're Different and What to Do About It*, Harmony, Broadway, New York.

- Raju, J.S., Srinivasan, V. & Lal, R. (1990). The effects of brand loyalty on competitive price promotional strategies, *Management Science*, 36 (3), 276–304.
- Richard, L. & Zhang, H. (2014). Sales promotion and purchasing intention: Applying technology acceptance model in consumer-to-consumer marketplaces, *International Journal of Business Humanities and Technology*, 4(3), 1-5.
- Sadeh, F. et, al., (2012). Survey on the effectiveness of promotional and communication strategies adopted by financial services, *African Journal of Business Management*, 6(4), 10925-10937.
- Sahin, O. & Singh, U.S. (2017). A Literary Excavation of University Brand Image Past to Present. *International Journal of Social Sciences and Educational Studies*, 3(3), 174-187.
- Sherwani, K., & Singh, U.S. (2015). Student perception on lecturer evaluation in higher education. *International Journal of Social Sciences & Educational Studies*, 49.
- Singh, S. & Singh, U.S. (2020). A Study Assessing the Brand Loyalty Creation by Promotion Mix for KOTON Brand, *Journal of Xidian University*, 14(5), 3460-3480.
- Singh, S. (2019). Rural Development and Tourism: Prospects, Issues and Challenges. In S. Agarwal, A. Ranjan, V.K. Dev & N. Chowdhary (Eds.), *Rurality, Ruralism and Rural Tourism: Challenges and Coping Strategies* (pp. 433-442). ANE Books Pvt. Ltd.
- Singh, S. (2020). Understanding Gender Spectrum: Indian Experience, *Eurasian Journal of Management and Social Science*, 1(1), 36-48.
- Singh, U. S., & Mishra, U.S. (2015). Assessment of need for vertical coordination in supply chain of vegetable industry. *International Food Research Journal*, 22(4), 1417–1423.
- Singh, U.S., & Bradosti H. (2015). Acceptability of banking operations in Iraqi Kurdistan. *Research Journal of Finance and Accounting*, 6(9), 276-286.
- Sohail, M.S. (2013). A Study of Mall Shopping Behaviour and Patronage: Perspectives from an Emerging Nation, Available at SSRN 2653640.
- Wierenga, B. (2010). Sales promotion and channel coordination, *Journal of the Academic Marketing Science*, 38, 383 -397.

CITATION: Swapnil Singh & Uma Shankar Singh (2021). Varying Consumer Brand Loyalty Push to Promotion Mix: A Gendered Perspective. *South Asian Res J Bus Manag*, 3(3), 52-62.