THE IMPACT OF MONETARY AND NON-MONETARY PROMOTIONS ON BRAND EQUITY IN INDUSTRIAL MARKET (CASE STUDY: "IRANPOTK" COMPANY)

Mohammad Reza Ramezani; Kambiz Heidarzadeh
Department of business management, science and research branch, Islamic Azad University, Iran
Corresponding Author: m_ramezani@iranpotk.com

ABSTRACT
The purpose of this study, is investigating monetary and nonmonetary promotions on purchase intention and customers loyalty to brand in industrial markets. In this study, we use "IRANPOTK" Company as a case study. This study is practical research in terms of research goal and is descriptive research in terms of research path. Statistical population contains representatives and retailers who had transactions with "IRANPOTK" Company. According to limited population, information-oriented sampling is used for gathering data. Structural equation modeling, are used for data analysis. Results shown that nonmonetary promotions, is the only predictor and effective factor. These results can be used for strategy determining and sales promotion selection for industrial markets participants and academics in industrial area.
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1. INTRODUCTION
Industrial marketing is one of the subjects that less research (in comparison with consumer marketing research’s) had been done on it. According to definition, industrial marketing means service and goods marketing in accordance with business organizations (Havalder, 2003). According to definition, industrial marketing importance and its bold rule in economics is being clear. It is clear that nearly all of producers that send their products to consumers by dealers need this kind of marketing.

In recent years, fairly good marketing researches have been done on brand equity of consumer marketing. But unfortunately and because of different reasons, a few researches has been done in industrial marketing area.

Brand equity elements have direct influence on customer’s perception and so affect brand purchase behavior. So, company needs strategies development for increasing brand equity (Keller, 2009).

Marketing mix is one of tools that affects brand equity and is an important challenge for determining optimized marketing budget for increasing target market (Soberman, 2000) and brand (Ataman Mela and Van Heerda, 2010).

Brand loyalty is one valuable properties of every company. Brand loyalty happens when a consumer purchases a brand continuously between other brands. This kind of loyalty may be because of habit to brand, because brand name has been dominated in consumer’s memory or there are some associations with brand image in consumer’s mind or because consumers realize partially deep to purchased brand. Although brand characteristics have the most important in creating brand loyalty, sale promotions are that keep consumers loyal to brand. These promotions can bring valuable communications for creating and maintaining positive brand associations in consumer’s mind. Brand loyalty happens when a company tries to create and maintain positive brand association in customer’s mind. At last, we can say that brand equity has been shaped.
Some researchers investigated different elements of marketing mix with brand equity (e.g. Keller and Lehmann, 2006). These researchers didn't investigate all dimensions of brand equity. There are some studies that include brand equity scale based on customers with marketing influence analysis. One of these exceptions is Yoo and et al., (2000) research that had been explained the relation between marketing selected mixes and brand equity based on customers. While their research creates new attitude about how marketing activities influences brand equity. Finally, Researcher needs more findings about marketing mix variables influences.

Another area of research is customer-based brand equity perception. Usually, researches are explained relation between customer-based brand equity dimensions (e.g. Yoo and Danthu, 2001; Pappu et al., 2005; Tong and Hawley, 2009). So, some researchers focus on brand equity dimension's order (e.g. Yoo and Danthu, 2001; Keller and Lehmann, 2006).

According to Yoo and et al. 2000 model, this study is far from research about brand equity resources in different ways. First, most of studies about brand equity concentrates on influence of monetary promotions repetition (such as: Yoo and et al. 2000; Valette and Florence, 2010). Also, this study analyses nonmonetary promotions. Recent studies about sales promotions are shown discrimination between monetary and nonmonetary promotions (e.g. Chandon and et al., 2000). Second, hierarchal-based study, analyzed the relation between brand equity dimensions. A hierarchy model is proposed according to brand equity dimension importance according to different studies (Agraval and Rao, 1996; Maio Mackay, 2001; Yoo and Danthu, 2001; Keller and Lehmann, 2003; 2006). So, there are few studies that investigate how brand equity dimensions influence each other.

According to literature of brand equity and gap between last studies, this research try to determine which agents are events and outcomes of brand equity. So, this research uses sales promotions with different targets as a predictor of brand equity. On the other hand, the research investigates consumer’s reaction to brand equity that includes perceived value of transaction and purchase intention.

1. LITERATURE REVIEW

Sales promotions are marketing events that are designed to increase customer’s purchase behavior in a determined period. Most of researches investigate customer’s reaction to sales promotions and real time influence on buyer’s behavior.

Sales promotions are one of main marketing tools that have effect on brand value (Florence et al., 2011). Different kinds of promotions (monetary and nonmonetary) probably have different effects on sale, profitability or brand value (Srinivasan and Anderson, 1998).

Most of previous researches concentrated on monetary promotions, such as price discounts and discounts coupons. Although some researches discussed about these promotions effects on brand equity (e.g. Joseph and Sivakumaran, 2008). But some of results shows that monetary promotion tools has negative influence on brand equity (Yoo et al., 2000). With focus on direct influences of brand equity dimensions, probably monetary promotions have negative influence on brand perceived quality and brand association. Decreasing in reference price is one of the main reasons that have negative influence on perception about quality in customer’s mind. Customers use price as an external agents for judging about product quality (Milgrom and Roberts, 1986; Rao and Monroe, 1989; Dodds et al., 1991; Agarwal and Teas, 2002).

Aaker (1996) believed sales promotions usage frequently during the time, decreases brand equity. Some other researchers concludes that between five selected variable of marketing mix, monetary promotion’s repetition has negative influence on brand equity (e.g. Mela, Atman and Van Heerde, 2006). In contrast, some others concluded that monetary promotions can decrease or increase brand equity (Delvecchio, Henard and Freling, 2006). Also, Leman and et al., (2003) showed results about long-term positive influence of monetary promotions on purchase reinforcement and brand performance.

In summary, we should say that frequent usage of sales promotions, has negative influence on perceived quality in consumer mind and brand association dealer. Because these tools will guide customers to the point where they think about price, not to think about brand name (Yoo et al., 2000).

There are researches that investigate price discount influence on customer’s intention. For example, researchers investigated how promotions influence customer’s perception of price in two tests.
According to above sentences, we can propose for below hypothesis:

H1: by using monetary promotions, brand perceived value is decreased by customer.

H2: by using monetary promotions, brand association is decreased by customer.

H3: by using nonmonetary promotions, brand perceived value is increased by customer.

H4: by using nonmonetary promotions, brand perceived value is increased by customer.

Brand equity creating process, is initiated with more brand awareness. First, customers should aware from brand. Then, they have associations with some special characteristics (Aaker, 1991). Brand awareness on brand association with type and size affect consumer, absolutely it contains perceived level of quality (Keller, 1993; Pitta and Katsanis, 1995; Aaker, 1996; Na et al., 1999; Keller and Lehmann, 2003; Konecnik and Gartner, 2007). So, brand awareness, is a predictor for brand association and brand perceived value (Keller and Lehmann, 2003; Pitta and Katsanis, 1995).

While customers obtain positive imagination of brand name, these will results to loyalty (Oliver, 1999). For example, we can say that: brand association and brand perceived value can cause increasing in brand loyalty (Keller, 1993; Chaudhuri, 1999; Keller and Lehmann, 2003; Pappu et al., 2005).

Sales promotions are marketing events and tools that are designed for stimulate customers to buy more in a determined time. Most of studies investigate customer’s reaction to sales promotions and their simultaneous influence on buyer’s behavior. Some studies was done on long-term effects of promotions, these studies shows that promotions have negative effect on brand equity and can cause changing in brand behavior (Papatla and Krishna Murthi, 1996). Aaker (1996) indicated that promotion repetition, decrease brand equity during the time and Mela and Atman (2006) concluded that between five marketing mix variable, monetary promotion repetitions, have negative effect on brand equity. In contrast, Delvecchino and Freling (2006) stated that sales promotion can increase or decrease brand preference. Keller et al., (2006) indicated promotions long-term effect on buying intention and brand preference.

Promotions with long-term targets can increase brand equity. Absolutely, unique, desirable and strong brand name is associated for customers, when they experience real product (Keller, 2009). On the other hand, short-term declining probably isn’t desirable for making strong brand name, even if they increased profit in short-term (Aake, 1991; Yoo et al., 2000).

Industrial marketing promotions, activities such as leaflets, sellers and websites, usually are used as a prerequisite for creating brand equity (Sharma, Krishnan and Grewal, 2001; Van Riel, 2005). Van Reil and et al., (2005) showed that promotions have positive effect on brand loyalty, so have a positive effect on brand perceived value.

Using promotional tools with long-term targets can cause increase in brand equity, this can be done by presenting real product and its experience. This action can help to create unique, desirable and also strong (Keller, 2009). On the other hand, cross-sectional price discounts like price discounts can’t increase brand equity, even if they reinforce profit in short-term (Aaker, 1991; Yoo et al., 2000). Leaflets, sellers and websites are the agents that create brand equity in industrial marketing promotional activities (Sharma, Krishnan & Grewal, 2001; Van Riel et al., 2005).

Exhibitions, conferences, direct advertising mails, word of mouth advertising and technical consultation are resources for given information. Especially in high technology market, a seller in industrial markets has important role in communication (Kuhn et al., 2008; Lynch & Chernatony, 2004; Mudambi, 2002). Bendixen et al., (2004) knew that technical consultants and sale representatives are the main path for obtaining brand awareness in industrial markets.

In addition, Reil and et al., (2003) showed that promotions, have direct influence on brand name and perceived value of quality by customers.

So we conclude that:

H5: Brand awareness increases, brand perceived value increases in customers mind.

H6: Brand awareness increases, brand association increases in customers mind.

H7: Brand perceived value increases in customers mind, brand loyalty increases.
According to studies, four components, brand awareness, brand perceived value in customer’s mind, brand association and brand loyalty are used for investigation of brand equity (for example, Cobb-Walgren et al., 1995; Yoo et al., 2000; Yoo and Donthu, 2001; Washburn and Plank, 2002; Ashill and Sinha, 2004; Pappu et al., 2005; Konecni and Gartner, 2007; Tong and Hawley, 2009; Lee and Back, 2010). So, in this research, we use these for dealer for investigation of brand equity.

2. CONCEPTUAL MODEL

Figure I: Conceptual model

3. METHODS

This research is quantitative and the research methods can be classified in terms of two criteria: 1) research goal, 2) data collection method. Since this work is an attempt to deal with the investigation and development of practical knowledge on customers' purchase intention, it can be considered as practical research in terms of research goal. Another criterion in the classification of the research methods is regarding the method of data collecting. In other words, the current research can be viewed as a correlation of descriptive researches, because the relationships between eight latent variables are studied. Research statistical population contains all of representatives and retailers who had interactions with "IRANPOTK" Company. According to limited population, information-oriented sampling is used for gathering data.

3.1. Measures

3.1.1. Brand awareness

Brand awareness was measured by using seven items, five-point Likert-type from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree). These seven items were extracted from studies by Yoo et al. (2000), Yoo and Donthu (2001), and Buil et al., (2013a, b).

3.1.2. Brand association

Brand association was measured by using eight items, five-point Likert-type from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree), and was adapted from Aaker (1996), Netemeyer et al. (2004), Pappu et al. (2005), and Buil et al., (2013a, b).

3.1.3. Perceived Value

Perceived quality was measured by using scales Netemeyer et al. (2004), Pappu et al. (2005), and Buil et al., (2013a, b). This measurement included eleven items, five-point Likert-type from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree).
3.1.4. Brand loyalty
Brand loyalty was measured by using eight items, five-point Likert-type from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree). These seven items were adopted from studies by Yoo et al., (2000), Yoo and Donthu (2001), Aaker (1996), and Buil et al., (2013a, b).

3.1.5. Purchase intention
Purchase Intention was measured by using six items, five-point Likert-type from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree), and was extracted from Buil et al., (2013a).

3.1.6. Monetary Promotion
Monetary promotion was measured by using scales extracted from Buil et al., (2013b). This scale included eleven items, five-point Likert type from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree).

3.1.7. Non-Monetary Promotion
Non-Monetary Promotion was measured by using scales extracted from Buil et al., (2013b). This measurement included eleven items, five-point Likert-type from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree).

3.1.8. Perceived value of transaction
Perceived value of transaction was measured by using scales extracted from Grewal et al., (1998b). This measurement included eleven items, five-point Likert-type from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree).

3.2. Methods for data analysis
“Structural Equation Modeling” (SEM) was used to experiment the hypothesized conceptual model. Eight latent variables (brand awareness, brand association, perceived value, brand loyalty, monetary promotion, Non-Monetary promotion, Perceived value of transaction, purchase intention) and 40 observed variables were also used in order to test the structural model. Following assessing the measurement model in terms of reliability was examined Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA) results. Then the path relationship between the eight latent variables (brand awareness, brand association, perceived quality, brand loyalty, brand equity, brand preference, purchase intention, and price premium) was examined. Hypotheses 1 to 11 was tested in order to decide whether there was an important relation among variables in the proposed model.

3.3. Evolvement of measurement scales
The proposed model comprises eight latent variables which are made up of 1) brand awareness, 2) perceived Value, 3) brand association, 4) brand loyalty, 5) Monetary promotion, 6) Non-Monetary Promotion, 7) Perceived value of transaction, and 8) purchase intention. After a broad literature study questions were made for the instrument so that they could measure all the constructs in the proposed model. Then a pretest was held following the primary questionnaire was constructed. The ultimate version of the questionnaire was made during the pretest that was constructed to reinforce the structure’s reliability and validity.

To test its validity, content validity and construct validity and to test its reliability, internal consistency reliability were utilized. When a researcher uses a method with a number of independent variables or items which measures an attribute or phenomenon it should make sure about consistency of them. To measure internal consistency reliability, Chronbach Alpha coefficient was used. To identify reliability, Chronbach Alpha of each variable was calculated. All variables had coefficient values more than 0.7.

4. RESULTS
According to descriptive statistics, the highest age frequency is for 42-49 years old age level with 24 percent. Also, 75 percent of participants are married and only 15 percent are single. In addition, most of respondents have high experience. As 72 percent have more than ten years work experience. According to statistical population, hypothesis results are surveyed by using structural equation modeling.

For evaluating reliability of model, first confirmatory factor analysis, reliability and validity should be validated, then hypothesis should be tested by structural model. Factor loading and items significant level in measurement model is showed in table I.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>items</th>
<th>C.R.</th>
<th>Significant level</th>
<th>Factor loading</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>item num1: brand</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>awareness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>item num2: brand</td>
<td>6.830</td>
<td>****</td>
<td>0.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>awareness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>item num3: brand</td>
<td>7.307</td>
<td>****</td>
<td>0.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>awareness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>item num4: brand</td>
<td>7.003</td>
<td>****</td>
<td>0.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>awareness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>item num5: brand</td>
<td>6.885</td>
<td>****</td>
<td>0.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>awareness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>item num1: brand</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.661</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>association</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>item num2: brand</td>
<td>8.118</td>
<td>****</td>
<td>0.689</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>association</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>item num3: brand</td>
<td>8.210</td>
<td>****</td>
<td>0.696</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>association</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item num4: brand</td>
<td>6.989</td>
<td>****</td>
<td>0.579</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>association</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>item num5: brand</td>
<td>8.638</td>
<td>****</td>
<td>0.721</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>association</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>item num6: brand</td>
<td>9.168</td>
<td>****</td>
<td>0.807</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>association</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>item num7 : brand</td>
<td>7.628</td>
<td>****</td>
<td>0.648</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>association</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>item num8: brand</td>
<td>9.054</td>
<td>****</td>
<td>0.793</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>association</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>item num1 : brand</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.591</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>loyalty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item num2 : brand</td>
<td>6.303</td>
<td>****</td>
<td>0.608</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>loyalty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>item num3: brand</td>
<td>7.283</td>
<td>****</td>
<td>0.744</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>loyalty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>item num4 : brand</td>
<td>7.318</td>
<td>****</td>
<td>0.800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>loyalty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item num5: brand</td>
<td>7.088</td>
<td>****</td>
<td>0.708</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>loyalty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item num3 : perceived</td>
<td>8.369</td>
<td>****</td>
<td>0.688</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>value of brand</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item num4 : perceived</td>
<td>8.679</td>
<td>****</td>
<td>0.752</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>value of brand</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item num6 : perceived</td>
<td>7.275</td>
<td>****</td>
<td>0.603</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>value of brand</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item num8 : perceived</td>
<td>5.959</td>
<td>****</td>
<td>0.510</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>value of brand</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item num11 : perceived</td>
<td>7.118</td>
<td>****</td>
<td>0.510</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>value of brand</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item num1 : perceived</td>
<td>5.948</td>
<td>****</td>
<td>0.693</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>value of brand</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item num2 : perceived</td>
<td>7.118</td>
<td>****</td>
<td>0.617</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>value of brand</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item num7 : perceived</td>
<td>8.507</td>
<td>****</td>
<td>0.742</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>value of brand</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item num9: perceived</td>
<td>5.948</td>
<td>****</td>
<td>0.509</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>items</td>
<td>C.R.</td>
<td>Significant level</td>
<td>Factor loading</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>perceived value of brand</td>
<td>7.528</td>
<td>****</td>
<td>0.662</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>monetary promotion</td>
<td>7.873</td>
<td>****</td>
<td>0.805</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>monetary promotion</td>
<td>7.525</td>
<td>****</td>
<td>0.682</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>monetary promotion</td>
<td>4.368</td>
<td>****</td>
<td>0.524</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>monetary promotion</td>
<td>5.429</td>
<td>****</td>
<td>0.0608</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>monetary promotions</td>
<td>4.238</td>
<td>****</td>
<td>0.758</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>monetary promotion</td>
<td>8.034</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.682</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>monetary promotion</td>
<td>6.521</td>
<td>****</td>
<td>0.588</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>monetary promotion</td>
<td>6.629</td>
<td>****</td>
<td>0.577</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nonmonetary promotions</td>
<td>6.063</td>
<td>****</td>
<td>0.517</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nonmonetary promotions</td>
<td>6.082</td>
<td>****</td>
<td>0.511</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>perceived value of transaction</td>
<td>7.015</td>
<td>****</td>
<td>0.659</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>perceived value of transaction</td>
<td>6.082</td>
<td>****</td>
<td>0.659</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>purchase intention</td>
<td>9.112</td>
<td>****</td>
<td>0.677</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>purchase intention</td>
<td>10.679</td>
<td>****</td>
<td>0.800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>purchase intention</td>
<td>9.300</td>
<td>****</td>
<td>0.681</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>purchase intention</td>
<td>8.859</td>
<td>****</td>
<td>0.672</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>purchase intention</td>
<td>10.933</td>
<td>****</td>
<td>0.695</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As we see, all of measurement model items have more than 0.5 load factor and significant level of items are below 0.05, so measurement model is desirable. After confirmatory factor analysis, for confirming study hypothesis, we define structural model and hypothesis are accepted or rejected.
according to T-test statistics. Structural model results are reported in Table II. Structural model fitness indexes are reported in Table III.

Table II. Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variable</th>
<th>Dependent Variable</th>
<th>C.R.</th>
<th>Significant Level</th>
<th>Coefficients Effect</th>
<th>Result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brand awareness</td>
<td>Brand association</td>
<td>4.753</td>
<td>****</td>
<td>0.893</td>
<td>Accept</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brand awareness</td>
<td>Perceived value of brand</td>
<td>4.875</td>
<td>****</td>
<td>0.880</td>
<td>Accept</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monetary promotion</td>
<td>Perceived value of brand</td>
<td>-0.779</td>
<td>0.436</td>
<td>-0.085</td>
<td>Reject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monetary promotion</td>
<td>Brand association</td>
<td>-1.627</td>
<td>0.104</td>
<td>-0.193</td>
<td>Reject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonmonetary promotion</td>
<td>Perceived value of brand</td>
<td>2.927</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>0.2296</td>
<td>accept</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonmonetary promotion</td>
<td>Brand association</td>
<td>3.189</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.317</td>
<td>Accept</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived value of brand association</td>
<td>Brand loyalty</td>
<td>2.935</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>0.728</td>
<td>Accept</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived value of brand association</td>
<td>Brand loyalty</td>
<td>0.849</td>
<td>0.397</td>
<td>0.208</td>
<td>Reject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brand loyalty</td>
<td>Perceived value of transaction</td>
<td>8.453</td>
<td>****</td>
<td>0.938</td>
<td>accept</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived value of transaction</td>
<td>Purchase intention</td>
<td>8.702</td>
<td>****</td>
<td>0.911</td>
<td>accept</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table III. Fitness indexes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fitness Indexes</th>
<th>Suitable bound</th>
<th>Reached indexes of study</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chi-square with degrees of freedom (CMIN/DF)</td>
<td>1 to 3</td>
<td>2.152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CFI index</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GFI index</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.630</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGFI index</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.597</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RMSEA index</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.080</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5. CONCLUSION

This study investigated consequences of brand equity in industrial area. While sales promotions is one of effective agents on brand equity. This research had been paid to brand equity dimensions increasing or decreasing with concentration on monetary and nonmonetary promotions in industrial marketing. At last, the study had been investigated brand equity increasing on purchase intention. According to case study in hardware industry area and there is no academic research about monetary and nonmonetary promotions in industrial area, so results can be beneficial in determining marketing strategies. In discussion and conclusion section, we pay to results of every hypothesis and then discuss about it.

According to statistical results, significant level is more than 0.05. So, we can’t accept first hypothesis. It means that there is no negative effect between perceived value and monetary promotion. This shows that monetary promotions can’t influence perceived value of brand in industrial marketing area. According to previous studies, Yoo and et al., (2001), Bill and et al., (2013) shows that monetary promotions only influence monetary discounts and decrease perceived value of brand.

A comparison with previous studies showed that, Yoo and et al., (2000) research on durable products showed that there is negative relation between cost reduction-based promotions and brand awareness. Kim and et al., (2003) showed that sales technique
with cost decreasing results in brand changing and makes new conditions for experimenting new brands.

According to statistical results for second hypothesis, significant level is more than 0.05. So, we can’t reject null hypothesis. T-test statistics isn’t in critical area and this shows that monetary promotions haven’t negative effect on brand association.

Results showed that monetary promotion can’t have negative influence on brand association. It may be because of economical conditions of country in recent years and no repeat of monetary promotions by producer. In other words, producer uses variety of monetary promotions in strategies. This causes no decrease in brand association by monetary promotions or reverses effect of these promotions on brand association.

Comparison with previous studies, Keller (2009) showed that discount-based promotions with short-term goals don’t results in brand equity.

According to statistics results for third hypothesis, significant level is less than 0.05. So, null hypothesis rejects in 95 confidence level and we conclude that nonmonetary promotion increase brand association with 0.25 impact factor.

This shows that if a country be in inflation conditions, customers want to obtain profit, they tend to nonmonetary promotions. This attitude cause positive brand imagination, positive attitude and brand desirable experience. So, the company has more brand discrimination in comparison with rivals.

Compared with previous studies, Keller (2009) showed that because of long-term effects event-based sales promotions is an effective agent on brand equity.

According to statistical results about hypothesis 4, significant level is less than 0.05. So, we can reject null hypothesis and T-test statistics is in critical area. We conclude that the more nonmonetary promotions increases, the more perceived value of brand increases.

This shows that in contrast with market participants, non-monetary promotions have direct influence on perceived value of brand in industrial market.

High inflation in Iran is one of the main reasons for this result. Because in inflation condition, national currency loses its real value and intermediates paid to attention to more profit. Nonmonetary promotions increment for providing representatives, because increasing in perceived value of brand. Because company causes risk declining, more after sale services and more availability, if uses this strategy by creating representatives in country.

In comparison with previous studies, Van Reil and et al., (2005) shows that sales promotions and sales employees are main elements agents on perceived quality of services.

Kim an Hyun, (2011) research shows that sales promotions affects brand awareness and perceived quality, but doesn’t affect brand loyalty.

According to statistics about hypothesis five, T statistics significant level is less than 0.05. So, we reject null hypothesis and brand awareness has direct influence on perceived value with 0.98 impact factor. According to results, the more awareness increases, the more brand value from “IRANPOTK” increases. It means that with one unit increment in brand awareness of “IRANPOTK” brand, perceived value of “IRANPOTK” brand increases 0.98 units for customers.

In comparison with previous results, Liu and Chang et al., (2009) findings showed that brand awareness has high position and so is important for market participants that manage their properties effectively and create procedures for developing brand loyalty and perceived quality. Bill et al., (2013) research results showed that brand awareness influences perceived quality.

According to statistical results about hypothesis six, significant level is less than 0.05. So, we can reject null hypothesis. Brand awareness has direct influence on brand association with 0.89 impact factor.
Medias such as websites, academic journals publication in hardware area cause brand awareness increment the other reason for creating brand association. When a company concentrates on product distribution by specialist representatives, not only this action helps to customers’ awareness, but also helps to increase positive brand awareness of “IRANPOTK” brand.

In comparison with previous studies, Yoo and et al., (2000) shows that brand awareness causes intuitive decision and creates more chance for familiar brands. Kim and et al., (2011) confirmed awareness influence on more sale in hotel industry. In a research Bill et al., (2013) confirmed brand awareness influence results on brand association.

About hypothesis 7, according statistical results, significant level is less than 0.05, so we reject null hypothesis. So, brand perceived value influence brand loyalty with 0.72 impact factor. Perceived value of brand is the only agent that influence brand loyalty directly.

Pappu, (2005) showed when a consumer is loyal to a brand; he/she thinks that brand has extreme quality. This relation is true reversely. Bill et al., (2013) perceived quality of brand influence brand loyalty directly. Keller and Lehmann, (2003) showed that higher level of perceived quality causes more brand loyalty.

According to statistical results for hypothesis 8, significant level is more than 0.05. So, we accept null hypothesis. We conclude that brand association doesn’t have relation with brand loyalty.

Comparison with previous studies, Yoo and et al., (2000) showed that positive association causes strong brand equity and this will results in brand loyalty. Bill and et al., (2013) confirmed that brand association influences brand loyalty.

According to statistical results for hypothesis 9, significant level is less than 0.05. So, we can reject null hypothesis. Brand loyalty influence perceived value of transaction with 0.93 impact factor.

According to statistical results for hypothesis 10, significant level is less than 0.05. So, we can reject null hypothesis. Perceived value of transaction influence purchase intention directly with 0.91 impact factor. This will cause 0.91 per increment in perceived value of transaction.

Comparison with previous researches, Cobb-Walgren et al., (1995) investigated the influence of purchase intension on brand equity and confirmed it. Chang and Liu, (2009) concluded that brand equity causes more brand preference and brand preference causes purchase intention.

While representatives and retailers have less participation in research activities, we can’t gather information by phone and verbally, and this research is done by post. This problem causes non cooperation and desirable and replication. We can’t have direct and accurate supervision because of gathering questionnaires by post. Research’s results influences by political and economic conditions of country. Future studies can be brand equity in other industrial areas. In future studies, if we don’t have limitations, we can use other events and outcomes of brand equity for developing model.

Industrial managers should pay attention to nonmonetary sales promotions in inflation-stagnation. We suggest to industrial managers pay attention to brand awareness increment according to hierarchical procedure for increasing brand equity and provide conditions for increasing brand association. Non-monetary promotions can be used in store area and monetary sales promotions can be used in product area to increase brand association and perceived value of brand. According to statistical results, companies should concentrate on products quality increment for increasing perceived value of brand. We recommend to industrial managers to concentrate on products distribution through specialist representatives and creating distributors in valid places, creating environments suitable for working, increasing brand association, increasing perceived value of brand by decreasing retailer risk and more availability. This will increase reliability.
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