

## **Gamified sales promotions vs BOGO sales promotions, a study comparing the effectiveness of rear-loaded incentive programs against each other**

---

Gamification as a promotion method is something that has been gaining increasingly in popularity during recent years. Due to this fact we wanted to investigate if this technique is as effective as many claim it is. We wanted to test if Gamification was more effective than a classic sales promotion technique, BOGO, when it comes to promoting hedonistic products. We based our evaluation of effectiveness on three areas, 1) Effects on sales, engagement and loyalty. 2) Effects on brand perception. 3) Possible difficulties that each promotion comes with. The study was conducted through an experiment consisting of 40 participants, equally divided into two groups; one Gamification and one BOGO. The hedonistic product chosen was coffee that was sold at the cafeteria in Stockholm School of Economics. We then monitored each group's consumption behavior and then followed up the results by a survey that was sent to the participants. Our results showed no empirical difference that Gamification would be more efficient than BOGO on any of the effectiveness parameters, but rather that BOGO was more efficient. Our conclusion to this was that promotions needs to be adapted to the product in terms of what benefits they provide the customer with and that Gamifications needs to be well designed in order to work. BOGO had a better fit according to our research. Our contribution to the field is that we have done first attempt of trying to measure the effectiveness of Gamification. More attempts on trying to measure the effectiveness of Gamification are encouraged.

**Keywords:** *Sales Promotions, Gamification, BOGO, Effectiveness, Consumer Behavior*

### **Authors:**

Charles Houdoy, 22012

Karl Rystadius, 21930

### **Tutor:**

Erik Modig

### **Examiner:**

Michael Dahlén

## **We would like to dedicate a big thank you to the following people:**

### **Erik Modig**

Thanks for all the good and inspiring advices you have given us during the course of this thesis.

### **Sivan's Café**

Thanks for helping us gather all the results by devoting your time and effort. This thesis would not be possible without you.

### **All participants in the experiment**

Thanks for your participation and dedication. You were invaluable for our thesis.

### **Andreas Fabbe**

Thanks for interesting and good hints about Gamification. You were a real source of inspiration.

### **Mikolaj Dymek**

Thanks for good and interesting inputs. You helped us get on right track with the thesis.

### **Friends and Family**

Thanks for patience and good inputs.

## Table of Contents

<b>1. Introduction</b>	<b>5</b>
1.1. Background	5
1.2. Problem definition	6
1.3. The purpose of this study	8
1.4. Delimitation	8
1.5. Expected knowledge contribution	9
1.6. Definitions	9
1.7. Disposition	11
<b>2. Theory</b>	<b>12</b>
2.1. How Sales promotions generate sales, engagement and loyalty	12
2.1.2. How BOGO programs generate sales, engagement and loyalty	14
2.1.3. How Gamification generate sales, engagement and loyalty	16
2.1.4. Gamification will be more efficient than BOGO	17
2.1.5. Hypothesis one	18
2.2. Sales promotions effect on brand attitude	19
2.2.1. Brand Choice	20
2.2.2. Gamification will create a more positive brand attitude than BOGO	20
2.2.3. Hypothesis two	21
2.3. How Gamification will generate more difficulties than BOGO	21
2.3.1. Gamification demands more resources than BOGO	21
2.3.2. Gamification can have negative effects on engagement	22
2.3.3. Hypothesis three	22
<b>3. Method</b>	<b>23</b>
3.1. The research approach	23
3.2. The data gathering	23
3.2.1. The gathering of primary data	23
3.2.2. The gathering of secondary data	24
3.3. Experiment design	24
3.3.1. The design of phase one - The promotions	24
3.3.2. Chosen location for the experiment - Sivan's Café	25
3.3.3. Chosen product for the experiment - Coffee	25
3.3.4. The participants of the experiment	26
3.4. The design of gamification	27
3.5. The design of BOGO	28
3.6. Research variables in phase one	28
3.6.1. Effect on sales	29
3.6.2. Effect on engagement	29
3.7. The design of phase two – the surveys	29
3.8. Research variables in phase two	30
3.8.1. Benefits provided by the promotion	30
3.8.2. Effect on sales, engagement and loyalty	30
3.8.3. Effect on the brand	31
3.9. Bad effects of the promotions	31
3.10. Deciding whether coffee is hedonistic or utilitarian	31
3.11. Internal validity	32
3.12. External validity	32
3.13. Analysis tool	32

<b>4. Results and Analysis</b>	<b>33</b>
4.1. Results under H1 - Compared with BOGO, Gamification will generate more sales, engagement and loyalty	33
4.1.1. Sales	33
4.1.2. Engagement	34
4.1.3. Loyalty	35
4.1.4. Conclusion of H1: Compared with BOGO, Gamification will generate more sales, engagement and loyalty.	36
4.2. Coffee - Hedonistic or utilitarian?	36
4.3. Benefits provided by the campaigns	37
4.4. Results under H2 - Compared with BOGO, Gamification will create more awareness around a brand and improve a brand's image.	38
4.4.1. Conclusion of H2: Compared with BOGO, Gamification will create more awareness around the brand and improve brand image	39
4.5. Results under H3 - Compared with BOGO, Gamification will face more difficulties	39
4.5.1. Wanting to give up	40
4.5.2. Perceived unreachability of the campaign	40
4.5.3. Conclusion of H3: Gamification will face more difficulties	40
<b>5. Conclusion &amp; Discussion</b>	<b>40</b>
5.1. Conclusion	41
5.2. Discussion	41
5.3. Theoretical implications	42
5.4. Practical implications	42
5.5. Limitations of our research	42
5.6. Future research	43
<b>6. References</b>	<b>44</b>
Businessweek, Douglas MacMillan, January 2011. 'Gamification': A Growing Business to Invigorate Stale Websites.	44
Kapp, Karl M. (2012). The Gamification of Learning and Instruction: Game-based Methods and Strategies for Training and Education. John Wiley & Sons Inc.	44
<b>7. Appendix</b>	<b>49</b>

## 1. Introduction

Today's managers and marketers are meeting a more and more competitive market where the noise from different communication channels is immense. It is then important to use as an effective method as possible to get through the noise and be able to gain new customers, but almost even more importantly to be able to retain old customers, hence keeping up sales and profits. There are many ways to retain customers, but to know which method to use and which one is the most effective for your specific case is not always the easiest. Depending on what you strive for, one method could be more effective for you to accomplish your goals. One way of retaining your customers is to implement sales promotion strategies that focus on giving incentives for the customers to shop more and come back to your company and rewards them for doing so, so called rear-loaded incentive programs. They will be rewarded at a subsequent purchase moment.

In this study we will put two rear-loaded incentive programs against each other to find out which is more effective, in terms of increased sales, improved brand perception, but also look at their downsides. The sales promotions strategies we will look at are a classic loyalty promotion, in the form of a BOGO, buy X get one free, program, and a Gamification promotion, where we will use techniques from the gaming world in a non-game context to improve the sales, engagement, loyalty and brand perception. We have chosen these two sales promotions as they have key features of a rear-loaded incentive program, but they differ from each other in terms of who will be rewarded, who the customer is competing against (himself or others partaking in the program) and what kind of incentive that drives the customers involved in the promotion program.

### 1.1. Background

During recent years more and more companies have gotten interested in using Gamification as a method to engage their customers and build loyalty with them. Companies such as McDonalds (Monopoly), Mini (Get away) and Yahoo! (Yahoo bus stop derby), have had great successes with their marketing campaigns and ways of using gamification. The term gamification started to gain in popularity in 2010 ([www.zefcan.com](http://www.zefcan.com)), but as a technique, it has been around for years. Successful loyalty programs such as frequent flier programs, which

started to get implemented during the 1970's, are using many techniques that are today considered as cornerstones in gamification, such as point systems, onboarding and levels. The term gamification comes from “game” and is the idea of implementing game thinking, game-design, and game-mechanics in non-game contents that are used for business purposes. These mechanics exploit fundamental human desires such as the urge of winning, self-actualization, and having fun ([www.zefcan.com](http://www.zefcan.com)).

The recent hype around the concept has its roots in the fact that the enabling tools are changing, such as social networks, technology and the accessibility to Internet have improved. Also the way we interact, communicate and entertain ourselves are changing. According to Prensky (2001), the new generations, born in the last decades of the 20th century, are fundamentally changed in the way they think and process information due to the rapid expansion of digital technology. He means that the new generations surround themselves with technology and have a media consumption behavior that previous generations have not had (Prensky, 2001). All this creates new opportunities for companies to use gamification in their marketing and in their sales promotions.

Though, we have seen many successful cases of gamification, we are wondering if gamification is as effective as many experts claim it is, as a tool for engaging customers, building loyalty and driving sales. How is it compared to more traditional rear-loaded incentive programs such as BOGO? The “Buy X get one free” programs have been around for decades and have been found to be an effective promotion tool. The popularity of this technique is due to the relative simplicity of implementing it and the fact that it does not affect the perceived value of the product, which a straight price discount would (Hardesty & Bearden, 2003).

In this paper we are going to explore the effects of gamification compared to a BOGO sales promotion program. We will do this by performing an experiment with two groups that we will apply the two different forms of sales promotion programs on.

## **1.2. Problem definition**

As previously stated managers and marketers continually have to face the problem of which sales promotion is most effective in what situation. Should they rely on front-loaded incentive

programs, where you short sightedly boost sales of a product, or should they have rear-loaded incentive programs, focusing more on customer retention. Kim, Sho and Srinivasan (2001) claim that reward programs have become increasingly common in many industries, while Quelch (1989), means that an important aspect to consider when choosing promotion vehicle is whether to use an immediate or delayed value promotion as they have different effects on the customers. Zhang, Krishna & Dhar (2000) studied the key factors that influence a firm's decision whether to use front-loaded or rear-loaded incentives and in which markets they are preferred. Which means that most studies done compare front-loaded incentives against rear-loaded incentives. We have not found any studies where they have compared two rear-loaded incentive programs with each other and especially no one that put a rear-loaded incentive against a Gamification program. With our research we will attempt to contribute to that said research field and fill what we believe is a knowledge gap. The products that will be in focus in our research are hedonistic products, which are products that allow the consumer to feel pleasure, fun and enjoyment from buying the product. Example of these could be furniture, art, chocolate or coffee.

As the field of Gamification is a relatively new area there has been very little research done to cover the effectiveness of gamification as a promotion technique compared to other rear-loaded incentive programs. Most research that has been done is covering the effects of gamification from a theoretical point of view, mostly in the field of employee development, education and marketing, but no one has done a comparative research between two rear-loaded sales promotion programs faced against each other, where one consists of a gamified program. We believe that this study, will provide a valuable knowledge contribution to the field of gamification and sales promotions, by answering the question:

*Is gamification a more effective rear-loaded incentive program than “buy X get one free”-programs, in terms of consumer behavior, buy intentions and brand perception on hedonistic products?*

We have chosen to focus our research around this topic, as we believe it is important to know which method is most effective if you are to market hedonistic goods. We also believe that this paper will fill a knowledge gap in an important and relevant field. At the moment a big restaurant chain is planning on launching a gamified sales promotion for their coffee, where they earlier have had a “buy X get one free” loyalty program. We take this as a sign that our

study is of need and also right in time. We have chosen to concentrate our study around hedonistic products, as it is a relevant area of products where many sales promotions take place, but it also suits our limitations from our school, in terms of scope, time and financial strength.

### **1.3. The purpose of this study**

There are many ways to try to achieve customer engagement and loyalty. Gamification is one of the recent methods and seems to gain ground in establishing itself as an important marketing tool for the future.

The purpose of this paper is to fill a knowledge gap in the research field of sales promotions and to gain an increased knowledge about the Gamification and the BOGO field. Our research is aiming to give answer to if gamification is the way to go when marketing products, or if a classic sales promotion would prove to be a better choice for that field.

### **1.4. Delimitation**

In order to receive as valid and reality based results as possible from our comparative study we have made the choice to focus on hedonistic products. This is in itself a broad area, but it is enough graspable for us to make interesting and, what we believe, accurate observations. In order to study this area we have chosen to set up an experiment consisting of two groups with two different rear-loaded incentive programs, one Gamification and one BOGO program. The duration of our experiment was two weeks, due to time and financial restrictions from our own and the schools side. For the same reasons we have chosen to let the experiment take place at the cafeteria at Stockholm School of Economics and the participants of the study are students at the school as they are the main customers at the café. The only product we will consider in our research is coffee, which is considered a hedonistic product according to earlier research done (Shavitt, 1990). Even though this means some limitations to our study it also means that we will be able to oversee this experiment in a controlled environment where we can control and contain parameters to gain as fair evaluation of our research topic as possible. In the method section in this paper we will go deeper in explaining how we have constructed our experiment and what consequences our choices have led to.

When we constructed the two sales promotion programs, we put up delimitations in order to make the two programs as similar as possible in terms of rewards in order to make accurate



comparisons. To do that we had to make assumptions in terms of weekly coffee consumption and what could be a desirable reward for the two groups. In our gamified sales promotion program we have also limited ourselves to use just a few game-mechanics, which are point system, leaderboard, levels, challenges and quests and onboarding. As Gamification often is used over a long period of time and many of the techniques are more effective in the long run, we have taken this in consideration when we created our gamified program.

### 1.5. Expected knowledge contribution

As the idea of gamification still is fairly new and needs to be explored, we wanted to measure the effectiveness of Gamification compared to other classic promotion programs that are driven by rear-loaded incentives. This thesis goal is to examine in which situations and why the use of Gamification may be more appropriate than another sales promotion program. The studies we found around this topic were relatively thin. There are studies that have examined the effectiveness between front-loaded incentive programs and rear-loaded incentive programs (Zhang, Krishna, and Dhar, 2000). But, so far we have not found any studies comparing two rear-loaded incentive programs, and especially not where a gamified promotion has been studied. According to this we believe that there is a knowledge gap, and we believe that our research will give some valuable knowledge within this area.

### 1.6. Definitions

*Here follows some explanations and definitions to terms, techniques and phenomena that will be used within this paper.*

**“Buy one get one free” (BOGO offers)** - It is a simple sales promotion program that rewards loyalty. If you buy enough times of the same product at the same place you will get a discount in form of a free product. Hence, you need  $N$  purchases to get a free  $X$ . Customers have a clear view what they get if they are loyal. Our definition of BOGO program that we will use in this study will not be that you will receive one free product per bought product, but that you will receive one free product after buying five products. Even though this can cause some confusion, we use this acronym, as we lack a better word that exactly describes how our program is formed. The effect and point of this program is still the same whether you have “buy one get one free” or “buy five get one free” ([www.telegraph.co.uk](http://www.telegraph.co.uk)), it is just the perceived discount that differs, and hence we will use this term.

**Gamification** - The use of game design and game mechanics in a non-game context, in order to create engagement, drive loyalty and promote favorable consumer behavior. Gamification has according to theory best effect over a longer time span, but due to the limitations we face we will examine it during a relatively short period of time. Before the implementation of game mechanics in our promotion we have examined which game mechanics that are effective both in the short and long run, to come up with a good set of mechanics that constructs our gamified experience.

**MDA framework** - MDA stands for Mechanics, Dynamics and Aesthetics. This is a framework used by game designers to create and analyze a game. It makes it possible to use systems thinking to describe the interplay of game elements and apply them outside of games. Mechanics are used to build the game and control the player. Dynamics are the interaction players have with the mechanics. They determine what each player is doing in response to the mechanics, both individually and with other players. Aesthetics is how the game mechanics and the dynamics make the player feel while interacting in the game (Gabe Zichermann, 2011).

**Game mechanics** - A series of tools used to create a gamified system. They allow the game designer to control the player and guide their actions. If these tools are used correctly they will yield a meaningful response from the players. Examples of game mechanics are: Point systems, Leaderboards, Achievements, Quests and Levels. Game mechanics is the only part that game designers can affect in the MDA framework (Gabe Zichermann, 2010).

**Point system** - A point system is the foundation of a gamified system according to Gabe Zichermann. He means that there are five types of point designs that game designers can use to create the experience for the player. The five point systems are Experience points, Redeemable points, Skill points, Karma points and Reputation points. In some cases the point system will be an overt, direct and highly motivational for the player. In other cases they are just a way for the designers to track the players moves within the system. It is a way for the designer to see how the players are interacting with the system, in order to make adjustments by designing for different outcomes (Gabe Zichermann, 2010).

**Leaderboard** - This technique is used to compare different players. It is a list of the players participating in the game, showing how much points they have earned so far in the game. This makes it possible to rank the players. According to Gabe Zichermann, leaderboards are used to create social incentives, which will help people reach their goals and also a way to create competition. The designer to get information about the players, and a way for him to guide the players through the game can also use it, by using different leaderboard techniques. (Gabe Zichermann, 2011).

**Challenges and Quests** - The purpose of this technique is to give players direction for what to do within the gamified experience. This will guide players in your game and will add depth and meaning. Players should always have something interesting and substantial to accomplish or try that is on your intended path for their overall experience (Gabe Zichermann, 2011).

**Levels** - Levels indicate progress in the game. They serve as a marker for players to know where they stand in the gaming experience. Levels in games are often designed in a curvilinear fashion, where you are starting out on a fairly easy level and then the difficulty of reaching the next levels increases exponentially and then decreases over time. This is due to the fact that game designers are interested in longer, stickier games. Levels can either define the difficulty of the stage you are at or it can be a passive marker to give depth and complexity to your gamified system (Gabe Zichermann, 2011).

### 1.7. Disposition

Disposition of our work will be as follows in *table 1*. The thesis is divided in five parts, together with *References* and *Appendix*. The introduction part comports a background that focuses on what approach we chose for our work and what research that is relevant for our study and will give the reader a good comprehension for the topic.

Our theory is divided in three main hypotheses that analyze the effects of gamification compared to BOGO programs. That is, the effects both programs have on sales, and brand image, but also for which type of product and benefits any kind of sales promotion should be applied.

The next part describes the chosen method for our work as well as why the research design is as it is in terms of length of the experiment but also what variables we chose to look into.

Part number four is an explanation of the results based on our hypotheses where we investigate if the groups in the experiment are significantly different from each other.

Our last part, before *References and Appendix*, is the discussion and interpretation of the result, and also the essay's limitations and how further research can continue on the same trail.

## 2. Theory

*This chapter presents the theory our thesis will rely on, but also which hypotheses we chose to study. It will give an overview about how the theories work and how they are implemented in our study.*

We have been able to observe that empirical studies about gamification and its effects on consumer behavior in terms of sales and brand loyalty are near zero in the academic literature of marketing despite the fact that gamification's impact on consumer behavior exist as a phenomenon.

Yet, all empirical studies about gamification have been made on effects it has on enterprises (Bajdor, Dragolea, 2011); or institutions, such as schools and the learning field, but almost nothing on its repercussion on consumer behavior. As an illustration, there are only twelve academic articles about gamification in our largest database, *Business Source Premier*.

The use of sales promotions is definitely not new in the marketing world and has been widely studied under every tiny angle. Also gamified processes have existed since the 1970's under different forms and long before using the term "gamification" (Esteban-Bravo, Múgica, Vidal-Sanz, 2009).

Moreover, our study is the first to cover a comparison between a classical BOGO program and a gamification campaign, from the consumer behavior's point of view.

### 2.1. How Sales promotions generate sales, engagement and loyalty

In order to be efficient, a sale promotion, whether it involves gamification or not, has to be well adapted to the product and the market. Classic sale promotions such as BOGO programs are monetary promotions, as it impacts consumers' idea of a product's price on the other hand, gamification is a typical example of a nonmonetary promotion, as its purpose is not to alter consumers' perception of the price of the product.

Both monetary and nonmonetary promotions provide customers with different benefits and their effectiveness may depend on the congruence that those benefits have with the promoted product. Hence, some products are more suited for monetary promotions, while other products will be better off with a nonmonetary promotion.

Chandon, Wansink, & Laurent (2000), have developed a benefit congruency framework, in order to define the types of products for which monetary and nonmonetary campaigns are most effective.

According to their “multibenefit framework”, the authors state that there are two different types of benefits. On the one hand, utilitarian benefits are “savings”, which is the monetary benefit provided; “higher product quality”, that enables consumers to upgrade to higher-quality products by reducing its prices; “improved shopping convenience”, as the availability of the product at the point of sale is marketed, the search and decision costs are reduced; and “opportunities for value expression”, because consumers’ self-perception is enhanced by the sales promotion as they see themselves as smart shoppers.

On the other hand, hedonic benefits are “opportunities for value expression” as well, “entertainment”, that represent sales promotions that are fun to see or to use; and “exploration”, that provide stimulation and help the consumer to fulfill his needs for information and exploration.

We notice here that “value expression” has both a utilitarian and hedonic nature and is then a good predictor for both monetary and nonmonetary promotions.

Consumers usually evaluate products on the basis of the benefits they provide. For example, for low-involvement products, only the most important benefits are considered in the purchase evaluation (Hoyer, 1984).

It is therefore expected that the utilitarian benefits are given more weight when a utilitarian purchase decision is made, and that hedonic benefits are given more weight when customers make a hedonic purchase decision. Hence, the various importance of the benefits sought implies that the effectiveness of a sales promotion is higher when its benefits are congruent with those sought for the purchase occasion (Chandon, Wansink, & Laurent, 2000).

Customers give more weight to the dimensions of an object when it is compatible with their goals as these dimensions can be more easily mapped with the output considered.

Katz (1960) showed that persuasion is improved when a persuasive message focuses on the hedonic or utilitarian function that provides the motivational basis of the attitude to change.

Similarly, persuasion efforts are more successful when addressing the salient beliefs underlying

the attitude to change, that is, the beliefs that are the most antecedents of an attitude (Fishbein, Ajzen; 1975).

Furthermore, the sales promotion itself has to be adapted to the product. As proved by Chandon, Wansink, & Laurent (2000) in their study, monetary promotions provide more utilitarian benefits and hence, fewer hedonic benefits than nonmonetary promotions. In the evaluation of a promotion, customers put more weight on hedonic benefits than on utilitarian benefits, if it is a hedonic product. They will therefore be more influenced by a nonmonetary promotion. In our case, a nonmonetary promotion will primarily evaluate hedonic benefits such as entertainment, exploration, and value expression. This has been illustrated by Strahilevitz & Myers (1998) who found that donations to charity, which can be seen as a nonmonetary promotion, were more efficient when performed for a hedonic product.

Shavitt (1990) gave another example to underline this phenomenon. He showed that the attitude toward a utilitarian product was impacted more by ads focusing on utilitarian benefits rather than hedonic benefits. Conversely, hedonic products were influenced more by campaigns emphasizing hedonic rather than utilitarian benefits.

#### **2.1.2. How BOGO programs generate sales, engagement and loyalty**

Reward programs create customer loyalty by offering incentives to consumers on the basis of cumulative purchases of a given product or service from a firm (Kim, Shi, Srinivasan, 2001). In a BOGO program these incentives consist in the possibility of receiving a future discount in form of a free product. These discounts are attractive for the customers as they lower the economic cost for them. The product they receive, as a reward for their behavior will often be interpreted as a gain segregated from the purchase price of the product (WD. Diamond, 1992). This programs major driving force for engaging consumers is built on extrinsic motivation. Most consumers are not participating in a BOGO program because of intrinsic motivation, such as fun or self-fulfilling; a consumer joins the program because it is extrinsically motivated by the reward.

Theories about the economic man states that people strive for maximum satisfaction with minimum sacrifice and have undrainable wants in their effort of trying to receive more goods or monetary rewards. Being rational and objective maximizing, people balance the utilities they gain from rewards against the disutility they experience in the pursuit of them. This is a fair representation of human behavior in a competitive market where the individual's behavior is

rewarded (Freeman, 1974). According to these theories consumers are evaluating the offer before and weigh the pros and the cons against each other before making a decision. When implementing a reward program, there is higher likeliness that consumer will behave loyal if the utilities connected with the program, outweigh the drawbacks of the program. BOGO programs can face a problem here as the perceived effort of receiving the reward increases the disutility for the consumer, which affects the loyalty. If the customer does not find the offer compelling enough he will not show a favorable behavior. The reason to why consumers can perceive higher disutility is due to the fact that many BOGO deals are likely to test the stockpiling capacity of the consumers for many products and is connected with a higher financial outlay before receiving the reward (Gendall, Hoek, Pope & Young, 2006).

Compared with a front-loaded incentive program, rear-loaded programs have a lower impact on sales, but due to the retention effectiveness of rear-loaded promotions they have better profitability (Zhang, Krishna & Dhar, 2000). They continue to state that how profitable a rear-loaded promotion is depends on what type of market the program is implemented in. They found in their study that rear-loaded incentive programs works best in high-variety seeking markets as they then retain customers who otherwise would have switched out.

However, BOGO-programs remain a short-term sales promotions. The properties of sales promotion can be defined as followed (Boddewyn & Leardi, 1989): “Techniques and devices commonly used on a temporary basis, to make goods and services more attractive to distributors or final customers by providing them with some additional benefit or inducement (incentive) or the expectations of such a benefit, whether in cash, in kind (nature) and/or services, whether immediately or at a later time, whether freely or conditionally.”

According to Liao (2006), a sales promotion is by definition a short-term sales mover that provides customers with extra incentives to the product.

Even though the impact of a sales promotion has been shown to be positive in the short-run (Ailawadi, Kusum & Neslin, 1998), some researchers have proven that they do not have a continued effect on sales in terms of volume sold. Sales tend to decrease and finally go back to the initial level at which it was before the sales promotion (Dekimpe, Hanssens, & Risso, 1999).

Hence, sales promotions are not a long-run weapon for a company to use.

Koen Pauwels (2002) showed that promotional effects were expected to die out within the short-term horizon of one quarter, that is, thirteen weeks.

Furthermore, as demonstrated by Syeda & Zehra (2012), a sales promotion will only be efficient in the long run if it succeeds in obtaining a place in the consumer's top of the mind recall, which very few brands are capable of.

### **2.1.3. How Gamification generate sales, engagement and loyalty**

As stated earlier, gamification is a typical example of a nonmonetary promotion. Hence, gamification provides customers with the same benefits as a nonmonetary promotion; that is, hedonic benefits such as "opportunities for value expression", "entertainment", and "exploration" (Chandon, Wansink, & Laurent, 2000).

A gamification campaign is then efficient in terms of sales when there is congruence between the product and the gamified campaign, that is, when we apply gamification to a hedonic product, hence activating hedonic benefits by the customers (Shavitt, 1990).

Gamification creates revenue by being engaging (Gabe Zichermann, 2011).

Gamification is a way of gaining customer loyalty through the use of games, maintaining the customers entertained, eager to be engaged in the process, and to change their behavior about a product or brand. According to Magnus Söderlund (2001), loyalty is the individual's will-based relationship over time (both in the physical and mental worlds) to a certain object. A loyal customer is defined as a profitable customer. The reason why we play can be explained in many different ways. Abramis (1990) believes that we play for fun, and thus, to feel happy, while Caillois (1961) sees playing as a voluntary and enjoyable activity.

However, interactivity is important and definitely in games (Thornton and Cleveland, 1990) as it allows people to compete with each other and discuss the evolution of the game they are playing.

According to Kapp (2012), games are incredibly appealing as they engage players, providing them with a context and an environment in which the actions of every player provide a feedback, leading to direct consequences.

According to Griffin (1996), democratization of the Internet enables companies to gain enormously in customer loyalty. It has in fact been proved that a simple increase of 5% in customer retention can boost profits 25- to 85%. A higher customer loyalty then leads to reduced customer turnover expenses, a larger share of customers through increased cross-selling success, and reduced failure costs assuming satisfaction of loyal customers. Mostly



conveyed on the Internet, gamification clearly is a method to gain customer loyalty for a long period of time, and a well-designed game may thus help a company improve sales drastically. Hence, a game that succeeds engaging customers and gives them motivation to play should relatively easily provide customer loyalty, thus improving company results.

Gaming also has a strong impact on player's motivation. To be motivated means to be *moved* to do something (Ryan, Deci, 2000).

In the learning field, Garris, Ahlers, Driskell, and James (2002) state that pairing instruction content, that are not enjoyable, with certain game features can control the power of games in order to engage customers and motivate them to achieve desired instructional goals.

Hence, gamification helps the player's ability to learn and to feel integrated by maintaining him/her involved and motivated in a game.



There are two types of motivation in Self-Determination Theory (SDT, Deci, Ryan, 1985): intrinsic motivation and extrinsic motivation. Intrinsic motivation occurs when activities are performed for the internal satisfaction of undertaking the activity itself; in other words, running for the enjoyment of running. On the other hand, extrinsic motivation takes place when an activity is performed to attain some external outcome, for example running to get a fitter body to look good with.

#### **2.1.4. Gamification will be more efficient than BOGO**

However, playing often is considered as an enjoyable and intrinsically fulfilling activity. Games are motivating as long as players experience autonomy, competence, and relatedness while playing. (Ryan, R. M., Rigby, C. S., & Przybylski, A., 2006). These three

psychological needs promote intrinsic motivation and are referred as the “Self-Determination Theory”

*Autonomy* refers to the choices people make and why, *competence* is the ability to challenge people in games, *Competence* is the ability to challenge people in games, and *Relatedness* is the player’s connection with others in a game where interaction and experience caring for others can also be a strong motivator.

It goes without saying that intrinsic motivation is a key for involving players in a game.

However, most of our activities after early childhood are not intrinsically motivated (Ryan, Deci, 2000). For example, it appears that intrinsic motivation becomes weaker for every higher grade in school. Extrinsically motivated behaviors can vary to the extent to which they represent self-determination.

According to Fearne, Garcia, and May (2010), consumers that are extrinsically motivated will show very little brand loyalty, but enjoy the repeated challenge of hunting down the promotions. Those consumers will be much more attracted to classic BOGO Programs.

It has been shown that the social contextual conditions that support one’s feelings of competence, autonomy, and relatedness are the basis for one maintaining intrinsic motivation and becoming more self-determined with respect to extrinsic motivation.

However, individuals are said to have a natural tendency to focus on intrinsic and growth-oriented goals rather than extrinsic goals, because the intrinsic goals are in theory more linked to satisfaction of the basic psychological needs for competence, relatedness, and autonomy (Vansteenkiste, Lens, Deci, 2006).

Another factor that can enhance intrinsic motivation are verbal rewards. On the other hand, the undermining of intrinsic motivation by tangible rewards has been proved to be an issue (Deci, Koestner, and Ryan, 2001).

A combination of both intrinsic and extrinsic motivation is thus important in gamification designs as players may play for the pleasure of playing and the fun it creates, but also for social recognition and separable rewards.

#### **2.1.5. Hypothesis one**

As we can see both of our sales promotions are able to generate and improve sales, engagement and loyalty in theory, depending on situation and techniques used. The many parts in the two programs have key-features that incentivize consumers to engage and buy more. There are factors that both prohibit and inhibit sales generation in the short run, but will lead to

profitability in the long run and vice versa. Due to the theory around the two techniques we ask ourselves which one does generate most sales and which leads us to our first hypothesis that will help us give answer to our main question. The hypothesis is:

*H1: Compared with BOGO programs, gamification will generate more:*

*i) sales*

*ii) loyalty*

*iii) engagement*

## **2.2. Sales promotions effect on brand attitude**

When studying sales promotion many have just focused on the effects they have on sales and out of that drawn conclusions about the effectiveness (Gupta, 1988), but during later years researchers have widen their view and begun study sales promotions effects on brand perception to increase the understanding of effectiveness (Yi & Yoo, 2011). It is to be considered a bit surprising that researcher of sales promotions, relatively recently started to study the effects on brands as another nearly related field, namely advertising, has been studying these effects for years with a lot of focus (Aaker & Carman, 1982). That sales promotion will affect the consumers' view of the company's brand is not farfetched. Consumers will be exposed to the technique for a period of time and will as a result from certain attitudes to the brand and the longer they are exposed the more likely it is that they will maintain their attitude. Hence these effects should be taken into consideration when evaluating a sales promotions effectiveness (Yi & Yoo 2011).

What effects the promotion have on the brand depends much on what type of promotion, monetary or nonmonetary, that has been used and the effects vary depending if you have a short-term perspective or a long-term perspective, according to research that has been done in the field.

But also, the effect of a sales promotion on a brand depends on the level of equity of the brand. According to Keller (1993), customers are more sensitive to the marketing mix of a brand with high brand equity. Furthermore, Blattberg and Wisniewski (1989) have demonstrated that, in the case of a duopoly, brands with higher equity, for example national brands, have a higher promotion elasticity than brands with low equity, such as private labels. Hence, the effects of

benefit congruency, explained under our first hypothesis, will be stronger for a brand with high equity than a brand with lower equity.

Moreover, a low equity brand will not deliver as many hedonic or utilitarian benefits than a high equity brand (Chandon, Wansink, & Laurent, 2000) and are mainly purchased because of their lower price.

Over the years the most popular promotion type for marketers to use has been price-oriented promotions. This has led to the fact that most research around brand attitude has had its focus on that area, but other promotion techniques such as volume promotions should be considered to understand more of the effects of promotions (Sinha & Smith, 2000). Research has found that repeated promotion could have a negative effect on brand attitude as it can lower the perceived quality of the product, due to lowering of the reference price (Kahn & Louie, 1990). Price is a sign of quality (Etgar & Malhotra, 1981).

#### **2.2.1. Brand Choice**

According to Dobson, Sternthal and Tybout (Dobson, Tybout, Sternthal, 1978) deals, which make consumers save money, will make consumers more prone to change brand, but depending on what promotion technique is used the effect varies. This is in accordance with economic utility theory as the deal gives economic incentives for the consumer to change brand. The economic incentive enhances the utility of the brand and the higher the economic value of the deal is the more likely it is that the consumer will switch brand (Dobson, Tybout, Sternthal, 1978). When comparing BOGO and Gamification this would mean that the one that can provide the customer with the highest economic value should be the one that will generate most positive brand switches, meaning that the consumers will change their behavior and buy more of the product that is promoted.

How prone a consumer will be to switch brand due to the promotion does not just depend on the economic value provided. Consumers also consider how much effort they need to put in, in order to get the deal (Dobson, Tybout, Sternthal, 1978).

#### **2.2.2. Gamification will create a more positive brand attitude than BOGO**

However, the goal of gamification is to obtain long-term customer loyalty, by keeping players engaged and motivated in the gamified process. In order to do so, a company should be very careful to design their games well to make them appeal to customers and feel personal to

them. A higher customer involvement leads to shifts in the direction of advocacy and thus creates favorable brand attitudes by the customers (MacKenzie et al. 1986).

An important feature of gamification for obtaining customer loyalty, and thus a favourable brand attitude, is design. A well-designed game is a system in which players engage in an abstract challenge, defined by rules, interactivity, and feedback that result in a quantifiable outcome often eliciting an emotional reaction (Kapp, Karl M. 2012). Customers create a positive attitude towards a brand when having this positive emotional reaction to a game they play, but also thanks to the reward they get. The engagement and enjoyment of users are expanded by the game-reward mechanic. Users also increase their sense of community, ownership and contribution by using rewards as the outcome of a game (Ling, K. Beenen, G. Ludford, P. et al. 2005).

### **2.2.3. Hypothesis two**

We have now studied some of the effects promotions can have on brands. We have seen that they can have both positive and negative effects. According to these theories we have designed our second hypothesis that will help us answer our research question. The second hypothesis is:

*H2: Compared with BOGO programs, Gamification will create more awareness around a brand and improve a brand's image.*

## **2.3. How Gamification will generate more difficulties than BOGO**

Even though gamification has been a very successful technique these past few years and seems to be an important marketing tool for the future, as it still is in its infancy, some critics have risen against it.

### **2.3.1. Gamification demands more resources than BOGO**

First of all, creating a highly engaging, full-blown game is difficult, but also time consuming, costly and may not be as efficient as expected, hence it can be risky (Kapp 2012).

Furthermore, people might get bored of gamification; to an extent that it just reduces it to gaining points. This is generally due to bad-designed games, which would lead to an unwarranted behavior.

### **2.3.2. Gamification can have negative effects on engagement**

When creating a game for its customers to play, a company has to be very careful to put the needs and goals of its customers over the needs of the company. It is called “Meaningful gamification” and focuses on introducing elements of play instead of elements of scoring. It is easy for a company to think about its own advantages, neglecting customer interaction in their game and thus, not benefit from it in the long-term (Nicholson, S. 2012).

Moreover, literature about extrinsic and intrinsic motivation have shown that expected rewards can have a detrimental effect on intrinsic motivations, which is generally the case in gamification processes. On the other hand, non-expected rewards can increase intrinsic motivation (Deci, Koestner, & Ryan. 1999). The fact that most players are not offered extrinsic motivation like joy, comfort, or early-stage reward, is a major reason why players have a strong tendency to give up (Sakamoto, Nakajima, Alexandrova, 2012).

Gamification can also be a cause of high stress for players, but also hopelessness when players see other players too far ahead when competing in a game.

Additionally, gamification encourages aggressive competition that may discourage players to continue in the game as it takes out the fun of it. According to Bostan and Marsh (2010), engagement to reach a goal is motivated by personal factors, such as needs, motivations, and goals; but also situational factors, that is, opportunities and possible incentives provided by the environment. This requires a deep understanding of players’ psychology, needs, and goals, and may thus be difficult to achieve.

Although loyalty programs are widely used within marketing, their effectiveness are restricted (Drèze & Hoch 1998; Sharp & Sharp 1997), mostly because they are difficult to evaluate with standard techniques as the rewards for cumulative purchasing can affect behavior negatively over a long period of time.

Moreover, nonmonetary sales promotions are not suited for any situation but mostly for short-term sales incentive as a brand building action (Chandon, Wansink, & Laurent, 2000).

The fact that nonmonetary sales promotions demand more time and engagement can also be an issue for the consumer that does not wish to be involved to such an extent and might thus be willing to give up because of too much frustration (Landers, Callan, 2011).

### **2.3.3. Hypothesis three**

We have just seen that Gamification is not just a plug-and-play solution that will benefit your company directly. There are several things to consider in order to give the customers an

engaging and fun experience. This has led us to form our last hypothesis that will help us answer the research question. The hypothesis is:

*H3: Compared with BOGO, gamification will face more difficulties*

### **3. Method**

*In this section we will describe the approach we have had in order to answer our research question. We will explain how data has been gathered and how our results have been analyzed. The reliability of our research will also be touched upon.*

#### **3.1. The research approach**

In order to study our research question we have conducted a deductive approach where we have found already existing theories that we have applied in the context of our topic.

Hypotheses have been made that were tested in an empirical way. (Bryman & Bell) We choose to use a quantitative approach, rather than a qualitative approach, as it is more suitable due to the fact that we are studying small groups of people and from that are drawing conclusions about a greater population.

#### **3.2. The data gathering**

As the area of gamification as sales promotion is new, not much research has been done around its effects, hence reliable data is scarce. More research has been done around BOGO programs, but there is still not an abundance of it, moreover the data about BOGOs are not always reliable as the definition of BOGO sometimes varies compared to ours. With this in mind we have gathered as much data as possible from already existing studies, but it has been used as secondary data to back up our primary data. The primary data has been gathered through an experiment consisting of two phases. We will explain more about that soon.

##### **3.2.1. The gathering of primary data**

Our primary data has been gathered through an experiment consisting of two phases. First we have conducted an experiment, which consisted of two groups. BOGO was applied on one group and gamification was applied on the other. We then monitored the coffee consumption of the participants in our study over two weeks. All data was gathered in collaboration with

Sivan's Café at Stockholm School of Economics, who noted all the purchases that the participants did.

During phase two of our data gathering, we sent out surveys to all the participants, in order to examine the effects the two promotion techniques have had on the participants. The survey was designed to give us answers to how they perceived the campaign, how they perceived the campaign's effects on the brand of the company and their views on their loyalty to the brand. It also investigated possible bad effects of the campaign.

### **3.2.2. The gathering of secondary data**

These data have been gathered by extensive search of articles related to our topic through major databases for articles. For example: ABI Inform, Business Source Premier and Scopus. The access to these databases has been provided for us, thanks to Stockholm School of Economics. In addition to articles we have also gathered data from relevant literature and websites.

## **3.3. Experiment design**

### **3.3.1. The design of phase one - The promotions**

In order to research our topic we designed an experiment that would measure the effectiveness of the two promotion techniques: Gamification and BOGO. Both techniques have certain characteristics that are representative for them and are key for their success. When we designed each experiment we followed these theories and common practices of how each of the promotions should be designed in order to be successful.

Even though we tried to make our experiment as realistic as possible for the participants, there is always the risk that they look at the experiment as just a research project. This difficulty to set up experiments that feel realistic for the participants is something that researchers point out as a problem, as the results might not be representative for real cases. (Söderlund 2010)

We chose to let the duration of the experiment be two weeks, which made it possible for us to measure the short-term effects that the promotions had. If we would have had more time and money to invest in this experiment we would have liked to set up a longer experiment to better get hold of the long-term effects, but it was not possible. The experiment took place between the 15<sup>th</sup> of April and the 26<sup>th</sup> of April 2013 at Stockholm School of Economics. These two weeks were considered normal, as there were no holidays or other disruptive



events during these weeks. According to this we made the assumption that these weeks would be representative for the participants' normal behavior.

In order to make the promotion techniques as comparable as possible we decided to have extrinsic rewards in both promotion groups, not just in the BOGO. These rewards were also set to be equally big, from the company's point of view. To do that, we made the assumption that the participants of the BOGO program would be able to reach one free coffee each during the two weeks of the experiment and a handful of heavy consumers of coffee might be able to reach two free cups of coffee. We based this assumption on what our participants had stated, before the experiment started, about their normal coffee consumption per week, which ranged between 3-7. We also took into consideration that the participants most likely would not buy all their coffee at Sivan's Café during the experiment. Hence we came to the conclusion that our assumption about how many free coffees we would have to give away in the BOGO program was a fair assumption. According to that we set the extrinsic reward of the gamification program to 22 cups of coffee.

We made sure that neither of the groups knew about the other group. This was done in order to avoid competition between the two groups, which could affect our results. We were also careful not to mention what we measured in the experiment. We just stated that we were measuring their coffee consumption.

### **3.3.2. Chosen location for the experiment - Sivan's Café**

To be able to run our experiment we needed a commercial place, which would be able to implement both our sales promotion. The store needed to sell hedonistic products as that is our main focus in this experiment. According to these criteria we chose to collaborate with Sivan's Café at Stockholm School of Economics. Sivan has a regular stream of customers from the school and the main product they sell is coffee, which is considered hedonistic. A café is also a place where sales promotions such as BOGO are common. This made it a perfect environment for us to test our research question.

### **3.3.3. Chosen product for the experiment - Coffee**

We chose to design our experiment around coffee. Coffee has been used by several researchers to represent an hedonistic product. (Shavitt, 1990, Chandon, Wansink & Laurent, 2000) This made it natural for us to base our experiment around this type of product.

#### **3.3.4. The participants of the experiment**

Each group consisted of 20 participants each, meaning that 40 participants were involved in the experiment. These participants were randomly selected coffee drinking students at the Stockholm School of Economics. We made the choice to just involve students, due to the fact that Sivan's Café's customers mainly consist of students from the school. Hence it would lead to skewed results if we were to choose participants that don't have a natural cause to reside in the school. When choosing the participants we posed four control questions in order for them to qualify for the experiment, which were: "Do you drink coffee?", "How much coffee do you drink?", "Do you buy coffee at Sivan's Café?" and "During the upcoming two weeks will you visit the school regularly?". We posed these questions so that we would know that the participants were customers at Sivan's Café and had a fairly normal coffee consumption. Normal coffee consumption was assumed to be between 3-7 cups of coffee per week. We also wanted to make sure that the participants would be present at the school and not have any abnormal behavior patterns during the duration of the experiment. The age of the participants was between 20 and 30. This means that we cannot draw conclusions for all age groups, but due to the settings of our experiment this aggregation of age could not be avoided. We tried to have fairly equal distribution of men and women, ending up with 24 for women and 16 men. When we divided the participants between groups, we took into consideration their gender and consumption, trying to make both groups as homogeneous as possible. We understand that our quite hefty limitation of who could participate in our experiment increases the risk that the samples aren't representative for a whole population, but we believe that it is acceptable as this is a first attempt on trying gamification as a promotion technique against other promotion techniques.

The fact that our samples just consists of 20 participants each, can be seen as a risk as each individual has greater impact on the results. If the participants have an abnormal behavior this will result in skewed results. But research have shown that it is harder to get significant results with a small sample and that you can get significant results just by increasing the sample size. As a consequence this means that if you get significant results in a small sample, it is an indicator that you have found something that truly affects the population, if the sample is not skewed. (Söderlund 2010)

### 3.4. The design of gamification

The point of the gamified promotion was for the participants to gather as much points as possible, which was done by buying coffee. The participant that had gathered the most coffee by the end of the experiment would be rewarded by 12 free cups of coffee. Second place was rewarded by 7 free cups of coffee and third place was rewarded with 3 free cups of coffee. The meaning of this was to create a fun game that would encourage the participants to buy more, be more loyal and get a better perception of Sivan's Café. Sivan noted all purchases of the participants. The only thing the participants had to do was to say that they were part of the gamified promotion.

To design this game we followed theories and common practices. When we designed the game we used the MDA framework to get as an effective promotion as possible. The MDA framework is a tool for game designers to create and analyze a game. It stands for mechanics, dynamics and aesthetics (Gabe Zichermann, 2011).

The mechanics we chose to use were: point system, leaderboard, challenges and quests, levels and onboarding.

- **Point system:** We used a basic experience point system in this experiment. Meaning that the players received points for each favorable action they made within the gamified system. This is a way for us to motivate and keep track of how the players were doing in the game (Gabe Zichermann, 2011).
- **Leaderboard:** All points that the participants collected were displayed in a leaderboard that all players could see. This made it possible to rank the players. It also create social incentives, which helps the participants to reach their goals and it creates competition amongst them (Gabe Zichermann, 2011). Due to lacking technical knowledge, we could not make a leaderboard that was highly interactive and aesthetically pleasing, but from a theoretical point of view our leaderboard was sound. The leaderboard was presented for the participants on a regular basis, which made it possible for them to see how they were doing in the game and compare the performance with other players.
- **Challenges and quests:** We designed challenges for the players that they could do in order to earn more points. The point of challenges and quests is to guide players towards a direction that the game designer wants and also to create meaning and motivation for the player (Gabe Zichermann, 2011). Example of challenges we used are: Buying several coffees during the same they or buying the coffee during certain

periods of time. If you bought two coffees during one day it will reward you with more points than if you bought the same amount of coffee over two days.

- **Levels:** We implemented levels that would give intrinsic rewards to the participants and show them their progress in the game. We designed the levels in a curvilinear fashion according to common game design practice. This means that the levels would be exponentially harder to reach the further in the game you come, which leads to stickier games (Gabe Zicherman, 2011). All levels were named in a fun way that was connected to coffee giving the players intrinsic motivation to reach the next fun stage.
- **Onboarding:** To help players get introduced to the game and reward them for taking part we used a form of onboarding. We used this as it has been found that the first moments of a game is decisive for how the players find the game and by offering an instant reward will lead to a more favorable evaluation (Gabe Zichermann, 2011). Our onboarding was done by giving the players an one time increased amount of points for their first purchase in the game.

### 3.5. The design of BOGO

The point of our BOGO promotion was to reward each individual with extrinsic rewards if they reached a certain level of consumption and loyalty. According to the assumptions around the participants coffee consumption we mentioned earlier we designed our BOGO in a classic way. To receive the free coffee, the participant had to buy five coffees at Sivan's Café. When the participant had reached the reward a new round of the deal started, meaning that five more coffees would have to be bought in order to get the next free coffee. When the participants bought coffee at Sivan's Café they just had to say that they were part of the BOGO program and Sivan noted the purchase. This group did not receive updates of how they were doing in the deal, as the other group got (the other group got updates concerning their position on the leaderboard).

### 3.6. Research variables in phase one

Sivan's Café noted all purchases during the experiment, which makes it possible for us to study the effects that the two sales promotions have had on sales and engagement in the campaign. The results of the two groups will be compared with each other with a Mann-Whitney U-test, and were rejected if the p-value exceeded the significance level of 0,1.

### **3.6.1. Effect on sales**

One of the variables that will be tested is the participants purchase behavior. We will study how many coffees that has been bought, in each group, during the course of the experiment and compare it with each other.

### **3.6.2. Effect on engagement**

The other variable that we will study is how the engagement behavior was in each group. We will look at how many have been utilizing the deal in each group, hence we can draw conclusions about how engaging each campaign was.

## **3.7. The design of phase two – the surveys**

To get comparable results from the two experiment groups, we designed two exactly similar surveys that we let our participant answer. The surveys were created with the Internet based survey program qualtrics.com and were sent to the participants' email- and Facebook accounts. All participants answered the survey.

We used the survey to get answers to how they perceived the campaign they participated in and what effects they felt that it had had on them. The survey consisted of 16 questions. 12 were of closed characteristic and four were of open characteristic. The reason for the open questions was to be able to understand why some of the participants hadn't been so active throughout the campaign. The reasons behind that would have been hard to get a clear answer to with a closed question. The closed questions simplified had the purpose to reduce the variance of the answers and to make it easier for us to code the answers for the analysis. (Malhotra 2010)

The closed questions had a scale of six, where only one answer could be given. The highest possible rating the respondents could give was "I completely agree" and was placed to the left in the scale, representing value 1. The lowest answer was "I do not agree at all", which was placed to the right, representing value 6. We used a six-grade scale so that the respondents had to decide what they thought about the campaign. This was for us to see if the campaign had had a positive or negative effect on the participants. We used multiple questions that gave answer to the same thing to increase the reliability of the questions. Cronbach's alpha was then calculated on these questions to see if it was possible to combine the questions. A Cronbach alpha of 0,6 was seen as the acceptance limit for combining (Malhotra 2004).

### 3.8. Research variables in phase two

All questions open questions in the survey were analyzed with the Mann-Whitney U-test at a and were rejected if the p-value exceeded the significance level of 0,1.

#### 3.8.1. Benefits provided by the promotion

To analyze the perceived benefits that each promotion provided the participants we used the question framework developed by Chandon, Wansink and Laurent (2000). The questions were translated to Swedish and adapted in order to get the right essence from each question. Six types of benefits were examined in the question: Savings, Quantity, Convenience, Value Expression, Exploration and Entertainment. Each type had three questions. These were then tested with the Cronbach's alpha and combined if it was over 0,6 (Malhotra, 2004). The Value Expression did not pass the Cronbach test, which made us remove one question that deviated too much. Reason for the deviation could be translation errors.

Cronbach Index of Benefits Provided	BOGO Alpha	Gamification Alpha
Savings	0,859	0,929
Quality	0,813	0,758
Convenience	0,698	0,847
Value Expression	0,873	0,839
Exploration	0,712	0,839
Entertainment	0,919	0,947

#### 3.8.2. Effect on sales, engagement and loyalty

To study the sales, engagement and loyalty we had a set of questions. The sales' effects were mainly analyzed with results from phase one of the experiment.

Engagement variable was examined by the question: *"Do you want to partake in more similar promotion programs?"*. This was a complementary question to the results we got from phase one.

To study the loyalty variable we posed the question. *"Have you only bought your coffee at Sivan's Café during the course of the campaign?"*. This was answered by a yes or no question, followed by a why question for people who answered no on the question. This variable was also examined by the question *"Do you feel that your coffee consumption at Sivan's Café has increased?"*

### 3.8.3. Effect on the brand

We used an adapted version of the benefit framework (Chandon, Wansink and Laurent, 2000) to analyze the effects on the brand. We studied how each promotion had affected the participants view on the brand from the benefit perspective. This was examined under the assumption that the brand that was affected by the promotion was Sivan's, rather than the brand of the coffee per se. We based this assumption on how the participants referred to the coffee. They always stated "Sivan's coffee", "Panini's coffee" or "Espresso House's coffee", hence we concluded that the sales promotions' effects were transmitted to affect Sivan's brand. We examined the effect on the brand in terms of Savings, Quality, Convenience, Value Expressions, Exploration and Entertainment. Each type had two questions. The Cronbach's alpha was used, which made it possible for us to combine all the questions for each type. All questions had a result above 0,6.

<b>Cronbach Index of Brand Questions</b>	<b>BOGO Alpha</b>	<b>Gamification Alpha</b>
<b>Savings</b>	0,962	0,918
<b>Quality</b>	0,843	0,955
<b>Convenience</b>	0,913	0,904
<b>Value Expression</b>	0,824	0,872
<b>Exploration</b>	0,953	0,980
<b>Entertainment</b>	0,784	0,984

### 3.9. Bad effects of the promotions

This variable was studied by the question "*Did the campaign feel hard to reach?*" and "*Did you feel that you wanted to give up during the course of the campaign?*". Both questions were answered by yes or no questions, but the last was followed by a why question if they answered that they wanted to give up.

### 3.10. Deciding whether coffee is hedonistic or utilitarian

We posed five questions to understand whether the participants saw the product as utilitarian or hedonistic. They were posed as bipolar questions, with one hedonistic against one utilitarian. An example of the questions is: "*I care about what coffee I buy*" against "*What type of coffee i buy does not matter*". This was done in order to reassure that our assumption that coffee is an hedonistic product was true. (Shavitt, 1990, Chandon, Wansink & Laurent, 2000)

### **3.11. Internal validity**

When we developed the experiment we wanted to make it as internally valid as possible. In order to do so we tried to make sure that all data we collected were a result of the experiment. This was done by trying to make the promotion programs, our independent variables, the only thing that affected our results. We did this by keeping everything in our experiment constant except the promotion technique we used. All questions were measured in the same way in both groups, the extrinsic rewards were equally big according to our assumption, and the surveys were identically designed. Even though, not everybody bought coffee at Sivan's Café during the experiment everybody answered the survey and gave us their opinions. We did not pretest anything on them that could give away and affect the results before the experiment started.

### **3.12. External validity**

Our results showed that the promotion techniques had an effect on the participants and it was a result of the promotion techniques that we use on them. The participants in each group were only under the effect of the promotion technique used on the specific group. We did not run several tests with the same people. The experiment was developed in a way that the participants would perceive it as real as possible. We used a real store and tried to make it feel like the promotion technique was something that the store had implemented. Several participants wanted to know what the purpose of our research was, which is a sign that the external validity is high.

### **3.13. Analysis tool**

The answers from our survey have been coded with the program "IBM SPSS Statistics" version 20 for the cases where different questions were used to answer the same variable, we tested a Cronbach's alpha method and merged the questions into a common variable, if the value exceeded 0,6. (Bryman & Bell 2003).

We used SPSS to perform Mann-Whitney U-tests, also called Wilcoxon rank-sum test. A Mann-Whitney test is a non-parametric test of the null hypothesis that two populations are the same, against an alternative hypothesis. This test was used as our sample was lower than 30 and thus, we could not assume normal distribution.

Hypotheses with a statistical significance of ten percent were approved.



## 4. Results and Analysis

*In this chapter we will present the findings from our experiment, analyze the findings and draw conclusions connected to the hypothesis that we have formed.*

As discussed in the earlier chapters, this study is significant because gamification promotions campaigns have become more common these past few years as a way of gaining long-term relationships with customers. We will here report the results from our tested hypotheses based on an experiment where a comparison was made between the consumer behavior of two groups from two different sales promotion campaigns. Naturally, some differences were observable between the two groups and we are about to analyze them. Those differences arose in terms of sales, loyalty and engagement to the promoted product, coffee.

This paper's purpose is to measure whether gamification is a more efficient tool than a BOGO program, to improve sales, customer loyalty, and engagement. Hence, a Mann-Whitney test was used as it clearly measures the differences that can arise between two separate groups.

To see if the two groups were comparable we wanted to know how the participants normal coffee consumption looked like. This was examined by letting them state how many coffees they drink during a normal week. The result showed that there were no significant difference between the groups' consumption rate. BOGO's mean rank was 21,28 while Gamification had the mean rank of 19,73.

### 4.1. Results under H1 - Compared with BOGO, Gamification will generate more sales, engagement and loyalty

#### 4.1.1. Sales

Research Variable	Means of Measuring	BOGO Mean Rank	Gamification Mean Rank	Difference	Decision	P-value
H1: Sales	Total Sales	22,53	18,48	4,05	Rejected	0,244

Our analysis of the data, that we received from phase one in the experiment, showed that there were no significant differences between BOGO and Gamification in terms of total sales. The mean rank of BOGO was 22,53 and for Gamification it was 18,48. Hence we reject our hypothesis that Gamification would have a greater effect on sales. The conclusion we can

draw from this is that both techniques have attributes that increase sales. BOGO affects sales by lower the economic cost by offering rewards (WD. Diamond, 1992), which creates extrinsic motivation for the consumer, who is trying to maximize the monetary reward (Freeman, 1974). Gamification on the other hand creates sales by turning something that might be uninteresting or routine to something fun and engaging (Garris, Ahlers, Driskell, and James, 2002; Gabe Zichermann, 2011). This is done by creating intrinsic rewards. What we can see is that the differences in intrinsic and extrinsic reward from the two programs does not make a big difference in terms of sales. Another reason that they had similar effect on sales is that both are rear-loaded incentive programs, which have lower impact on sales (Zhang, Krishna & Dhar, 2000).

#### 4.1.2. Engagement

Reasearch Variable	Means of Measuring	BOGO Mean Rank	Gamification Mean Rank	Difference	Decision	P-value
<b>H1: Engagement</b>	Participation rate	18,00	23,00	-5,00	Rejected	0,118
	Desire to participate in similar deals	16,53	23,30	-6,77	Accepted	0,011

We studied the engagement level of each campaign compared to each other by looking at the participation rate. We could not find that there were any statistical differences in participation rate. BOGO had a mean rank of 18,00 and Gamification had a mean rank of 22,00. Hence we rejected the hypothesis that Gamification would create more engagement through participation on a 0,1 significance level.

The analysis of our other research variable, the desire to engage in more similar campaigns, that would help us explain differences in engagement between the two campaigns showed significant results for a difference. We found that the participants of the BOGO program had more desire to participate in more similar campaigns. The mean rank for BOGO was 16,53 and for Gamification it was 23,30. As the results show that BOGO is a more effective promotion in engaging customers to participate in more similar campaigns in our experiment, we reject the hypothesis that Gamification is more effective. As both our questions that we used to examine the engagement effectiveness of Gamification compared to BOGO were rejected, we conclude that we cannot see that gamification is more effective in that area.

This result is somewhat surprising as the strength of Gamification is to create engaging and fun experiences for the consumer (Gabe Zichermann, 2011). This makes us question the design of our Gamification promotion, even though we have designed it according to theories around the different game-mechanics. One reason to the poor performance of the gamified promotion can be that due to our limited resources, we could not make the game aesthetically pleasing enough, meaning that there was not balance between mechanics and the dynamics in our experiment, leading to unfavorable evaluation of the game.

Another reason could be that, according to Self-Determination Theory (SDT, Deci, Ryan, 1985), gamification campaigns are efficient in terms of motivation for intrinsic reasons, that is, the internal satisfaction of undertaking the activity itself; and may thus not be efficient when it comes to attain some external outcome. Moreover, it has been empirically proven that tangible rewards weaken intrinsic motivation and is thus an issue within nonmonetary campaigns (Deci, Koestner, and Ryan, 2001).

People are also weighing the utilities against the disutilities of a deal before they decide to engage in it (Freeman, 1974). The participants of the BOGO might have felt that they received more utility from the deal with respect to the amount of effort they had to put in, which meant that they were more likely to be engaged in the campaign.

#### 4.1.3. Loyalty

Research Variable	Means of Measuring	BOGO Mean Rank	Gamification Mean Rank	Difference	Decision	P-value
<b>H1: Loyalty</b>	Increased consumption at Sivan's	19,00	22,00	-3,00	Rejected	0,262
	Only bought coffee at Sivan's	21,00	20,00	1,00	Rejected	0,317

Our analysis of differences in increased consumption at the store showed no significant results. The mean rank of BOGO was 19,00 and for Gamification 22,00. We rejected the hypothesis that gamification creates more loyalty than a BOGO program due to increased consumption at the store on a 0,1 significance level.

The other question measuring loyalty concerning if the participants had only bought their coffee at Sivan's Café during the course of the experiment showed no significant results of a difference between the two promotions. BOGO received a mean rank of 21,00 and Gamification received the mean rank of 20,00. Hence we rejected that Gamification would be more effective in making the consumers more prone to just buy their coffee at Sivan's on a 0,1 significance level. These two overall questions made us draw the conclusion that Gamification do not create more loyalty than a BOGO program, hence we are rejecting that Gamification is more effective than BOGO in creating loyalty.

This can be explained by the fact that BOGO programs create loyalty by incentivising cumulative purchases. (Kim, Shi, Srinivasan, 2001) The incentives of receiving a discount in form of a free product was clearly evaluated higher than the incentives provided by Gamification.

#### **4.1.4. Conclusion of H1: Compared with BOGO, Gamification will generate more sales, engagement and loyalty.**

All our research variables that served to explain that Gamification would be more effective in generating sales, engagement and loyalty were rejected in our experiment. As a result we have to conclude that Gamification is not more effective as a mean to create sales, engagement and loyalty.

*As our results so far were quite surprising, we had to revisit some of our assumptions. Maybe our assumption that coffee was an hedonistic product did not hold.*

#### **4.2. Coffee - Hedonistic or utilitarian?**

We examined if the participants perceived coffee as an hedonistic or an utilitarian product, by posing five control questions. The result of the five questions showed a mean of 1,535, where 1 represented utilitarian and 2 represented hedonistic. This made us draw the conclusion that the participants perceived coffee as both utilitarian and hedonistic. We found out, thanks to our survey, that many participants drank coffee for the energy kick they get out of caffeine, rather than for its taste and the pleasure of enjoying a cup of coffee. Half of them did not care about the brand or type of coffee they bought, as long as it awoke them.

Our assumption that coffee was an hedonistic product (Shavitt, 1990) was hence concluded to be false in our experiment, which increases our understanding of the results we have received. One explanation of this could be cultural differences. The researchers that claimed that coffee is an hedonistic product, does not come from Scandinavia where the coffee consumption is amongst the highest in the world, around 8 kg per year per capita. (Jordbruksverket, Miljöstylningsrådet, Löfbergs Lila) This could have implications on how people view the product, suggesting that it is more of an utilitarian product, than it is considered in other countries.

#### 4.3. Benefits provided by the campaigns

	<b>Research Variables</b>	<b>BOGO Mean Rank</b>	<b>Gamification Mean Rank</b>	<b>Difference</b>	<b>Decision</b>	<b>P-value</b>
<b>Benefits</b>	Savings	16,18	24,83	-8,65	Accepted	0,018
	Quality	17,50	23,50	-6,00	Accepted	0,085
	Convenience	18,38	22,63	-4,25	Rejected	0,239
	Value Expression	17,23	23,78	-6,55	Accepted	0,072
	Exploration	22,38	18,63	3,75	Rejected	0,299
	Entertainment	21,53	19,48	2,05	Rejected	0,577

To explain why this assumption about coffee had so big impact on our experiment we used the multibenefit framework developed by Chandon, Wansink, and Laurent (2000). They suggest that promotions provide customers with different benefits, that deliver utilitarian values or hedonistic values to the customer. In order for a promotion to be successful, the type of product (hedonistic or utilitarian) on a promotion should match the promotion method. We examined what types of benefits the participants felt they were provided with thanks to the campaigns. Our results showed that there was a significant difference in Savings provided. We accepted that the BOGO promotion gave the participants a higher perception of savings on a 0,05 significance level. We also accepted that the BOGO promotion gave the participants a higher perception of quality on a 0,1 significance level. There was also significant results that there was a difference in value expression between the two programs. BOGO was accepted to give an higher ability for the participants to express their values on a 0,1 significance level. We could not find any significant differences between BOGO and Gamification when it came to convenience, exploration and entertainment. These were rejected on a 0,1 significance level.

The results from the benefit question shows us that BOGO provide the participants with more utilitarian promotion benefits and are matching the gamified promotion in the hedonistic benefits. This result was somewhat surprising as we believed according to theories that Gamification would give higher results in the hedonistic benefits, especially in the exploration and entertainment parameters. Why we believed that they should be higher there is due to the mechanics we used in the Gamification promotion. Challenges and quests incentivises exploring and the whole purpose of a game is to entertain the customer (Gabe Zichermann, 2011; Abramis, 1990; Caillois, 1961).

#### 4.4. Results under H2 - Compared with BOGO, Gamification will create more awareness around a brand and improve a brand's image.

*We now know that coffee is considered both an utilitarian and an hedonistic product. We also know what types of benefits that were provided by the promotions to the customers. Hence we wanted to see how the promotions had affected the participants view on the brand of the company. Here we had the assumption that the brand the were affected of the promotions was Sivan's Café, rather than the brand of the coffee per se. We based this assumption on the fact that everybody are referring to the coffee they buy as Sivan's coffee, Panini's coffee or Espresso House's coffee.*

	Research Variable	BOGO Mean Rank	Gamification Mean Rank	Difference	Decision	P-value
<b>H2: Brand Perception</b>	Savings	14,90	26,10	-11,20	Accepted	0,002
	Quality	17,83	23,18	-5,35	Rejected	0,137
	Convenience	20,50	20,50	0,00	Rejected	1,000
	Value Expression	17,98	23,03	-5,05	Rejected	0,163
	Exploration	17,30	23,70	-6,40	Accepted	0,077
	Entertainment	19,43	21,58	-2,15	Rejected	0,555

In order to study the promotions effect on the brand, we used the benefit framework (Chandon, Wansink, and Laurent, 2000) and asked the participants how the campaign had improved their view on the brand in terms of savings, quality, convenience, value expression, exploration and entertainment. The questions we used were combined with the help of Cronbach's Alpha. An alpha above 0,6 was accepted (Malhotra, 2004).

Our analysis of the data showed that there was a difference in how the campaigns had affected the participants view of the brand. We found significant results that the participants of the BOGO program evaluated the brand more favorably after the campaign in terms of savings. This result was accepted on a 0,01 significance level. We also found that there was a difference in how the BOGO participants viewed the brand in terms of possibilities to explore thanks to the campaign. We accepted this result on a 0,1 significance level. Hence, deals that allow consumers to save money, will have positive effects on a brand (Dobson, Tybout, Sternthal, 1978).

The results showed no significant difference in terms of how the campaign had affected the brand in terms of quality, convenience, value expression or entertainment. The conclusion we draw from our results is that there are differences between the two programs in terms of how they have affected the brand. However we cannot find any evidence that Gamification affects the brand in a more positive way than BOGO, hence we will reject our hypothesis that Gamification is more effective to create brand awareness and improve brand image.

#### 4.4.1. Conclusion of H2: Compared with BOGO, Gamification will create more awareness around the brand and improve brand image

The results showed us that either the two techniques had similar effect on the brand of Sivan's Café or that BOGO had a more favorable effect. This means that we will reject our hypothesis that Gamification will create more awareness and improve brand image more than BOGO.

#### 4.5. Results under H3 - Compared with BOGO, Gamification will face more difficulties

Research Variable	Means of Measuring	BOGO Mean Rank	Gamification Mean Rank	Difference	Decision	P-value
H3: Bad Effects	Wanting to give up	24,50	16,50	8,00	Accepted	0,012
	Unreachability of campaign	22,00	19,00	3,00	Rejected	0,343

#### **4.5.1. Wanting to give up**

When analyzing the differences between the two promotion techniques in terms of “wanting to give up during the campaign” we found significant results that participants of the gamification program were more likely to give up. BOGO had a mean rank of 24,50 and Gamification had the mean rank of 16,50 which made us accept the hypothesis on a 0,05 significance level (Landers & Callan, 2011). Hence we can conclude that Gamification promotions are facing more problems than a BOGO program in a short-term sales promotion.

#### **4.5.2. Perceived unreachability of the campaign**

Our results when we measured the difference between the two promotion techniques were not significant. There was a similar feeling in both groups when it came to how hard it was to reach the goal of each campaign (Sakamoto, Nakajima, Alexandrova, 2012). The BOGO program had a mean rank of 22,00 and the Gamification had a mean rank of 19,00. On the basis of this question we cannot conclude that Gamification will face more problems than BOGO. The hypothesis was rejected on a 0,1 significance level.

#### **4.5.3. Conclusion of H3: Gamification will face more difficulties**

The findings show that both techniques were similar in how hard they perceived it was to reach the goal of the campaign. On the other hand we found significant results showing that participants of the Gamification was more prone to give up during the campaign. Weighing the two research variables together we can conclude that Gamification will face more problems.

Gamification, as a technique, seems to be more suited for creating long-term relationships with customers, but in order to achieve this loyalty, gamification will need much more advertising, money, resources, and time, than a classic BOGO program. A low-designed, short-termed sales promotion such as ours will not give participants the envy and motivation to engage in the process of a game.

## **5. Conclusion & Discussion**

*In this chapter we will present our conclusion considering our research question. There after a discussion will follow on what implication this has on theory and how this impacts*



*practitioners. We will also present what we believe are the limitations of our study and give suggestions to future research.*

## **5.1. Conclusion**

The intention of this of this thesis was to get an answer to our research question:

*Is gamification a more effective rear-loaded incentive program than “buy X get one free”-programs, in terms of consumer behavior, buy intentions and brand perception on hedonistic products?*

What we can conclude from our research is that Gamification is not always more efficient than BOGO when it comes to promoting hedonistic products. The success of the promotion depends on how well the promotion technique fits the product it tries to promote, in terms of benefits it provides for the customer, as it has been shown by Chandon, Wansink, and Laurent (2000). We can also conclude that Gamification is an advanced technique to use that demands great work and development in order for it to be efficient. Even though we have studied theories and common practices around Gamification, lack of time and resources did not permit to create a game that was enough aesthetically pleasing for the consumers to change their behavior to a greater extent. BOGO on the other hand was easy to implement, showed good results in both sales, engagement, loyalty and effect on brands. We believe that BOGO is a more efficient way of promoting hedonistic products of low value, and due to its nature, is also more suitable for classic sales promotions and low-term involvement. Gamification can be a great way to promote hedonistic products of greater value where consumers gets even more involved with the product.

## **5.2. Discussion**

Our results from the experiment did definitely not go in the same way as our theory and we found several explanations to explain why. First of all, our assumption, supported by theory (Shavitt, 1990), that coffee was a hedonistic product did not hold. In fact, coffee is seen both a hedonistic and a utilitarian product and people consume it as much for the taste (hedonistic benefit) than for the caffeine kick (utilitarian benefit). This could have a cultural explanation as it seems that nordic people also see coffee's utilitarian benefits. Hence, seeing coffee that way, the likelihood that participants would be motivated to play and engage themselves in a

game about it was weakened and many of them gave up almost directly, which supports our theory (Landers & Callan, 2011).

BOGO, however, as a form of a monetary promotion, was tailored for a product that enhance utilitarian benefits and was thus, more suited to succeed in promoting coffee, as a utilitarian product. A low-involvement product such as coffee is not enough of a motivation to make people participate in a gamified process in order to get post-campaign rewards.

As we demonstrated in the theory, a product that presents utilitarian benefits, such as “savings” or “improved shopping convenience” is destined to fail when marketed in a nonmonetary sales promotion such as the one we performed about gamification (Chandon, Wansink, & Laurent, 2000).

### **5.3. Theoretical implications**

Implications of our study are important for academic researchers as gamification and a comparison between a gamified sales promotion and a classic monetary promotion such as BOGO were poorly investigated. We demonstrated, according to theory (Chandon, Wansink, & Laurent, 2000) that monetary and nonmonetary sales promotions should be properly adapted to the marketed products, and thus, suit right benefits, either hedonistic or utilitarian. Additionally, we established “bridges” between gamification and its effectivity in terms of sales and brand attitude, as not a single empirical study existed about it.

### **5.4. Practical implications**

The implications that result from this study are of significance for marketers who wish to use sales promotions as a marketing tool. Our work show that it is primordial to adapt the right sales promotion campaign to the right product. That is to say, adapt a nonmonetary campaign to products that respond to hedonic benefits, and monetary sales promotions to products responding to utilitarian benefits. Hence, a study of the product should be done before any sales promotion in order to define which form of promotion to use.

### **5.5. Limitations of our research**

The first limitation of our study is that we decided to go with coffee as the chosen product for our research as it is not an all out hedonistic product. This makes it hard for us to draw conclusions about hedonistic products in general, as we do not know which parameters affected sales and loyalty the most. Why we chose to have coffee as our hedonistic product

was decided as previous researchers had used coffee as an example for hedonistic products (Shavitt, 1990; Chandon, Wansink and Laurent, 2000), but we also chose it due to convenience that we had the possibility to collaborate with Sivan's Café.

It is also hard to evaluate the true effects of Gamification as we did not have the money nor time to develop a well-designed, aesthetically pleasing game for the consumers. We believe that the back-end of the game was good as we developed the game according to theories, but to make the front-end pleasing enough for the consumers, we did not have the skills or resources to do it. Much of the gamified promotions today uses technical infrastructures such as smartphones with gps and internet to make their promotions engaging, which would clearly favor our research if we would have been able to introduce some of those techniques in our gamification.

The choice of just having students as participants in our experiment also limits our study as it is not sure that they are representative for the population as a whole. On the other side, much research that is done, is often based on a sample of students. (Söderlund, 2010)

We also believe it is unfair to evaluate Gamification on this short period of time that our experiment was active. As much of the research has shown, Gamification is more efficient over longer time periods. If we would have the possibility to do the test again we would have let the duration of the experiment be longer.

## **5.6. Future research**

Along with the lack of previous research on gamification, we strongly encourage future research on this topic and the effects a nonmonetary sales promotion, under the form of a gamified process, may have on consumer behavior towards results, the brand, but also the product. It would thus be interesting to perform a similar study, experimenting a clearly hedonistic product and observing the effects of a well-designed and ambitious gamification campaign on consumers, compared to a direct monetary promotion such as a BOGO campaign. But also measuring its effects in terms of long-term loyalty and engagement. We believe that performing such a study, during a longer period of time and with adequate advertising, money, and resources, might completely alter the results and show that gamification still can be improved and be used as an efficient marketing tool for future nonmonetary sales promotions.

## 6. References

### **Internet Sources:**

Zefcan, January 2013. A brief History of Gamification.  
<http://zefcan.com/2013/01/a-brief-history-of-gamification/>

B&T, december 2011. Are you Game?  
<http://www.bandt.com.au/news/top-stories/are-you-game->

Businessweek, Douglas MacMillan, January 2011. 'Gamification': A Growing Business to Invigorate Stale Websites.  
[http://www.businessweek.com/magazine/content/11\\_05/b4213035403146.htm?chan=magazine+channel\\_news+-+technology](http://www.businessweek.com/magazine/content/11_05/b4213035403146.htm?chan=magazine+channel_news+-+technology)

Maritz Loyalty Marketing, 2013. Brand Loyalty.  
<http://www.maritzloyaltymarketing.com/>

<http://www.bigdoor.com/gamification/>

The Telegraph, Harry Wallop, July 2008. Food waste: Why Supermarkets will never say "BOGOF" to Buy One Get One Free.  
<http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/uknews/2263645/Food-waste-Why-supermarkets-will-never-say-bogof-to-buy-one-get-one-free.html>

Jordbruksverket, Livsmedelskonsumtion och näringsinnehåll, 2011.  
[http://www.jordbruksverket.se/webdav/files/SJV/Amnesomraden/Statistik,%20fakta/Livsmedel/Statistikrapport2013\\_4/201304..pdf](http://www.jordbruksverket.se/webdav/files/SJV/Amnesomraden/Statistik,%20fakta/Livsmedel/Statistikrapport2013_4/201304..pdf)

Miljöstyrningsrådet, kaffe, te och kakao.  
<http://www.msr.se/Upphandling/Kriterier/Livsmedel/Kaffe-te-och-kakao/>

Löfbergs Lila, Kaffekonsumtionen i Världen.  
[http://www.ssp.mastersofcoffee.se/web/texter.nsf/om\\_kaffe/kaffekonsumtion-varlden?opendocument](http://www.ssp.mastersofcoffee.se/web/texter.nsf/om_kaffe/kaffekonsumtion-varlden?opendocument)

### **Books:**

Bryman & Bell (2003). Företagsekonomiska forskningsmetoder. Liber

Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (1985). Intrinsic motivation and self-determination in human behavior. *New York: Plenum.*

Caillois, R. (1961). Man, play and games. University of Illinois Press.

Kapp, Karl M. (2012). The Gamification of Learning and Instruction: Game-based Methods and Strategies for Training and Education. John Wiley & Sons Inc.

Malhotra, N. K. (2004), Marketing Research: An Applied Orientation, 4th edition, 46 Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Söderlund, M. (2001), Den lojala kunden, Malmö: Liber Ekonomi.

Söderlund, M. (2010), Experiment med människor. Stockholm: Liber förlag.

Zichermann, G. & Linder, J. (2010). Game-based Mmarketing. Wiley

Zichermann, G. (2011). Gamification by Design. O'Reilly

### **Academic Journals:**

Aaker, David A. and James M. Carman (1982), "Are You Over Advertising?" *Journal of Advertising Research*, 22 (4), 57-70.

Abramis, D. (1990). "Play in Work: Childish Hedonism or Adult Enthusiasm". *American Behavioral Scientist*, 33 (3), pp. 353-73.

Ailawadi, Kusum, & Neslin, S. (1998). "The Effect of Promotion on Consumption: Buying More and Consuming it Faster". *Journal of Marketing Research*, 390-398

Bajdor, Dragolea, (2011). "The Gamification as a Tool to Improve Risk Management in the Enterprise". *Annales Universitatis Series Oeconomica*, 2011, Vol. 13, Issue 2, p. 574-583.

Blattberg, Robert C. and Kenneth J. Wisniewski (1989), "Price Induced Patterns of Competition," *Marketing Science*, 8 (Fall), 291-309.

Boddewyn, J.J., Leardi, M. (1989). Sales Promotion: Practice, Regulation, and Self-Regulation Around the World. *International Journal of Advertising*, 8, pp. 363-374.

Bostan B., Marsh T. (2010). "The Interactive of Interactive Storytelling: Customizing the gaming experience". *Proceedings of the 9th International Conference on Entertainment Computing, Seoul, Korea*.

Chandon, P., Wansink, B., & Laurent, G. (2000) "A Benefit Congruency Framework of Sales Promotion Effectiveness", *Journal of Marketing* Vol. 64 (October 2000), 65–81.

Deci, Koestner, and Ryan, (200). "Extrinsic Rewards and Intrinsic Motivation in Education: Reconsidered Once Again". *Review of Educational Research*, Vol. 71, No. 1, pp. 1-27.

Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (2000). "Intrinsic and Extrinsic Motivations: Classic Definitions and New Directions". *Contemporary Educational Psychology* 25, 54–67 (2000).

Dodson, JA., Tybout, AM., Sternthal, B. (1978). "Impact of deals and deal retraction on Brand Switching". *Journal of Marketing Research*, Vol XV, p.72-81.

Esteban-Bravo, Múgica, Vidal-Sanz, (2009). "Magazine Sales Promotion". *Journal of advertising; Spring 2009*, Vol. 38, Issue 1, p. 137-146.

- Dekimpe, M. G., Hanssens, D. M., & Risso, J. S. (1999). Long run effects of price promotion in scanner markets. *Journal of econometrics*, 89, 269-291
- Deterding, S., Dixon, D., Khaled, R., Nacke, L. (2011), "From Game Design Elements to Gamefulness: Defining Gamification" *MindTrek'11*, September 28-30, 2011.
- Diamond, William D. (1992). "Just what is a "dollar's worth"? Consumer reactions to price discounts vs. extra product promotions". *Journal of Retailing*, Vol 68(3), 1992, 254-270.
- Drèze, X. and Hoch, S.J. (1998), "Exploiting the Installed Base Using Cross-Merchandising and Category Destination Programs," *International Journal of Research in Marketing*, 15 (5), 459–71.
- Etgar, Michael and Naresh K. Malhotra (1981), "Determinants of Price Dependency: Personal and Perceptual Factors," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 8 (September), 217-222.
- Fearne, A., Garcia, C., May, C. (2010). "From Consumerism to Citizenship: A Journey of Involvement". *Kent Business School, University of Kent*.
- Fishbein, Martin, and Icek Ajzen (1975), "Beliefs, Attitude, Intention, and Behavior: An Introduction to Theory and Research". *Reading, MA: Addison Wesley*.
- Freeman, Katherine B. (1974). Human needs and utility maximization. *International Journal of Social Economics*, Vol. 38 Iss: 3, pp.224 – 236.
- Garris, R., Ahlers, R., Driskell, J.E. (2002). "Games, Motivation and Learning: A research and Practice Model". *Simulation & Gaming* (Dec. 2002): pages 441-472.
- Gendall, Hoek, Pope & Young (2006). "Message Framing Effects on Price Discounting". *Journal of Product & Brand Management*, Vol. 15 Iss: 7, pp.458 – 465.
- Gupta, Sunil (1988) "Impact of Sales Promotions on When, What, and How Much to Buy". *Journal of Marketing Research*, 25 (November), 342-355.
- Hardesty, David M. and William O. Bearden (2003), "Consumer Evaluations of Different Promotion Types and Price Presentations: The Moderating Role of Promotional Benefit Level," *Journal of Retailing*, 79 (1), 17-25.
- Hoyer, Wayne D. (1984), "An Examination of Consumer Decision Making for a Common Repeat Purchase Product," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 11 (December), 822–29.
- Kahn, Barbara E. and Therese A. Louie (1990). "Effects of Retraction of Price Promotions on Brand Choice Behavior for Variety-Seeking and Last-Purchase-Loyal Consumers". *Journal of Marketing Research*, 27 (August), 279-89.
- Kapp, Karl M. (2012), "What Every Chief Learning Officer Needs to Know about Games and Gamification for Learning", *Department of Instructional Technology and Institute for Interactive Technologies*.

- Kapp, Karl M. (2012). "Games, Gamification and the Quest for Learner Engagement". *T+D* 66.6 (2012): 64-68.
- Katz, Daniel (1960), "The Functional Approach to the Study of Attitudes," *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 24 (2), 163–204.
- Keller, Kevin Lane (1993), "Conceptualizing, Measuring, and Managing Customer-Based Brand Equity". *Journal of Marketing*, 57 (1), 1–22.
- Kim, Byung-Do; Shi, Mengze; Srinivasan, Kannan, (2001). "Reward Programs and Tacit Collusion". *Marketing Science*, 20:99-120.
- Landers, Richard N., Callan, Rachel C. (2011). "Casual Social Games as Serious Games: The Psychology of Gamification in Undergraduate Education and Employee Training". *Serious Games and Edutainment Applications*, p.399-423
- Liao, Shu-Ling. (2006). "The Effects of Nonmonetary Sales Promotions on Consumer Preferences: The Contingent Role of Product Category". *Journal of American Academy of Business, Cambridge*. Mar2006, Vol. 8 Issue 2, p196-203.
- Ling, K. Beenen, G. Ludford, P. et al. (2005). "Using Social Psychology to Motivate Contributions to Online Communities". *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication*, 10, 4, art 10.
- Mackenzie, S.B., Lutz, R.J. and Belch, G.E. (1986), "The role of attitude toward the ad as a mediator of advertising effectiveness: a test of competing explanations", *Journal of Marketing Research*, Vol. 23 No. 2, pp. 130-48.
- Nicholson, S. (2012). "A User-Centered Theoretical Framework for Meaningful Gamification". Paper Presented at Games+Learning+Society 8.0, Madison, WI
- Pauwels, Koen (2002). The Long-Term Effects of Price Promotions on category Incidence, Brand Choice, and Purchase Quantity". *Journal of Marketing research* Nov2002, Vol. 39 Issue 4, p421-439.
- Prensky, M. (2001). "Digital Natives, Digital Immigrants". *On the Horizon*. MCB University Press, Vol. 9 No. 5, October 2001.
- Quelch, John A. (1989). "Sales Promotions Management". Englewood Cliffs, New York: Prentice Hall
- Ryan, R. M., Rigby, C. S., & Przybylski, A. (2006). "The Motivational Pull of Video Games: A Self-Determination Theory Approach". *Motivation and Emotion*, 30(4), 344–360.
- Sakamoto, Nakajima, Alexandrova, (2012) "Digital-physical hybrid design: Harmonizing the real world and the virtual world". *Department of Computer Science and Engineering, Waseda University*.
- Shavitt, S., (1990), "The Role of Attitude Objects in Attitude Functions," *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 26 (2), 124–48.

Sharp, Byron and Sharp, Anne, (1997). "Loyalty Programs and Their Impact on Repeat-Purchase Loyalty Patterns, *International Journal of Research in Marketing*, 14 (5), 473–86.

Sinha, I., Smith, M., (2000). "Consumers' Perception of promotional framing of price". *Psychology & Marketing*, Volume 17, Issue 3, p. 257-275.

Strahilevitz, Michal and Myers, John G. (1998), "Donations to Charity as Purchase Incentives: How Well They Work May Depend on What You Are Trying to Sell," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 24 (March), 434–46.

Syeda Nazish, Zehra Rizvi, (2012) "Short Term and Long Term Impact of Sales Promotion on Organizations' Profitability: A Comparative Study between Convenience and Shopping Goods". *International Journal of Business and Management*.

Thornton, G. C.; Cleveland, J. N. (1990). "Developing managerial talent through simulation". *American Psychologist*, 45, 1990, pp. 190-199.

Vansteenkiste, Lens, Deci. (2006). "Intrinsic Versus Extrinsic Goal Contents in Self-Determination Theory: Another Look at the Quality of Academic Motivation". *Educational Psychologist*, 41, 19–31.

Yi, Y., Yoo J. (2011) "Long-term effects of sales promotions on brand attitude across monetary and non-monetary promotions". *Psychology & Marketing* Volume 28, Issue 9, p.879-896.

Zhang, Krishna, and Dhar (2000). "The Optimal Choice of Promotional Vehicles: Front-Loaded or Rear-Loaded Incentives?". *Management Science* 46:348-362.



## 7. Appendix

Enkät om kampanjen

Q1 Tack för att du har deltagit i vår kampanj vi har gjort tillsammans med Sivan's Cafe. Här kommer lite frågor för att ta reda på hur du upplevt kampanjen. Vi skulle uppskatta om du försökte svara på alla frågor så gott du kan.

Q2 Hur väl stämmer dessa påståenden in på hur du upplevt kampanjen? Om ni känner att ni inte tagit del av erbjudandet fullt ut, försök tänk er in i hur ni skulle känt kring erbjudandet.

	Instämmer helt (1)	Instämmer (2)	Instämmer delvis (3)	Instämmer delvis inte (4)	Instämmer inte (5)	Instämmer inte alls (6)
Tack vare erbjudandet sparade jag pengar (1)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Tack vare erbjudandet kände jag att jag fick en bra deal (2)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Tack vare erbjudandet kände jag att jag spenderade mindre pengar men fick fler varor (3)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Tack vare erbjudandet kände jag att jag fick en mer kvalitativ produkt fast till vanligt pris (4)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Tack vare erbjudandet kände jag att jag hade råd med en produkt som var bättre än vad jag brukar köpa (5)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Tack vare erbjudandet kunde jag uppgradera till ett bättre varumärke än	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

<p>vad jag brukar köpa (6)</p> <p>Tack vare erbjudandet blev jag påmind om att jag behövde produkten (7)</p> <p>Tack vare erbjudandet kände jag att mitt liv blev enklare (8)</p> <p>Tack vare erbjudandet kunde jag komma ihåg det jag ville ha (9)</p> <p>Tack vare erbjudandet känner jag att jag gjort något bra för mig själv (10)</p> <p>Tack vare erbjudandet så kunde jag vara stolt över mitt köp (11)</p> <p>Tack vare erbjudandet kände jag att jag var en medveten och smart köpare (12)</p> <p>Tack vare erbjudandet kände jag för att köpa varan på nya sätt (13)</p> <p>Tack vare erbjudandet kunde jag undvika att köpa varan på samma sätt som jag brukar (14)</p>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
---	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------

Tack vare erbjudandet fick jag nya idéer om hur jag kunde köpa varan (15)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Jag känner att erbjudandet jag tog del av var kul (16)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Jag känner att erbjudandet jag tog del av var underhållande (17)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Jag känner att erbjudandet jag tog del av skänkte mig glädje (18)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Q3 Hur tycker du kampanjen har påverkat din syn på Sivan's Café? När du tänker på påståendena, tänk att det är Sivan's Café som legat bakom kampanjen.

	Instämmer helt (1)	Intämmer (2)	Instämmer delvis (3)	Instämmer delvis inte (4)	Instämmer inte (5)	Instämmer inte alls (6)
Tack vare kampanjen upplever jag Sivan's Café som mer prisvärt (1)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Tack vare kampanjen upplever jag Sivan's Café som ett café som ger bra deals (2)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Tack vare kampanjen upplever jag Sivan's Café som ett café med bättre kvalitet (3)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Tack vare kampanjen	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

<p>upplever jag Sivan's Café som ett café med bättre varor (4)</p> <p>Tack vare kampanjen upplever jag Sivan's Café som ett mer hjälpsamt café (5)</p> <p>Tack vare kampanjen upplever jag Sivan's Café som ett café med bättre service (6)</p> <p>Tack vare kampanjen upplever jag Sivan's Café som ett café som representerar det jag står för (7)</p> <p>Tack vare kampanjen upplever jag Sivan's Café som ett café som delar mina värderingar (8)</p> <p>Tack vare kampanjen upplever jag Sivan's Café som ett café jag vill utforska (9)</p> <p>Tack vare kampanjen upplever jag Sivan's Café som ett café som är lockande att</p>	○	○	○	○	○	○
	○	○	○	○	○	○
	○	○	○	○	○	○
	○	○	○	○	○	○
	○	○	○	○	○	○
	○	○	○	○	○	○

undersöka (10)						
Tack vare kampanjen upplever jag Sivan's Café som ett roligare café (11)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Tack vare kampanjen upplever jag Sivan's Café som ett mer underhållande café (12)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Q4 Har din syn på Sivan's café förändrats till det bättre?

- ☐ JA (1)  
☐ NEJ (2)

Q5 Här följer några påståenden kring kaffe, kryssa för den ruta du tycker stämmer in bäst.

	1 (1)	2 (2)
Jag köper kaffe för att det är gott:Jag köper kaffe för att få energi (1)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Jag köper kaffe för att jag njuter av det:Jag köper kaffe för att jag behöver det (2)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Jag köper kaffe för smakens skull:Jag köper kaffe för att det piggar upp (3)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Jag bryr mig vilket kaffe jag köper:Vilket kaffe det är spelar ingen roll (4)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Jag tycker upplevelsen är viktigast när jag köper kaffe:Jag tycker priset är den viktigaste faktorn när jag köper kaffe (5)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Q6 Vad skulle du säga att din normala kaffekonsumtion ligger på per vecka?

	0 (1)	1-3 (2)	4-6 (3)	7 eller mer (4)
Antal kaffe du köper per vecka (1)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Q7 Känner du att din generella kaffekonsumtion har ökat medan erbjudandet gällt?

- ☐ JA (1)
- ☐ NEJ (2)

Q8 Känner du att din kaffekonsumtion hos Sivan har ökat medan erbjudandet gällt?

- ☐ JA (1)
- ☐ NEJ (2)

Q9 Har du enbart köpt ditt kaffe hos Sivan medan kampanjen pågått?

- ☐ JA (1)
- ☐ NEJ (2)

Q10 Om du svarade NEJ på föregående fråga, varför har du köpt kaffe någon annanstans?

Q11 Kändes kampanjen svåruppnålig?

- ☐ JA (1)
- ☐ NEJ (2)

Q12 Kände du att du ville ge upp under kampanjens gång?

- ☐ JA (1)
- ☐ NEJ (2)

Q13 Om du svarade JA på föregående fråga, varför ville du ge upp?

- ☐ Hård konkurrens (1)
- ☐ Icke prisvärt erbjudande (2)
- ☐ Kaffe var inget lockande pris (3)
- ☐ Övrigt (4) \_\_\_\_\_

Q14 Skulle du vilja delta i fler liknande kampanjer?

- ☐ JA (1)
- ☐ NEJ (2)

Q15 Om du svarade NEJ, varför skulle du inte vilja delta i fler liknande kampanjer?

Q16 Till er som valde att inte utnyttja erbjudandet (inte registrera köp eller inte köpt något medan erbjudandet gällde), vänligen ge en kort anledning till varför.

Q17 Tack så jättemycket för att du tagit dig tid att delta i vårt experiment! Vi uppskattar det väldigt mycket och din medverkan har betytt enormt för vår uppsats.

Q18 Vänligen skriv ditt inskrivningsnummer här så vi kan hålla reda på vilka som svarat på enkäten