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Abstract
This research focused on the void that may be extant due to the little attention given to the application of conceptual/theoretical approaches to study packaging as an increasingly potent promotional tool. The study used the “VIEW” concept of packaging as the conceptual or theoretical framework to evaluate the promotional effectiveness of the sachet of Peak milk. Using a survey sample of 250 respondents, convenience/judgmental sampling methods were used to obtain data on consumers’ retrials of sachet Peak milk in Awka, capital city of Anambra State, Nigeria. The data were analyzed using multiple regression and analysis of variance (ANOVA) procedures. The results from the study indicate that the “VIEW” concept of packaging is relevant and significant in the evaluation of promotional effectiveness; in terms of consumers’ retrials of sachet Peak milk. The packaging variables (visibility, information, emotion, and workability attributes) in the “VIEW” concept explained about 53% of the variability in retrials, with the visibility, and information components having dominant influences on consumer segments who indicated that they are likely to retry sachet Peak milk. The study recommends studying the “VIEW” concept variables along with other packaging and promotional variables, in order to compare their relative contributions to promotional effectiveness.
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INTRODUCTION
In contemporary promotional strategy, packaging is increasingly receiving attention as a sales promotion medium. The increasing function of packaging as a promotional tool has taken the task of packaging beyond the, hitherto, traditional role of providing protection for the product in transit from producer to consumer. However, the escalating recognition of packaging in the arena of promotion, one of the key marketing mix variables, has been on the contrary lightly examined in the literature. In the literature, there are several studies on packaging as a protective device, but the literature on packaging as an increasingly salient, and a potentially potent promotional tool has been rather thin, both within and outside Nigeria. Some of the early works on the promotional role of packaging outside Nigeria include Twedt (1968), Davis (1978), Engel, Warshaw, and Kinnear (1979), Blatterberg, Briesch, and Fox (1995), Rowley (1998). Recent works and writings on the promotional role of packaging include Underwood (2003), Young (2010), Laforet (2011), Fontaine (2011), Fashionmarketing (2011), Interpack (2013), Chaneta (2013), Brandchannel (2013). There is no clear evidence in the literature to suggest the existence of empirical studies on the application of the “VIEW” concept and other methodical concepts of packaging in evaluating how promotional effectiveness, e.g., consumers’ purchase intent/retrials, consumer satisfaction, etc, may be influenced by packaging.

Twedt (1968) advanced the “VIEW” concept of assessing packaging, keeping in “VIEW” it’s expected performance and contribution in the promotional mix. The “VIEW” concept of packaging, as enunciated by Twedt, prescribes a paradigm of four variables for evaluating a package design. The four criteria are, as cited in Engel et al., ‘V’ for Visibility of the package that makes the package stand out in an array of products displayed, for instance, in a supermarket or shop; ‘I’ for the Information provided by the package that informs the consumer of key product attributes and expected benefits; ‘E’ for the Emotional appeal the package provides the consumer by way of conveying an image of modernity, luxury, etc.; and ‘W’ for the Workability of the package that suggests to the consumer the ability of the package to perform its function of protecting and preserving the freshness of the contents after opening.

This study operationalized the “VIEW” concept by extending the testing and application of the concept through an empirical study of the influence of the “VIEW” variables on consumers’ retrials of sachet Peak milk.
milk in Awka, a capital city of Anambra State, Nigeria. Thus, the conceptual/theoretical framework for this study rests on the “VIEW” concept of packaging as enunciated by Twedt.

In Nigeria, studies on packaging include Nwaizugbo (1990), Oghojoafor, Ladipo and Nwagwu (2012). Nwaizugbo through an empirical work on packaging in Nigeria summarized a ranking of some package attributes in terms of their importance in evaluating a package. However, Nwaizugbo did not suggest that the ranking was in relation to promotional effectiveness, nor did the study indicate that a methodical concept such as the “VIEW” concept was applied to evaluate packaging as a promotional tool in Nigeria. The work on sachet water brands by Oghojoafor, Ladipo and Nwagwu (2012) examined the health aspects of packaged water, but did not visualize packaging as a promotional tool. The findings from the work of Oghojoafor et al. also did not suggest that the “VIEW” concept or any other systematic approach was used in evaluating the sachet’s effectiveness as a package. Furthermore, literature does not point to studies on assessing promotional effectiveness in relation to packaging in Nigeria.

Promotional effectiveness is an outcome variable resulting from the influence of some promotional variables, including packaging variables such as described above in the “VIEW” concept of packaging. Depending on the promotional objectives, promotional effectiveness, as a composite variable, may be measured in terms of the increase in consumers’ awareness of the product, consumers’ purchase intent/trials/retrials of the product, consumers’ attitudes towards the product (e.g., consumers’ feelings of satisfaction with the product), inter-alia, (Engel et al.). Product retrials, for instance, may consequently improve the company’s bottom-line of profit and brand equity. This study applied the “VIEW” packaging concept to evaluate how promotionally effective the variables in the “VIEW” concept of packaging are, in relation to consumers’ retrials of sachet Peak milk.

In Nigeria, consumer goods packaging may be promotionally effective. However, as discussed earlier, there is a dearth of studies on specifically using a theory or concept, such as the “VIEW” concept, to methodically study the promotional effectiveness of consumer goods packaging in Nigeria. Consequently, this study is informed by the researcher’s quest to fill in the vacuum which may be extant due to the non-application of systematic concepts, such as the “VIEW” concept of packaging, in evaluation of promotional effectiveness in Nigeria. The study used data from consumers of sachet Peak milk in Awka, a commercial city which is also the capital of Anambra State, Nigeria. The Peak milk brand is offered in three package forms of sachet, cans of liquid and powdered milk. The Peak milk brand is imported into Nigeria.

In relation to consumers’ retrials of sachet Peak milk in different parts of Nigeria, packaging may be significantly effective in promoting sachet Peak milk. Consequently, the research problem focuses on the, probably, little attention given to methodically evaluating the promotional effectiveness of packaging in terms of consumers’ retrials of sachet Peak milk in different parts of Nigeria.

The subject scope of this study is delimited to packaging as a promotional variable in the area of promotion, a variable in the marketing mix. In this study, packaging was examined from the “VIEW” concept of packaging which is composed of four variables or criteria that prescribe, more or less, what a package design should incorporate in order to be promotionally effective. The four variables articulated in the “VIEW” concept of packaging are the visibility, information, emotion, and workability attributes that should work synergistically, as a promotional medium, to influence promotional effectiveness, which in this study is an outcome variable measured by consumers’ retrials of sachet Peak milk in Awka. The geographical scope of the study is Awka, a commercial city which is also the capital of Anambra State, Nigeria. Anambra State of Nigeria consists of a constellation of closely related cultural groups, in terms of language, customs and traditions, with nuances that may or may not be distinguishable, with a lingua-Franca of English. The study unit scope is only the consumers of sachet Peak milk who had bought and consumed sachet Peak milk at least once, intended to retry sachet Peak milk, and at the time of the resided in Awka, Anambra State, Nigeria. Only the sachet Peak milk brand is of interest in this study.

Several brands of sachet milk are available in the market in the study area. The concept of consumer-based marketing research is perhaps still in its infancy in many parts of the world, including the part of Nigeria in this study where the literacy level may also be an issue. Nonetheless, the constraints and limitations were prudently handled so as to have uncompromised findings from the study.
LITERATURE REVIEW
This study was not intended to cover promotion in its entirety as a subject and variable in the marketing mix. Since the study focused on the application of a theoretical approach to study packaging as a promotional variable, the review of related literature was guided by the focus of the study. Consequently, the review of related literature examined some of the academic/theoretical and empirical works relating to packaging variables, and packaging as a promotional variable.

Engel, Warshaw, and Kinnear (1979), writing on promotional strategy, posit that the principal promotional characteristics of a package include the packages “ability to identify a product from an array of competing products”, in addition to its ability to communicate meaningful information about the product. In describing the functions of packaging, the authors surmise that a product package plays a role as the salesperson, and increasingly so, in various situations in which products are sold by either self service or require very little clerical assistance or/and service at the point of purchase. Furthermore, according to Engel et al., a package plays the part of getting attention or provides a stimulus that triggers the sales process when the attention of the consumer shifts from noticing the product, amongst several product alternatives, to possibly developing a purchase intent, which in turn may result in a purchase behavior consummating in a trial/retrial, thus sale of the product. Engel et al. further opined that information on product attributes such as price, how to use instructions, warranty, quality and quantity, inter alia, is provided by the package acting as a silent and perhaps potent salesperson. Emotional and psychological stimuli are also generated by the package through colors, shapes, and sizes. For instance, green colored packages may provide the psychological meaning of association with natural constituents; white colored packages may be suggestive of clean and pure, while red colored packages may project the image of a “hot” product that is new (Engel et al.). The relevance of promotional variables, of which packaging variables are part, in evaluation of promotional effectiveness such as consumers’ trials/retrials of a product, is pointed out by Engel et al., but did not show any empirical work to buttress this. This study, hopefully, gives an empirical verification of the relevance of packaging variables in evaluating promotional effectiveness, such as consumers’ retrials of sachet Peak milk in Awka.

Ditcher (1957) postulated a framework, consisting of six package variables, for assessing the effectiveness of a package, which are convenience, adaptability, security, status or prestige, dependability, and aesthetic satisfaction. Ditcher argued that the package should conveniently contain sufficient quantity of the product for the price the consumer might consider convenient; be designed so as to be storable in the fridge, freezer or other kitchen storage devices; that the package should reflect that quality of the contents are not compromised security-wise; reflect some personality compatible with the consumers’ perceptions of their own personality; reflect trust from the producer; and radiate aesthetic satisfaction with color, size and shape. There may be a dearth of evidence in the literature that Ditcher’s postulates have been tested and applied in an empirical setting.

Twedt (1968) enunciated a concept or theory to support the need for purposely focused packaging design and evaluation for promotional applications. In the concept of “VIEW”, Twedt robustly attempted to justify the use of the four criteria of Visibility, Information, Emotion, and Workability (represented by the acronym “VIEW”). Twedt advanced the “VIEW” concept of assessing packaging, keeping in “VIEW” its expected performance and contribution in the promotional mix. The “VIEW” concept of packaging, as enunciated by Twedt, prescribes a paradigm of four variables for evaluating a package design. The four criteria are, as cited in Engel et al., ‘V’ for Visibility of the package that makes the package stand out in an array of products displayed, for instance, in a supermarket or shop; ‘I’ for the Information provided by the package that informs the consumer of key product attributes and expected benefits; ‘E’ for the Emotional appeal the package provides the consumer by way of conveying an image of modernity, luxury, etc.; and ‘W’ for the Workability of the package that suggests to the consumer the ability of the package to perform its function of protecting and preserving the freshness of the contents after opening. Twedt, however did not support the “VIEW” concept with any empirical study, though the concept may have been tested and applied empirically elsewhere. The study operationalized the “VIEW” concept by extending the testing and application of the concept through an empirical study of the influence of the “VIEW” variables on consumers’ trials/retrials of sachet Peak milk in a part of Nigeria. Thus, the theoretical framework for this study is the “VIEW” concept as enunciated by Twedt.
Davis (1978), as cited in Engel et al., describes the product package as “an advertisement and one that has to work hard in its environment”. Davis’ empirical work on package design is vividly described in Engel et al. In the study, Davis conducted an empirical research on a new toothbrush package design, purposely used as a promotional medium. Davis innovatively designed a toothbrush package for Johnson & Johnson. In the empirical design of the package for promoting the new toothbrush, Davis used the picture of the new toothbrush to not only show the contents of the package, but also to advertise the toothbrush. Davis, however, did not fully or specifically consider a methodical approach such as the “VIEW” concept in designing the toothbrush package, but simply sought to provide an emotional appeal of functionality by the use of the toothbrush picture.

Young (2010) evaluated the impact of packaging on the environment. In a study on cultural perspectives on sustainable packaging, the author assessed packaging as a possible source of environmental pollution through waste generation, and noted the role which multinational organizations such as Walmart are playing in sustainable packaging. Leforet (2011) used multiple regression analysis to study “whether appearance of corporate, product and dual brand names (or a combination of brand names used together) on packaging influence consumer purchase preference”. Using a survey, the author used a Likert-type scale to obtain information from consumers of chocolate and cereal. Peters-Texeira & Badrie (2005) examined “consumers’ perception of food packaging and its impact on food choices”. Through a survey of 82 packaged foods consumers in Trinidad, West Indies, the authors obtained questionnaire data on five packaging variables, namely: “visual impact or attractiveness of the packaging; type of packaging material; labelling and nutritional information; new products; and fruit preserves”. The study by Peters-Texeira et al. showed that information on the packaged explained about 42% of the variability in food choices. Nwaizugbo (1990), in an empirical study on the functions of packaging in Nigeria, ranked some package variables in their order of importance as follows: “convenience, information, storage, aesthetic satisfaction, protection of its contents”. Nwaizugbo, however, did not indicate in the literature if the variables contained in the ranking significantly affect promotional outcome variables such as consumers’ trials/retrials of any product in Nigeria, which this study did. Some of the studies reviewed support the use of surveys, interval scales of the Likert-type and regression analysis in studies on packaging influences on consumer responses to stimuli from packaging variables. However, it is noteworthy that the studies reviewed above did not indicate that a conceptual or theoretical approach was adopted in the studies.

This study operationalized the Twedt concept of packaging, as reviewed above, as a contribution to filling the gap which may be extant due to the non-application of a conceptual/theoretical approach to study the effects of packaging on promotional outcome variables, such as consumers’ trials/retrials of sachet Peak milk in Nigeria.

OBJECTIVES
In this study, promotional effectiveness was measured by consumers’ retrials of sachet Peak milk. The components of “VIEW” are the promotional variables whose influences on consumers’ retrials of sachet Peak milk in Awka were measured. Therefore, applying the “VIEW” concept of packaging, this study evaluated how consumers’ retrials of sachet Peak milk are influenced by the promotional variables in the “VIEW” concept of packaging, using data from consumers of sachet Peak milk in Awka, with the following specific objectives which are to:

1. identify the promotional variables in the “VIEW” concept of packaging that significantly influence or drive consumers’ retrials of sachet Peak milk, using data from consumers of sachet Peak milk in Awka
2. determine if the promotional variables in the “VIEW” concept of packaging have comparable influences on consumers’ retrials of sachet Peak milk, using data from consumers of sachet Peak milk in Awka

RESEARCH QUESTIONS
In order to accomplish the objectives of the study, the following research questions (RQs) were addressed:
RQ1: Are consumers’ retrials of sachet Peak milk in Awka significantly influenced or driven by the variables encapsulated in the “VIEW” concept of packaging?

RQ2: Are there significant variations in the influences that the promotional variables in the “VIEW” concept of packaging have on consumers’ retrials of sachet Peak milk in Awka?

METHODOLOGY

As I have previously discussed, quantitative and qualitative research methodologies exist in the literature on research methodology (Malhotra, 2007). Quantitative methodology was used in this study. Unlike qualitative methodology, quantitative methodology uses quantifiable and structured data, as were collected for this study. Furthermore, unlike qualitative methodology, quantitative methodology uses statistical analysis to make inferences and recommendations.

The survey method is the research design for this study. The survey method involved a descriptive, single cross-sectional design in which non-probability sampling methods (convenience and judgmental sampling methods) were used to obtain a one-time (single cross-sectional) sample from the qualified population of sachet Peak milk consumers in Awka, Anambra State, Nigeria. The quantitative methodology was used on the assumption that consumers’ trials/retrials of sachet Peak milk and the influence of the “VIEW” promotional variables on consumers’ trials/retrials can be measured on a continuous scale, and thus be treated as interval variables that possess means and variances which can be statistically analyzed. The population for the study consisted of only the consumers of sachet Peak milk who have bought and consumed sachet Peak milk at least once, intended to retry sachet Peak milk, and at the time of the study resided in Awka, Anambra State, Nigeria. As I have previously noted, Anambra state, one of the thirty six states of Nigeria, has a population of about 4.1 million people, which is about 3% of Nigeria’s 140.5 million people (Nigerian Population Commission, 2006). There was no database of consumers of sachet Peak who, at the time of this study, had bought and consumed sachet Peak milk at least once, intended to retry sachet Peak milk, and resided in Awka, Anambra State, Nigeria. Consequently, no sampling frame was available. Where no sampling frame exists, probability sampling techniques cannot be used, and Malhotra (2007) suggests the use of a convenience/judgmental sample of about 200 for a study such as this. For this study, a convenience/judgmental sample of 250 respondents was used. Using the convenience/judgmental sampling methods, the sample was obtained from small shops, shopping kiosks, supermarkets, and markets within Awka city. Data on the influence of the “VIEW” concept variables on the consumers’ trials/retrials of sachet Peak milk were obtained from the respondents using a questionnaire (see appendices).

Literature shows that consumer purchase intent/trials/retrials of products can be measured on continuous scales of the Likert type (Malhotra, 2007). Leaning on the interval characteristics that consumer trials/retrials of a product can take, as espoused in the literature, a structured questionnaire containing interval variables was used for data collection in the study. The interval variables on the questionnaire were used to measure consumers’ trials/retrials of sachet Peak milk, and the influence that consumers think the “VIEW” variables have on their trials/retrials.

Of the typologies of reliability tests in the literature, the study used SPSS to conduct the Cronbach’s alpha reliability test (Malhotra, 2007). A convenience sample of 20 consumers of sachet Peak milk in Awka was used to pretest the questionnaire, and Cronbach’s alpha was computed from the pretest data, using the SPSS computer software. A value of approximately .80 was obtained for Cronbach’s alpha, thus yielding a high internal reliability. From the array of validity tests that exist in the literature, the face or content validity test was used to validate the questionnaire (Malhotra, 2007). The questionnaire was evaluated for content relevance by some five practitioners in marketing.

The area of study from which primary data were collected is Awka, Anambra State, Nigeria. A survey method of data collection was used to collect primary data from consumers who resided in Awka, Anambra State, had bought and consumed sachet Peak milk at least once, and intended to retry sachet Peak milk. Since a questionnaire, (see Appendices), was used as the instrument of data collection in the survey, the questionnaire was administered to qualified respondents face-to-face at small shops, shopping kiosks, supermarkets, and other markets in Awka city. The respondents were judgmentally and politely intercepted at those places and requested to willingly participate in the survey. Only
primary data were collected during the survey. Convenience and judgmental sampling techniques were used to obtain the required sample. Data were not collected over the internet.

One of the objectives of this study is to identify the promotional variables in the “VIEW” concept of packaging that significantly influence or drive consumers’ retrials of sachet Peak milk, using data from qualified consumers of sachet Peak milk in Awka. Literature suggests that packaging variables may drive consumers to buy a product (Meyer, 2013; Verial, 2013). The possible driver relationship between consumers’ retrials of sachet Peak milk in Awka, and the VIEW packaging variables was analyzed using an associative model approach. To accomplish this objective, through testing the hypotheses in the study, computerized associative modeling involving the use of multiple regression analysis was used to evaluate the influences which the “VIEW” variables have on consumers’ retrials of sachet Peak milk, a measure of promotional effectiveness. Consumers’ retrials of sachet Peak milk is the dependent variable whose behavior is explained by the size of the coefficient of multiple determination, R-squared, yielded by the independent variables, the “VIEW” variables. R-squared, in this instance, is the percentage of variability in consumers’ retrials of sachet Peak milk that is explained by the “VIEW” variables.

Another objective of the study is to determine if the promotional variables in the “VIEW” concept of packaging have comparable influences on consumers’ retrials of sachet Peak milk in Awka. To accomplish this objective, by testing the hypotheses in the study, computerized analysis of variance (ANOVA), with post hoc multiple means comparisons using the Duncan option with overlap analysis, was used to compare the mean influences which the “VIEW” variables have on consumers’ retrials of sachet Peak milk in Awka.

As I have also previously discussed, the notion that statistical inferences can be made on the basis of non-probability sample information, such as information obtained through convenience and judgmental sampling methods, was a ‘painful’ assumption that must be noted. The results from a non-probability sample may not be generalized to the population, simply because the convenience and judgmental sampling methods do not produce representative samples. However, Malhotra (2007) notes that even though convenience sampling has its limitations, yet it is used in huge market research surveys, and the author recommends sample sizes that are experientially suitable for market research surveys involving non-probability sampling (Malhotra, 2007). The assumption that consumers’ retrials and the influences of the “VIEW” variables on consumers’ retrials can be measured on continuums bearing the semblance of interval scales may be arguably overbearing. Churchill (1979) posited that there was some controversy surrounding the use of itemized rating scales that are used to measure variables that may be non-continuous. To worsen the pain in the assumption of continuity in the scale of measurement, some other requirements according to theoretical statistics may not have been met (Malhotra, 2007). However, Malhotra (2007) opined that, often, the statistical theory requirements are satisfied in pragmatic data analyses involving analysis of variance, and regression analysis, thus making them commonly used analytical techniques. Furthermore, the assumption that the variables involved in the study need not be transformed into other forms, such as log-linear, quadratic, and other forms, may be erroneous. The assumptions made in the study were by no means exhaustive.

FINDINGS

Computerized data analysis was used to test the hypotheses in the study, as shown in Tables I, II, IIA, IIB, IIC, and IID below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>“VIEW” Variables</th>
<th>Beta coefficient</th>
<th>Std Error</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>P-value</th>
<th>Sig. level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Visibility(V)</td>
<td>.225</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>5.056</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information(I)</td>
<td>.496</td>
<td>.045</td>
<td>10.902</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotion(E)</td>
<td>.082</td>
<td>.064</td>
<td>1.275</td>
<td>.204</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workability(W)</td>
<td>-.015</td>
<td>.066</td>
<td>-.233</td>
<td>.816</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: R² = .528
In testing Ho1, an associative model (multiple regression model) was used to examine, through computerized data analysis, the “VIEW” variables that may significantly influence or drive consumers’ retrials of sachet peak milk in Awka. Table I shows the results of the computerized multiple regression analysis in which visibility (V) and Information (I) emerged as significant positive drivers of consumers’ retrials of sachet Peak milk, at the .01 level of significance. All the “VIEW” variables jointly explain more than 50% (.528) of the variability in retrials, thus showing that the ‘VIEW’ concept makes substantial contribution towards promotional effectiveness, in terms of retrials of sachet Peak milk in Awka.

Table II
Ho2: There are no significant variations in the influences that the promotional variables in the “VIEW” concept of packaging have on consumers’ retrials of sachet Peak milk in Awka.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>“VIEW” Variables</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Mean influences</th>
<th>Groupings/Overlap</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Visibility(V)</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>3.96</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information(I)</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotion(E)</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>2.26</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workability(W)</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>2.07</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Means with the same alphabets are comparable at the .05 sig. level.

Table II contains the results of computerized analysis of variance (ANOVA) of the mean influences of the “VIEW” variables on consumers’ retrials of sachet Peak milk in Awka. The results indicate that there are significant variations in the influences that the promotional variables in the “VIEW” concept of packaging have on consumers’ retrials of sachet Peak milk in Awka. The results show also that with respect to the influences on consumers’ retrials of sachet Peak milk in Awka, generally, visibility (V) and information (I) attributes of the sachet have influences that are significantly higher than the influences of emotion (E) and workability (W).

Table II A
Ho2: There are no significant variations in the influences that Visibility (V) in the “VIEW” concept of packaging has on segments of retrials of sachet Peak milk in Awka.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Retrial Segments</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Mean influence</th>
<th>Groupings/Overlap</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Somehow likely to retry</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>4.47</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very much likely to retry</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>4.32</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somehow unlikely to retry</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very much unlikely to retry</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2.12</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Means with same alphabets are comparable at the .05 sig. level.

The results in Table II A are a segmentation analysis of the influences of visibility (V) on the different retrial segments. The results in Table II A show that in Awka, visibility (V) of the sachet has high and comparable influences on the segments of Peak milk consumers who are somehow likely or very much likely to retry sachet Peak milk. The influences of the visibility (V) attribute on the other retrial segments are rather low.

Table II B
Ho2: There are no significant variations in the influences that Information (I) in the “VIEW” concept of packaging has on segments of retrials of sachet Peak milk in Awka.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Retrial Segments</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Mean influence</th>
<th>Groupings/Overlap</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Somehow likely to retry</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>4.56</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very much likely to retry</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>4.47</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very much unlikely to retry</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1.94</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somehow unlikely to retry</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1.88</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Means with same alphabet are comparable at the .05 sig. level.
The results of the analysis in Table IIB indicate that there are significant variations in the influences of the information (I) attribute of the sachet on the retrial segments. Information (I) has very high and comparable influences on the segments of consumers who are likely or very much likely to retry sachet Peak milk, while the influences of the (I) attribute on the other retrial segments are very low.

**Table IIC**

Ho2: There are no significant variations in the influences that Emotion (E) in the “VIEW” concept of packaging has on segments of retrials of sachet Peak milk in Awka.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Retrial Segments</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Mean influence</th>
<th>Groupings/Overlap</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Somehow likely to retry</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very much likely to retry</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>2.29</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somehow unlikely to retry</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very much unlikely to retry</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1.94</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Means with same letter are comparable at the .05 sig. level.

The results of the analysis in Table IIC show that there is no significant variation in the influences of Emotion (E) on the retrial segments.

**Table IID**

Ho2: There are no significant variations in the influences that Workability (W) in the “VIEW” concept of packaging has on segments of retrials of sachet Peak milk in Awka.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Retrial Segments</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Mean influence</th>
<th>Groupings/Overlap</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Somehow likely to retry</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somehow unlikely to retry</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very much likely to retry</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>2.07</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very much unlikely to retry</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1.94</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Means with same letter are comparable at the .05 sig. level.

The results of the analysis in Table IID indicate that there are no significant variations in the influences of Workability (W) on the retrial segments.

**CONCLUSION AND DISCUSSION**

From the analysis contained in Tables I, II, IIA, IIB, IIC, and IID above, the following conclusions emerge.

1. The “VIEW” concept of packaging is very relevant and significant in the evaluation of promotional effectiveness since the concept explains a substantial part of the variability in consumers’ retrials of sachet Peak milk in Awka.
2. The visibility and information components of the “VIEW” concept have very high and comparable influences in getting consumers to retry sachet Peak Milk in Awka. Consequently, the visibility and information attributes of the sachet seem to have dominant promotional effects on consumers of sachet Peak milk in Awka.
3. The emotional and workability appeals of the sachet, being insignificant drivers of consumers’ retrials of sachet Peak milk in Awka, have little promotional effects on consumers of sachet Peak milk in Awka.

The implication of this study is evident in its multi-faceted significance to the academia, marketing practitioners, and consumers. In the academia, the pedagogy on marketing and formulation of marketing strategy, of which promotional strategy is part, has hitherto considered a paradigm of four Ps (product, price, promotions, and place) as fundamental and pivotal. If methodical studies on packaging are sustained, with the increasing attention given to packaging as a key player in the promotional mix, the findings from this study will give support to adding packaging as, possibly, another ‘P’ in the marketing mix. Packaging often represents the product itself, gives the product an image, a brand name, position/reposition, and is often the only real thing about the product that the consumer first experiences at the point of purchase, thus giving the package as serious a consideration as the product itself.
Actually, the consumer simply buys a package of something that is, arguably, unknown until used. When a consumer purchases a sachet of Peak milk, for instance, what is first recognized as the product is the package that contains what may or may not be milk. The content of the sachet is simply taken to be milk because the package is trusted as saying so. The content is confirmed to be milk only when the package is opened and the content is either consumed, tasted, or tested. For the consumers, methodically designed packages will not only act as the salesperson to the consumers at the point of purchase, but also as an advertising medium that conveys essential messages about the product to the consumers. The advertising role played by a methodically designed package gives consumers adequate time to comprehend the benefits of the product as they read the information on the package, unlike some other advertising media that may not provide adequate time for consumers to comprehend the benefits and instruction on how to use the product. Thus, the consumers become informed about the product and value for their money. For the producers and marketers, based on methodically designed packages, informed consumers may then try, retry, and in time may develop loyalty to the brand. Brand loyalty, if sustained, may enhance sales, profit, and brand equity. In a competitive marketplace, methodically designed packages may be used for product positioning and repositioning, if packaging variables that contribute to promotional effectiveness are identified through research, such as this study.

In line with the significance of the study, findings, and conclusions from this study, the following recommendations are made.

1. Given that the ‘VIEW’ concept of packaging substantially and significantly contributes to promotional effectiveness in terms of consumers’ retrials, the pedagogy on marketing and promotional strategies should incorporate packaging as a major player in the marketing mix and promotional strategy.

2. Since the visibility and information attributes of the sachet are significant positive drivers of retrials of sachet Peak milk, manufacturers and marketers of sachet Peak milk should consider using more visible and information rich packages which will likely attract and produce more retrials from more informed consumers of sachet Peak milk in Awka. Such an increase in informed consumers may lead to increase in brand loyalty with subsequent beneficial effects on the brand’s market share, equity, and position/repositioning.

3. Other promotional variables should be considered along with the ‘VIEW’ concept variables in evaluation of promotional effectiveness. By so doing, the contributions of the ‘VIEW’ concept variables can then be compared with the contributions of other promotional variables in evaluation of promotional effectiveness.

4. A marketing opportunity may exist if the emotional and workability aspects of the sachet can be improved upon, hopefully, boost the influence which the sachet has on consumers of sachet Peak milk.

5. While caution should be exercised in adopting and generalizing the results from this study because of the use of non-probability sampling methods, future studies should consider the use of larger probability samples, if possible, to produce more generalizable results.
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**APPENDICES**

A. Data Collection Instrument

**SACHET MILK STUDY**

I am Okey Akabogu, a doctoral marketing student at Anambra State University. I am conducting a research on how consumers who reside in this state purchase sachet Peak milk for their consumption. The information obtained from this study will be used strictly and only for the purposes of understanding the consumption of sachet Peak milk in Awka, Anambra State, Nigeria, and also for the teaching of marketing in educational institutions. Your name is not required for this study, and all information that you volunteer will be used only for the purposes stated above. Please, would you be kind enough to freely partake in this study by completing this short questionnaire? Your cooperation will be highly appreciated.

(Q1 is asked only after ascertaining that the respondents currently reside in Awka, Anambra State, have bought and consumed sachet Peak milk at least once, intend to retry sachet Peak milk, and are aware that other brands of sachet milk are available in the market).

**Q1** On a scale of 1-5, as shown below, how much are you likely to retry (repeat purchase) of sachet Peak milk? (Check one answer only.)

5 = Very much likely to retry
4 = Somehow likely to retry
QII Now, in thinking about the **visibility** of the package of sachet peak milk on the shelf with other sachet milk brands displayed, how much do you think that the **visibility** of the package of sachet Peak milk influences your retry of sachet Peak milk? (Check one answer only.)

- 5 = Very much influences
- 4 = Somehow influences
- 3 = Neutral or No opinion
- 2 = Somehow does not influence
- 1 = Very much does not influence

QIII Now, in thinking about the **information** on the package of sachet peak milk on the shelf with other sachet milk brands displayed, how much do you think that the **information** on the package of sachet Peak milk influences your retry of sachet Peak milk? (Check one answer only.)

- 5 = Very much influences
- 4 = Somehow influences
- 3 = Neutral or No opinion
- 2 = Somehow does not influence
- 1 = Very much does not influence

QIV Now, in thinking about the **color and shape (emotion)** of the package of sachet Peak milk on the shelf with other sachet milk brands displayed, how much do you think that the **color and shape (emotion)** of the package of sachet Peak milk influences your retry of sachet Peak milk? (Check one answer only.)

- 5 = Very much influences
- 4 = Somehow influences
- 3 = Neutral or No opinion
- 2 = Somehow does not influence
- 1 = Very much does not influence

QV Now, in thinking about the **opening, closing, and preservation of the contents (workability)** of the package of sachet Peak milk on the shelf with other sachet milk brands displayed, how much do you think that the **opening and closing, and preservation of the contents (workability)** of the package of sachet Peak milk influences your retry of sachet Peak milk? (Check one answer only.)

- 5 = Very much influences
- 4 = Somehow influences
- 3 = Neutral or No opinion
- 2 = Somehow does not influence
- 1 = Very much does not influence