

# AN ANALYSIS OF PERCEPTION OF TOBACCO CONSUMERS TOWARDS THE DE-MARKETING OF TOBACCO PRODUCT(S)

Umesh Raut<sup>1</sup> and Dr. Prafulla Pawar<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Research Fellow, Department of Management Sciences (PUMBA), University of Pune,  
Pune

Email: ur.raut@gmail.com

<sup>2</sup>Associate Professor, Department of Management Sciences (PUMBA), University of Pune,  
Pune

Email: mypumba@gmail.com

## ABSTRACT

*De-marketing is an effort or tool to reduce or bound demand for consumption of a particular product or service on a permanent or temporary basis. De-marketing can be used as a device to decrease or reduce total demand, or types of demand and uses in relation to a particular stage of supply. Therefore, de-marketing is able to be applied on both private and public sector goals. Injurious goods are sometime being promoted to the consumers by manufacturer and their distributors. The effect of this fact has made it essential for government and private sector to make use of de-marketing plan to tackle with these circumstances. The present study shows the effectiveness of de-marketing strategies for diminishing the use of tobacco products in India. The objective of this study is to find out the perception of tobacco users towards the de-marketing of tobacco goods. In other word, the objective of this study is to examine how de-marketing tools have been effectively used against consumption of harmful products in India. The results of the findings indicated that there is a positive perception of tobacco user towards the de-marketing of tobacco products.*

**Keywords:** De-marketing, tobacco products, consumption of tobacco, smokeless and smoke tobacco products

## INTRODUCTION

According to WHO (World Health Organization) Country profiles, India has one of the maximum rates of oral cancer in the globe and rates of oral cancer patient are still increasing. This inconsistent incidence of oral cancer has been related to the high percentage of tobacco chewers, a habit unique to Indians. Oral cancer accounts for one-third of the total cancer cases and 90% of the patients are tobacco users. This is true across a broad spectrum of people, rich and poor, male and female, old and young. According to GATS (Global Adult

Tobacco Survey) Indian report 2009-2010 more than one-third (35%) of adults in India use tobacco in some form. The tobacco use is high 18% even among population age 15-24. Estimation of tobacco use in the general population are essential for monitoring the epidemic in the particular and provide the evidence base for developing policies for effective implementation of a comprehensive tobacco control programme. De-marketing is a kind of tools of marketing which can be use for the control of tobacco consumption and for enhancement of the awareness about harmfulness of tobacco products.

## OBJECTIVES

The objective of research is to highlight the concept of de-marketing with concern of tobacco product de-marketing in India. Another objective of this present study is to find out the perception of tobacco users towards the de-marketing of tobacco products.

## REVIEW OF LITERATURE

The concept of de-marketing was initially proposed by Kotler and Levy in 1971. De-marketing defined as “Attempts to discourage customers in general or a certain class of customers in particular for consumption of a specific product on either a temporary or a permanent basis.” The functions of marketing have characteristically emphasized the task of creating and maintaining demand in an environment of abundance. However, recent changes in the business environment have focused attention on a wider range of marketing tasks which include that of reducing overfull demand, or de-marketing (Philip Kotler and Sidney J. Levy, 1971). De-marketing is “that aspect of marketing that deals with discouraging customers in general or a certain class of customers in particular on either a temporary or permanent basis,”( Kotler and Levy 1971). One problem with de-marketing is that it is has received relatively little attention from the marketing profession itself. (Annabelle Mark and Ross Brennan1995)

These de-marketing efforts have had a profound impact on smoking behavior in the United States (ROBERT S. MOORE, 2005). The de-marketing of smoking has primarily occurred along three fronts: mass media (i.e., the use of antismoking advertisements), regulatory measures (i.e., taxes and smoking bans), and public opinion (i.e., normative behavior). The goal of mass media efforts of governments and some cigarette manufacturers has been to discourage and prevent smoking behavior (Logan & Longo, 1999). The goal of many of these social marketing campaigns has been to prevent adolescents from starting to smoke cigarettes (Bauman, LaPrelle, Brown, 1992). The targeting of adolescents is due to the majority of smokers taking up the habit before age of 18 years, even though tobacco sales to minors are illegal. Findings concerning antismoking advertising have shown that exposure of students to these ads has contributed to the enhancement of school-based prevention programs (Flynn et al.), resulting in decreased smoking rates, the formation of less favorable evaluations of peers who smoke (Pechmann & Ratneshwar, 1994), and the recall and use of negative smoker stereotype (Pechmann & Knight, 2002).

Governments use various de-marketing strategies and tools in parallel to control smoking (rising taxes, clean indoor regulations, banning advertising); little research is accessible on how the 4Ps of marketing work in combination with each in the direction of reducing tobacco use. We can use marketing mix elements (Product Price Place and Promotion) for fulfillment de-marketing objective. (Shiu E, Hassan LM & Walsh G., 2009) Awareness,

Prevention, Protection and Prosecution can also be considered as tools of de-marketing. The de-marketing campaign has resulted in increased negative attitudes toward smoking and a stigma toward individuals who smoke (Kim & Shanahan; Pechmann & Ratneshwar, 1994). Antismoking advertising alone is not responsible for changes in perceptions of smoking. Researchers (e.g., McAlister, Krosnick, & Milburn, 1984; Meier, 1991) have long noted that negative public sentiment as expressed through parents, peers, and siblings are important factors in the formation of unfavorable attitudes toward smoking.

Marketing scholars have studied de-marketing primarily in the context of smoking (e.g., Andrews 2004; Pechmann 2003), drug use (e.g., Kelly, Swaim, and Wayman 1996), and energy conservation (e.g., Deutsch and Liebermann 1985; Kasulis, Huettner, and Dikeman 1981), often focusing on government, not business, de-marketing (Gerstner, Hess, and Chu 1993). Leverett (2002) noted that a 10% increase in the price of a pack of cigarettes effectively decreases smoking in the young adult market by 4% and smoking among children and adolescents by 6%–7%. Therefore, tax increases are effective in preventing young smokers from becoming regular smokers. Hu, Sung, and Keeler (1995) and Liang, Chaloupka, Nichter, and Clayton (2003) have even argued that because demand can be managed through price, excise taxes may be more effective in reducing cigarette smoking than advertising.

Kotler and Levy recognized different types of de-marketing, based on the nature of the demand that it is essential to reduce. These are:

- (1) General de-marketing;
- (2) Selective de-marketing; and
- (3) Ostensible de-marketing.

**General de-marketing:** General de-marketing is used when a firm (or government) wants to de-market to everyone. For instance, the government de-markets cigarettes and alcohol (discouraged goods) and illegal drugs (a banned good). This occurs when demand for a product or service is deemed to be too high. De-marketing is undertaken effectively to shrink total demand to an acceptable level.

Demand may exceed the potential supply for a variety of reasons:

- (1) There may be a temporary shortage of products, with the company unable to meet the resultant demand. This presents the problem of adjusting supply to meet the unsatisfied demand by, for example, increasing production capabilities through plant expansion. However, long term solutions like this will not resolve temporary shortages, therefore companies must seek to contain demand to reduce the risk of further aggravating product shortage.
- (2) Chronic over-popularity may exist for a product or service. This is of particular relevance for manufacturers of exclusive products where scarcity contributes to their quality image and widespread popularity will undermine this. Alternatively, producers may simply not wish to cope with high levels of demand for practical reasons.

(3) The decision may have been taken to eliminate a product for which a level of demand still exists. The challenge for the company is to eliminate the demand, or encourage customers to accept substitutes, without losing their goodwill.

**Selective De-marketing:** Selective de-marketing is concerned with a company seeking to reduce demand within certain segments of the market amongst specific types of consumer. For example, a motorway service area may seek to discourage football fans or a pub may want to de-market itself to underage drinkers. As Kotler emphasized, the classification of customers into "desirable" and "undesirable" may raise ethical questions and can be interpreted, in some instances, as discrimination.

**Ostensible De-marketing:** Ostensible de-marketing involves the manufacturer appearing to discourage demand, with the actual intention of increasing it. This relies on the principle that customers will be attracted as the product becomes harder to obtain. For example, a concert promoter will promote a concert as "nearly sold out — limited number of tickets left", with the hidden intention of encouraging potential attendees to rush out and purchase tickets (Philip Kotler and Sidney J. Levy, 1971). The need of more research in this area because, de-marketing as a strategy for social marketers is a popular, but poorly understood part of social marketing practice.

## METHODOLOGY

A descriptive research design, involving 271 samples size was used for this study. On the basis of informal discussions with several regular consumers an inventory of 10 possible de-marketing statements was prepared. A structured questionnaire was used as research instrument. It was pre tested for further refinement. The Likert scale type statements were generated to measure the perception of tobacco users towards the de-marketing of tobacco products on a simple five point scale, preferred for ease of administration in short time. The points on the scale were labeled as, 1 (strongly disagree), to 5 (strongly agree). In all, 29 questionnaires were to be rejected for being incomplete. The remaining 271 properly filled up questionnaires formed the basis for the study. The fieldwork was conducted during the year 2012.

The aim of this research is to find out effectiveness of de-marketing strategies for diminish or Cessation of the consumption of tobacco products, and also enhance the de-marketing strategies against the consumption of tobacco product. Another social aim of this research is that, to raise the awareness about harmfulness of use of the tobacco products. The research will also enhance the understanding of de-marketing concept in the field of marketing and will contribute some future oriented knowledgeable aspects in the area of marketing. The objective of this study is to find out the perception of tobacco users towards the de-marketing of tobacco products.

This research develops a set of hypotheses aimed at understanding the impact of de-marketing of tobacco products (such as smokeless and smoke tobacco products) on the consumption of tobacco products. In earlier period Edward Shiu, Louise M. Hassan, Gianfranco Walsh (2007) has done the research on the use of 4Ps for de-marketing, that research presents a conceptual model linking the 4Ps in a de-marketing context with three outcome measures: consumers' attitude toward the tobacco industry, consumers' attitude toward smoking, and consumers' intention to quit smoking. According to Kotler and Levy in

1971 de-marketing is the Attempts to discourage patrons in general or a definite class of patrons in particular for consumption of a specific product on either a temporary or a permanent basis.” Research shows that government sponsored anti-smoking campaigns reduce positive perceptions of smoking and hence have a direct negative effect on attitude toward smoking (Siegel and Biener, 2000). According GATS India Report 2009-2010 more than one-third (35%) of adults in India use tobacco in some form: smoking, chewing, application to the teeth and gums or sniffing. About 29 % of adults use tobacco on a daily where a little 5% use it occasionally. In Maharashtra the 41.1% of the tobacco users started the use of tobacco on the 20-34 years age. Given the normative power of reference-group and word-of-mouth influence, future studies should investigate the perceptions and influences of non-smokers (Edward Shiu, Louise M. Hassan, and Gianfranco Walsh2009).

### **RESEARCH HYPOTHESIS**

Formally, following hypotheses proposed for the present study;

H1: There is a positive perception of tobacco users towards the de-marketing of tobacco product(s) (requires a rating 4 or higher on five point scale).

### **RESULT**

The table 1 shows the characteristics of survey sample, the table exhibits demographic characteristics of the sample as well as select information about the respondents towards the use of tobacco products and. The percentage of participants on the basis of their gender is male (98.15) and female (01.85%). A total of 75 per cent of respondents were between 18 and 35 years of age. 66.43% of responded has income 1to 2 Lac per annum.

The table 2 shows that the total means score of ten statements about the de-marketing of tobacco products. The total mean score for these ten statements is calculated to be 4.24 on five point scale of 1-5.as the attend score is higher than 4, so the there is a positive perception of tobacco users towards the de-marketing of tobacco product. Thus the hypothesis first is accepted. These all statement which presented in the questionnaire are positive towards the de-marketing of tobacco products.

### **CONCLUSION AND SCOPE FOR FUTURE STUDY**

To conclude this issue of de-marketing, it is not hard to express that de-marketing is only marketing in the opposite situation that includes 4Ps policies (i.e. product, price, place and promotion) which can be used to reduce demand. The de-marketing is scientific way to diminish the demand of tobacco products. The present research shows that the perception of tobacco users towards the de-marketing of tobacco product is positive. There is only need to formulation of proper de-marketing strategies and implement the in social environment to reduce the usage of tobacco products. The de-marketing strategy should base on the demographics of tobacco users that are the demographics of tobacco users should consider at the time of formulation of de-marketing strategy. This research will enhance the understanding of de-marketing tools and will find out the use of de-marketing tools in ideal way for decline the level of tobacco consumption or Cessation of the consumption of tobacco. The scope for future research is to find out whether this scale presented in present study for de-marketing of tobacco useful with the consideration of young tobacco users or

not. Research also need to find out that if the tobacco users shows the positive perception towards the de-marketing of tobacco products, then why these users consumes tobacco.

**Table 1.** Select Characteristics of Survey Sample

Characteristics	Value	Frequency	Percent
Gender	Male	266	98.15
	Female	5	01.85
Age Group	18-25	115	42.43
	25-35	89	32.85
	35-40	42	15.50
	More than 40	25	09.22
Income group	Less than 1 Lac	45	16.60
	1 Lac to 2Lac	180	66.43
	2 Lac to 3 Lac	32	11.80
	More than 3 Lac	14	05.17

**Table 2.** Mean score of Perception towards de-marketing of tobacco product

Sr. No.	Statements	N Valid	Mean Score
1.	Increase of tax on tobacco products is useful for diminishing the use of tobacco.	271	3.80
2.	Increase the price of tobacco product is beneficial for diminishing the use of tobacco.	271	4.15
3.	Anti-smoking advertising always advantageous for diminishing the use of tobacco.	271	4.34
4.	The (health warning) picture present on tobacco products changes the users' attitude towards the use tobacco product, positive to negative.	271	3.98
5.	The law should be stronger against use of tobacco in public places.	271	4.64
6.	Government should increase the level of de-marketing of tobacco products.	271	4.32
7.	Government should take an active role in the de-marketing of tobacco products.	271	4.26
8.	De-marketing is the most effective strategy for reducing the demand for tobacco products.	271	4.14
9.	Publishing information about adverse effects of tobacco will reduce the use of tobacco products.	271	4.15
10.	Government should restrict smoking in public places.	271	4.63
	<b>Total mean score</b>	-	<b>4.24</b>

**REFERENCES**

1. Annabelle Mark and Ross Brennan, 1995 de-marketing: Managing Demand in the UK National Health Service, Public money and Management , July-Septemer, Blackwell Publishing Limited, pp.17-21.
2. Andrews, Craig, Richard Netemeyer, Scot Burton, Paul Moberg, and Ann Christiansen (2004), "Understanding Adolescent Intentions to Smoke: An Examination of Relationships Among Social Influence, Prior Trial Behavior, and Anti-tobacco Campaign Advertising," Journal of Marketing, 68 (July), pp.110–23.
3. Bauman, K. E., LaPrelle, J., Brown, J. D., Koch G. G. & Padgett, C. A. (1991). "The influence of three mass media campaigns on variables related to adolescent cigarette smoking: Results of a field experiment". American Journal of Public Health, 81(5), pp. 597–604.
4. Edward Shiu, Louise M. Hassan, Gianfranco Walsh, (2009), "De-marketing tobacco through governmental policies – The 4Ps revisited", Journal of Business Research, 62, pp. 269–278.
5. Deutsch, Joseph and Yehoshua Liebermann (1985), "Effects of a Public Advertising Campaign on Consumer Behavior in a De-marketing Situation," International Journal of Marketing Research, 2 (4), pp.287–96.
6. Gerstner, Eitan, James Hess, and Wujin Chu (1993), "De-marketing as a Differentiation Strategy," Marketing Letters, 4 (1), pp.49–57.
7. Global Adult Tobacco Survey (GATS) India Report 2009-2010, conducted by international institute for population sciences, Mumbai, on behalf ministry of Health and family welfare, India.
8. Donald R Cooper and Pamela S Schindler ;( 2006); Business Research Methods; Tata Mc-Graw-Hill Publishing Company Limited; New Delhi; pp.152-159.402-426.
9. Hu, T., Sung H., & Keeler, T. E. (1995). Reducing cigarette consumption in California: Tobacco taxes vs. an anti-smoking media campaign. American Journal of Public Health, 85(9), pp.1218–1222.
10. Kasulis, Jack, David Huettner, and Neil Dikeman (1981), "The Feasibility of Changing Electricity Consumption Patterns," Journal of Consumer Research, 8 (3), pp.279–90
11. Kelly, Kathleen, Randall Swaim, and Jeffery Wayman (1996), "The Impact of a Localized Antidrug Media Campaign on Targeted Variables Associated with Adolescent Drug Use," Journal of Public Policy & Marketing, 15 (Fall), pp.238–53.
12. Kim, S., & Shanahan, J. (2003). Stigmatizing smokers: Public sentiment toward cigarette smoking and its relationship to smoking behaviors. Journal of Health Communication 8(4), pp.343–367.
13. Kultar Singh; (2009); Quantitative Social Research Methods; SAGE Publication India Pvt. Ltd; New Delhi; pp. 66-67. Bridget Somekh and Canthy Lewin; (2009); Research Methods in the social science; Vistaar Publications; New Delhi; pp.215-225.
14. Leverett, M., Ashe, M., Gerard, S., Jenson, J., & Woollery, T. (2002). Tobacco use: The impact of prices. Journal of Law, Medicine & Ethics, 30(3), 88–95.

15. Liang, L., Chaloupka, F., Nichter, M., & Clayton, R. (2003). Prices, policies and youth smoking. *Addiction*, 98(1), pp.105–122.
16. Logan, R. A., & Longo, D. A. (1999). Rethinking anti-smoking media campaigns: Two generations of research and issues for the next. *Journal of Health Care Finance*, 25(4), pp.77–90.
17. McAlister, A. L., Krosnick. J. A., & Milburn, M. (1984). Causes of adolescent cigarette smoking: Tests of a structural equation model. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 47(1), pp.24–36.
18. Meier, K. S. (1991). Tobacco truths: The impact of role models on children's attitudes toward smoking. *Health Education Quarterly*, 18(2), pp.173–182.
19. Pechmann, C., & Ratneshwar, S. (1994). The effects of antismoking and cigarette advertising on young adolescents' perceptions of peers who smoke. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 21(2), pp.236–251.
20. Pechmann, C., & Knight, S. J. (2002). An experimental investigation of the joint effects of advertising and peers on adolescents' beliefs and intentions about cigarette consumption. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 29(1), pp.5–19.
21. Pechmann, Cornelia, Guangzhi Zhao, Marvin Goldberg, and Ellen Reiblinget (2003), "What to Convey in Antismoking Advertisements for Adolescents: The Use of Protection Motivation Theory to Identify Effective Message Themes," *Journal of Marketing*, 67 (April), pp.1–18.
22. Philip Kotler and Sidney J. Levy, "De-marketing, Yes, De-marketing," *Harvard Business Review*, Vol. 49 (November/ December 1971), pp.74-80.
23. ROBERT S. MOORE (2005), the Sociological Impact of Attitudes toward Smoking: Secondary Effects of the De-marketing of Smoking, the *Journal of Social Psychology*, 2005, 145(6), pp.703–718.
24. Siegel M, Biener L. The impact of an antismoking media campaign on progression to established smoking: results of a longitudinal youth study. *Am J Publ Health* 2000; 90(3):pp.380–386.