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# Introduction

Gamification is a very topical and frequently mentioned subject due to the several reasons. First of all, gamification may provide additional motivation for customers to be involved in firm’s activities which subsequently lead to increasing company performance results. Secondly, the gamification market is one of the fastest growing markets. There is a research gap in the intersection between loyalty programs and gamification – influence of loyalty program perception was not studied before in foreign and Russian scientific community. To start with, author takes an survey to see possible implications of gamification on potential increase of loyalty program efficiency. Practical problem lies in the fact there is no proof that gamification has positive or negative effect on loyalty program efficiency, or even on the most of management techniques. Gamification itself is rapidly developing since 2010



**Fig. 1.** Gamification market forecast (Source: Games Industry.biz)

According to M2 research[[1]](#footnote-1), gamification market reached 3$ billion milestone in 2016, and may reach 5$ billion in 2018, which will make average yearly growth rate at approximately 65%. These forecasts were also supported by “Research and Markets”[[2]](#footnote-2) agency in last year. They provided a forecast of growth continuation with same 50-60% rate until 2020, which will enlarge market volume to more than 10 billion dollars. These brief figures definitely show that gamification is a hot topic nowadays and is quite promising in terms of practical application in management. Also, loyalty programs in retail industry are considered as ineffective, and gamification can possibly can breathe the life into them.

Just several surveyal studies were conducted in recent years towards the influence of gamification on a perception of a customers and none of them was affecting actual or hypothetical loyalty programs. There is a short compilation of outcomes for recent studies in practical use of gamification in the table below. Author had discovered about half hundred articles with actual studies for last five years, mainly concentrated on fields of education and healthcare. Most of them have positive results – gamification actually helps to certain extent, but some has mixed or negative results which supports the point: gamification must be studied further in different situations and fields due to its complexity and possible reflection of user’s personal traits.

**Table 1.** Literature review, mixed effects of gamification for last five years.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Cite** | **Field of management. Where gamification tested** | **Brief conclusion** |
| Gasland (2011) | Education, Learning Support | Gamification has no proven impact on enhancing users’ experience |
| Downes-Le Guin et al. (2012) | Marketing, Online Surveys | Gamification slightly increases satisfaction, but has no significant effects on customer engagement |
| Dominguez et al. (2013) | Education, Motivation and Engagement | Gamification has positive effect on initial motivation and score, but significant negative on written exercises and class participation |
| Bruggeman (2015) | Marketing, Branded Apps | Gamification has no significant influence on customer perception of branded application and overall brand |
| Alahäivälä, Oinas-Kukkonen (2016) | Healthcare, Marketing and Operations | Gamification has positive influence on persuasion and makes behavioral change of customer |

Thus, as it is seen, gamification is not the obvious “Grail” for the managers to easier reach their various KPI’s and under different circumstances game added to the process can decrease its efficiency and disregard previous company results. Also, there is from little to no connection between loyalty programs and gamification use in retail sector – and indicator of research gap of current topic development.

Research aim was to explore how gamification influences perception of loyalty program in terms of its efficiency and prove the significance of such influence. Research objectives are as follows:

* Explore contemporary approaches to the loyalty programs and their efficiency;
* Define gamification and distinguish gamified objects from not or low gamified;
* Combine current cutting edge theoretical and practical frameworks of gamification;
* Compare application of loyalty programs and gamification in an international and Russian practice;
* Conduct a survey to collect primary data on topic of loyalty program perception;
* Analyze and process the data, gathered from survey;
* Formalize conclusions and possible recommendations for practice in management.

Research object of a paper is use of gamification in loyalty programs for retail industry. Research subject is the actual influence of gamification on loyalty programs efficiency through consumer perception.

Theoretical base of this research rely on works of Y.Chou, D. Aaker, M. Hoffman, C. Voorhees, M. McCall, P. Volle, A. O’Cass, K. Werbach and other specialists’ researches on marketing, psychology and branding.

Practical side of the research is based on survey, collected with snow-ball technique. Questions methodology is based on O’Cass, Bridson, Mimouni-Chaabane, and further adjusted by the author, considering the topic of retail sector and gamified entities.

First chapter consist of literature review on issues of brand loyalty and loyalty programs. Existing frameworks adjusted and efficiency measures classified. Recent development on topic of loyalty program efficiency discovered and explained. Connections between efficiency and customer perception supported.

Second chapter is concerning recent development on a gamification topic. Due to the two ways of development: scientific and practical, author takes an attempt to combine both into a conceptual gamification framework for both purposes of theoretical and practical topic development. Both views are descripted and explained. Examples of gamified loyalty programs discussed and generalized.

Third chapter is devoted to the actual survey conducted by author. Several test runs were taken to verify methodology and prove actual gamification influence on customer’s perception. Connection between research design and practical application embodied into, recently gathered results analyzed and preliminary recommendations formalized.

# Loyalty Programs and Efficiency. Brand Loyalty

Brand loyalty seems to be one of the most important “weapon” of the companies to achieve not only additional profits, but also make them less fluctiative. Thus, building a Brand loyalty towards repetition of purchases will bring company to enhanced financial results, lying not only in actual net incomes or revenues, but in stock price and other KPIs positive change (Giddens, 2010).

Nowadays, during information age, we, as humans, have more sources of information than in was ever. Average human proceeds 5 times more information flows today than several decades before (Gilbert, 2008). So, now it is more important not just to spread information about your product. To do it more closely to the customer and his undisclosed passion towards different aspects. First point of previous statement is directly connected to the information source choice. Second point – how to deliver information or how to make customer be arranged with company, products, services, brands – characteristics of actual delivery. Gamification in the second case can help make online advertisement more effective in terms of assessing customers loyalty to the brand by providing fun, direct or indirect incentives thus having customer spent much more time in relation with brand and leaving positive messages about the brand in his or her mind.

## **Two dimensions of Brand Loyalty and How to Use It**

Brand loyalty itself has different meanings argued between researchers. Kahle & Kim (2006) provide definition as “increased profits or other benefits of a branded product, corporation, person in comparison to generic ones”. AMA (American marketing association) defines it as “situation when customer usually buys the same manufacturer originated product or service repeatedly over time than buy from other manufacturers”. Chegini (2010) states that brand loyalty is a tool of controlling a potential customer in terms of theory and guidance leadership which transforms to a positive behavior, repurchase and overall support from customer. According to the Penefit Report (2015), price becomes less of concern for brand loyal customers – they are spending in average 67% more than newcomers. It has changing influence from one sector of economy to another, but in retail, for example, 10-15% of customer base can have 50-70% more spending thus generating that more revenue for the firm by being loyal (Tate Report, 2014). So, the definition to use in this research goes as is: “a state, when customer prefers one product of particular brand over another variety of choices and transfer his or her preferences in repurchasing, word-of-mouth promotion among other customers and spends more and more time with brand-related activities”.

Brand loyalty itself is not a solid figure, it can be described from different perspectives due to its complexity. According to Cheng (2011) there are several main factors creating brand loyalty: perceived value of service\product, perceived quality, switching costs, satisfaction, perceived status, trust and other situational factors. This way, some other factors can be mentioned: community influence, time spent on actions related to the brand. Two additional factors come through other aspects of human being. According to Carlson (2005) brand users can make communities and share their beliefs and values to become more connected to a particular product or service. This kind of addiction is a powerful factor of tying customer to the brand. One of the examples – Apple, which can lie in unacceptance of their fellow having device bought from other manufacturer. Time spent on actual activity towards the brand is closely connected to the further descripted aspect of gamification – more time you spent, more hesitate you will to the ceasing any kind of relations due to the burden of spent value time. It is quite close to the concept of switching costs, but shows particular important aspect of current research. Concept is explained in details by Guldner (1995) and Jeon (2008).

What are the other reasons to establish brand loyalty? Giddens (2010) proved that brands with developed customer loyalty are able to set premium pricing, which makes brand a point of differentiation. Other aspect mentioned by same author is that companies tend to spent less on marketing and advertising due to the fact of obtaining major group of customers tied to the brand – they already know company’s message, product lines, offerings and strong points of actual product. Also, this move works in other direction. Loyal customers may tend to buy additional quantities of the goods they did not use before, but under same brand name (Allen, 2010). Shanmugan (2011) states that establishing strong brand loyalty results in strategically important competitive advantage.

Brand loyalty can be decomposed to two dimensions: behavioral (sometimes called “purchase”) and attitudinal loyalty. Kanuk and Wisenblit (2010) described behavioral aspect in three terms: how much customer buys, how often customer purchase and redundancy in purchasing the product. Level of purchased loyalty is a brand preference – overall amount of resource spent over time (Roy & Chau, 2011). But, this concept is enhanced by the second part of brand loyalty – attitudinal loyalty (Liu-Thompkins & Tam, 2013). Attitudinal loyalty is the general commitment from customer to the brand. Grisaffe & Nguyen (2011) show attitudinal part of a loyalty as a mostly emotional bonds to the brand. Valuable additions made by Chaudhuri & Holbrook (2001) – market share is positively related to behavioral loyalty and relative price – to attitudinal one. Word-of-mouth, advertising through community, thoughts and beliefs connected to the product are depicting attitudinal aspect, which enhances overall level of purchase loyalty.

As it is proceeding, both dimensions of brand loyalty are being enhanced by so-called loyalty programs. Loyalty programs usually defined as a system of marketing implications that reward and encourage “loyal buying behavior” to benefit firm in various fields (Sharp, 1997). Other definition is provided by Benton (2015). He states that these programs are applying towards the stimulation of future purchases even through third party benefits and other gifts to the customer in exchange of contribution to the brand, products and company’s growth. Yi & Jeon in 2003 also state another point of loyalty programs – they are differentiating products promoted by.

Are these programs really efficient? Logically, from a customer point of view – they must be due to widespread usage and visible advantages for consumer. But, let us look at perspective. There are several common incarnations of loyalty programs

**Table 2-1.** Common types of loyalty programs (based on Benton, 2015)

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **#** | **Type** | **Commentary** |
| 1 | Points and\or Tier System | After each purchase or action, customer receives points or being promoted to the next tier. Point-based systems are concentrated on short-term relationships. You spent points – you get the reward. Tier-based helps to build long-term and higher commitment. |
| 2 | VIP-Card or Account | Customer is paying upfront to achieve discounts, lottery participations, etc. |
| 3 | Non-monetary rewards or discounts | Customer gets some additional advantages from being loyal – enhanced warranty, more comfortable support, free shipment, etc. |
| 4 | Third party company benefits | Company suggest customer to use services of another firm to get some benefits from this one. Usually, third party provides some complementary activities and goods |
| 5 | Return or payback programs | Providing trade-offs or cashback to a loyal customer or just easing the process of payback or goods exchange |

**Table 2-2.** Common types of loyalty programs (based on Benton, 2015) (cont.)

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **#** | **Type** | **Commentary** |
| 6 | Certificates | Making customer free to choose not only actual goods to buy but even a receiver person. Used to provide gifts from one customer to another, who is usually unrelated to the brand |
| 7 | Frequent buyer program | Depends on amount or value of actual purchases to provide customer with special offers or additional services |
| 8 | Discount over time program | During the time customer subscribed to the loyalty program he gets increased discounts or actual benefits in some quantity of goods or services. Used to create long-term relationships and only when the time of relationships matters most |
| 9 | Bundles | Customer can buy some goods in package only if he is a member of loyalty program and he or she fulfilled some requirements for actual bundle offering |

Actually, the list provided is not entirely full and can be enlarged by some other inventions as lotteries, club-related issues (meetings, special events for loyal customers), special offerings and some gamified schemes. The last point will be disclosed further and last parts of paper are devoted to this topic totally.

Despite of the program types, they’ve been used in different industries. For example, in low-cost retail segment it is not relevant to provide some certificates or introduce discount over time program. Wener (2004) also stated three main objectives for loyalty programs: building true attitudinal and behavioral loyalty, increasing efficiency of profits and increase effectiveness of profits. Also, there can be mentioned other points which are indirectly related to mentioned one: PR and enhancing brand value. First one is related to the common promotion of company or a brand – to increase the fame and build actual image of a company – tie perceptional image to the desired one. Loyalty programs and information spreading about them help to introduce brand to newcomers and solve issues with current and frequent buyers as a group of stakeholders. Brand value enhancement goes as a consequence of broadening customer base and increasing average purchase. Loyalty programs became an additional tool in improving business in addition to the actual operations management – how to increase margin, profits? Tie customers to you, increase switching costs by providing additional value to the relationships between brand and customer.

Clark in 2010 enlisted benefits which are provided by loyalty programs to the business. Most of them are quite obvious and related to the subjects mentioned. But some require attention: increase customer’s lifetime value, select stock lines, plan merchandising, reduction of advertising costs and picking new trading sites. CLV concept is directly connected to the amount of money flows generated by an actual or average customer during all-time relationships with brand (Damm, 2011). This concept combines three value-generating aspects – time of relationships, average purchase amount and time value of money. More CLV means increased money flows to the company. Company can manipulate its stocks and layout of goods with help of loyalty programs – we just increase discounts or giveaways of particular goods to optimize warehouse and sell goods before expiration date or empty more viable spots on shelves to the goods which has more profitable contracts with retailer firm (retail-related loyalty program applies only). Last point is more complicated – company can get some feedback from customer and relying on new information decide – how to reach frequent customers directly by increasing purchase value for them.

Another point lies in presumption of potential individualization of loyalty programs. According to IIFA (International Institute For Analytics, 2014), making customizing rewards for contributive customers will make them to retain with firm for a longer time due to the fact that they are treated personally with care for their individual needs.

To conclude short review of definitions, author provides most complex and comprehensive: “Loyalty program is a system of actual marketing efforts implied to enhance customer loyalty to the brand, product or service by means of providing rewards, with help of third parties, in exchange for future company’s performance, sales, efficiency and fame increase. These programs usually are personified and relating individual customer contribution and purchase”

## **Efficiency Indicators of Loyalty Programs**

At first, there is a general question, are loyalty programs efficient and generate additional profit for brand in comparison to operations without actual loyalty program. According to the various open sources, loyalty programs are efficient and improve company’s turnover for big retailers with relatively less effort for smaller ones. Side effect can imply in decreasing revenue and profit growth rate from average 3,3% to 2,7% (McEachern, 2014). According to MSI (Marketing Science Institute, 2013), despite huge amount of companies’ expenditures: annually varying from one to one and half billion dollars, most of them become inefficient and rejected after some time after the launch. It is a possible threat for the future development of current topic due to rejecting loyalty programs movement which may even encourage companies from different industries to invent new and efficient marketing tools to improve company’s marketing mix in exchange of driving loyalty programs into the void. Some big companies like Virgin have ceased their loyalty programs due to some mergers, acquisitions and, mainly due to inefficiency issues. One of the key concept of mistakes is the “bullwhip effect” – by discounts and other sales stimulation retailer can generate a situation when supplies are no longer needed in such quantities, because customers already bought sufficient amount of goods in advance with help of loyalty programs or discounts. It makes inefficient stock management and decreases product margin for retail store.

Profits are not “the king” in terms of efficient loyalty programs. Yes, using points and discounts on particular goods will definitely decrease unit margin. But, if after loyalty program launch, store will experience 10% more people coming the second and next time – revenue flow will be broadened – revenue increases and, consequently, profits in absolute value for whole store or even a chain. But it is not the only indicator of loyalty program efficiency. Changed customer perception, increased value of a purchase are also viable indicators. Detailed look on them is applied above.

One of the latest development on loyalty program effectiveness is made by McCall & Voorhees in 2010. They had introduced a model of loyalty program effectiveness, which relies on four layers - Program’s structure, Structure of program’s rewards, Customer factors and loyalty program effectiveness itself, which is stated as a result of past three layers’ analysis. Main indicators stated in the table below with preliminary formulas and common connection to the subject. In further studies this model of loyalty program effectiveness will be incorporated into general author’s framework with separation into two dimensions of brand loyalty – purchase and attitudinal one.

**Table 3-1.** Factors of loyalty program efficiency (based on McCall & Voorhees, 2011)

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Factor** | **Connection to loyalty programs** | **How to estimate?** |
| Increased purchase frequency | Leads to the extended revenue flows from a particular customer and ties him or her to the firm | CLV, purchase frequency, time per one purchase (relationship length divided by amount of purchases by customer within short- or medium-ranged time perspective (1-2 years)) |
| Decreased customer price sensitivity | One of the trickiest points in this list. Firm may increase total value of purchase by loyalty programs – enhance switching costs and make customer buy more or after initial purchase even if he or she sees less expensive alternatives | Qualitative data from questioners about price and value perception, relation of average relative price increase to average relative quantity of goods sold decrease |
| Customer advocacy | The more firm interacts individually with client, more client has commitment, especially, if his problems are solving (quality of products, service, delivery, etc.) | Increase of solved tickets, perceptional quality of feedback by customers, wastes amount due to supply with higher probability of unqualified products |
| Extended relationships length | The more customer stays with firm - more purchases he or she makes. More purchases he or she makes, more revenue he or she generates | CLV, average relationship time (with purchasing once per a period of time at least) |

**Table 3-2.** Factors of loyalty program efficiency (based on McCall & Voorhees, 2011) (cont.)

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Factor** | **Connection to loyalty programs** | **How to estimate?** |
| Increased share of wallet | Relatively new concept which shows proportion of expenditures spent or particular activities. Can be used to show percentage of expenses converted into the revenue of particular firm | Increase of SOW |
| Development of customer community | Reputation and PR issues are also connected to the loyalty programs, which can be the main interaction with customer except ads, which not all retailers use. Some of low-priced chains are rarely use any type of advertisements | Increase of subscribers amount, increased subscribers activity rating, citation rank increase, increased active users amount for website or application |
| Increased firm performance | As a managerial decision, any loyalty program launch or modification should be applied to enhance company’s performance and be in line with company’s goals | Net profit, gross revenue, any type of margin, average purchase amount (revenue divided by amount of purchases) |

Stated list of factors definitely emphasizes what is an actual influence loyalty programs have on firm characteristics. Liu & Yang (2009) had presented different vision of factors, which are affecting effectiveness of loyalty programs. They imbued three dimensions – loyalty program itself, customers’ characteristics and state of the competition. All three dimensions are divided into groups of factors. Program design delivers three aspects – participation requirements, point structure and rewards. Program management is a fourth aspect for loyalty program. As it seems quite logical, not only points can be inserted into this framework, certificates, tiers. Even points can be different; several types may be applied. Rewards can actually vary from discounts and free products. Previous analysis may add here other benefits like presents from third parties, special incentives and personified cashback or discount system

Figure below shows actual state of Liu & Yang model of Loyalty Program Effectiveness, while Figure 2 upgrades previous one with additions disclosed in this paper before.

**Fig. 2.** Liu & Yang model of Loyalty Program Effectiveness (2009)

Previously stated papers of McCall and Voorhees disclose really thick model which lacks of several elements in 2010, which are mentioned in 2009. Still model of eastern authors has not any implication of measuring or assessing quality or an effectiveness of actual loyalty program, which is essential for practical purposes. Other essential element to be added is considered as gradation of efficiency factors. Aspects of brand loyalty – purchasing and attitudinal can be used to stratify factors stated.

****

**Fig. 3.** Author’s framework of Loyalty Program Effectiveness (based on Fig. 2 and studies mentioned above)

 Particular framework shows actual interconnection between loyalty programs and overall effectiveness estimation, based on a brand loyalty layout – two layers, purchase and attitudinal loyalty. As an effective management tool, loyalty program should affect the whole subject it is designed for – to enhance brand loyalty. Thus, from actual indicators of revenue, profitability, etc., particular indicators of purchase loyalty become a marker of success. Financial result is considered to be an aftermath of created or enhanced brand loyalty (Firm Performance Indicators).

 In the upper part, there is a simplified image of Liu & Yang framework: loyalty program is not a solid being, it is a constructed being from various instruments and tools, used by marketers to enhance company performance. Consumer-related factors are mainly about potential and targeted audience – “Who they are?”; “What are their customs?”; “What do they like?” etc. Describing the customer from demographical to behavioral traits. Program-related factors are the actual setup of loyalty program – what elements will be included, what is the stimuli for the consumer to participate and change his or her own expenditures, in what design it is made – all of these points are constructing the base of program. Two other factor groups are considered to be external factors. Program-related factors are internal. The last group of factors are competition-related and mean the “atmosphere” of competitive environment and how it affects the loyalty program. Liu & Yang point out the benchmarking as the main technique of gathering own loyalty program to create its base due to the fact that by any means, companies used a particular set of mechanics are still profitable and well. Loyalty estimation itself comes as an inseparable part of management process cycle, containing stages of monitoring, revealing flawing aspects and correcting them across all the operation or process.

For other instance, there is a strong connection between customer satisfaction and customer loyalty, which was proven recently by Bae (2012) and elaborated towards this effect differentiation among industries and firm’s efforts, which makes satisfaction another indicator to show efficiency of loyalty program. In these terms, connection between attitudinal loyalty factors and overall satisfaction, discovered and proved by Mimouni-Chaabane and Volle (2010) help author to propose questionnaire model in further chapters for verifying gamification effect significance.

Overall progress of scientific researches towards loyalty programs and its effectiveness is shown in the table below, only last 10 years of research included concerning retail industry.

**Table 4-1.** Literature review retrospective of loyalty programs topic since 2006

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Cite** | **Major Findings** | **Focal Area** |
| Keh & Lee (2006) | Delayed rewards mainly affect satisfied customers. Direct rewards are more probably help to build proper relationships in comparison to indirect. Delayed rewards make worse impact in situation of cheering dissatisfied customers than immediate one. Reward program effectiveness depends on service experience, reward type and its timing. | Rewards timing and type |

**Table 4-2.** Literature review retrospective of loyalty programs topic since 2006 (cont.)

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Cite** | **Major Findings** | **Focal Area** |
| Leenheer (2007) | Effect of membership on share of the wallet is not influenced directly by promoted savings or discounts. Saving for future purchases has more effect than immediate savings on enrollment decision of a customer as they plan on further retention to the particular store, chain, firm or even a brand. | Rewards timing |
| Smith & Sparks (2009) | Redemption process of reward has same importance as the question of free choice – to what extend can this reward be applied. Redemption of some rewards is something “free” in perception of loyal customer, which can be embodied in some additional loyalty towards firm | Flexibility |
| Nunes (2009) | Three-level program is more satisfying for the customer than two-tier due to higher commitment and perception of possible success as being third-tier customer (highest one). Difficulty to achieve highest tier also plays important role. Third-tier customers are more satisfied if the process of reaching third tier is difficult. | Tiers model |
| Bose & Rao (2011) | Individual “ego-pleasure” benefits are utmost importance in loyalty programs on Indian context – they help develop more loyalty than non-individual ones | Rewards application |
| Omar et al. (2011) | Program satisfaction isn’t related to the store loyalty in terms of SOW and location preferences, but, program loyalty is crucial due to influence on program satisfaction | Loyalty & Satisfaction |
| Toit & Cant (2012) | Little support was found in theory that loyalty to the store is directly developed by loyalty program membership. Customers commitment to the retailer is regardless to customer status towards relationship program | General |

**Table 4-3.** Literature review retrospective of loyalty programs topic since 2006 (cont.)

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Cite** | **Major Findings** | **Focal Area** |
| Toit & Cant (2012) | Little support was found in theory that loyalty to the store is directly developed by loyalty program membership. Customers commitment to the retailer is regardless to customer status towards relationship program | General |
| Krithika & Ganesh (2013) | Monetary (financial) rewards solely has more influence on customer satisfaction and attraction than non-monetary ones. It is definitely that a rewards combination has synergetic and more influential effect than purely monetary reward system. Customer perception of loyalty programs has its influence on purchase behavior and store loyalty | Rewards structure |
| Beneke et al (2015) | Item-based discount system has greater influence on customer satisfaction than an accumulative point reward system. They also have greater influence on customer retention than accumulative point reward system. Satisfaction-retention link is found significant. There is indirect statement that effective loyalty program should include item-based discounts and points accumulation to achieve better retention-satisfaction result | Program structure and effectiveness |
| Hofman-Kohlmeyer (2016) | Financial and psychological factors of reward program have more effects than only using financial incentives for customer to build long-term relationships | Rewards structure |
| Reinares-Lara et al. (2016) | Multi-vendor loyalty program increases purchase frequency. Does not affect average spending. It is not affected by characteristics of customer | Third parties in loyalty programs |

What are the main insights developed from current literature review on a topic of loyalty programs and loyalty program effectiveness? First of all, there is a definite importance of several loyalty program aspects:

* Timing of rewards – immediate vs. delayed;
* Program structure – tier-based vs. non-tier;
* Reward types – direct vs. indirect, financial vs. non-financial, individual vs. non-individual, point-based vs. item-based;
* Freedom of choice – reward is tied to particular product or not;
* Affiliation of third-parties – multi-vendor program vs. solo-vendor;

In particular, it is clear that delayed rewards can help to build long-term relationships with retailer, tier-based systems are more preferable by customers due to visualized or felt progress with satisfaction due to personal supremacy over low-tier customer. Direct rewards are always more helpful in terms of retention and satisfaction. Only financial rewards do not affect customer better than well balanced system of psychological and material benefits for individual. Redemption of reward to a particular good seems like free advantage from perspective of a customer, but choice flexibility should be also applied to make customer feel powerful. Satisfaction and retention of a customer seems to be related to each other, which is logical. Why customer must continue purchases if he is not satisfied with program he is enrolled to.

On top of that review, there is a conceptual article by Steinhoff & Palmatier (2014) which states that main purpose of loyalty program and its effectiveness is to manage target and indirect effects. These effects are compelled into psychological mechanisms as gratitude, status and unfairness – they are influenced by the delivery of loyalty program – clarity of the rules, reward exclusivity and reward visibility. More detailed view on each point reveals actual importance and levers of use to make customers more retained or satisfied. Customer gratitude relies in comparisons – what customer expect to get from relationships and what they actually get – when difference is higher, gratitude generates and develops. Status lies in comparison with benefits and value other customer get from actual vendor – ranks, tiers, differences in rewards, attitude, respect, etc. Unfairness comes from the point where customer realizes that relationship, membership gives him extended output in comparison with others in the same time when input stays same. How delivery of program can develop on psychological mechanisms? Rule clarity helps customer to define own gratitude towards program and then appreciate possible unfairness, which leads to supreme position of membership. Reward visibility can emphasize on customer status, which differentiate member from not-member of loyalty program and promote unfairness. Reward exclusivity favors all the mechanisms to improve evaluated customer loyalty and lead to increase of incremental sales as the efficiency measure.

All these major findings will find an implication in the questionnaire to determine – is gamification increases customer perception values towards loyalty program? The next chapter is devoted to the gamification topic and its recent development.

# Gamification. Theoretical Framework and Business Application

## **Gamification. Main Elements and Levels of Game Design Elements.**

Difference between upcoming parts of thesis lies in the fact that this one is devoted to the approved by scientific community frameworks and definitions which were defended and published, thus, widely accepted. Next chapter is concerning non-scientific view of top-world expert of gamification, who does not have scientifically defended approach, but it is worth mentioning and emphasizing on to develop accumulation of knowledge and complete whole picture with author’s conceptual framework.

Latest development on gamification in management science is strongly connected with Kevin Werbach – one of the main popularizers of this concept. His two last books: For the Win (2012) and The Gamification Toolkit (2015) are the spearhead of the topic. Generally, gamification is a management technique of applying game-design principles and game elements to some non-game contexts (Huotari & Hamari, 2012)

According to Werbach, there are four categories of gamification – internal, external, changing behavior inside the firm, changing behavior of individual.



**Fig. 4.** Four categories of gamification. Source: For the Win (2012)

First two categories consider internal environment as an environment of particular firm. Internal gamification is used to improve work efficiency or other indicators of business result through employees. It has two own characteristics – be a part of the company and use existing management and benefit structures. One of the most obvious examples of internal gamification can be found in objective logistics. Unknown restaurant can track waiters’ performance and, depending on gathered data distribute more tables, preferred schedules or even higher rate of common tips (Chou, 2016). In this case, gamification helps restaurant to improve service quality, increase profits and, at the same time, distribute rewards objectively between employees depending on their actual performance – motivate them for better service.

Second category is an external gamification. If gamification involves customers – actual and potential – it can be called external. Actual aims for external gamification are: customer retention, improving relationships between business and customers, increasing engagement and brand reputation, increasing revenues, etc. Teleflora Rewards system can be a great example of external gamification. Social actions like comments, reviews, Q&A, reposting content add personal points for particular customer who does this activity. These points can be used by customer as redeemable certificate for random prize – discount, free flower or free shipping (Chou, 2016). Customer does not know beforehand which reward he will actually obtain.

Third and fourth category is a behavior change gamification – it generates new patterns of behavior out of game – like consuming more green products, doing more charity, running longer, etc. Usually used by some nonprofit organizations to achieve their goals towards humanity. One of the most fascinating example appeared in US. One startup from major city of US was concentrating on gathering health data from user – program was showing to the user the result of actual lifetime choice in change of health data. But the response was at its lowest – people did not bother about it. After this failure, CEO had introduced quizzes about health into a program, adding leaderboards, levels and team-based elements. In a week program became more appreciate by customers – they had started using this data for good and participating in quizzes. This initiative was transformed into a national program, which is connecting gaming and healthcare. This way some unpopular activities can be promoted and people’s engagement amplified due to simple psychological clue – we all love playing games of any sort – computer, tabletop, any kind of games, and if we can do some real positive outcome while playing – we, as people, becoming more engaged by the game or these unpopular activities game promotes (Werbach, 2012).

History of Gamification starts with its definition invented in 1980s by Richard Bartle. Then, first practical example of gamification is dated of 2003 – it was the year when Nick Pelling created firm, which created interfaces for electronic devices which had game mechanics. Since 2010, topic was emphasized due to major discussion about serious approach to videogames and their potential in different fields.

Werbach states that overall gamification-based motivation lies into three dimensions: engagement, surveyation, results. First dimension itself is highly important in any case of gamification. For example, to engage people know each other personally inside the firm, you can introduce the quizzes for employees about their colleagues. By answering correctly. Employee get some points, which can be spent on some benefits and\or used as a distinction characteristics or leaderboard position as a status reward. Surveyation contains another game-based approach – when you play the game you collide into some challenges which require different approach – you try to find out proper tactics and survey with decisions, and if player or a customer is convinced to play and wants to finish the game – he will make his way through surveys and trial-and-error approach. Actual result of game should finalize customers’ experience and let him know that his efforts was not a waste of time and resources – you will get actual reward on an equal term with engagement and progress he made.

Actually, not all the businesses or activities really need gamification improvement. Werbach offers to answer four questions to understand this possibility and assess it:

* Does more engagement bring you additional value?
* Are target activities interesting?
* Can desired pattern of behavior be made as an algorithm?
* Can game actually overcome conflicts with existing motivation system?

The last question is more unclear and controversial thus requires additional description. Conflict lies in a fact that gamification can ruin existing management practices while treated without caution. Bright example can be though out of employee routine. For example, playing the game can offer more benefits than actual work and responsibilities thus making less engagement into everyday work than in game. Also, gamification of experience can damage initial perception of given activity. For example, if we can earn some points through cleaning the neighborhood – we can make people think of such activity as about paid one, which eliminates proper engagement motivation – people need to understand initial activity importance without destroying non-financial reasoning.

This potential conflict with actual motivation can lead to the another one. Motivation and rewards can be also classified as extrinsic and intrinsic – first one is found outside, second one – inside the individual and his mindset. That is why it is commonly accepted – extrinsic motivators can help people to complete some boring and tedious activities. Intrinsic reward lies into the pleasure or understanding inner positive insights of game or activity itself. If you get discounts from the gaming – it is an extrinsic motivator. The main insight for the management and gamification practices lies in a simple tense – both motivators should be balanced. Sometimes, only intrinsic motivators can be applied – situation where some outer reward only ruins all the effort of game master.

But what happens, if consumer or employee can’t be motivated from the inside? Can anybody personally find inner motivation in a process of filling another blank or creating same structured document over and over? In such cases of tedious deeds only extrinsic reward can help to motivate actors.

Some firms and individuals make major mistake – if they see points, badges or leaderboards attached to some activity – they say “it’s gamified”. According to literature – it is not. What is essential – it is a presence of several game elements out of given list below:

* Dynamics;
* Mechanics;
* Components.

Further tables show decomposition of each element into pieces stated by Werbach (2012).

**Table 5-1.** Decomposition of Game Dynamics (based on Werbach, 2012)

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Name** | **Description** | **Example** |
| Constraints | Limitations, fixation of actual list of actions user is able to do, achieve or complete within the game | In McDonalds Monopoly you cannot set your own prizes, but you can do whatever you can to obtain card you need to complete the set and take reward |
| Emotions | Inner feelings generated by gameplay. Used to enhance engagement process and provide unique experience | One can feel better after finishing card set in McDonalds Monopoly, other can became upset after calculating initial expenses led to this collection |

**Table 5-2.** Decomposition of Game Dynamics (based on Werbach, 2012) (cont.)

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Name** | **Description** | **Example** |
| Narrative | Storyline development to attract player attention and guide it through play | Assume that any action towards particular product (reviews, likes, etc.) proceed your hero towards the story and each milestone reveals new part of developing plot |
| Progression | Growth and development of player’s results, skills | During the FreeRice you can see your contribution to the charity as it goes |
| Relationships | Social interactions inside the game or leading game progress towards reward | Writing a report for actual points is a social interaction. Teleflora Rewards |

Overall, dynamics are enforced to give player a bigger picture of what is going on in the game – setting rules of it. It is close to the concept of “invisible hand” – set the rules and everyone will behave you need without actual intervene.

Mechanics are smaller pieces of the game which is more similar to the business processes. From the resource gathering to the creation of final product, processes drive action ahead and generate engagement. Mechanics work the same way.

**Table 6-1.** Decomposition of Game Mechanics (based on Werbach, 2012)

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Name** | **Description** | **Example** |
| Challenges | Set of tasks which should be completed to proceed | Obtain three of something to get to the next level |

**Table 6-2.** Decomposition of Game Mechanics (based on Werbach, 2012) (cont.)

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Name** | **Description** | **Example** |
| Chance | Random element to enhance curiosity of a player. Must not be overwhelming to refrain unlucky ones to play | eBay auctions – you do not know, how much you will pay for good or get from the sale |
| Competition | Clashing with other individuals or groups to proceed through the game or win something | Objective Logistics in premium restaurants. Waiters are competing to get better tables, tips and holidays. Performance-based reward inside the gamified process |
| Cooperation | Sharing the goals to master particular aspect of the game | Conquering hunger together, FreeRice initiative |
| Feedback | Receiving information of player’s progress | Automatically sent informational messages about amount of points player have |
| Resource Acquisition | Process of gathering some valuable assets inside the game | Getting the points for additional repost or review in Teleflora Rewards |
| Rewards | Kind of payment for achieving or doing something inside the game | - |

**Table 6-3.** Decomposition of Game Mechanics (based on Werbach, 2012) (cont.)

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Name** | **Description** | **Example** |
| Transactions | Trading inside the game, with other players or artificial vendors | In-game trading points for actual reward |
| Turns | Type of participation, when players make their move one after another | - |
| Win states | Requirements, which, by completion can give one of the players the title of winner | “Person who receive most points for the calendar year will win the grand prize” |

It is not definitely clear, but mechanics are devoted to actual dynamics and support them directly. For example, rewards show the progression of a player as a result of achieving some milestone. And this interconnection serves as a helping hand for the marketeer or game designer to tie all the elements into one system. The last part of game elements are the components. They are more concrete and support both dynamics and\or mechanics.

**Table 7-1.** Decomposition of components (based on Werbach, 2012)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Name** | **Description** |
| Achievements | Some state of condition which can be obtained by the player. Means difficult task to accomplish |
| Avatars | Visual representation of the player or group of players |
| *Badges* | Visual representation of achievements or status |

**Table 7-2.** Decomposition of components (based on Werbach, 2012) (cont.)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Name** | **Description** |
| Boss fights | Hardest challenges, which can be considered as a milestone – culmination event |
| Collections | Set of some items to acquire |
| Combat | Confrontation or a battle between players or with environment |
| Content Unlocking | Progression embodiment as player reach some milestone or obtain an achievement – new ability or item appears |
| Gifting | Ability to send resource to other player |
| *Leaderboards* | Players’ relative progress visualization |
| Levels | Steps in the game plot |
| *Points* | Numerical progression representation |
| Quests | Scripted challenges |
| Social graphs | Representation of player’s interaction inside the game in the kind of network |
| Teams | Players groups working to achieve common goal |
| Virtual goods | Game assets |

Examples for the table above was abolished due to obviousness and enormous amount of possible implications. In italics are three most used components, which are usually imposed as gamification itself? For instance, if some activity has leaderboards or points, it definitely called a gamification by some unaware person. But Werbach framework has its great value for the fact that gamified experience should include some of three elements inside – components, mechanics and dynamics. BPL (Badges, Points, Leaderboards) are only the components, they must be treated as a contributor to the mechanics, but not used solely without connection or proper game system.

 This whole logic differentiates sales promotions, and other enhanced events from actual gamification. Simply, to gamify, subject must incorporate story, actual game mechanics and moreover, some game logic and elements into an event or activity. It is utmost importance for such a topic. Current state of Werbach’s framework is lacking of some interconnections between elements. We see only actual parts of the system, and the connection is explicitly mentioned by him even if For the Win (2012), but it was not incorporated to establish clear ties between particular components, mechanics and dynamics.

On the other hand, there is a major spin-off from scientific gamification development. This situation refers to the conflict in Chess in the middle of 90s – both of confronting federations had their own World Champion. From the non-scientific or better be called practical side of gamification there is a Yu-Kai Chou, practical researcher and gamification popularizer since the beginning of 2000s. His thoughts, examples and frameworks are valuable additions to the currents state of arts and overall understanding of the gamification development.

## **Non-Scientific Development of Gamification**

According to Yu-Kai Chou (2003), gamification is a technique, when some non-game related activities gather game-related mechanics and incorporate them inside to create “Human-Forced Design”. Chou states that almost any productive activity can be made more fun and interesting for human being than “Function-Forced Design”. Here lies one major point, games are trying to reach some kind of inner hero inside of any human – complete important objectives, achieve a status, save somebody, improve some characteristics of their own (or his or her avatar – person embodiment on a turf of the game) and so on. The main point here is that people are engaged to play games and this exposure stays with them as they are interested in process of the game (Chou, 2012).

This topic became widespread for last decade (Deterding, 2011; Huotari & Hamari, 2012; Werbach, 2014; Taylor, 2009 etc.) and declassified as well. The first point is that gamification activities are not just in applying new game-like system in non-game activities, gamified experience should be emphasized through Core Drivers. According to Chou (2014) drivers are parts of whole gamification framework which are making the whole system to be perceived as a game by not only doing the same thing that game results in (badges, points or leaderboards), but by the way how game works and why people play games actually.



**Fig. 5**. Octalysis Framework

Chou developed framework shown in figure 1 to make all the Core Drivers gathered and explained as a part of gamified experience and gamification implemented as an adjustment of production process.

**Table 8-1.** Core Drivers of Octalysis (based on Chou, 2013-2017)

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Driver Name** | **Description** | **Examples** |
| Epic Meaning & Calling | Establishing the sense of gameplay. Player beliefs that he doing something for greater good or valuable. That he was “chosen” to do something important | FreeRice, TOM’s Shoes. People know that by playing they really help someone poor |

**Table 8-2.** Core Drivers of Octalysis (based on Chou, 2013-2017) (cont.)

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Driver Name** | **Description** | **Examples** |
| Development & Accomplishment | Making progress through a challenge and succeeding in reaching some goals. | OmniCare leaderboards, Objective logistics in restaurants |
| Empowerment of Creativity & Feedback | Engaging creativity within gaming community. People need space for creativity and to become evaluated on this basis by likes, comments and reviews | Unlocking new milestone to obtain new functionality, community networking features |
| Ownership & Possession | Feeling that you really possess something somewhat real enhances engaging and addicting player | McDonalds Monopoly, IKEA business model |
| Social Influence & Relatedness | Mentorship, companionship, other interactions with players | Teleflora Rewards system, Groupon |
| Scarcity & Impatience | Understanding that in-game resources are not infinite and ability make pressure towards closing character of achievement | eBay auctions, Krave microsite |
| Unpredictability & Curiosity | Random factor which makes game more interesting due to some unknown characteristic of a game element such as reward, obstacles, etc. | Teleflora Rewards grants you with random reward after obtaining certain amount of points (percentage or sum of discount, limited offering, free flower). Characteristics of actual reward are unknown to the customer before he will obtain it |
| Loss & Avoidance | Avoiding happening of some negative event. In cases of retention – if you leave the game, everything you have done becomes pointless | Delivery Club countdown timers, Groupon “limited” opportunities |

Two models – Werbach’s and Chou’s are referring to the different aspects. Werbach has more material approach and decomposing gamified experience by pieces of skeleton, Chou is kind of organizing the soul of gamified experience – he emphasizes on psychological aspects and ability to maintain particular feelings of participants. It is valuable to have two almost opposite but constructive approaches, but it messes everything when it comes to the generalization and understanding of gamification. Both frameworks are doing great job in explaining any gamified activity into pieces and actual framework elements, thou they can be used as practical tool for managers. But, Chou’s framework is lacking of strict pattern and clear logic of what element belongs to which Core Driver clearly. For instance, some elements like Mentorship, Avatar, Badges, Torture Breaks, Build from scratch, Crowning, Aura Effect and many others (almost a half of elements) can be redistributed to other Core Drivers and parts of Octalysis (Left vs. Right Brain and White vs. Black Hat), which is inappropriate for a decent framework, which should be stable and applicable for most of cases with same pattern from researcher. In his defense it must be stated that such psychological issues can be translated differently and carry other meaning to be implied in different Core Driver easily – it is a task of highest difficulty to distribute all elements to just one actual Driver surely. That is why this framework and most of Chou’s work are difficult to promote and defend within scientific community – they are based mostly on undefended empirical of Chou lie mostly on his gut feelings towards particular element of gamification.

Main reason, why this so imperfect model of Chou is used in academic paper is that it reveals definitely valuable pieces missing in Werbach’s articles and framework. All these additions can be solved by generating new gamification model.

Achievements, points and badges have a lot of common issues – they all show player’s progress through implication of feedback and serve as content unlocking item to get some rewards. Some of them are has popularity among collectors and has status of a game resource. Achieving something or even certain amount of points will actually make player win in some games. Some achievements are challenges itself. So, this block is used everywhere.

In comparison, both models have some missing parts and controversies. Author founds points below to be enhancing Werbach’s interpretation from Chou’s experience and Octalysis:

* Scarcity of resources is one of the motivators which boosts player’s desire to achieve it in exchange for progress of actual rewards;
* Possession and private equity issues are also one anchors to keep player at the game as well as real life – to build emotions towards assets and caring about;
* Creativity invites gamers to create own content, spend more time inside gaming sphere and enhance social attention to the topic;
* Epic individualization will help to realize some dreams of players’ in virtual reality and obtain new experience. Fiction;
* Some of the existing dynamics, mechanics and components can obtain additional or even new meaning:
	+ Chance and randomness aspect is shown as a tool to make game played again which is called replay ability – to make player’s experience different each time he starts;
	+ Transactions in Werbach’s opinion are only concerning in-game assets. But, Chou has one of the most valuable insight – mentoring is the transaction, exchange of experience and opinion, which also increases value of playing the game;
	+ Loss aversion comes from Nobel prized paper of Kahneman and Tversky – people tend to strive to have less losses, thus they do not want to lose even virtual asses on which acquiring players spent lots of time and efforts and due to possession issues.

Research findings on a topic of loyalty programs developments, revealed in table 4, can be clearly matched with gamification frameworks development in the second chapter. Model of tiers in the loyalty program is similar to the levels of the game, usage of non-financial benefits as a position of player in leaderboards, empowerment in game narration and overall attachment to game situation will show resemblance to the work of Hofman-Kohlmeyer (2016) and Ganesh (2013). Elements as titles can be also applied in the same way to increase non-financial benefits of a program. Element of chance and freedom of player’s actions choice are also show connection between gamification parts which can be used and recent research on a topic of loyalty programs.

## **Gamification in Practice. How to Detect Gamification?**

After previously executed theoretical analysis, only two tasks left unaccomplished – how presence of gamification can be defined and what are the common contemporary practice in use of gamification for loyalty programs enhancement. For further use in empirical research, two levels of gamification presence will be defined: low (no) use of gamification and high use of Gamification. Relying on about a dozen of examples author connects factors and identifications to both levels. To find those examples, it is important to recap gamification definition: “The use of game elements and game-design techniques in non-game contexts” (Werbach, 2012). But recalling to the actual game elements and technics, we can see it widely used solely. Points, and rarely badges are used in almost any loyalty program despite of industry, market and product differentiation. So, how to define real use of gamification? Author used several foreign examples of gamification and aggregated main methods and tools used in such programs.

**Table 9-1.** Foreign examples of gamification use in loyalty or promotion purposes

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Company, Program** | **Industry** | **Program Description** | **Gamification elements used** |
| Nike, Nike+ Fuel | Apparel | Consumers use branded application with combination of several Nike gadgets to track their progress. Achieved results are connected with virtual rewards, progress is visualized with player’s avatar. At some period of time players could “run” from zombies by running in real life. | Points, Badges, Leaderboards, Avatars, Narrative, Progress. |
| Magnum, Pleasure Hunt | FMCG | Before the launch of new product, Magnum, ice cream producer, launched browser-based game in adventure genre. Game consisted with unique scenarios. After completing each scenario, player got some “bon bons” and reached position in leaderboards. Then, on a company website player can exchange bon bons for some bars of new ice cream | Points, Leaderboards, Narrative, Exchange[[3]](#footnote-3). |

**Table 9-2.** Foreign examples of gamification use in loyalty or promotion purposes (cont.)

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Company, Program** | **Industry** | **Program Description** | **Gamification elements used** |
| Starbucks, My Reward | Retail \ Restaurants | Each time, registered consumer purchase something at Starbucks, he is rewarded with “stars”. More “stars” consumer collect, more benefits he can get in the future, like additional cup of coffee or even customized birthday gift. Also, this system had three levels, depending on amount of “stars” collected. | Collections, Progress, Exchange, Personalization. |
| McDonald’s, Monopoly | Restaurants | Since 1987, McDonalds issues cards with some of their served products for just one month a year, which can be exchanged as a collection on a certain prize. Some cards can be exchanged for immediate prizes – beverages, small burgers, etc. Some consumers are trading or exchanging cards with each other, even if there is no predetermined online platform and all the event goes offline | Collections, Transactions, Social Collaboration, Exchange, Narrative, Chance. |
| Heineken, Star Player Game | FMCG | Being the main sponsor of UEFA Champions League, Heineken launched an event. While Heineken application user watched the football match, he could answer some questions to guess the outcome of actual in-game situation. By answering correctly, user got the points and able to compete with other players around the world | Points, Leaderboards, Competition, Chance.  |

Table above describes such examples shortly in program mechanics and gamification characteristics used. Comparison analysis easily shows main common features between them.

Mentioned above examples of gamification in loyalty programs or promotion campaigns show actual common features. Most of them has some story or background behind the gameplay, which reflected in table 9 as “Narrative” element, which is really important to describe the game and tie players to the gameplay on a something more than rational trade-off between resources spent and rewards granted. In every case there was some kind of virtual currency or assets, which could be accumulated, collected and exchanged for benefits. All these cases included some form of challenge between players or social collaboration, which creates additional value to the player in a journey to satisfy other kind of needs.

On the other hand, same analysis should have been done on Russian retail companies with loyalty programs. But first screening (screening results are in Appendix 6) show that only one retailer from a premium segment actually performs gamification – Азбука Вкуса. It does not only use typical points and membership cards with attached discounts but also tries to build a narrative inside the phone application: earn achievement, complete tasks and achieve rewards (also some expensive ones, like participation in luxury vine degustation event).

So, it can be definitely stated that loyalty programs in Russian retailers are just plain sales promotions without complex use of gamification elements and mechanics.

For the purposes of this research, loyalty programs with low use of gamification can be distinguished from high use of gamification programs. Low use of gamification is devoted to the presence of one or two gamification elements (mostly components) without a use of narration or any form of player collaboration \ competition. There is no creating of a common context for the game itself. High use of gamification is devoted to the presence of systemized gamification elements with embedded forms of storytelling, competition between players and other dynamics or mechanics.

Most widely used form of loyalty program in retail sector worldwide (collecting points or achieving discounts by having a loyalty card) can be marked as low use of gamification, due to fact that having only points and some exchange mechanisms does not make this experience gamified. Only several elements are present, but no story is behind, no competition or no progress applied.

Gamification is a management technique of applying game-design principles and game elements to some non-game contexts. In perspective of gamification usage in loyalty programs for retail firms, there is a great field for surveyation and matching final configuration, depending on various factors. Due to the fact that gamified elements are present in most of loyalty programs (points, levels, progression etc.), author states creating a common context and systematization of gamified elements used as crucial distinguishing differences between the actual gamification use and current state of sales promotion development.

# Survey Design and Results

##  **First Test Run of Survey and Changes Made**

According to the presented model of loyalty program efficiency, the most viable approach of assessing its performance is to ask customers about their perception of loyalty program due to inability to perform real loyalty program and monitor its efficiency through financial and other quantitative data.

Due to that fact, author introduce questionnaire of two fantasy loyalty programs for famous Russian retailer “Перекресток”. Choice of model retailer is determined due to inability to distinguish issue of loyalty program efficiency and its dependence of client segmentation. In this case retailer belongs to the middle price-to-quality ratio. Respondents were chosen randomly out of homogeneous group of people aged from 20 to 26 from Saint-Petersburg, majority of them are students or workers on first full-time job. Respondents were distributed into two groups, one of them were introduced to the non-gamified loyalty discount program and sales promotion events, other one was introduced to gamified program. Due to the assuring that only difference in two programs is the gamification – gamified program provides same financial value as the program for the first group.

Questions from Q1 to Q16 are aiming to assess customer’s perception of loyalty programs, Q17-Q21 asking demographical and preferences over retail chains. All respondents were asked to the same questions. First sixteen questions are measured on Likert scale from 1 to 7, when 1 represents strong disagreement and 7 – strong agreement with statement incorporated in question. Table below consists of main cores of data gathering – “What was asked?” and “What is the purpose?”. In terms of the purpose is meant clear connection between question asked and certain measure of loyalty program efficiency to show questions value and common sense in application to the loyalty programs efficiency estimation. All first 15 questions are starting from “Do you agree with the statement: “X”?”, sixteenth is referring to the readiness to participate in loyalty program.

**Table 10-1.** Statements in question asked and connection with indicators

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **#** | **Statement in Russian** | **Statement in English** | **Indicator** |
| Q1 | Мне интересны условия данной акции | I found terms of this program interesting | Customer’s attraction |

**Table 10-2.** Statements in question asked and connection with indicators (cont.)

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **#** | **Statement in Russian** | **Statement in English** | **Indicator** |
| Q2 | Я бы хотел поучаствовать в данной акции | I would want to participate in this program | Customer involvement |
| Q3 | Будучи участником программы, я стал бы чаще осуществлять покупки в сети «Перекресток» | If I was a participant, I’d make purchases in “Перекресток” more frequently | Purchase frequency |
| Q4 | Я готов покупать товары дополнительно чтобы увеличить свой чек до указанных в акции сумм | I am ready to buy additional goods to increase the tip up to the sums mentioned in terms of participation | Decreased price elasticity |
| Q5 | Я готов рекомендовать своим друзьям, коллегам, знакомым, участвовать в данной акции | I am ready to recommend participation in this program to my relatives, friends, colleagues | Customer advocacy |
| Q6 | Я вижу определенную ценность в своем участии в данной акции | I see actual value in my participation | Perceived value of purchase |
| Q7 | Участие в данной программе представляет для меня интерес | I am interested in participation | Customer’s attraction |
| Q8 | Я бы хотел осуществить покупку в «Перекрестке» во время данной акции | I would buy something in “Перекресток” during the given time period of program realization | Purchase rate |
| Q9 | Я бы хотел продолжать осуществлять покупки в «Перекрестке» после проведения данной акции | I would continue buy in “Перекресток” after ceasing the program | Extended relationships length |

**Table 10-3.** Statements in question asked and connection with indicators (cont.)

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **#** | **Statement in Russian** | **Statement in English** | **Indicator** |
| Q10 | Представленная акция поможет мне выбрать перекресток в следующий раз, когда я буду выбирать розничную сеть для покупок | This program makes me to choose “Перекресток” over other retailers | Customer’s attraction |
| Q11 | Представленная акция повышает положение бренда «Перекресток» в моих глазах | This program is increasing my personal brand perception of “Перекресток” | Brand value |
| Q12 | Я буду участвовать в данной акции, так как она представляет ценность лично для меня | I will participate, because it makes actual value for me personally | Perceived purchase value |
| Q13 | Меня привлекает данная акция | This program is attractive for me | Customer’s attraction |
| Q14 | Участие в данной акции делает меня более вовлеченным в процесс совершения покупок | Participation in this program makes me involve more in process of purchasing something | Purchasing process involvement |
| Q15 | Участие в данной акции приносит мне чувство удовлетворения | Participation in this program satisfies me | Customer satisfaction |
| Q16 | Оцените Вашу готовность зарегистрироваться в программе лояльности сети «Перекресток» | Evaluate your readiness of becoming a participant of “Перекресток” loyalty program | - |

Below that table there are results of first several days of conducting the survey, and changes are quite obvious, results are not similar. Total number of respondents is 10 for gamification group and 15 for no gamification group.

**Table 11.** Average results of survey

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **#** | **With Gamification** | **W/o Gamification** |
| Q1 | 5,6 | 4,93 |
| Q2 | 5,5 | 4,33 |
| Q3 | 5,4 | 4,67 |
| Q4 | 5,5 | 4,47 |
| Q5 | 6 | 4,33 |
| Q6 | 5,4 | 4,33 |
| Q7 | 5,2 | 4,53 |
| Q8 | 5 | 4,60 |
| Q9 | 5 | 4,53 |
| Q10 | 4,8 | 4,33 |
| Q11 | 4,9 | 4,40 |
| Q12 | 5,3 | 4,33 |
| Q13 | 4,7 | 4,13 |
| Q14 | 5,5 | 4,13 |
| Q15 | 5,4 | 4,33 |

To obtain more indicator-related results, questions were distributed to the characteristics from table 10. The average results for each characteristic is shown in table 11.

**Table 12.** Results of survey by category

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Score category** | **With Gamification** | **W/o Gamification** | **Difference** |
| Attraction | 5,075 | 4,483 | 0,592 |
| Involvement | 5,500 | 4,233 | 1,267 |
| Frequency | 5,200 | 4,633 | 0,567 |
| Elasticity | 5,400 | 4,667 | 0,733 |
| Advocacy | 6,000 | 4,333 | 1,667 |
| Relationships | 5,000 | 4,533 | 0,467 |
| BV perception | 4,900 | 4,400 | 0,500 |
| Satisfaction | 5,400 | 4,333 | 1,067 |
| Perceived value | 5,350 | 4,333 | 1,017 |

As it is seen, trial survey shows overall prevailing of gamified program over non-gamified one. But, still, this test survey reveals just preliminary results due to high amount of its limitations:

* Sample used in this survey was homogeneous and show overall perception only in restricted age group from 20 to 26 years, students or working on first job with low-middle income;
* Only one gamification configuration is tested;
* Overall amount of rewards is restricted and not connected to the actual respondent purchase volume;
* Questions used show author’s perception of connection between characteristics of program’s perception and asked items formulations.

Therefore, author developed new questionnaire for more valid and complex survey, including more diverse sample and more flexible structure with actual connection to the proven marketing scales.

Responses of test run lead to several outcomes: gamification is perceived as a tool to attract younger people and may not be operating same for other age group, which is a drawback in terms of results validity. Other opinion from respondents (they could reach author by mail) was that connecting game to the cars will definitely attract some portion of potential customers. Therefore, multiple choice question about game setting was added to the final test

Additionally, some gamification elements will be applied in the same way for configurations 4-6: leaderboards, storytelling, empowerment, avatar, progress tracking, etc. As well as whole test design changed, questions were modified also. Appendix 1 shows updated set of questions to be used in the second questionnaire run. Also, range of scores will be downsized to 5. Another additional question is connected with affiliation to the marketing science and will refrain marketers from taking this questionnaire to achieve fair results.

##  **Second Run of Survey**

In this part author justifies methodology connected with conducted survey, provides hypothesis formulated and further tested on a statistical basis.

Test run of the survey, previously conducted had a lot of drawbacks, which can be stated blandly:

* Questions asked to the respondents had no direct connection to previously done literature review and concepts used in thesis;
* Clustering of questions was done on an intuition basis and was not connected to the papers issued previously;
* Sample size was comparatively small (not more than 40 items for both groups);
* No screening done beforehand by any characteristic.

These mistakes resulted in very obvious, invalid and unreliable results which cannot be applied as a model or any practical implication or justification of gamification promotion to the use in loyalty programs. But, test run provided fuel for additional questions inclusion and survey redesigning.

The basis of the questionnaire, questions itself were modified according to several marketing scales proved their efficiency. These scales are used for purpose of loyalty programs testing and can be applied to any industry or loyalty program with minor modifications. Bridson (2008), Mimouni-Chaabane and Volle (2010), O’Cass (2001) – this theoretical basis helped author to compile new questionnaire model which estimates five aspects, related to customer’s perception of loyalty programs: Advocacy, Commitment, Involvement, Entertainment and Satisfaction. The choice became clear after initial literature review. According to general survey design, all participants are set into fictional environment, when they can answer questions only relying on personal experience and information provided (terms of fictional loyalty program). Customer satisfaction, as it was mentioned earlier, has direct connection to building up customer loyalty according to the various researchers. Involvement and Entertainment aspects contributes to two pillars – relationship length (more you are involved, more you will be with something) and gamification itself, as it is stated in second chapter, gamified activities involve actors better and trying to entertain them. As an example, company can introduce gamification for reports preparation – to increase employees’ efficiency and make them feel better during routine activities. Advocacy and Commitment are related to mentioned factors of loyalty program effectiveness.

This questions composition is made according several assumptions. First of them relies in the fact, that due to the chosen survey design, researcher cannot assess gamification influence on purchase loyalty through customer perception. Such test would have required real implementation of gamified loyalty program, or a long-run survey with fixed respondents, reflecting on a topic of their purchase behavior change according to provided loyalty programs.

Number of questions in each aspect was limited to four due to the fact that actual parametric tests can be used only in case if data consists of Likert-type scales, if it has only Likert-type items – non-parametric test must be in use to test hypothesis. That assumption made the maximum amount of questions in questionnaire to 20. Supportive questions were used to make first level screening of respondents. To subtract biased respondents, was introduced additional question for marketing occupation. If respondent somehow was related to the marketing (worked or studied in this field of management), his response was taken off the hypothesis testing, but saved for possible analysis. Other subtraction was made by the question of being a customer of “Перекресток” or a participant of this retailer’s loyalty program in real life. To support small analysis provided in part 2.3., final questions was introduced as: “Do you consider this loyalty program to be gamified?”. Respond to this question will show, how people recognize and detect gamification and is it really in line with author’s case analysis.

Other demographic or lifestyle questions, related to gender , occupation, age and salary can be used for pivoting survey results and mining another piece of recommendations. Questionnaire was distributed to potential respondents through private messages with some restrictions: no respondent can take both types of questionnaire (cannot be included in both groups) due to the issue of probably biased results in this case; due to the limited time resource, sample became homogeneous – average respondent is 22 years old, student or working on first job, earning in average 34 thousand rubles, frequent buyer in “Перекресток” and a member of this retailer’s loyalty program.

After excluding respondents, subtracted through two screening questions and excluding outliers (which were not found according to IQR criteria), 42 responses left for low gamified loyalty program and 38 responses for highly gamified one, in total exceeding test run more that in triple, which will increase reliability of significance testing in mean comparison and possible implication for questionnaire model in other situations, locations, markets, etc.

From this part main question of questionnaire consistency lies in internal validity of provided questions and their grouping. Do they in fact test the same aspect of consumer perception or not. For this purpose, internal validity test based on Cronbach’s alpha was conducted for each group and for all questions inside each aspect of customer perception.

The same test was taken by all the researchers named above (Bridson, O’Cass, Volle) and its core is described in classic article of Nunnally J (1967), which was lately reissued in collaboration with Bernstein I in 1994. Internal validity test based on Cronbach’s alpha is stated as the most necessary to be conducted. According to “Psychometric theory”, the optimal level which distinguish internally valid or invalid clusters lies near 0,7. The more Cronbach’s alpha achieved through the test, more consistent results are. Next tests conducted through SPSS program and show internal validity of each cluster and possible enhancements, which can be made by excluding Likert-type items from group. Full results will be embedded into appendices further. Table below shows main results of internal validity tests.

**Table 13.** Results of internal validity testing[[4]](#footnote-4)

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Category** | **Cronbach’s Alpha L** | **Cronbach’s Alpha H** | **Items to exclude L** | **Items to exclude H** |
| Advocacy | 0,727 | 0,693 | None | A4 (+ 0,036) |
| Commitment | 0,735 | 0,693 | C3 (+ 0,018) | None |
| Involvement | 0,652 | 0,850 | None | None |
| Entertainment | 0,666 | 0,664 | E2 (+ 0,167) | None |
| Satisfaction | 0,842 | 0,716 | S4 (+ 0,008) | S1 (+ 0,006) |

Overall conclusion is that model provided is internally valid and consistent, as well as all Scales are valid according to the recommendations in “Psychometric theory” and varies from “satisfactory” to “good”. Additional comments must be addressed to the possible exclusions from scales. All five exclusions, which will definitely increase internal validity from relatively small to tremendous levels will dramatically decrease corrected item total correlation, therefore weaken connections between items inside the scale. Trade-off of this kind is found unacceptable by the author.

Provided internal validity makes free road to formulating and testing hypotheses about consumer perception of loyalty programs. Consequently, number of hypotheses is equal to the amount of scales – five.

H1: “Gamification has a positive influence on a consumer perception in terms of his ability to advocate participation in loyalty program or \ and retailer”;

H2: “Gamification has a positive influence on a consumer perception in terms of his commitment to loyalty program or \ and retailer”;

H3: “Gamification has a positive influence on a consumer perception in terms of his involvement into loyalty program participation”;

H4: “Gamification has a positive influence on a consumer perception from entertainment aspect of loyalty program participation”;

H5: “Gamification has a positive influence on a consumer perception of his satisfaction from loyalty program participation”;

All hypotheses were tested with statistical tool of independent two-sample t-test, computed in SPSS. If the means of Likert-type scales, which can be used in parametrical testing will not be significantly different, Hn will not be accepted, or if results of highly gamified program will be significantly lower than for low gamified one.

Main results of hypotheses testing are provided in the table below.

**Table 14.** Hypotheses testing[[5]](#footnote-5)

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Hypothesis** | **Scale Mean** | **Scale Std. dev.** | **P-value for equal variances** | **P-value for equal means** |
| H1 | 1,72 \ 1,78 | 0,47 \ 0,42 | 0,184 | 0,533 |
| H2 | 1,95 \ 2,07 | 0,44 \ 0,42 | 0,368 | 0,195 |
| H3 | 2,17 \ 2,63 | 0,35 \ 0,66 | 0,000 | 0,000 |
| H4 | 2,19 \ 2,09 | 0,45 \ 0,42 | 0,083 | 0,298 |
| H5 | 2,76 \ 3,19 | 0,47 \ 0,49 | 0,853 | 0,000 |

Hypothesis testing shows actually sudden results, which were unexpected by author. First two hypotheses are rejected on a 5% level of significance, even if means show slight prevail of results in gamified loyalty program. Hypotheses three and five were not rejected according to the zero p-value, in case of H3, independent t-test was conducted without assumption of equal variances. Hypothesis four, which consists influence on entertainment, was rejected with advantage of low gamified loyalty program, which is surprisingly different from author’s suggestion and common sense.

Overall, results of hypotheses testing can be called “Mixed”. It is proven, that gamification significantly influences consumer’s involvement and satisfaction, insignificantly increases consumer’s commitment and advocacy and decreases entertainment.

##  **Limitations and Research Perspective**

Even if, presence of gamification in the second group loyalty program was proven by short analysis, whole gamification concept is highly complex. Different incarnations of elements, number of elements used and combinations of their correlation are not predetermined and may vary from company to company, market to market, country to country – therefore, testing one spherical gamification programs loses actual ability to provide more detailed recommendations for practitioners in retail (Chou, 2015). That is why current study limits itself in terms of possible wide range of solutions.

Another limitation lies in sample design. As it is stated before, respondents’ composition is quite homogeneous, which limits recommendations for gamification influence to the same potential consumers with same traits as it was in second run. More heterogeneous sample will definitely add validity to the questionnaire model and reliability for all the results. Thus, overall increase of external validity can be achieved through taking same test under condition of heterogeneous sample.

Next limitation also lies in sample design. Due to questionnaire platform, which does not allow to include variables (i.e. average purchase amount), respondents’ answers are affected by fixed amount of maximum financial reward, which in any case should be equal to hold ceteris paribus principle. In other instance, gamification provides supplemental psychological rewards, which are not in line with financial ones. This assumption goes in line with Ganesh (2013) and Hofman-Kohlmeyer (2016) studies about mixture and synergy of financial and non-financial rewards.

Last limitation of the design, is to take into consideration only one layout of gamified program and one low-gamified, which can be solved with using different gamification mechanics. Features included in possible six configurations are presented in table 15.

**Table 15.** Loyalty programs configurations

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **№** | **Configuration brief** |
| **1** | No gamification applied, customer gets points for purchase, no tier system applied, points can be spent in various ways |
| **2** | No gamification applied, customer gets stickers, which can be exchanged for known rewards |
| **3** | No gamification applied, customer gets stickers, which can be exchanged for random valuable reward with known value |
| **4** | Gamification elements applied, no tier system, customer gets points for purchase and spent points in various ways |
| **5** | Gamification elements applied, tier system applied, customer gets points for purchase and exchange for known rewards |
| **6** | Gamification elements applied, tier system applied, customer gets points for purchase and can spent points for random reward with known value |

More detailed study of international examples of gamification in loyalty programs could’ve improve level of details in separation of two types of programs – highly and low gamified. But in overall, due to absence of such distinguish factors in academic literature, such theoretical contribution is promising to make further studies of gamification subject easier.

Cross-sectional character of data provided after survey is less informative than possible panel-data based research, which will help to explain development of gamification effect over the time. That addition will help practitioners to invent actual strategy alternatives with proper plan and timing for loyalty programs realization and development (Bridson, 2008).

Last limitation lies in fact that “Перекресток” cannot represent overall retail segment, and, definitely, premium or low segmented retailer customers may behave differently and perceive in other way.

## **Discussion and Findings**

The aim of present study was to examine actual influence of gamification on a perception of loyalty program in retail sector of economics. As hypothesized (H3 and H5), highly gamified loyalty program shows significantly higher estimations of consumer perception in terms of involvement and satisfaction. This arc is supporting findings of Poondej (2016), Looyestyn et al. (2017), Cahyani (2015), Brunello (2013), Myhre (2015) and many others. While rejected hypothesis of H4 is controverting with almost any researcher mentioned in previous sentence. Why could this result appear? Author suggest different angles of view: first of all, actions of player in highly gamified program were restricted to the same as for non-gamified. Only the shell and rewards differ. Secondly, relation to the setting of the game (cars) could play the role, which can be eliminated by subtracting non-indifferent respondents to a particular setting from data for analysis. Thirdly, most of researches are being done in western and European countries, which has different mentality than Russians. It goes in line with Hofstede cultural dimensions. And indulgence is a level of average ability of people to have fun. As you can see on a figure below, Russia is less indulgent that three other countries, where similar researches of consumer perception were made (authors above).



**Fig. 6.** Dimensions of cultural distance by Hofstede[[6]](#footnote-6)

The same explanation is possible for H1 and H2 rejected, but, overall, even if results are insignificant, they are quite in line with gamification logic described in the second chapter. Percent of respondents answered about gamified character of loyalty program presented (11,9% for non-gamified versus 92% for gamified) show that given separation of loyalty programs in terms of certain degree of gamification in use is correct and lines with perception of society.

# Conclusion

Author’s research aim was to explore and prove gamification influence on perception of loyalty programs. Consequently, such research question led to the decomposition into several research objectives.

Decomposition of gamification on certain elements, mentioned in Werbach’s and Chou’s frameworks makes a clear understanding that loyalty programs are in need with gamification, because it can provide some effective practices as a balance between financial and non-financial benefits, tier system, tweak reward timing and much more simultaneously increasing consumer’s engagement, involvement and overall satisfaction of loyalty program. Last addition is viable in retail sector, due to the fact that retail loyalty programs are usually same across the world and even segments inside the market and potential customer does not wait any significant bargain in participation in new custom loyalty program, moreover to gain some non-financial benefits. Gamification of loyalty program can breathe life into retail sector techniques of customer retention and consumer base development.

Analysis of frequently mentioned examples of gamification in loyalty programs helped author to definitely distinguish gamified from non or low gamified objects. They should have complete system of gamification elements on different levels, present Narration and \ or Competition \ Collaboration between players to make the experience like a game for players and to obtain possible characteristics of gamification and somehow enhance certain activity.

Two surveys were conducted to prove the significance of gamification influence on loyalty programs perception. Latest one had tested internal validity and was compiled from three marketing scales, establishing connection between scales and loyalty program efficiency. But tests external validity is not huge. Due to the limitations of sample, survey design, platforms used for survey, survey lost ability to have wider range of supported practical recommendations. Still, it derived some of them, stated below. Gamification has significant positive influence on involvement (engagement) and satisfaction. Other hypotheses were rejected as far as there is no significant proof of opposite side.

Enhancing external validity and providing detailed recommendations even about actual content of gamified program is the priority for the author.

Table below shows the short comparison of stated tasks and the competition status as research is at current competition stage.

**Table 16.** Objective - Accomplishment comparison

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Research objective** | **Competition description** |
| Explore contemporary approaches to the loyalty programs and their efficiency | Loyalty programs topic discussed. Main types and instruments mentioned. Latest research progression on a topic of loyalty programs provided |
| Define gamification and distinguish gamified objects from not or low gamified | According to the brief analysis of foreign gamification examples and in comparison, with plain sales-promotion based loyalty programs, low and highly (or just “gamified”) gamified loyalty programs distinguished (narrative, common context, complex, not single usage of game mechanics and other elements) |
| Combine current cutting edge theoretical and practical frameworks of gamification | Yu-Kai Chou and K.Werbach visions of gamification are discussed and compared, stating lacking points on each side. Connection between loyalty programs development and possible use of gamification established. |
| Compare application of loyalty programs and gamification in an international and Russian practice | Various examples of gamified foreign loyalty programs are compared to the actual scarcity of loyalty programs in Russian retail market. Findings, based on the found examples helped to distinguish gamified loyalty programs |
| Conduct a survey to collect primary data on topic of loyalty program perception | Two surveys were conducted to reach the research aim. Progression of surveys characteristics is explained in chapter three, as the connection between questions asked and actual aspects of customer perception |
| Analyze and process the data, gathered from survey | Data analysis was completed using SPSS program. Hypotheses testing was supported with descriptive statistics and internal validity testing |
| Formalize conclusions and possible recommendations for practice in management | Overall comprehension of the results can be found in Discussion and Conclusion sections |

Theoretical significance of present research lies in several discoveries:

* There are certain indicators of loyalty programs efficiency related to each dimension of loyalty, but even if author suggest theoretical model of loyalty programs efficiency, it is arguable, which indicator can be related to what type of loyalty or both at the same time;
* Two ways of gamification development are compared, valuable additions and missing points are marked by author and suggested to be incorporated into scientific approach. Still, actual proof of these additions significance must be found on practice;
* Analysis of gamification foreign examples helped to define actual difference between less and more gamified (or just gamified) loyalty programs as well as between custom loyalty programs in retail and gamified one;
* Presented a model of disintegrated consumer perception with supported connections to actual factors of loyalty programs effectiveness.
* Possible connection suggested between gamification performance and cultural distance.

Practical significance of present research lies in several discoveries:

* Latest development in loyalty programs efficiency topic has connections with gamification practices and frameworks. Particular elements and core attributes of gamification can turn more effective practices of loyalty programs in life;
* Gamification is justified as a “game changer” in retail sector loyalty programs and proven significance for consumer’s engagement and satisfaction show possibility of enhancing value of such program to the customer, consequently, enhancing loyalty program effectiveness indicators;
* As well as partial positive influence of gamification on attitudinal loyalty is proven in this research, companies can enhance the effect by adding some gamification elements to boost up social activity like Teleflora in Rewards program, or Foursquare.

Possible recommendations for business practices, which comes from current paper results:

* Use gamification in configuration custom loyalty programs for retail sector companies and brands as it improves attitude of the consumers and customers towards the retailer brand;
* Try to engage customers more and involve them with unusual narrative, significant bonuses for more diligent participation;
* Status elements also more attractive for the customer due to being more used to sales promotions and discounts;
* Using same sales promotion with same cost will have lesser effect on customer perception than with gamification elements applied on a high level of concentration;
* According to the complex outcomes of gamification experience analysis and survey, the easiest method to enhance involvement and overall commitment is to add narrative in loyalty program (author’s suggestion mainly)
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# Appendices

## **Appendix 1. Questions table with justification for the second survey run**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Question** | **Russian equivalent** | **Category** | **Modified from** |
| I will try to convince friends, family and co-workers to participate in this loyalty program | Я постараюсь убедить своих друзей, коллег, знакомых участвовать в подобной программе | Word of Mouth (customer advocacy). Degree to which customer is willing to spread information about program and related issues. | Bridson et. al (2008) |
| I would spread positive opinion about this program to other people | Я стал бы делиться с другими людьми своим позитивным мнением о данной программе |
| I would recommend to participate in this program to someone who seeks my advice | Я бы порекомендовал участвовать в данной программе сети «Перекресток» всем, кто спросит у меня совета |
| I encourage others to do participate in this program | Я бы подтолкнул других людей к участию в данной программе |
| Even if this retailer was more difficult to reach, I would still keep buying from it because of participation in this program | Даже если «Перекресток» будет менее досягаем, чем другие розничные сети, я все равно бы продолжил покупать в нем из-за участия в данной программе | Customer commitmentA level of customer contribution to the “host” of loyalty program | Bridson et. al (2008) |
| Even if another retailer had a sale, I would still buy from this retailer, while participating in this program | Если другая розничная сеть организует распродажу, я все равно буду покупать в «Перекрестке», участвуя в данной программе |
| Regardless of competitors’ offers, I will shop at this retailer | Несмотря на предложения конкурентов, я буду отовариваться в «Перекрестке» |
| I would hardly consider switching to another retailer during this event | Я навряд ли соберусь делать покупки в другой розничной сети во время подобной акции |
| I am very interested in participation in this loyalty program | Я очень заинтересован в участии в данной программе | Involvement | O’Cass (2001) |
| Participation in this loyalty program is very important to me | Участие в данной программе очень важно для меня |
| I am willing to participate in this program | Я бы хотел поучаствовать в данной программе |
| Terms of this program are appealing to me | Условия данной программы меня привлекают |
| Participation in this loyalty program seems to be entertaining | Участие в данной программе кажется мне увлекательным | Entertainment | Mimouni-Chaabane and Volle (2010) |
| Redeeming points is enjoyable | Получение наград за баллы приносит мне удовольствие |
| When I redeem my points, I’m good at myself | Когда я получаю награду за баллы, то чувствую себя хорошо |
| It is a good choice to participate in this program | Участвовать в данной программе – это хороший выбор | Satisfaction | Mimouni-Chaabane and Volle (2010) |
| My overall evaluation of this program is good | В целом, я оцениваю данную программу положительно |
| The advantages I receive, being a member of this program, meet my expectations | Преимущества, что я могу получить, участвуя в данной программе, совпадают с моими ожиданиями |
| All in all, I’m satisfied with this program | В целом, я удовлетворен данной программой |

## **Appendix 2. Questionnaire about low gamified loyalty program (test run)**

**Оценка программы лояльности магазина "Перекресток"**

Уважаемый респондент!

Перед вами представлено описание программы лояльности розничной сети "Перекресток".

Прочитайте внимательно ее положения и оцените согласно представленным ниже позициям по шкале от 1 до 7.

“Уважаемый покупатель! Приглашаем Вас зарегистрироваться и получить личную карточку члена "Клуба дорог". Карточка будет выдана Вам при следующем посещении нашего магазина.

При наличии данной карты Вы сможете получить 5% скидку на последующие 5 покупок в нашей сети, приобретя товаров в нашем магазине на более чем 500 рублей!

Совершив 10 покупок на сумму от 500 рублей в течение месяца Вы начинаете накапливать баллы в размере 1 балл за каждые 10 рублей, потраченных на товары любых категорий, но не более 1000 баллов. Баллы можно обменять в следующем месяце по курсу 1 балл = 1 рубль на любой товар из списка на нашем сайте

В акции участвует только первая покупка за день!

Предложение действует только до 01.08.2017. Максимальный размер одноразовой скидки составляет 50 рублей.”

\* Ответ на вопрос обязателен

**Согласны ли Вы со следующим утверждением "Мне интересны условия данной акции"? \***

**Согласны ли Вы со следующим утверждением "Я бы хотел участвовать в данной акции"? \***

**Согласны ли Вы со следующим утверждением: "Будучи участником программы, я бы стал чаще обычного осуществлять покупки в сети "Перекресток""? \***

**Согласны ли Вы с данным утверждением: "Я готов покупать товары дополнительно, чтобы увеличить свой чек до указанных в программе сумм"? \***

**Согласны ли Вы с данным утверждением: "Я готов рекомендовать своим друзьям, коллегам, знакомым участвовать в данной акции"? \***

**Согласны ли Вы с данным утверждением: "Я вижу в своем участии в данной акции определенную ценность"? \***

**Согласны ли Вы с данным утверждением: "Участие в данной программе представляет для меня интерес"? \***

**Согласны ли Вы с данным утверждением: "Я бы хотел осуществить покупку в Перекрестке во время действия этой акции"? \***

**Согласны ли Вы с данным утверждением: "Я бы хотел продолжить осуществлять покупки в Перекрестке после проведения данной акции"? \***

**Согласны ли Вы с данным утверждением: "Представленная акция поможет мне выбрать Перекресток в следующий раз, когда я буду выбирать розничную сеть для покупок"? \***

**Согласны ли Вы с данным утверждением: "Представленная акция повышает положение бренда "Перекресток" в моих глазах"? \***

**Согласны ли Вы с данным утверждением: "Я буду участвовать в данной акции, так как она представляет ценность лично для меня"? \***

**Согласны ли Вы с данным утверждением: "Меня привлекает данная акция"? \***

**Согласны ли Вы с данным утверждением: "Участие в данной акции делает меня более вовлеченным в процесс совершения покупок"? \***

**Согласны ли Вы с данным утверждением: "Участие в данной акции приносит мне чувство удовлетворения"? \***

**Оцените Вашу готовность зарегистрироваться в программе лояльности сети "Перекресток" \***

**Укажите Ваш пол \***

Женский

Мужской

**Какие розничные сети Вы посещаете чаще всего? \***

Пятерочка

Перекресток

Ашан

О'Кей

Лента

Азбука Вкуса

Магнит

Дикси

Другое:

**Укажите Ваш возраст (число лет) \***

**Укажите Ваш род деятельности \***

**Укажите Ваш среднемесячный доход (в тысячах рублей) \***

## **Appendix 3. Questionnaire about gamified loyalty program (test run)**

Оценка программы лояльности магазина "Перекресток"

Уважаемый респондент!

Перед вами представлено описание программы лояльности розничной сети "Перекресток".

Прочитайте внимательно ее положения и оцените согласно представленным ниже позициям по шкале от 1 до 7.

“Уважаемый покупатель! Приглашаем Вас зарегистрироваться и получить личную карточку члена "Клуба дорог". Карточка будет выдана Вам при следующем посещении нашего магазина.

Карточка является "ключом" от Вашего "Рыцаря дорог" - виртуального автомобиля, на котором вы сможете осуществить любое путешествие и проехать столько перекрестков, сколько захотите!

Каждый потраченный рубль в нашем магазине при покупке от более чем 500 рублей продвигает Вашего "Рыцаря" на 100 метров вперед!

Будьте бдительны, после каждой покупки можно продвинуться вперед не более чем на 100 километров!

Размеченная трасса в длину имеет всего лишь 1000 километров.

Все гонщики, достигшие финиша за этот месяц, получают возможность при первой покупке в следующем месяце получить специальный случайный приз примерным номиналом по курсу "1 километр = 1 рубль".

Также, все участвующие гонщики получают 5% скидку на первые пять покупок за которые они смогли продвинуть своего "Рыцаря". Максимальный размер скидки на одну покупку - 50 рублей.

Будьте бдительны! Продвинуть "Рыцаря" может только лишь первая покупка, совершенная в течение дня по вашей личной карте "Клуба дорог"!

Свой прогресс вы можете отслеживать в своем личном кабинете на нашем сайте. Там же вы сможете увидеть список возможных призов за победу в заезде!

Первые 10 гонщиков, пришедшие к финишу в каждом магазине розничной сети "Перекресток" будут отмечены в таблице заезда, вывешенной у входа в магазин. В течение всего следующего месяца к ним будут обращаться не иначе как "Победитель"!

Акция действует только до 01.08.2017. Успейте дойти до финиша и получить призы!”

\* Ответ на вопрос обязателен

**Согласны ли Вы со следующим утверждением "Мне интересны условия данной акции"? \***

**Согласны ли Вы со следующим утверждением "Я бы хотел участвовать в данной акции"? \***

**Согласны ли Вы со следующим утверждением: "Будучи участником программы, я бы стал чаще обычного осуществлять покупки в сети "Перекресток""? \***

**Согласны ли Вы с данным утверждением: "Я готов покупать товары дополнительно, чтобы увеличить свой чек до указанных в программе сумм"? \***

**Согласны ли Вы с данным утверждением: "Я готов рекомендовать своим друзьям, коллегам, знакомым участвовать в данной акции"? \***

**Согласны ли Вы с данным утверждением: "Я вижу в своем участии в данной акции определенную ценность"? \***

**Согласны ли Вы с данным утверждением: "Участие в данной программе представляет для меня интерес"? \***

**Согласны ли Вы с данным утверждением: "Я бы хотел осуществить покупку в Перекрестке во время действия этой акции"? \***

**Согласны ли Вы с данным утверждением: "Я бы хотел продолжить осуществлять покупки в Перекрестке после проведения данной акции"? \***

**Согласны ли Вы с данным утверждением: "Представленная акция поможет мне выбрать Перекресток в следующий раз, когда я буду выбирать розничную сеть для покупок"? \***

**Согласны ли Вы с данным утверждением: "Представленная акция повышает положение бренда "Перекресток" в моих глазах"? \***

**Согласны ли Вы с данным утверждением: "Я буду участвовать в данной акции, так как она представляет ценность лично для меня"? \***

**Согласны ли Вы с данным утверждением: "Меня привлекает данная акция"? \***

**Согласны ли Вы с данным утверждением: "Участие в данной акции делает меня более вовлеченным в процесс совершения покупок"? \***

**Согласны ли Вы с данным утверждением: "Участие в данной акции приносит мне чувство удовлетворения"? \***

**Оцените Вашу готовность зарегистрироваться в программе лояльности сети "Перекресток" \***

**Укажите Ваш пол \***

Женский

Мужской

**Какие розничные сети Вы посещаете чаще всего? \***

Пятерочка

Перекресток

Ашан

О'Кей

Лента

Азбука Вкуса

Магнит

Дикси

Другое:

**Укажите Ваш возраст (число лет) \***

**Укажите Ваш род деятельности \***

**Укажите Ваш среднемесячный доход (в тысячах рублей) \***

## **Appendix 4. Raw survey data (2nd run). “Gamified” sample.**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Participant # \ Question # | A1 | A2 | A3 | A4 | C1 | C2 | C3 |
| 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| 4 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 |
| 5 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| 6 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| 7 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 2 |
| 8 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 3 |
| 9 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 |
| 10 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| 11 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 |
| 12 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 |
| 13 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| 14 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| 15 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| 16 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 |
| 17 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| 18 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 |
| 19 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| 20 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 |
| 21 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 |
| 22 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 1 |
| 23 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| 24 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| 25 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 |
| 26 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 3 |
| 27 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| 28 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 2 |
| 29 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| 30 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| 31 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| 32 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 1 |
| 33 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| 34 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 5 | 3 |
| 35 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 |
| 36 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 3 |
| 37 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 |
| 38 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Participant # \ Question # | C4 | I1 | I2 | I3 | I4 | E1 | E2 |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 |
| 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 |
| 3 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 2 |
| 4 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 |
| 5 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| 6 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| 7 | 3 | 4 | 2 | 4 | 4 | 2 | 2 |
| 8 | 2 | 5 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 2 |
| 9 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 4 | 2 | 2 |
| 10 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 2 |
| 11 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| 12 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 |
| 13 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 2 |
| 14 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| 15 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 16 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 2 | 2 |
| 17 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 |
| 18 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 1 |
| 19 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 2 |
| 20 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| 21 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 |
| 22 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| 23 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 2 |
| 24 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 4 | 4 | 2 | 2 |
| 25 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| 26 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| 27 | 2 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 2 |
| 28 | 3 | 5 | 3 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 2 |
| 29 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 30 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| 31 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| 32 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 1 | 1 |
| 33 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 2 |
| 34 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 2 |
| 35 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| 36 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 |
| 37 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 2 |
| 38 | 2 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Participant # \ Question # | E3 | S1 | S2 | S3 | S4 |
| 1 | 2 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 |
| 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| 4 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 4 |
| 5 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| 6 | 2 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 4 |
| 7 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 |
| 8 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 4 |
| 9 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 3 |
| 10 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| 11 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| 12 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| 13 | 3 | 5 | 3 | 4 | 4 |
| 14 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 4 |
| 15 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 4 |
| 16 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 |
| 17 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| 18 | 1 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 5 |
| 19 | 1 | 3 | 5 | 4 | 4 |
| 20 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| 21 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| 22 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 5 |
| 23 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 3 |
| 24 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| 25 | 2 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 2 |
| 26 | 2 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 2 |
| 27 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 3 |
| 28 | 2 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 3 |
| 29 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| 30 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 4 |
| 31 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| 32 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| 33 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 3 |
| 34 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 4 |
| 35 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| 36 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 |
| 37 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| 38 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 |

## **Appendix 5. Raw survey data (2nd run). “Low gamified” sample**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Participant # \ Question # | A1 | A2 | A3 | A4 | C1 | C2 | C3 |
| 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 |
| 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| 3 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| 4 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 |
| 5 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 |
| 6 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 2 |
| 7 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 |
| 8 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 3 |
| 9 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 |
| 10 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| 11 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 1 |
| 12 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| 13 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| 14 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| 15 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 |
| 16 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 2 |
| 17 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| 18 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 |
| 19 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 |
| 20 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 2 |
| 21 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 |
| 22 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 3 |
| 23 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 24 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 2 |
| 25 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 26 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| 27 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 2 |
| 28 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| 29 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 |
| 30 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| 31 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| 32 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 |
| 33 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 |
| 34 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 3 |
| 35 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 |
| 36 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 3 |
| 37 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 |
| 38 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 2 |
| 39 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 1 |
| 40 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| 41 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 2 |
| 42 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Participant # \ Question # | C4 | I1 | I2 | I3 | I4 | E1 | E2 |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 |
| 4 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 5 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 2 |
| 6 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 2 |
| 7 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 2 |
| 8 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 |
| 9 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 2 |
| 10 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 2 |
| 11 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| 12 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 |
| 13 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 2 |
| 14 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| 15 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 16 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| 17 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 |
| 18 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 1 |
| 19 | 1 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 2 |
| 20 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 2 |
| 21 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 2 |
| 22 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 |
| 23 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 2 |
| 24 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 |
| 25 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| 26 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 |
| 27 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 2 |
| 28 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| 29 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 30 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| 31 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 |
| 32 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 33 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 2 |
| 34 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 2 |
| 35 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 2 |
| 36 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 3 |
| 37 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 2 |
| 38 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| 39 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| 40 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 |
| 41 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 2 |
| 42 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Participant # \ Question # | E3 | S1 | S2 | S3 | S4 |
| 1 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| 3 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 3 |
| 4 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 2 |
| 5 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 3 |
| 6 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| 7 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| 8 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 |
| 9 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 3 |
| 10 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| 11 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| 12 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| 13 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 2 |
| 14 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 4 |
| 15 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 4 |
| 16 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 |
| 17 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| 18 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| 19 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 3 |
| 20 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| 21 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| 22 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 |
| 23 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| 24 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| 25 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 2 |
| 26 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 2 |
| 27 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| 28 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| 29 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| 30 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 |
| 31 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| 32 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| 33 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 3 |
| 34 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 4 |
| 35 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| 36 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 |
| 37 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| 38 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| 39 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| 40 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| 41 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| 42 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 |

## **Appendix 6. Raw loyalty programs comparison of retail companies in Russia.**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Сеть** | **Ссылка** | **Наличие программы лояльности** | **Наличие игрификации** | **Прочие акции** | **Комментарий** |
| 7Я | [[7]](#footnote-7) | Отсутствует | Отсутствует | Скидки тематические \ SP \ по категориям товаров | - |
| Ашан | [[8]](#footnote-8),[[9]](#footnote-9) | Есть, скидочная карта | Отсутствует | Скидки тематические \ SP \ по категориям товаров | Также, имеют договора с банками, добавляющие к программе лояльности балльную систему с обменом на рубли |
| Дикси | [[10]](#footnote-10) | Есть, скидочная карта | Отсутствует | Скидки тематические \ SP \ по категориям товаров | - |
| Карусель | [[11]](#footnote-11) | Есть, скидочно-балльная карта | Баллы |  | - |
| Лента | [[12]](#footnote-12) | Есть, скидочно-балльная карта | Баллы, скидки за баллы, токены | Скидки тематические \ SP \ по категориям товаров | - |
| О’кей | [[13]](#footnote-13) | Есть, скидочно-балльная карта | Баллы, скидки за баллы, токены | Скидки тематические \ SP \ по категориям товаров | - |
| Пятерочка | [[14]](#footnote-14) | Есть, скидочно-балльная карта | Баллы, скидки за баллы | Скидки тематические \ SP \ по категориям товаров | Также, имеют договора с банками, добавляющие к программе лояльности балльную систему с обменом на рубли |
| Перекресток | [[15]](#footnote-15) | Есть, скидочно-балльная карта | Баллы, скидки за баллы, токены | Скидки тематические \ SP \ по категориям товаров | Также, имеют договора с банками, добавляющие к программе лояльности балльную систему с обменом на рубли |
| METRO | [[16]](#footnote-16) | Есть, скидочно-балльная карта. Обязательна. | Баллы, скидки за баллы, токены | Скидки тематические \ SP \ по категориям товаров |  |
| Азбука Вкуса | [[17]](#footnote-17) | Есть, скидочно-балльная карта. | Баллы, скидки за баллы, токены, награды за активности в приложении, нарратив | Скидки тематические \ SP \ по категориям товаров | Единственный пример реальной игрификации |

1. M2 Research is an American market research and strategy consulting firm, specializing on digital media, technologies and games. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. Research And Markets is a firm, specializing on market research worldwide. Known as the world largest market research store. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. In all the cases, exchange comes with Ownership element of the gamification. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. L – Low gamification use; H – High gamification use group. [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. Low \ High [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. Hofstede Insights. (2018). Compare countries - Hofstede Insights. [online] Available at: https://www.hofstede-insights.com/product/compare-countries/ [Accessed 25 Feb. 2018]. [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
7. http://www.7-ya.ru/akcii.php?city=spb [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
8. http://my-trade-group.com/index.php/ritejl/vlasna-marka/item/6286-kak-programma-loyalnosti-auchan-rabotaet-s-stm/6286-kak-programma-loyalnosti-auchan-rabotaet-s-stm [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
9. http://credit-card.ru/articles/partner-programs/ashan.php [↑](#footnote-ref-9)
10. https://dixy.ru/akcii/skidki-nedeli/ [↑](#footnote-ref-10)
11. http://karusel.ru [↑](#footnote-ref-11)
12. https://www.lenta.com/page/1071/ [↑](#footnote-ref-12)
13. https://www.okeydostavka.ru/spb/акция-с-наклейками [↑](#footnote-ref-13)
14. https://5ka.ru/card/ [↑](#footnote-ref-14)
15. https://my.perekrestok.ru/registration [↑](#footnote-ref-15)
16. https://www.metro-cc.ru [↑](#footnote-ref-16)
17. https://spb.av.ru/collection/odnorazovaya-servirovka?utm\_source=google&utm\_medium=cpc&utm\_content=&utm\_campaign=&utm\_term=&gclid=Cj0KCQjw6J7YBRC4ARIsAJMXXscbLqTn5teINWg2ib\_n0bbMXogmqMufc2KJYw6GYsGPuSXqYSIHVyMaApQGEALw\_wcB [↑](#footnote-ref-17)