

PRICING AND DISCOUNT PRACTICES OF SCIENTIFIC INSTRUMENTS INDUSTRY IN AMBALA CANTT

Karnika Gupta* and Ishu Garg**

ABSTRACT

The present study is a humble attempt to examine the pricing and discount related practices of manufactures from the scientific instruments industry Ambala Cantt in the state of Haryana. It divides the manufacturing units into micro, small and medium (MSME) enterprises, and compares the level of their practices. For accomplishing the purpose, a sample of 150 units is selected. Collected data are analyzed by using descriptive statistics (mean, standard deviation), and inferential statistics of ANOVA and Post Hoc Test. Results indicate that 'skimming' and 'cost-plus' pricing methods are highly employed in the industry; whereas, 'penetration pricing' is least preferred. Likewise, 'quantity discount' and 'cash discount' are in high preference, and 'seasonal discount' practice is rarely used. These are the medium units who apply all the pricing and discount practices firmly. Small units are also on their track. But, micro units lack behind in the level of usage of different practices. Hence, it is implied by the findings that micro units simply follow their counterparts. Correspondingly, this paper calls for further research to understand the complications involved in the decisions, and finding the solutions of enterprises' problems.

Keywords: Practices, Scientific Industry, Manufacturers, Price, Discount, Ambala, MSME

* Assistant Professor, Department of Commerce, SNRL Jairam Girls College, Lohar Majra, Kurukshetra, Haryana, E-Mail: karnikagupta7@gmail.com

** Assistant Professor, Department of Economics, Kurukshetra University, Kurukshetra Haryana, E-Mail: ishu_grg@rediffmail.com

INTRODUCTION

Price is the total sum of all the values that is charged from the customer in consideration of the benefits of consuming a product/service. Price is the only element in marketing mix which generates revenue to businessmen; all other elements entail only costs. So, pricing decisions are about determining a suitable price for marketing offering, and are very crucial. It is a process of defining the value of offering in quantitative/money terms. If talked about Discount, it can be understood as a special concession offered by businessmen to their customers. There may be several reasons behind offering discounts such as sales increase, prompt payment, clearance, encouraging buyers to buy in bulk, out of seasonal purchases etc. Discount is also used as a sales promotion tool because it motivates the customer to purchase the offering at less price than actual or printed price. Accordingly, most of the businesses, almost all, offer discounts to customers in many forms. In this way, it is an art of deciding about the suitable amount or percentage which should be offered so that the motives behind giving discounts can be achieved. Many strategies have been developed by marketing academics to determine this price and level of discount (Czinkota and Kotabe, 2002; Kotler et al. 2012).

Scientific instruments industry in Ambala Cantt is undertaking its operations from pre-independence period (MSME Development Institute, Karnal, 2011; Dandekar, 2013). This industry produces bulk of scientific instruments as are required in all branches of science. In the present era, no industry including scientific instruments industry can survive without affirmative marketing decisions such as related to pricing and discount. Times ago, Ray (1960) highlighted the importance of developing scientific instruments industry. But, it is a predicament that somehow this industry has been neglected regarding its necessities and development; likewise, it is suffering from large number of problems (Gupta and Garg, 2016). This industry is lacking behind with regard to affirmative marketing decisions, and urgent work is needed in this direction (MSME Development Institute, Karnal, 2011; Dandekar, 2013). Taking this backdrop, the present paper is a novel attempt to investigate practices related to pricing and discount as exercised by manufactures of scientific instruments in Ambala Cantt.

Specifically, it works to achieve objectives set out in the next section of this paper and analyzed upon in later sections. A formal section of literature review has not been presented because least efforts have been made to study this industry. Times ago, one attempt was made by Singh (1994) as he analyzed marketing practices in this Industry. And now, recent attempts have been made by Gupta and Garg (2016), Gupta and Garg (2018A), and Gupta and Garg (2018B). Gupta and Garg (2016) empirically examined managerial practices of scientific instruments industry in Ambala Cantt. Gupta and Garg (2018A) and Gupta and Garg (2018B) respectively analyzed distribution practices and product practices of this industry.

RESEARCH OBJECTIVES

This research works on two objectives specified as under:

- 1) To examine the *Pricing practices* of Scientific Instruments Manufacturing Units and compare these practices across Micro, Small and Medium (MSME) Units.
- 2) To investigate *discount practices* of Scientific Instruments Manufacturing Units and Compare these practices across Micro, Small and Medium (MSME) Units.

CLASSIFICATION OF SCIENTIFIC INSTRUMENTS MANUFACTURING UNITS

As per the objective of comparing practices of MSME units, at the outset, the sample units are categorized in line with MSMD Act, 2006 by considering enterprise' investment in plant and machinery as the base. The classification and number of units is visible in table 1. In total 150 units were surveyed (described later in sampling). As analyzed by the level of Enterprises' investment in plant and machinery, majority of the units are micro (N=80; %= 53.33), 50 units (%=33.33) are small and 20 units (%=13.34) are medium. This Classification is used for further analysis.

Table 1: Classification of Manufacturing Enterprises

Investment in Plant and Machinery	N (%)
Less than 25 Lakhs (Micro)	80 (53.33)
25 Lakhs to Less than 5 Crores (Small)	50 (33.33)
5 Crores to Less than 10 Crores (Medium)	20 (13.34)
Total	150 (100)

Source: Questionnaire Survey and Researchers' Calculations

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This section is divided into four sub-sections and elaborates on the methodology adopted for achieving the objectives.

Data Collection Instrument and Scaling

The data collection instrument is a questionnaire which is designed specifically for this study. The questions were presented verbatim to every respondent with five fixed response categories from 'never use (coded 1) to use at larger extent (coded 5)'.

Population, Sample Size and Sampling

Target population constitutes all the units in Ambala Cantt as listed on the website of “*ambala yellow pages*” (total listed units are found as 691) which is a complete business dictionary about the district Ambala and provides all categories of business listing on its official website which is: ambalayellowpages.com. By and large, this is the complete list of all the units in the absence of other significant source. Taking certain aspects of selection of sample (Krishnaswami and Rananatham, 2010), a sample size of 150 units was considered suitable among 691 units, and selection of manufacturing units for collecting data is based on “Snow Ball Sampling” method.

Profile of Respondents

Required information is collected about the manufactures/entrepreneurs of scientific instruments of this industry who are the sample respondents for the study. With regard to entrepreneurs' education, only 18 per cent are highly educated and majority of entrepreneurs from medium units fall among them. Rest of the 82 per cent had either completed school level education or are graduates. Also, maximum of micro entrepreneurs have completed only school level education while the numbers of graduates were high in small enterprises. Considering entrepreneurs' academic field, Arts and Science education have been acquired by a large number of them. Commerce academics attain sufficient percentage only among entrepreneurs of medium enterprises. Vast majority of entrepreneurs are operating in this industry because this business is their parental business. Further, all of the entrepreneurs in medium enterprises are running their parental business. Also, only few entrepreneurs have acquired technical knowledge.

Data Analysis

The processing was completed in *Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS–Version 20)*. Simple Mean, Standard Deviation, ANOVA and Tukey Post Hoc Test are used for the purpose of analysis.

ANALYSES AND INTERPRETATIONS

This section presents two sub-sections in line with the objectives. Firstly, examination for pricing practices is done. Then, practices for discount are investigated.

(A) Analyses for Pricing Practices

By and large, pricing methods are used to decide a fair price of the product. Five types of pricing methods were asked in the questionnaire which is analyzed here. In all the

tables, S.D. and M.D. respectively represent Standard Deviation and Mean Difference.

Penetration Pricing: Penetration pricing is a pricing strategy where the price of a product is initially set low to rapidly reach a wide fraction of the market and initiate word of mouth. The strategy works on the expectation that customers will switch to the new brand because of the lower price (https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Penetration_pricing). It is clear from table 2 that Penetration pricing is firmly used in Medium enterprises ($\bar{X}=3.94$; $s=1.10$) followed by small ($\bar{X}=3.45$; $s=1.11$) and micro ($\bar{X}=2.14$; $s=1.07$) enterprises. By and large, ANOVA F-statistics ($F=34.64$; $p=0.00$) confers that mean differences for the usage of this practice is significant. Further, Tukey HSD Post Hoc Test states that mean differences between micro-small and micro-medium units are significant; however, difference between small and medium units are not significant.

Table 2: Analysis for Penetration Pricing

Pricing Practice		Micro		Small		Medium		Total	
		Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.
Penetration Pricing		2.14	1.07	3.45	1.11	3.94	1.10	2.82	1.31
ANOVA Statistics	Tukey HSD Post Hoc Test →	Pairs/Groups			M.D.	95% Confidence Interval			Sig.
$F_{(df=2, 147)} = 34.64$; $p = 0.00$		Micro vs Small			1.31	0.85 to 1.77			0.00
		Micro vs Medium			1.80	1.16 to 2.44			0.00
		Small vs Medium			0.49	-0.19 to 1.17			0.21

Source: Questionnaire Survey and Researchers' Calculations

Skimming Pricing: Price skimming is a pricing strategy by which initially a firm charges the highest price; then, lowers it over time as the demand of the first customers is satisfied and competition enters the market (<https://www.investopedia.com/terms/p/priceskimming.asp>). Mean values show that average usage of skimming pricing policy is highest for medium enterprises ($\bar{X}=4.13$; $s=1.15$) followed by small ($\bar{X}=3.94$; $s=1.13$) and micro enterprises ($\bar{X}=3.73$; $s=1.08$). As ANOVA F-statistics ($F=1.28$; $p=0.28$) shows insignificance, it can be said that mean differences happen only by chance. Due to insignificance of F-

Value pair comparison also shows insignificance.

Table 3: Analysis for Skimming Pricing

Pricing Practice		Micro		Small		Medium		Total	
		Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.
Skimming Pricing		3.73	1.08	3.94	1.13	4.13	1.15	3.85	1.11
ANOVA Statistics	Tukey HSD Post Hoc Test →	Pairs/Groups			M.D.	95% Confidence Interval			Sig.
$F_{(df=2, 147)} = 1.28; p = 0.28$		Micro vs Small			0.21	-0.26 to 0.68			0.54
		Micro vs Medium			0.40	-0.25 to 1.05			0.32
		Small vs Medium			0.19	0.50 to 0.88			0.79

Source: Questionnaire Survey and Researchers' Calculations

Price Lining Pricing: Price lining, also referred to as product line pricing, is a marketing process wherein products or services within a specific group are set at different price points. (<https://smallbusiness.chron.com/price-lining-12459.html>). Like penetration pricing, the results here are indicative that price lining policy is exercised in medium enterprises followed by small and micro enterprises ($\bar{X}=4.52 > \bar{X}=4.12 > \bar{X}=2.22$), and overall ANOVA F-statistics ($F=61.38; p=0.00$) confers that mean differences for the usage of this practice is significant. Further, Tukey HSD Post Hoc Test states that paired differences between micro-small and micro-medium units are significant; but, difference between small and medium units is not significant.

Table 4: Analysis for Price Lining Pricing

Pricing Practice		Micro		Small		Medium		Total	
		Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.
Price Lining Pricing		2.22	1.12	4.12	1.14	4.52	1.06	3.16	1.51
ANOVA Statistics	Tukey HSD Post Hoc Test →	Pairs/Groups			M.D.	95% Confidence Interval			Sig.
$F_{(df=2, 147)} = 61.38; p = 0.00$		Micro vs Small			1.90	1.42 to 2.38			0.00
		Micro vs Medium			2.30	1.34 to 2.96			0.00
		Small vs Medium			0.40	-0.30 to 1.10			0.37

Source: Questionnaire Survey and Researchers' Calculations

Competition Based Pricing: This method makes use of competitors' prices as a

benchmark for setting a price. The business may sell its product equal to, above or below such benchmark (<https://www.accountingverse.com/.../pricing.../competition-based-pricing.html>). It can be seen from table 5 that regarding Competition Based Pricing, Medium units attain first rank due to its highest mean value ($\bar{X}=4.06$; $s=1.50$), at second rank small units got place with a mean value of $\bar{X}=3.45$ allied with standard deviation of $s=1.10$. Obviously, third rank is obtained by micro units ($\bar{X}=2.90$; $s=0.98$). Regarding significance testing of mean differences, ANOVA shows reliable mean differences as F-value is significant. Also, pair wise mean differences are significant as attained with Tukey HSD Post Hoc Test.

Table 5: Analysis for Competition Based Pricing

Pricing Practice		Micro		Small		Medium		Total	
		Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.
Competition Based Pricing		2.90	0.98	3.45	1.10	4.06	1.50	3.24	1.17
ANOVA Statistics	Tukey HSD Post Hoc Test →	Pairs/Groups			M.D.	95% Confidence Interval		Sig.	
F _(df= 2, 147) = 10.29; p = 0.00		Micro vs Small			0.55	0.08 to 1.02		0.02	
		Micro vs Medium			1.16	0.51 to 1.81		0.00	
		Small vs Medium			0.61	-0.08 to 1.30		0.09	

Source: Questionnaire Survey and Researchers' Calculations

Cost plus Profit Pricing: Cost plus profit pricing is a cost-based method for setting the prices. Under this approach, the direct material cost, direct labour cost, and overhead costs for a product are added, and a mark-up percentage (to create a profit margin) is also added to the cost in order to derive the price of the product (<https://www.accountingtools.com/articles/2017/5/16/cost-plus-pricing>). It is clear from table 6 that usage of Cost-plus pricing is high in medium and small enterprises. Tukey HSD post hoc test is insignificant for their mean difference. Hence, it can be said that the level of use is similar in both units ($\bar{X}_{Me}=4.82$; $\bar{X}_s=4.33$). However, usage of cost plus profit pricing is at mediocre level in micro units. The mean differences between micro-small and micro-medium units are also significant which states that level of use is similar in small and medium units but micro units differ on this point. Significant F-value ($F=26.86$; $p=0.00$) also stresses upon the same point.

Table 6: Analysis for Cost Plus Profit Pricing

Pricing Practice		Micro		Small		Medium		Total	
		Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.
Cost Plus Profit Pricing		3.12	1.14	4.33	1.18	4.82	1.14	3.75	1.34
ANOVA Statistics	Tukey HSD Post Hoc Test →	Pairs/Groups			M.D.	95% Confidence Interval			Sig.
F _(df= 2, 147) = 26.86; p = 0.00		Micro vs Small			1.21	0.72 to 1.70			0.00
		Micro vs Medium			1.70	1.01 to 2.38			0.00
		Small vs Medium			0.49	-0.23 to 1.21			0.25

Source: Questionnaire Survey and Researchers' Calculations

Contrasting of All the Pricing Practices

A simultaneous analysis of all the tables related to pricing practices is done for investigating overall pricing practice.

- **Overall Practice:** It can be read out from the mean values of total units that 'penetration pricing' is a rare practice and 'skimming' and 'cost plus profit' pricing methods are often used in scientific industry.
- **Practices in Micro Units:** The mean scores as per classification of units further highlight that main method of pricing in micro units is 'skimming pricing'. 'Cost plus profit pricing' is also employed by them to an extent.
- **Practices in Small Units:** Small enterprises employ 'cost plus profit' and 'price lining' policies. 'Skimming' method is also employed but less frequently than the other two methods as discussed. Alike mean values ($\bar{X}=3.45$) for 'penetration pricing' and 'competition base pricing' imply that these methods are also employed to a certain extent.
- **Practices in Medium Units:** In case of medium enterprises 'cost plus profit', 'price lining', 'skimming', 'competitive' and 'penetration pricing' all are firmly used as indicated by the mean values. Also, medium enterprises possess higher mean scores than both micro and small enterprises. It specifies that the use of all sorts of pricing methods by medium units is more as compared to other units.

(B) Analyses for Discount Practices

Discount refers to special concession in price offered by enterprises to either middlemen or end-users to attract them towards the product. These are included in pricing practices as these are related with price and reduces the quoted price of the product.

Quantity Discount: A quantity discount is an incentive offered to a buyer that results in a decreased cost per unit of goods or materials when purchased in greater numbers. A quantity discount is often offered by sellers to entice buyers to purchase in larger quantities (<https://www.investopedia.com/terms/q/quantity-discount.asp>). Table 7 displays that quantity discount is the method significantly employed by all the units but medium enterprises have highest mean score ($\bar{X}=4.67$; $s=1.20$) as compared to small units ($\bar{X}=4.34$; $s=1.09$) and micro units ($\bar{X}=4.23$; $s=1.14$). But, ANOVA test and Post-Hoc Test depicts insignificance of mean differences. So, it can be said that quantity discount is in usage preference for all the units.

Table 7: Analysis for Quantity Discount Method

Practice for Discount		Micro		Small		Medium		Total	
		Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.
Quantity Discount		4.23	1.14	4.34	1.09	4.67	1.20	4.33	1.13
ANOVA Statistics	Tukey HSD Post Hoc Test →	Pairs/Groups			M.D.	95% Confidence Interval			Sig.
$F_{(df=2, 147)} = 1.22$; $p = 0.30$		Micro vs Small			0.11	-0.37 to 0.59			0.85
		Micro vs Medium			0.44	-0.23 to 1.11			0.27
		Small vs Medium			0.33	-0.38 to 1.04			0.51

Source: Questionnaire Survey and Researchers' Calculations

Cash Discount: A cash discount is a deduction allowed by the seller of goods or by the provider of services in order to motivate the customer to pay within a specified time. The seller or provider often refers to the cash discount as a sales discount, and the buyer often refers to the same as a purchase discount (<https://www.accountingcoach.com/blog/what-is-a-cash-discount>). Like quantity discount practice, the method of cash discount is highly favoured by medium units

($\bar{X}=4.12$; $s=1.17$) followed by small ($\bar{X}=3.97$; $s=3.97$) and micro units ($\bar{X} = 3.89$; $s=1.08$); but again owing to the insignificance of F-statistics and Post Hoc Test, the level of usage of cash discount can be taken as similar.

Table 8: Analysis for Cash Discount Method

Practice for Discount		Micro		Small		Medium		Total	
		Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.
Cash Discount		3.89	1.08	3.97	1.11	4.12	1.17	3.95	1.10
ANOVA Statistics	Tukey HSD Post Hoc Test →	Pairs/Groups			M.D.	95% Confidence Interval			Sig.
$F_{(df=2, 147)} = 0.36$; $p = 0.69$		Micro vs Small			0.08	-0.39 to 0.55			0.91
		Micro vs Medium			0.23	-0.42 to 0.88			0.68
		Small vs Medium			0.15	-0.54 to 0.84			0.86

Source: Questionnaire Survey and Researchers' Calculations

Trade Discount: A trade discount is the amount by which a manufacturer reduces the retail price of a product when it sells to a reseller, rather than to the end customer (<https://www.accountingtools.com/.../what-is-a-trade-discount.html>). Again the classified analysis of units in table 9 gives impression that medium enterprises are ahead of small units which are practicing 'trade discount policy' a step further from micro units; but due to insignificance of mean differences, the usage can be termed as similar across the units.

Table 9: Analysis for Trade Discount Method

Practice for Discount		Micro		Small		Medium		Total	
		Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.
Trade Discount		3.54	1.16	3.59	1.12	3.68	1.18	3.58	1.14
ANOVA Statistics	Tukey HSD Post Hoc Test →	Pairs/Groups			M.D.	95% Confidence Interval			Sig.
$F_{(df=2, 147)} = 0.12$; $p = 0.88$		Micro vs Small			0.05	-0.44 to 0.54			0.97
		Micro vs Medium			0.14	-0.54 to 0.82			0.88
		Small vs Medium			0.09	-0.63 to 0.81			0.95

Source: Questionnaire Survey and Researchers' Calculations

Seasonal Discount: It is offered as incentive to buyers so that they make out-of-season purchases (www.businessdictionary.com/definition/seasonal-discount.html). In case of

seasonal discount, again medium units are utilizing this method frequently in comparison of small and micro units. The overall mean differences are found significant with F-value of 3.05 with a significance level of 0.05. However, in pairwise comparison only the difference of micro units with medium units is obtained as significant.

Table 10: Analysis for Seasonal Discount Method

Practice for Discount		Micro		Small		Medium		Total	
		Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.
Seasonal Discount		3.26	1.05	3.33	1.17	3.94	1.21	3.37	1.13
ANOVA Statistics	Tukey HSD Post Hoc Test →	Pairs/Groups			M.D.	95% Confidence Interval			Sig.
$F_{(df=2, 147)} = 3.05; p = 0.05$		Micro vs Small			0.07	-0.40 to 0.54			0.94
		Micro vs Medium			0.68	0.02 to 1.34			0.04
		Small vs Medium			0.61	-0.09 to 1.31			0.10

Source: Questionnaire Survey and Researchers' Calculations

Special Discount:

Special discounts accumulate all other discounts offered by the manufacturers of scientific instruments for increasing their sales. If table 11 is analyzed, like other methods of discount, special discount is highly adopted in medium sized units followed by small and micro units ($\bar{X}=4.20 > \bar{X}=3.92 > \bar{X}=3.12$). Test of Analysis of Variance shows considerable mean differences as F-value is significant ($F=11.54; p=0.00$). However, Tukey HSD Post Hoc Test displays inconsiderate mean difference for the pair of small and medium units.

Table 11: Analysis for Special Discount

Practice for Discount		Micro		Small		Medium		Total	
		Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.
Special Discount		3.12	1.14	3.92	1.13	4.20	1.17	3.53	1.22
ANOVA Statistics	Tukey HSD Post Hoc Test →	Pairs/Groups			M.D.	95% Confidence Interval			Sig.
$F_{(df=2, 147)} = 11.54; p = 0.00$		Micro vs Small			0.80	0.31 to 1.29			0.00
		Micro vs Medium			1.08	0.40 to 1.76			0.00
		Small vs Medium			0.28	-0.43 to 0.99			0.62

Source: Questionnaire Survey and Researchers' Calculations

Contrasting of Practices of Discount

Here, a simultaneous analysis of all the tables is done for discount practices.

- **Overall Practice:** It can be read out from the mean values of total units that 'quantity discount' is firmly favoured by the units and the second preference is 'cash discount'. 'Trade Discount' and 'special discount' are utilized at a mediocre level and the usage of 'seasonal discount' is very low.
- **Practices in Micro Units:** The mean scores as per classification of units further highlight that main method of discount in micro units is 'quantity discount' and 'cash discount'. 'Trade discount' is too employed but least usage is found for 'seasonal discount' and 'special discount'.
- **Practices in Small Units:** Small enterprises too employ 'quantity discount' highly. 'Cash discount' and 'special discount' practices are identical. 'Seasonal discount' is also used but less frequently than the 'trade discount'.
- **Practices in Medium Units:** In case of medium enterprises 'quantity discount', 'special discount', and 'cash discount' all are strongly used. Medium units also offer 'seasonal discounts' and 'trade discounts' to certain extent. Also, medium enterprises dominate with higher mean scores than micro and small enterprises which are reflective for more usage of all types of discount practices by them in comparison with their counterparts.

CONCLUSION

It can be concluded that medium units utilize all the pricing methods. Perhaps due to the knowledge of entrepreneurs that price is the most competitive weapon in their hands; and as per market suitability, they should alter their pricing methods. Entrepreneurs of small units appear to follow medium units. They utilize all methods of pricing like their medium correspondents. Accordingly, it can be said that they also

tend to alter their pricing methods as situation changes. The entrepreneurs of micro group have stated the prime method of use as 'skimming pricing'. Perhaps they think that it is better to cover up the cream when the product is introduced in the market. They may also think that it is better to cover the cost before they are to face tough competition in the market which may be given to them by both small and medium enterprises.

Largest usage has been noticed for 'quantity discount' in all the enterprises. It is found that all the methods of discounts are used by firms to attract consumers but the scale of usage is high in medium enterprises followed by small and micro enterprises. Medium enterprises are found to be providing more types of discounts to their customers may be due to their strong financial position and their goal to win customer satisfaction. They also do it perhaps in order to have more competitive advantage in the market.

IMPLICATIONS AND DIRECTIONS

Entrepreneurs in all kinds of units are using a range of pricing methods to decide a fair price of product. But, when it will come to price competition, micro units may disappear from the struggle because of relying only on 'skimming' and 'cost plus pricing'. Micro enterprises are also lagging behind from small and medium units in case of offering discounts to their customers. Thus, micro units need farsightedness and should cooperate with each other for strengthening themselves. They should have proper knowledge of how and when to alter the price, and how they can attract customers with a range of discount practices. Accordingly, further researches can study the opportunities available to them and can strive for finding solutions to their way obstacles.

REFERENCES

Czinkota, Michael R. and Kotabe, Masaaki (2002), “*Marketing Management*”, 2nd Edition, Thomson South Western College Publishing, pp. 1-598.

Dandekar, Ajit Chandrakant (2013), “Need Assessment Survey Report for Physics Scientific Instruments Industry Cluster, Ambala”, pp. 1-169 [Accessed on 19 July, 2015] [Available online at: <http://designclinicsmsme.org/Design%20Awareness%20Programme%20Reports/PHDChamberofCommercePhysicsInstrumentCluster.pdf>].

Gupta, Karnika and Garg, Ishu (2016), “Managerial Practices of MSME Enterprises in Scientific Instruments Industry Ambala”, *Diviner–A Research Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences*, Vol. 13, No. 2, pp. 220-230.

Gupta, Karnika and Garg, Ishu (2018A), “Investigating Distribution Practices of Scientific Instruments Manufacturers in Ambala Cantt”, *GGGI Management Review*, Vol. 8, Issue 1, pp. 20-26.

Gupta, Karnika and Garg, Ishu (2018B), “Product Management Practices: A Study of Scientific Goods Industry in Ambala”, *Apeejay Journal of Management & Technology*, Vol. 13, No. 2, pp. 27-36.

Kotler, Philip; Keller, Kevin Lane; Koshy, Abraham and Jha, Mithilehwar (2012), “*Marketing Management–A South Asian Perspective*”, 13th Edition, Dorling Kindersley (India) Pvt. Ltd., Licensees of Pearson Education in South Asia, pp. 1-612.

Krishnaswami, O. R. and Ranganatham M. (2005), “*Methodology of Research in Social Sciences*”, 2nd Edition, Himalaya Publishing House, Mumbai, pp. 1 – 445.

Micro, Small and Medium Enterprises Development (MSMED) Act (2006), Ministry of Law and Justice, Government of India, [Accessed on 19 July, 2015] [Available online at: http://www.msmeodisha.gov.in/PDF/MSMED_Act.pdf].

MSME-Development Institute Karnal (2011), “Brief Industrial Profile of Ambala District”, Ministry of MSME, Govt. of India, [Accessed on 19 July, 2015] [Available online at: http://dcmsme.gov.in/dips/har_ambala.pdf].

Ray, Kamalesh (1960), “The Scientific Instruments Industry”, *The Economic Weekly*, Journal of Gandhi Peace Foundation, pp. 424-428 [Accessed on 19 July,

2015] [Available online at: http://www.epw.in/system/files/pdf/1960_12/10/the_scientific_instruments_industry.pdf].

Singh, Narender (1994), “A Study of Selected Marketing Practices in the Scientific Goods Industry in Haryana”, *Unpublished Doctoral Thesis*, Kurukshetra University, Kurukshetra.

WEB SOURCES

www.accountingcoach.com

<https://www.accountingcoach.com/blog/what-is-a-cash-discount>

www.accountingtools.com

<https://www.accountingtools.com/articles/2017/5/16/cost-plus-pricing>

<https://www.accountingtools.com/.../what-is-a-trade-discount.html>

www.accountingverse.com

<https://www.accountingverse.com/.../pricing.../competition-based-pricing.html>

www.ambalayellowpages.com

<http://www.ambalayellowpages.com/scientific-instruments.html>

businessdictionary.com

www.businessdictionary.com/definition/seasonal-discount.html

www.en.wikipedia.org

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Penetration_pricing

www.investopedia.com

<https://www.investopedia.com/terms/p/priceskimming.asp>

<https://www.investopedia.com/terms/q/quantity-discount.asp>

smallbusiness.chron.com

<https://smallbusiness.chron.com/price-lining-12459.html>