International Journal of Creative and Open Research in Engineering and Management
ISSN: 3108-1754 (Online)
Volume 02 Issue 11 November-2026 | Impact Factor: 3.5



A Critical Analysis of the Marketing Mix (4Ps) and Its Role in Market Development: A Case Study of Morerro Foods Pvt. Ltd., Baramati

Author: - **Siddhiraj Sapkal**, Indira University School of Business

How to Cite this Article:

Sapkal, S. (2026). A Critical Analysis of the Marketing Mix (4Ps) and Its Role in Market Development: A Case Study of Morerro Foods Pvt. Ltd., Baramati. International Journal of Creative and Open Research in Engineering and Management, 02(11), 1-9. https://doi.org/10.55041/ijcope.v2i11.012

License:

This article is published under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (CC BY 4.0), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author(s) and the source are credited.

© The Author(s). Published by International Journal of Creative and Open Research in Engineering and Management.







https://doi.org/10.55041/ijcope.v2i11.012

Abstract

This study examines the Product, Price, Place and Promotion (4Ps) of Morerro Foods Pvt. Ltd., Baramati, and looks at how these elements may work together to support market development. The study uses a descriptive case-study approach based mainly on observations recorded during the On-the-Job Training (OJT) period from May to August 2026. The field report records approximately 150 retailer interactions across Baramati, Baramati MIDC and nearby areas, and nearly 20 potential retailer opportunities passed to the senior sales team. The observed portfolio included a ₹5 chocolate bars of different flavors and ₹350 chocolate spreads. The bar received comparatively stronger acceptance during the observed visits, while the spread was more difficult to introduce; retailers reportedly indicated limited customer requests and low product awareness. These observations do not represent audited company-wide results and do not prove cause and effect. The analysis points to the need for different positioning and channel approaches: availability and visibility of bar, and use-based communication, targeted trials and closer evaluation of perceived value for the spread. The approximately 13.3% ratio of potential opportunities to interactions is treated only as a lead-generation indicator, not a sales conversion rate. Evidence gaps include the absence of verified product-wise sales, margins, consumer survey results and promotional effectiveness measures.

Keywords: marketing mix; FMCG; retailer acquisition; market development; product positioning; confectionery

Introduction

The marketing mix provides a framework for coordinating decisions by which an organisation develops and delivers an offer to a target market. McCarthy's (1960) formulation of product, price, place and promotion organised these decisions into four interrelated categories. Borden (1964) emphasised that managers must combine marketing activities rather than treat them as isolated instruments. Product features and positioning need to be supported by a defensible price, accessible distribution and communication that explains the offer.

This coordination is particularly relevant to fast-moving consumer goods (FMCG), where retail availability, price comparisons, brand familiarity and repeat purchase can shape a product's prospects. A low-priced chocolate bar and a higher-priced chocolate spread may belong to the same broad category but differ in purchase occasion, frequency, intended user, channel fit, and the amount of explanation required before trial. This paper studies Morerro Foods Pvt. Ltd. through the chocolate and confectionery products observed during OJT in Baramati city, Baramati MIDC and nearby areas. The report records retailer interactions, product demonstrations, sampling, merchandising, pricing comparisons and retailer relationship activities.

This paper does not attempt to assess the company's complete commercial performance. Instead, it considers what the observations may mean for product positioning, perceived value, channel selection and promotion. It distinguishes reported field evidence from interpretation and proposed actions because the available material does not include verified product-wise sales, retailer margins, consumer research, repeat-order data or measured promotional outcomes.



Review of Literature

Marketing mix and positioning

Borden (1964) presented the marketing mix as a combination of managerial decisions assembled to serve market needs, while McCarthy (1960) organised these decisions into the familiar 4Ps. The framework is useful as a diagnostic structure but can encourage siloed thinking if each element is evaluated separately. Kotler and Keller (2016) place the marketing mix within segmentation, targeting, positioning and value delivery. In this study, the 4Ps are used as an organising framework rather than a substitute for understanding customers and channel economics.

Positioning concerns how a product is understood relative to alternatives, and which benefits it is associated with (Aaker & Shansby, 1982). Keller (1993) argues that consumer-based brand equity partly depends on brand awareness and the associations held in memory. When retailers report that customers do not ask for a product, possible explanations include limited awareness, weak associations, unfamiliarity with usage or genuinely low demand; the observation alone cannot identify which explanation dominates. Narver and Slater (1990) support the importance of understanding customers and competitors rather than relying only on internal assumptions.

Price, distribution and promotion

Zeithaml (1988) explains that perceived value is not reducible to price alone; consumers evaluate what they receive relative to what they give up. A lower price does not automatically produce stronger value perceptions, and a higher price may be suitable if benefits are understood and valued. Retailing research also treats assortment, price, promotion, presentation, consumer behaviour and channel design as connected topics (Grewal & Levy, 2007). An outlet visit is not the same as distribution: an outlet may be visited without agreeing to stock the product, an interested lead may not place a first order, and a first order may not lead to repeat purchases.

Retailers act as gatekeepers to shelf space and can provide information about consumer requests, competitive products and stock movement. Corsten and Kumar (2005) highlight the role of collaborative supplier-retailer relationships. Promotion can inform, remind, persuade and encourage trial, but its effectiveness depends on the product, audience and execution. Sampling may have immediate or sustained effects under conditions, but trial needs to be linked to a clear use case, suitable location and follow-up measurement. Ansoff (1957) distinguishes market penetration, market development, product development and diversification. For Morerro Foods, the immediate question is whether current regional market activity can be strengthened through better product-market fit and reliable outlet servicing.

Research Gap, Problem Statement and Objectives

The OJT evidence suggests that the ₹5 chocolate bar was easier to introduce and showed stronger observed movement than the ₹350 chocolate spread. Retailers reportedly raised concerns around price, customer demand, brand awareness and competition, while awareness was a particular issue for the spread. The available evidence does not establish whether the spread's weaker observed response was caused primarily by price, unfamiliarity, product attributes, channel mismatch, seasonality or another factor. Nor does it show how many potential retailer opportunities became active stocking outlets or repeat-order accounts.

The main question is how Morerro Foods can use a more product-specific and measurable marketing mix to support market development. The objectives are to critically analyse the 4Ps observed at the company; examine differences in the observed response to the two products; identify potential gaps affecting retailer acceptance, awareness and distribution; consider improvements in positioning, perceived value, channel selection and promotional communication; and recommend measurable actions while identifying data needed for validation.

The research questions are: What marketing-mix gaps are suggested by the OJT observations? Why did the bar receive comparatively stronger acceptance during the observed fieldwork? How could positioning and perceived-value communication be improved for each product? How should retailer acquisition and distribution be measured beyond visits and lead generation? Which promotional approaches should be tested, and what indicators should assess them?

Research Methodology

This study uses a descriptive and exploratory case-study design. Fieldwork occurred from 15 May to 17 August 2026 in Baramati city, Baramati MIDC and nearby areas. The main source is the supplied OJT report. It records direct retailer interactions, informal discussions, product demonstrations, sampling, merchandising, pricing comparisons, discussions



with the senior sales mentor and use of a company-provided lead sheet. Outlets included kirana stores, general stores, bakeries and small shops near schools. The trainee's main responsibility was retailer identification, lead generation and handover; the senior sales team handled further follow-up and deal closure.

The OJT records approximately 150 retailer interactions and nearly 20 potential retailer opportunities. The opportunities-to-interactions ratio is approximately 13.3% (20 divided by 150), but it is only a descriptive lead-generation indicator. It is not a verified conversion rate because the records do not establish first orders, active outlets or repeat orders. The outlets were selected purposively rather than through random sampling: outlets were approached based on suitability and potential interest rather than random selection. Published marketing literature provides theoretical context, not evidence of Morerro Foods' performance. No structured consumer questionnaire, formal consumer survey, hypothesis test or verified company-wide sales analysis is claimed.

Company and Product Context

Morerro Foods Pvt. Ltd. is identified in the OJT report as a food-products business operating in the chocolate and confectionery category, with manufacturing operations in Baramati MIDC. This paper focuses on a ₹5 chocolate bar and a ₹350 chocolate spread. The bar was described as easier to introduce, with comparatively stronger observed acceptance and movement. Its low price point may be compatible with impulse purchases and a broad range of general retail outlets. The spread was comparatively difficult to introduce. Retailers reportedly indicated that customers did not regularly ask for it and that awareness was limited. The OJT report identifies bakeries, cake shops and cafés as potentially suitable outlets for the spread.

The report notes that school and college holidays affected demand from some bakery and café outlets during the observation period. This is contextual and does not prove that seasonality explains the product's overall performance. The report also records comparatively fast delivery associated with local production. This may be an operational advantage for nearby markets, but available data do not include order-level service times, delivery reliability or a comparison with competitors; it should be treated as a potential capability to validate through service records.

Critical Analysis of the Marketing Mix (4Ps)

Product

What the OJT records show: The ₹5 chocolate bar received stronger acceptance and was easier to introduce. The ₹350 spread was more difficult to sell, and retailers reportedly said customers did not regularly ask for it. The OJT materials identify low awareness and suggest bakeries, cake shops and cafés as potentially suitable outlets. Demonstrations and sampling were among the field activities, but no systematic product-wise trial or feedback dataset is available.

What this may mean: One possible explanation for this difference is that the bar has a more immediately understood role as an affordable individual purchase, while the spread may require a clearer consumption occasion and a more specific target market. However, the available information does not confirm this explanation. The difference could also relate to brand familiarity, price outlay, pack quantity, taste, packaging, ease of use, product-quality perceptions or outlet customer profile. The available information does not show which of these factors matters most. The issue may lie in the fit between the spread's positioning, intended buyer, channel and communication rather than in the product alone.

Suggested improvement: Define separate positioning hypotheses. For the bar, test the idea of an accessible, convenient chocolate purchase. For the spread, specify the user and occasion—such as household use or bakery/café operators—only after validating product fit. Collect structured feedback on outlet type, prior awareness, intended use, taste response, packaging, pack-size fit, price objections and purchase intention. Run a controlled spread trial with selected bakeries, cake shops and cafés. For the bar, prioritise consistent availability and shelf visibility in suitable general stores, kirana outlets and shops near schools, subject to company approval and seasonal context. Suggested indicators are trial-to-first-order rate, product-wise active outlets, repeat orders and recurring feedback themes.

Price

What the OJT records show: The bar's low price was associated in the OJT report with easier introduction and stronger observed acceptance. The spread at ₹350 was harder to sell. Retailers considered price alongside demand, brand awareness and competition. The documents do not provide verified retailer margins, production costs, product quantity, a complete competitor comparison for the spread or price-elasticity estimates.



What this may mean: The bar's price reduces the absolute amount a consumer must spend at the point of purchase and may support impulse buying, but price cannot be isolated as the sole cause of stronger acceptance. The spread's ₹350 price creates a higher monetary commitment, so buyers may need a clearer understanding of the quantity received, possible uses and benefits that justify the outlay. It would be too early to recommend an immediate price cut: it might increase trial if affordability is the main barrier but could reduce contribution or fail to solve low awareness, unclear usage or limited channel relevance.

Suggested improvement: Maintain the bar's accessible price positioning while monitoring retailer feedback and competitive shelf prices. For the spread, collect net weight/quantity, retailer purchase price, recommended selling price, retailer margin, competitor pack-price comparisons and exact objections. Distinguish cash outlay, margin, expected movement, pack size and customer unfamiliarity rather than recording all objections as "price." If feasible, test a smaller trial pack or limited introductory offer in selected outlets against comparable outlets without the offer. Assess first purchase, repeat purchase, retailer feedback and margin implications. Do not change the list price solely on anecdotal objections.

Place (Distribution)

What the OJT records show: Fieldwork covered approximately 150 retailer interactions across Baramati, Baramati MIDC and nearby areas. Nearly 20 potential retailer opportunities were passed to the senior sales team. Visits included kirana stores, general stores, bakeries and small shops near schools. The OJT reports comparatively fast delivery due to local production. However, verified active stocking outlets, outlet-level availability, stock-out frequency, order service time, distributor coverage and repeat-order records are unavailable.

What this may mean: The ratio of about 13.3% shows the share of interactions that resulted in potential leads, not confirmed sales. Lead generation, lead qualification, first order, active stocking, replenishment and repeat purchase are distinct stages. Without tracking them, management cannot determine whether market-development activity creates durable distribution or only initial interest. Local manufacturing may support shorter replenishment routes or more responsive service, but this requires validation. Product-specific channel selection is a reasonable hypothesis: the bar may suit a wider range of general-trade outlets, while the spread may warrant focused testing in bakeries, cake shops and cafés.

Suggested improvement: Create an outlet master and lead dashboard with outlet ID, location, outlet type, contact person, product discussed, lead status, first-order date, product stocked, last visit, stock status, next follow-up date, lead owner and reason for non-conversion. Use consistent stages: identified, visited, interested, handed over, contacted, first order, active outlet, repeat order and inactive/lost. Define "active outlet" using a company-approved period. Assign responsibility for follow-up after handover and review progress regularly. Monthly indicators may include unique outlets visited, qualified leads, first orders, active outlets, repeat-order outlets, order frequency, stock-outs, order fill rate and service time where records are available.

Promotion

What the OJT records show: The OJT records direct retailer communication, product demonstrations, sampling, merchandising and display. Established brands such as Cadbury and Nestlé were visible in outlets visited, while product awareness was a particular challenge for the spread. The supplied material does not provide campaign budgets, sample counts by product, measured awareness levels, promotion-attributed orders or evidence that current promotional activities failed.

What this may mean: Direct interaction may explain an unfamiliar product and allow questions, but it does not guarantee stocking or consumer demand. Promotion needs to address the barrier relevant to each product. For the bar, consistent shelf presence and product recognition may be more useful than a long explanation. For the spread, communication may need to show how and where it can be used, who might use it and what benefit it offers. Sampling should be evaluated rather than assumed to be effective; demonstrations need a clear audience and message, followed by checks on whether interest became a first order and then repeat demand.

Suggested improvement: Develop two concise product pitches. The bar pitch should communicate its identity, price point and availability without unsupported superiority claims. The spread pitch should demonstrate validated usage ideas and explain the intended user or outlet. Where permitted, use simple point-of-sale cards or shelf communication. In



selected bakeries and cafés, trial a short demonstration and record samples, people reached, feedback, first orders and repeat orders. For every promotional activity, record date, outlet, product, execution type, sample or demonstration count, feedback, lead outcome and subsequent order. Measures may include trial-to-first-order rate, first-order-to-repeat rate and cost per acquired active outlet if cost data exist.

Integrated Analysis of the 4Ps

The four elements should support one another. Positioning determines which customer and occasion the product is intended to serve; price communicates and enables the exchange; place determines whether the product is available where the intended buyer shops or works; and promotion explains the value and encourages trial. A spread positioned for bakery or café use would need relevant channel selection, a value explanation based on pack quantity and use, and communication demonstrating practical application. Broad promotion without channel targeting could use effort on outlets where the product has limited relevance, but this is a hypothesis to test rather than a proven current failure.

For the bar, the observed stronger response suggests a comparatively clearer fit with low-ticket retail purchases. The practical priority is to protect availability and visibility and track repeat movement. For the spread, the priority is diagnostic: clarify the target user, test product-use communication and measure price/value objections before making major price or product decisions. In both cases, disciplined outlet tracking is the foundation for determining whether the marketing mix produces durable market development.

Prioritisation

The priority is measurement infrastructure because it enables evaluation of every other intervention. Second, maintain the bar's availability and visibility in outlets where its low-ticket role is appropriate. Third, run a small, measurable spread trial in selected channels rather than expanding indiscriminately. Fourth, collect verified price, pack and margin information before pricing decisions. Finally, use the resulting evidence to decide whether wider market expansion, product changes or more promotional investment is justified.

Findings and Discussion

First, the OJT records different observed responses to the two products. The ₹5 chocolate bar was easier to introduce and showed stronger observed movement than the ₹350 spread. This is consistent with the idea that product format, price outlay and purchase occasion influence acceptance, but the study cannot isolate these effects. The fieldwork did not include a controlled comparison or consumer survey, so the difference is descriptive evidence from the observed market.

Second, retailers reportedly identified low awareness and limited customer requests as issues for the spread. Brand-awareness theory provides one possible interpretation, but awareness is only one explanation. Taste, pack size, product-quality perceptions, price, seasonality and channel fit remain untested alternatives. Third, approximately 150 retailer interactions and nearly 20 potential retailer opportunities show field activity and lead generation. The ratio of approximately 13.3% is arithmetically correct but does not measure confirmed conversion because final order information was unavailable.

Fourth, promotional activities were undertaken, but their effectiveness was not measured. Sampling and demonstrations may help explain an unfamiliar product, yet the evidence does not show how many trials resulted in orders or repeat demand. The reported local-delivery advantage is promising but should be validated with order and service records. Overall, the observations suggest a need to improve the fit among the four Ps; they do not prove one specific failure. The bar appears to have a clearer observed market fit; the spread requires more focused investigation into target customer, usage, perceived value and channel.

Recommendations and Implementation Plan

- Immediate (first 2–4 weeks): Introduce a lead/outlet tracker with stage definitions, lead owner, next action and outcome. Review the share of leads with a recorded status, first orders, active outlets and repeat orders.
- Immediate and ongoing: Check shelf presence and stock status for the bar in suitable general stores, kirana shops and relevant high-footfall outlets. Track availability by visited outlet, stock-outs and repeat-order outlets.
- Short term (4–8 weeks): Run a limited, documented spread trial with selected bakeries, cake shops and cafés; demonstrate validated uses and record trials, first orders, repeat orders and feedback by outlet type.



- Short term (4–8 weeks): Collect standardised feedback on price, pack quantity, margin, awareness and perceived value. Review price objections, retailer margin, trial and repeat purchase alongside verified pack and competitor information.
- Ongoing: Record each sampling, display and demonstration activity and connect it to later orders. Where cost data exist, assess trial-to-first order, first-order-to-repeat and cost per active outlet.
- Before expansion: Review product and outlet performance before adding geographies or broadening channels. Consider active outlets, repeat-order rate, service levels and outlet productivity.

Numerical targets should be set only after a baseline is established and the company approves realistic goals. A short pilot should have a defined period, selected outlets, consistent recording and a review decision: continue, modify or stop.

Limitations of the Study

The study covers only in Baramati, Baramati MIDC and nearby areas. Retailer types and responses may not represent other towns, channels or consumer groups. The approximately 150 interactions reflect OJT field coverage using purposive, non-probability selection, not a random sample. Results should not be generalised to all Morerro Foods outlets or the wider Indian chocolate market.

The analysis is observational and descriptive. The documents do not provide verified product-wise sales, profitability, production costs, retailer margins, consumer survey results, customer-level purchase behaviour, active-outlet counts, repeat-order records, promotional expenditure or measured promotional effectiveness. The trainee's responsibility centred on lead generation and handover, while the senior sales team handled follow-up and deal closure. Nearly 20 potential opportunities therefore cannot be treated as confirmed sales conversions.

The study cannot establish why the spread was harder to sell. Limited awareness and low customer requests were reported, but the relative importance of price, taste, packaging, pack size, shelf life, quality perception, seasonality or channel mismatch remains unknown. The local-production delivery advantage is reported but not quantified using service records. A future study would need structured retailer and consumer instruments, product-wise sales and margin data, outlet-level tracking and controlled promotional tests across comparable outlets and time periods.

Conclusion

This case study uses OJT observations to examine how Morerro Foods' marketing mix may support market development. The central observation is that the ₹5 chocolate bars received comparatively stronger acceptance and movement during fieldwork, whereas the ₹350 chocolate spreads was more difficult to introduce and was associated with reported low awareness and limited customer requests. These are local field observations, not audited company-wide results or proof of a single causal factor.

The findings suggest that the products should not automatically receive the same marketing approach. The bar's accessible price and impulse-oriented role make availability, visibility and regular servicing sensible priorities. The spread may require more specific positioning, usage demonstrations, targeted outlet selection and a clearer value explanation. A price cut should not be assumed to solve the problem before pack, margin, awareness and demand evidence is collected.

Approximately 150 retailer interactions and nearly 20 potential retailer opportunities demonstrate activity and lead generation, but do not establish confirmed sales conversion or repeat distribution. A system tracking leads, first orders, active outlets, replenishment and repeat orders would give the company a stronger basis for decisions. The practical next step is to improve record-keeping, test different approaches for each product, and make changes based on the results.



References

Ansoff, H. I. (1957). Strategies for diversification. Harvard Business Review, 35(5), 113–124.

Aaker, D. A., & Shansby, J. G. (1982). Positioning your product. Business Horizons, 25(3), 56–62. https://doi.org/10.1016/0007-6813(82)90130-6

Borden, N. H. (1964). The concept of the marketing mix. Journal of Advertising Research, 4(2), 2–7. https://doi.org/10.1080/00218499.1964.12519724

Corsten, D., & Kumar, N. (2005). Do suppliers benefit from collaborative relationships with large retailers? An empirical investigation of efficient consumer response adoption. Journal of Marketing, 69(3), 80–94. https://doi.org/10.1509/jmkg.69.3.80.66360

Grewal, D., & Levy, M. (2007). Retailing research: Past, present, and future. Journal of Retailing, 83(4), 447–464. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jretai.2007.09.003

Keller, K. L. (1993). Conceptualizing, measuring, and managing customer-based brand equity. Journal of Marketing, 57(1), 1–22. https://doi.org/10.1177/002224299305700101

Kotler, P., & Keller, K. L. (2016). Marketing management (15th ed.). Pearson.

McCarthy, E. J. (1960). Basic marketing: A managerial approach. R. D. Irwin.

Narver, J. C., & Slater, S. F. (1990). The effect of a market orientation on business profitability. Journal of Marketing, 54(4), 20–35. https://doi.org/10.1177/002224299005400403

Chandukala, S. R., Dotson, J. P., & Liu, Q. (2017). An assessment of when, where and under what conditions in-store sampling is most effective. Journal of Retailing, 93(4), 493–506. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jretai.2017.07.002

Verhoef, P. C., Kannan, P. K., & Inman, J. J. (2015). From multi-channel retailing to omni-channel retailing: Introduction to the special issue on multi-channel retailing. Journal of Retailing, 91(2), 174–181. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jretai.2015.02.005

Zeithaml, V. A. (1988). Consumer perceptions of price, quality, and value: A means-end model and synthesis of evidence. Journal of Marketing, 52(3), 2–22. https://doi.org/10.1177/002224298805200302