



## The Long-Term Erosion of Repeat-Purchase Loyalty

Journal:	<i>European Journal of Marketing</i>
Manuscript ID	EJM-01-2018-0042.R4
Manuscript Type:	Original Article
Keywords:	Brand Loyalty, Erosion, Repeat-Purchase, NBD model

SCHOLARONE™  
Manuscripts

## The Long-Term Erosion of Repeat-Purchase Loyalty

### Abstract

**Purpose.** The study investigates the long-term erosion of repeat-purchase loyalty among consumers who purchase brands in a one-year base period.

**Design/Method.** The study utilises a five-year consumer panel of continuous reporters. We identify brand buyers in a base year, then calculate the proportion that fail to buy the brand in later years. We analyse the top 20 brands in 10 consumer goods categories.

**Findings.** We find pronounced erosion in repeat-buying over the long-term. The proportion of buyers from a base year that fail to buy the brand in a later year increases steadily over time, from 57% in year 2 to 71.5% by year 5. Moreover, we identify brand and marketing mix factors linked to this over-time customer loss, or erosion.

**Research Implications.** The study provides evidence that consumers' propensity to buy particular brands changes over a period of years, even though those brands continue to exhibit stable market share. This evidence provides a different interpretation than the literature to date, which has viewed purchase propensities as fixed.

**Practical Implications /limitations.** The study finds that store brands and niche brands exhibit lower levels of erosion in their buyer base; that a broad range is associated with lower erosion, and that high price promotion incidence is associated with lower erosion for manufacturer brands.

**Originality/Value.** Loyalty erosion has been reported before (Ehrenberg, 1988; East & Hammond 1996) but only over short periods. This study examines the phenomenon over five years, confirms that the rate of erosion does diminish over time, and that it is related to category and brand characteristics, as well as marketing mix decisions.

**Keywords:** repeat-purchase, loyalty, NBD model, erosion

## 1. Introduction

In developed economies, most packaged consumer-goods brands compete in categories characterized by stable, split-loyal brand buying (East et al., 2008). Under these conditions, many brands have stationary metrics over periods such as a quarter-year or year. That is, the brand's market share, penetration (% buying) and loyalty (average number of purchase occasions per period, share of category requirements) from one quarter to another or one year to another are quite stable. Furthermore, those metrics such as penetration and loyalty can be estimated with a high degree of accuracy by the NBD-Dirichlet model (Ehrenberg et al., 2004), using only category-level information and brand market shares. Another important brand metric is the proportion of one period's buyers who return to buy the brand in the next period. This we term the repeat-rate (Ehrenberg, 1988). Again, the NBD-Dirichlet estimates the repeat rates for brands with a high degree of accuracy (Fader and Schmittlein, 1993); usually for one-period ahead forecasts such as next quarter or year. The model assumes stable long-term buying propensities (Goodhardt et al., 1984), which matches well with the stability in market shares exhibited by many brands (Dekimpe and Hanssens, 1995a, Graham, 2009). However, several pieces of research have shown that the repeat-rate *declines* as one looks further forward in time from a base period (East and Hammond, 1996, Ehrenberg, 2000). For example, the proportion of base period 1 buyers who re-buy in period 2 drops in period 3 and again in 4 and 5, and so on. This decline has been termed *erosion*. The surprising fact about erosion is that it occurs for stable brands – the brands that have been studied maintain their overall market share, penetration and purchase frequency despite erosion in their initial buyer base.

While it is obvious that to maintain market share, these stable brands are replacing eroded or 'lost' buyers with new ones, the loss of base period customers is an important phenomenon to

1  
2  
3 investigate. First, in order to maintain their market share, brands are replacing lost buyers –  
4  
5 this maintenance would be easier to accomplish if it were possible to reduce the rate of  
6  
7 erosion, because fewer ‘new’ buyers would be needed to top up the loss. However, it is as yet  
8  
9 unknown if some brands have a superior ability to dampen their erosion rate - apart from the  
10  
11 fact that brand size negatively correlates with erosion, as per East & Hammond (1996).  
12  
13 Identifying if there are brand characteristics that are linked to lower or higher erosion rates  
14  
15 would have practical as well as theoretical significance. Additionally, it is also not known if  
16  
17 there are marketing mix elements (price, promotion, new products) that might reduce the  
18  
19 erosion rate; nor indeed if erosion continues over the long term. Knowing how these aspects  
20  
21 influence erosion would enable managers make better decisions how to deal with it.  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26

27 East & Hammond (1996) found the rate of erosion slowed down after four quarters but did  
28  
29 not look further than 18 months. It is not presently known if the rate continues to slow, and  
30  
31 consequently how significant the problem of erosion is over multiple years. There is a  
32  
33 growing recognition of the importance of a long-term view of brand building (Ataman et al.,  
34  
35 2008, Lodish and Mela, 2007), therefore an investigation of erosion in the customer base over  
36  
37 multiple years will contribute to the literature on effective management of brands.  
38  
39  
40  
41

42 Next, in a stationary category, if a brand’s initial buyer base is drifting away over time, those  
43  
44 customers are likely buying other brands - but it is not known if erosion manifests as the  
45  
46 brand’s customer base switching to a tighter assortment of competitors, or to a broader brand  
47  
48 repertoire. The contribution of this study is to establish the nature and extent of erosion over  
49  
50 the long-term, as well its antecedents and outcomes. The principal questions the study  
51  
52 addresses are:  
53  
54  
55

- 56 1. Does erosion continue linearly over multiple years?
- 57
- 58 2. Are there category, brand and marketing mix variables that link to the rate of erosion?
- 59
- 60

1  
2  
3 3. Does erosion in the brand's customer base result in a narrower or broader competitor  
4 repertoire over time?  
5  
6

7  
8  
9 4. What are the implications of erosion for brand management?  
10

11  
12 We address these questions using a five-year consumer panel of continuous reporters, across  
13 multiple product categories. We identify brand buyers in a base year, then calculate the  
14 proportion that fail to buy the brand in later years.  
15  
16  
17  
18

19  
20 In the next section, we review literature on brand repeat-purchase, introduce the erosion  
21 concept and why it is important. We develop a series of hypotheses relating to the scale and  
22 shape of erosion over multiple years, and a series of factors that are likely to co-vary with it.  
23  
24

25 We explain the nature of a long-term dataset of continuous panel reporters used to test the  
26 hypotheses, present the empirical results, and then discuss the implications for theory and  
27 practice. Table 1 contextualises the present study with the limited previous work on this  
28 issue.  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

**Table 1. How the present study builds on past work on Erosion**

	<b>Ehrenberg 1988</b>	<b>East &amp; Hammond 1996</b>	<b>This study</b>
<b>Overall objective</b>	Identify that erosion occurs	To identify the magnitude of erosion and its shape	To explicate how erosion manifests in the long term, identify antecedents and consequences
<b>Time period and trajectory of erosion considered</b>	Four quarters. Change in rate over time not considered	Eight quarters. Yes, but limited	Long time frame (five years). Yes, trajectory considered
<b>Number of brands and categories</b>	Top five brands. One category	Top five brands. Nine categories	Top twenty brands. Ten categories
<b>Brand and categories characteristics as antecedents / covariates of erosion considered</b>	No	Yes	Yes
<b>Marketing mix elements as antecedents / covariates of erosion considered</b>	No	No	Yes
<b>Consequences of erosion considered</b>	No	No	Yes. Marketing implications are drawn
<b>Explanation for how erosion occurs</b>	No	No	Yes. Explanation relates to drift in purchase propensities over time

## 2. Background and Literature Review

It should almost go without saying that repeat-purchase loyalty is an important marketing metric. At its most obvious, the ‘sales equation’ for a brand is: (adapted from Uncles and Ellis, 1989)  $Brand\ unit\ sales = Number\ of\ brand\ buyers \times average\ purchase\ frequency \times average\ units\ per\ occasion$ . On-going brand sales are therefore highly contingent on maintaining an acceptable level of repeat purchasing across a buyer base. Next, repeat-buying loyalty makes for more certainty about the future of the brand, as it implies buyer satisfaction (Kumar et al., 2013). And indeed, a further sale made to a current buyer is said to be easier than finding a new buyer (e.g. Reichheld, 1993), although this axiom is more of an intuitive belief than empirical fact (Sharp, 2010 p. 29).

Given the importance of loyalty, it is not surprising that many conceptual and empirical models have been constructed to understand, measure and explain it over the past sixty years. We focus first on behavioural loyalty and discuss a stochastic model widely used to predict repeat-purchase rates. We then discuss the phenomenon of *erosion*, and describe it from a strictly behavioural viewpoint before considering how an attitudinal viewpoint can also help in understanding it. From this discussion, we formulate a series of hypotheses relating to erosion, as well as factors that are related to lower or higher levels of erosion. We then test the hypotheses using a long-term panel of continuously-reporting households.

Commencing in the late 1950’s, researchers discovered empirical patterns in brand performance metrics such as market share, penetration, and various behavioural loyalty indicators such as purchase frequency and share of category requirement (SCR). First was that category purchase rates followed a Negative Binomial Distribution or NBD (Ehrenberg, 1959). Brand purchase rates were shown to follow the same pattern (Ehrenberg, 1988), and also that there was a systematic relationship between indicators of a brand’s size (market

1  
2  
3 share or penetration) and loyalty: the famous double jeopardy pattern (Ehrenberg et al., 1990).  
4  
5 Furthermore, the extent to which buyers of one brand also purchase others was found to  
6  
7 closely follow the penetration levels of each brand (Ehrenberg, 1988) in a category. These  
8  
9 empirical patterns or regularities form part of an integrated model of buyer behaviour and  
10  
11 brand performance called the Dirichlet (Ehrenberg et al., 2004), of which a central part is the  
12  
13 NBD. We briefly elaborate on the NBD.  
14  
15

## 16 17 18 *2.2 The NBD*

19  
20 The NBD was introduced into marketing literature by Ehrenberg over fifty years ago (1959).  
21  
22 The model assumes that individual propensities to buy a category or brand are fixed,  
23  
24 distributed Gamma over the population, and that individual brand purchase incidence will  
25  
26 follow an as-if random Poisson distribution over time. Mixing the two gives an NBD, or  
27  
28 negative binomial distribution. The NBD describes the distribution of brand purchase  
29  
30 frequencies  $0, 1, 2, 3, \dots, n$  across the population in a specified period. For consumer goods, this  
31  
32 distribution invariably takes the form of an 'inverse J', with a very large number of purchasers  
33  
34 buying infrequently, for example 1 or 2 times per year, far fewer buying 3 or 4 times, and a  
35  
36 long tail of very few households buying more frequently. Many marketing applications of the  
37  
38 NBD have been reported in the literature including consumer packaged brands and categories  
39  
40 (Chatfield et al., 1966, Dawes, 2014, Ehrenberg, 1988, Ludwichowska et al., 2017, Trinh,  
41  
42 2014, Tanusondjaja et al., 2016), gambling products (Mizerski et al., 2004, Lam and  
43  
44 Mizerski, 2009), consumption of mobile phone service (Lee et al., 2011), cultural venue and  
45  
46 event attendance (Trinh and Lam, 2016), and industrial purchasing (McCabe and Stern, 2009,  
47  
48 Wilkinson et al., 2016).  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55 The NBD is also able to accurately estimate the proportion of period 1 households who buy a  
56  
57 brand  $0, 1, 2, 3, \dots, n$  times that will buy it  $0, 1, 2, 3, \dots, n$  times in period 2 (Goodhardt and  
58  
59 Ehrenberg, 1967). This feature of the NBD model is called Conditional Trend analysis  
60



1  
2  
3 (Morrison, 1969, Lenk et al., 1993, Habel et al., 2003). It highlights that even though a  
4 brand's penetration in aggregate usually remains constant from period to period, the actual  
5 mix of households and the rate at which they buy varies from period to period. Importantly,  
6 the NBD specifies that for a stationary brand, the proportion of repeat buyers from one period  
7 to another will be the same regardless of whether it is measured *from an adjacent or non-*  
8 *adjacent period*, even if those periods are years apart.  
9

### 17 2.3 The Leaky Bucket – Erosion

18 In *Repeat Buying* (1988, p47) Ehrenberg reported a deviation from the NBD-expected levels  
19 of repeat purchase, described as the 'leaky bucket'. The study compared the proportion of  
20 brand buyers in an initial quarter (Q1) that repeated in the next (Q2) with its NBD estimate,  
21 and then increased the time lag of the repeat-buying observations from Q1 to Q3, and from  
22 Q1 to Q4. There was a drop of four points in the proportion of buyers repeating from Q1  
23 each time. This figure translated to a decay of 6.5% in repeat purchase loyalty for each  
24 quarter beyond a base period. East and Hammond (1996) replicated and extended  
25 Ehrenberg's initial analysis. This study examined a longer time period using nine product  
26 categories. It found erosion reached an average 15 percentage-point loss in a year, even  
27 though quarterly brand penetrations were stationary. Several other findings emerged. First,  
28 large brands had lower erosion rates than small brands, and erosion was consistent across  
29 light, medium and heavy buyers. Notably, the study found no co-variation with other factors  
30 such as purchase frequency, country, category, or market concentration. Erosion was  
31 therefore described as "*a consistent pervasive empirical fact that is little related to the other*  
32 *factors studied.*" (p. 169). East and Hammond also reported that the rate of erosion slowed  
33 after the first year.  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57

58 This erosion of loyalty among buyers from a base period is worthy of further study for several  
59 reasons. In simple terms, erosion means a brand is 'losing' customers from a base period  
60

1  
2  
3 over time. Given the intense interest in customer loyalty and retention (e.g. Evanschitzky et  
4 al., 2017), further understanding of erosion has theoretical and practical importance. Firstly,  
5  
6 al., 2017), further understanding of erosion has theoretical and practical importance. Firstly,  
7  
8 clarifying if the rate of erosion does indeed decline as found by East & Hammond (1996) will  
9  
10 help us to understand the extent to which it poses a challenge for marketers. Second, the  
11  
12 NBD, a widely-used stochastic model, assumes fixed purchase propensities (Sharp et al.,  
13  
14 2012). More insights into long-term erosion may provide a different interpretation. Indeed,  
15  
16 further understanding of erosion will increase our knowledge about how consumer's brand  
17  
18 purchase propensities evolve over time. For example, if there is indeed erosion over the long  
19  
20 term, it could conceivably manifest in smaller brand repertoires among the brand's initial base  
21  
22 period of buyers, consistent with them merely dropping the focal brand. An alternative is that  
23  
24 erosion coincides with a larger, expanded repertoire among those initial buyers - one brand is  
25  
26 dropped, one or more enters the repertoire.

27  
28  
29  
30  
31 Next, from a practitioner viewpoint, while brands appear to maintain their market share  
32  
33 despite erosion occurring, it may be the case that some erode less than others over time.

34  
35 While there is evidence that brand growth arises more from superior acquisition of new  
36  
37 buyers than retaining existing ones (e.g. Riebe et al., 2014), an enhanced ability to retain last  
38  
39 year's buyers makes maintenance or brand growth an easier task. Identifying factors that co-  
40  
41 vary with erosion may give guidance for managers interested in remediating the problem.

42  
43  
44 The study considers how price promotions (Bogomolova et al., 2015), niche brand  
45  
46 (Bhattacharya, 1997), brand type - store brand or manufacturer brand (De Wulf et al., 2005),  
47  
48 the brand's price level (Sethuraman and Srinivasan, 2002) and range breadth (e.g.  
49  
50 Tanusondjaja et al., 2018) are associated with lower or higher levels of erosion. The outcome  
51  
52 of erosion in terms of brand repertoire change over time is also examined.  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

#### 2.4. Potential reasons for Erosion

Given that brands often have stable market share, it is not necessarily obvious how erosion occurs. But what it suggests is that some consumers' propensities to buy brands alter over time. The simplest explanation is that marketing activity for brands is noticed, and in addition to reinforcing and reminding existing buyers (Ehrenberg et al., 2002), it has a customer acquisition effect: as a result of the marketing stimuli, some consumers add the brand to their repertoire and therefore have less need of another brand they previously bought. Another potential explanation is variety seeking (Kahn, 1995, McAlister and Pessemier, 1982), whereby some consumers simply wish to try a different brand, one they have not purchased before or for a long time period. Such a purchase may result in some positive purchase reinforcement (Givon and Horsky, 1990, Kahn et al., 1986), thus the household may add it to their longer-term repertoire.

To this point, the discussion about loyalty and loyalty erosion has principally been from a strictly behavioural perspective, but the loyalty literature also canvasses *attitudinal* loyalty. Indeed, many authors in this area discuss the idea of *true* loyalty, requiring a combination of high levels of purchasing *and* positive brand attitudes (Dick and Basu, 1994). Apparently, however, only a minority of brand buyers, in the order of 10% or less, meet these criteria (Baldinger and Rubinson, 1996, Bandyopadhyay and Martell, 2007). Low levels of 'true' loyalty appear consistent with the fact that consumers typically buy from repertoires of several brands in a category. Multi-brand buying makes the incidence of heavy brand buying somewhat less common, and it would be paradoxical for a consumer to have very positive attitudes about multiple brands in a category. However, this pattern of most buyers having fairly low 'true' loyalty may actually be consistent with the studies of erosion to date. Given that, as per Baldinger & Rubinson (1996) and Bandyopadhyay & Martell (2007), most brand

1  
2  
3 buyers are apparently not strongly attitudinally attached to a brand, it would not be difficult  
4  
5 for some to down-weight their purchase propensity for the brand over a time period of several  
6  
7 years, i.e., to erode. By contrast, the brand buyers who are more attitudinally loyal may be  
8  
9 more likely to remain in the brand's long-term base. Some potential evidence for the role of  
10  
11 attitudes in limiting loyalty erosion comes from Baldinger & Rubinson (1996), which found  
12  
13 that prediction of a brand's purchase rates in year 2 was superior using a combination of year  
14  
15 1 purchasing and attitudinal information than from year 1 purchasing data alone. This finding  
16  
17 suggests that attitude may be causally implicated in directing future behaviour; and that  
18  
19 stronger attitude is linked to higher future purchase. However, it may also be the case that the  
20  
21 attitudinal scores actually reflect long-run brand purchasing propensity, which would help  
22  
23 account for the fact that in any given time period, the observed brand purchase rate can  
24  
25 fluctuate around its longer-term level<sup>1</sup> (Schmittlein et al., 1993).  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30

31  
32 Erosion may also be realistically understood from a consumer based brand equity perspective,  
33  
34 particularly in relation to memory structures. Consumers form beliefs and perceptions about  
35  
36 brands from experience and exposure to marketing communications. Consumers' ability to  
37  
38 retrieve these perceptions from memory has been found to be quite variable over time, with  
39  
40 research finding that only around 50% of those that agree a brand has a given characteristic,  
41  
42 or is suitable for a particular usage situation, will do so again when re-surveyed (Castleberry  
43  
44 et al., 1994, Dall'Olmo Riley et al., 1997). Therefore, it may be the case that some consumers  
45  
46 happen to not see or notice marketing communications for a brand they normally buy,  
47  
48 accidentally forget to buy it, or it simply fails to 'come to mind' in a buying situation. The  
49  
50 outcome is that a different brand to one in the normal repertoire is bought, the original brand  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55

---

56  
57  
58 <sup>1</sup> For example, a household might usually buy a brand six times per year but just happened to buy it only twice  
59  
60 in one specific year. Its attitudinal score for that brand at the time might more fully reflect its usual purchase  
behaviour and so appear 'predictive' of the return to the normal buying rate of around six times, in year 2.

1  
2  
3 loses its place in the consumer's repertoire, and may perhaps not be bought again for years  
4 afterwards. This process of customer churn occurs to some extent for all brands in a category,  
5  
6 and yet brand shares maintain equilibrium over time. Unfortunately, the present study does  
7  
8 not have access to attitudinal or brand awareness/mental availability data, therefore further  
9  
10 investigation of the role of these factors in erosion is outside its scope.  
11  
12  
13  
14

15 In the next section, we identify category and brand characteristics as well as several  
16  
17 marketing mix variables that logically link to erosion levels. These form the basis of a series  
18  
19 of hypotheses.  
20  
21  
22

### 23 **3. Hypothesis development**

#### 24 **3.1 Extent of Erosion over multiple years**

25  
26  
27 Ehrenberg (1988) reported an erosion rate of approximately 6% per quarter, but the analysis  
28  
29 was limited to a 12-month period. East and Hammond (1996) reported an erosion rate of 15%  
30  
31 per year, but also found the rate of erosion flattened in the second year. We now consider the  
32  
33 possible shape of erosion over a longer timeline. There are two factors to be considered.  
34  
35  
36

37 First, it is logical to think that base-period buyers with weaker memory structures (or perhaps  
38  
39 lower levels of positive attitude) relating to the brand might erode earlier, leaving a  
40  
41 progressively more positive or more memory-prominent cohort. This implies erosion should  
42  
43 slow as the time period lengthens between the base year and the subsequent year in which we  
44  
45 observe re-purchase. However, a longer elapsed time period from the base provides more  
46  
47 opportunity for change in tastes to occur (e.g. Swait and Adamowicz, 2001), therefore the rate  
48  
49 of erosion might accelerate. For example, more of the base might erode between year 3 and 4  
50  
51 than between year 2 and 3. These two factors may result in mutual cancellation of effects.  
52  
53  
54

55 Therefore, we hypothesise:  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 **H1.** Erosion in the brand's base period buyer base occurs at a constant rate over multiple  
4  
5 years.  
6  
7

### 8 9 **3.2 Repertoires**

10  
11  
12 Next, we consider how erosion might influence the evolution of consumer repertoires. There  
13  
14 is evidence that consumer brand repertoires get larger over longer time periods such as from a  
15  
16 quarter to a year (Banelis et al., 2013), or longer (Trinh, 2014). A relevant question for this  
17  
18 study is, if we observe a cohort of brand buyers that exhibits erosion, how will that erosion be  
19  
20 reflected in terms of the accumulated growth in those buyers' repertoires over time. One  
21  
22 possibility is that repertoire growth is slower than expected. This could happen because those  
23  
24 buyers that erode away do not tend to replace that 'lost' brand in their repertoire. However, it  
25  
26 may be the case that, due to erosion, repertoires grow *more* than would be expected. The  
27  
28 reason is because brands often exhibit aggregate level equilibrium in sales and market share  
29  
30 over multi-year periods (Dawes et al., 2015, Dekimpe and Hanssens, 1995a). If brands are  
31  
32 stable in the aggregate, yet have buyer bases that are eroding, they are simultaneously topping  
33  
34 up the eroded buyers with new ones. This in turn means that cumulative buyer repertoires  
35  
36 will be larger than they otherwise would be. Another way of conceptualising this scenario is  
37  
38 that for any brand, *it and its competitors have buyer bases that are eroding*, so there is overall  
39  
40 more mobility in the consumer base across all brands. However, a theoretical benchmark is  
41  
42 needed to determine the size of brand repertoires after five years if there were no erosion.  
43  
44 The NBD model, which assumes constant purchase propensities and therefore no erosion,  
45  
46 provides such a theoretical benchmark (East and Hammond, 1996, Trinh, 2014).  
47  
48

49  
50 Accordingly,

51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56 **H2.** Buyer repertoires over a multi-year period will be larger than predicted by the NBD  
57  
58 model.  
59  
60

### 3.3 Incidence and depth of promotion.

Temporary price promotions attract existing brand buyers (Ehrenberg et al., 1994) as well as attracting some switchers who primarily buy other brands. Given that price promotions are very prevalent (Ataman et al., 2010) yet brand repertoires are quite small, i.e. 2-3 brands in an annual period (Banelis et al., 2013), promotions are likely to primarily appeal to existing brand buyers. Recent empirical support for this conclusion was reported in Dawes (2018). The theoretical mechanism is that a brand is recognisable and familiar to its own buyer base (Ambler et al., 2004), and a promotion offers consumers the chance to buy a brand they already have a high probability of buying, via enhancing evaluation (Grewal et al., 1998) and value perceptions (Zeithaml, 1988). Price promotions also draw attention to the brand to those who do not normally buy it, however, the focus of this study is erosion of the brand's existing buyer base. Based on these points, higher promotion incidence should help retain the brand's buyer base by offering it periodic opportunities to buy it at a reduced price, hence retarding migration to competitor brands.

**H3a.** High promotion incidence for a brand is negatively related to erosion.

It would be useful to identify if the effect of promotion incidence on erosion is different for manufacturer brands compared to store brands. Past work does not provide clear guidance for a hypothesis in this regard, for example Bijmolt, van Heerde and Pieters (2005) finds non-significant differences in price response for store brands compared to manufacturer brands. Therefore, we do not formulate a specific hypothesis in this regard, but in our regression model we create an interaction term for brand type and promotion incidence to examine this potential difference.

A point related to H3a is that consumers may be exposed to price promotions for several of the brands they buy in a category; and some of those brands may offer deeper price cuts than

1  
2  
3 others. One viewpoint, as suggested by the reference price literature, is that deep price cuts  
4  
5 lead consumers to form a lower reference price for the brand (Kalwani et al., 1990, Lattin and  
6  
7 Bucklin, 1989). This will arguably have a negative effect on re-purchase during non-  
8  
9 promotion periods, and therefore also lead to heightened erosion. However, empirical work  
10  
11 indicates little in the way of negative buyer behaviour after-effects from price cuts (Ehrenberg  
12  
13 et al., 1994). The alternative viewpoint is that brands endeavour to preserve their buyer base  
14  
15 in the face of price-cutting by competitors, and deeper cuts offer more perceived value to  
16  
17 consumers (Alford and Biswas, 2002). Therefore, a brand offering on-average deeper price  
18  
19 cuts will likely retain its buyers compared to a brand offering shallower ones. Therefore,  
20  
21  
22

23  
24  
25 **H3b.** Depth of price cuts for brand price-promotions is negatively related to erosion<sup>2</sup>.  
26  
27

### 28 **3.4 Niche brand.**

29  
30

31 Niche brands have high loyalty for their market share (Bhattacharya, 1997). Bhattacharya  
32  
33 suggests that this high loyalty is due to the brand accommodating the needs of a specific  
34  
35 market segment. Kahn et al suggests a niche brand is catering to a specific need (Kahn et al.,  
36  
37 1988). These points suggest that a niche brand is somewhat less substitutable than other  
38  
39 competing brands in the market, and so buyers would find it more difficult to replace the  
40  
41 brand in their repertoire. Relatively high loyalty can also be due to localised presence in  
42  
43 geographies or channels (Pare and Dawes, 2011) - such brands may be highly salient or well-  
44  
45 known in the selected places they are available. These points suggest the rate of erosion  
46  
47 should be lower for brands that have more pronounced niche characteristics.  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52

---

53  
54 <sup>2</sup> In theory there is a third potential measure of promotion, namely breadth – the proportion of a brand's range of  
55  
56 items that is promoted, which unfortunately we are unable to calculate. This measure would require information  
57  
58 on the weekly promotional status of every SKU in each brands' range within every retailer. This level of detail  
59  
60 is not available in the supplied datasets. We mention the use of this measure as an avenue for further work.



1  
2  
3 **H4.** The extent to which a brand is niche (relative to other brands in the category) will be  
4 associated with a lower rate of erosion.  
5  
6

### 7 8 **3.5 Store Brands.** 9

10  
11  
12 Manufacturer brands are generally sold in the stores of multiple retailers. Retailers also sell  
13 their own store brands, and have control over shelf space and in-store communication to  
14 promote these brands (e.g. Hyman et al., 2010, Nogales and Suarez, 2005). This control may  
15 result in a greater level of in-store salience for store brands, thereby helping to retain buyers  
16 and so slowing the extent of erosion. Also, store brands are often present across many  
17 categories (Sayman and Raju, 2004) although some retailers such as Aldi use a multiplicity of  
18 store brand names. Many households are likely to buy a retailer-named store brand from at  
19 least one category on many shopping trips. There is some limited evidence in the literature of  
20 positive, albeit weak, purchase feedback effects (Allenby and Lenk, 1995, Keane, 1997), and  
21 so buying a store brand in one category could potentially re-inforce the purchasing of that  
22 same brand, in a different category. This wide cross-category presence of store brands may  
23 therefore have a dampening effect on erosion. Also, while store brands are no longer strictly  
24 low-price, lower-quality offerings, they may still appeal to consumers with a 'value trait'  
25 (Seenivasan et al., 2015) which may help preserve their buyer base over time. Therefore,  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44

45 **H5.** Store brands will have lower rates of erosion.  
46  
47

### 48 **3.6 Low-price brands.** 49

50  
51  
52 Studies indicate that buyers of lower-priced brands exhibit greater purchase loyalty to them  
53 (Bhattacharya et al., 1996, Dawes, 2013, Jung et al., 2010). A theoretical rationale relates to  
54 what is called the asymmetric price effect (Sethuraman et al., 1999) between high price and  
55 low-price brands. That is, when high-price brands price-promote they make the brand  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 temporarily more affordable to low-price brand buyers, who therefore occasionally 'switch  
4 up'. This switching-up inflates the high-price brand's penetration, but because it is only  
5 occasional, diminishes the higher priced brands' repeat-purchase loyalty. By contrast, when  
6 low-priced brands price-promote they do not attract much 'switching down' from high-priced  
7 brand buyers, because those buyers perceive a large quality difference (Sethuraman, 1996).  
8 The upshot is that the buyer base of low-priced brands comprises buyers who buy low-price  
9 more consistently, whereas the buyer base of high-priced brands includes a larger proportion  
10 of occasional (low-price) switchers. A second rationale is that certain buyers are more price-  
11 sensitive, perhaps linked to demographics such as household size (Hoch et al., 1995). Such  
12 buyers may confine their purchases to lower-priced brands (Sethuraman and Cole, 1999),  
13 which increases the purchase loyalty of those brands. It is a reasonable proposition that if  
14 low-priced brands enjoy higher loyalty, this will translate to lower customer loss or erosion  
15 over time. Accordingly,

16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34 **H6.** Low brand price, relative to the category average, will be associated with lower erosion.

35  
36  
37 Note that H5 pertains to store brands and H6 relates to low brand price. The question may  
38 arise as to whether low brand price is a characteristic closely associated with store brands.  
39 While store brands have traditionally been low-priced competitors (Kumar and Steenkamp,  
40 2007), in many cases they now offer comparable quality and price to national brands (ter  
41 Braak et al., 2014). In a subsequent section we show that the variables of low price and store  
42 brand are sufficiently distinct for the analysis.

### 51 52 **3.7 Large range.**

53  
54  
55 A large range of line items may help a brand appeal to both existing and non-buyers, preserve  
56 or win shelf-space (Tanusondjaja et al., 2018), and demonstrate category leadership to retail  
57 channels. A large range may also act to retain buyers over time. There is less motivation to

1  
2  
3 cease using a brand if it offers a very wide range of options (e.g. Kahn, 1995). Indeed,  
4  
5 Tanusondjaja, Trinh and Romaniuk (2016) found that new variants tend to be purchased by  
6  
7 buyers of the parent brand, suggesting they play a role in retention. Therefore, if a brand's  
8  
9 range (measured as number of line items) is larger, erosion should be lower. Accordingly,  
10  
11

12  
13 **H7.** A larger brand range, relative to the category average, will be associated with lower  
14  
15 erosion.  
16

### 17 18 19 **3.8 Brand Size (penetration), Category Purchase rate and category penetration.**

20  
21  
22 Larger brands, that is, brands with higher market share and penetration, are known to have  
23  
24 higher loyalty (Ehrenberg et al., 1990, Dawes et al., 2017). East & Hammond (1996) also  
25  
26 found they had lower erosion rates. Since this relationship is already known, we do not  
27  
28 include a hypotheses relating to brand size, but we include it in the model to avoid omitted  
29  
30 variable bias (Greene, 2011 Ch.8). We also include category purchase rate, as did East &  
31  
32 Hammond (1996). We also include category penetration, which has been linked to brand  
33  
34 loyalty on the basis that larger categories have a greater number of infrequent users with less-  
35  
36 formed preferences (Casteran et al., 2019).  
37  
38  
39

## 40 41 **4. Data and Method**

42  
43 Household panel data were provided by Kantar. The Kantar UK panel comprises  
44  
45 approximately 35,000 households. In order to evaluate long-term erosion and to avoid  
46  
47 confounding erosion with panel attrition, a sub-sample of 12,400 continuous reporters over 5  
48  
49 years was extracted. The sub-sample comprised only households who reported purchases  
50  
51 over the entire time period.  
52  
53

54  
55  
56 A question arises as to whether the long-term panelists might be intrinsically more loyal  
57  
58 (since they stay in the panel for many years); which could bias the estimation of erosion  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 downward. To check if this was the case, we compared the loyalty of the long-term panelists  
4  
5 in the fifth year, to that for the entire panel (which includes those who dropped out) in the first  
6  
7 year. If the long-term panelists have some intrinsic loyalty proneness or have become  
8  
9 habituated from reporting, then loyalty in the fifth year (among the long-term panelists only)  
10  
11 should be higher than what we see from the entire panel in the base year. For this comparison  
12  
13 we used annual Share of Category Requirements or 'SCR', a commonly used loyalty metric  
14  
15 (Farris et al., 2016). Higher SCR indicates higher behavioral brand loyalty, and is more  
16  
17 comparable across categories than other measures such as brand purchase frequency. We  
18  
19 found average Share of Requirements allocated to each brand (over the top 20 brands in our  
20  
21 10 categories) to be 26% in year 1 panel-wide, and 25.5% among the long-term panelists in  
22  
23 year 5 ( $t=1.2$ ,  $df 199$ ,  $p=0.22$ ). Therefore, the long-term panelists do not exhibit higher  
24  
25 behavioral loyalty compared to panel members generally, and so the estimates of erosion  
26  
27 should be unbiased.  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33

34 We use ten diverse consumer packaged goods categories to ensure reasonable generalizability  
35  
36 of results. The categories are subsequently detailed in Table 2.  
37  
38  
39

40 The two prior studies upon which this study builds (Ehrenberg 1988, East & Hammond 1996)  
41  
42 used brands with stable market shares. We do the same. A study of brand share stability  
43  
44 (Graham, 2009) used a threshold of 3 percentage point change over five years. We use a  
45  
46 stricter criterion of 2 percentage point change over the period<sup>3</sup>. We also show an analysis that  
47  
48 uses all brands, i.e. including those that grew or declined by more than 2 points for  
49  
50 comparison. This supplementary analysis produced very similar results.  
51  
52  
53  
54

---

55  
56 <sup>3</sup> We also selected stable brands by regressing year 1 market share on year 5 market share, calculating  
57  
58 standardized residuals and selecting only those brands with a residual between +/- 1.96, i.e. brands for whom the  
59  
60 difference in year 5 market share was non-statistically significant at  $p \leq 0.05$ . The results are invariant to this  
criterion, compared to the 2-point change criterion.

1  
2  
3 We used the top 20 brands in ten categories, to avoid confounding effects from brands with  
4 very small numbers of purchases (Pare and Dawes, 2011). These brands accounted for 84%  
5 market share on average (min.=72%) in each category, and feature in the data across the  
6 entire five years. Therefore, we have an inclusive and representative sample of brands, and in  
7 a diverse variety of categories including food, personal care and household goods.  
8  
9

10 To investigate the occurrence of erosion, we first identified all the households who purchased  
11 a brand in the base year. We use a one-year period, whereas Ehrenberg (1998) and East &  
12 Hammond (1996) used quarters. The reason for using a year is that it results in a larger  
13 number of buyers for all brands, making the comparisons between base and the later years  
14 more accurate. A one-year period also eliminates potential seasonality effects that might arise  
15 using quarters.  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29

30 After identifying the households who purchased a brand in the base year, we then identified  
31 the proportion of those households who did not purchase that brand in the second year, i.e.,  
32 one year on from the base. We continued this process to identify the proportion of base-year  
33 (year 1) buyers who did not purchase the brand in year 3, 4 and 5; in other words, the  
34 progressive loss of the brand's base year customers. In each case we examine one-year  
35 windows that progressively get further away from the base year.  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44

45 We then calculated from the Kantar data annual observations for the suite of brand and  
46 category characteristics used as independent variables. We consequently have observations  
47 for 200 brands over a four-year period from the base year, for a total of 800 observations.  
48  
49

50 The measures used in the analysis are now outlined.  
51  
52  
53  
54

### 55 **Measures.**

56  
57  
58 **Customer Loss** (the dependent variable).  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 Proportion of base year (year 1) brand buyers that fail to re-purchase brand in year 2, 3, 4, 5.  
4

5 The accumulation of this customer loss over time is erosion (based on East and Hammond,  
6  
7 1996). Variable type: metric.  
8  
9

### 10 11 **Repertoire Size.** 12

13  
14 Average number of brands bought (Banelis et al., 2013) in each category by its buying  
15  
16 households, over the five-year period. This is calculated by summing the total number of  
17  
18 different brands bought in the base year, and cumulatively over five years, by buyers in each  
19  
20 of the 10 categories. For example, the average repertoire size in the fabric care category in  
21  
22 the base year is 2.4 brands, over the five years it is 4.3 brands. This variable is used to test  
23  
24 H2, and is not included in the regression model. Variable type: metric.  
25  
26  
27  
28

### 29 **Independent variables.** 30

#### 31 32 **Promotion incidence and depth.** 33

34  
35 This variable is the proportion of each brand's sales sold on promotion (Scriven et al., 2017)  
36  
37 in each year. We index this measure and others relative to the category average (e.g., Macé  
38  
39 and Neslin, 2004, Jung et al., 2010) to avoid confounding the analysis results with category  
40  
41 level differences in variables such as promotion, price levels or range breadth. Variable type:  
42  
43 metric.  
44  
45  
46  
47

#### 48 **Promotion depth.** 49

50  
51 Average depth of each brand's price-promotion discount depth, for each year (Bogomolova et  
52  
53 al., 2015), indexed to the category average. Variable type: metric.  
54  
55  
56

#### 57 **Niche brand.** 58 59 60

1  
2  
3 This variable is brand purchase frequency compared to the formula  $(w_i(1-b_i))$  (Bhattacharya,  
4 1997, Kahn et al., 1988). We first calculate the proportion of households that buy each brand  
5 in each year. We then calculate the average number of occasions those buyers buy each brand  
6 in each year. In the formula  $(w_i(1-b_i))$ ,  $w_i$  denotes brand purchase frequency and  $b_i$  denotes  
7 brand penetration. Substituting each brand's actual penetrations and purchase frequency  
8 produces a figure that is approximately constant for brands in a category, in line with the  
9 double jeopardy pattern (Graham et al., 2017). We take the average of the constant. We then  
10 subtract the actual purchase frequency of each brand in the category from this constant.  
11 Figures above the constant indicate the brand is 'niche' - purchased more frequently than  
12 expected, for its market share. Figures below the constant indicate the brand is 'change of  
13 pace' - purchased less frequently than expected, for its market share. Kahn et al (1988) also  
14 provides detailed calculations. Variable type: metric.

### 31 **Store brand.**

32  
33  
34  
35 Retailer's own brand, sold only in that retailer (Pare and Dawes, 2011). Store brand is  
36 indicated with a 0,1 code (1=Store brand), for each brand, in each year of the data. This is a  
37 time-invariant variable, whereas all the other variables take different values across years.

38  
39  
40  
41 Variable type: binary.

### 42 **Low-priced brand.**

43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48 We calculate each brand's non-promoted price relative to the category average for each year  
49 in the data. Prices are price per unit of weight to control for pack size differences across  
50 brands. Previous examples of this measure are Bolton (1989); Mace and Neslin (2004) and  
51 Keller & Deleersnyder (2019). Variable type: metric.

### 52 **Range breadth.**

1  
2  
3 Number of variants offered by the brand in each calendar year (Tanusondjaja et al., 2018).

4  
5 This is calculated by observing the number of line items of each brand with non-zero sales  
6  
7 within each year. This measure is then indexed relative to the category average. Variable  
8  
9 type: metric.

### 10 11 12 13 **Brand penetration.**

14  
15  
16 We calculate the proportion of panel households that purchase each brand in each year. We  
17  
18 then index this measure relative to the category average. Variable type: metric.

### 19 20 21 22 **Category purchase rate.**

23  
24  
25 This is the mean average number of occasions the category is purchased per year (Dawes et  
26  
27 al., 2015). Note, median was also used as a robustness check and did not alter the results.

28  
29 The distribution of category purchase occasions fits the NBD well, with a MAPE of 0.09 on  
30  
31 average (Table 2). This variable is used as a covariate to control for the possibility that  
32  
33 erosion for brands in a category is associated with the frequency with which that category is  
34  
35 purchased. Variable type: metric.

### 36 37 38 39 **Category penetration.**

40  
41  
42 Proportion of panel households that purchased the category in each year. This variable is  
43  
44 used as a covariate to control for any association between erosion and category penetration.  
45  
46 Variable type: metric.

47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55 Descriptive results and a correlation matrix of these variables are presented as an Appendix.



1  
2  
3 A question arises regarding the Store Brand variable, and whether it might be highly related  
4  
5 to certain other variables such as price. We report the correlations between all variables in the  
6  
7 Appendix. Store brand is indeed correlated with several other independent variables at up to  
8  
9 moderate levels of approximately  $r=-0.5$ . However, we calculated the VIF indicator of  
10  
11 collinearity for Store Brand to be 3.1, which is far below the level of 10.0 considered  
12  
13 problematic for regression (Hair et al., 1995 Ch. 4). The maximum VIF in the model was 3.6,  
14  
15 for promotion incidence.  
16  
17  
18  
19

### 20 **Analysis model**

21  
22  
23 We employed a panel data<sup>4</sup> regression in Stata using the xtreg procedure to test the  
24  
25 hypotheses. This model is ideally suited for longitudinal data of the type employed in this  
26  
27 study (e.g., Cameron and Trivedi, 2010).  
28  
29

30  
31 Note that certain brands, in particular retailer brands such as Tesco and Tesco Value, Asda  
32  
33 and Asda Smartprice, Sainsbury and others are present in multiple categories. This introduces  
34  
35 a lack of independence across observations for these brands that could deflate standard errors  
36  
37 and lead to biased estimation (e.g. Greene, 2011 ch.11). Therefore, we coded brands that  
38  
39 appeared across multiple categories with the same code (i.e., all Tesco coded as Tesco, all  
40  
41 Asda coded as Asda and so on). We specified robust clustered errors for the analysis using  
42  
43 this coding scheme. We specified that the model errors were double-clustered by brand and  
44  
45 year, to accommodate both sources of dependence across observations.  
46  
47  
48  
49

50  
51 We checked that the model results were not sensitive to the large number of observations for  
52  
53 some of the large retailer brands by running subsets of the dataset, omitting each one in turn.  
54  
55

---

56  
57  
58 <sup>4</sup> In this context the term panel data refers to repeated cross-sectional observations, in this case of  
59 brands.  
60

1  
2  
3 That is, running the model without Tesco, replacing Tesco and omitting Asda, and so on. The  
4  
5 sign and magnitude of the model parameters stayed extremely stable. This checking provides  
6  
7 confidence the results are not biased by the presence of the retailer brands across multiple  
8  
9 categories. We also ran the models omitting one category at a time, and again the sign and  
10  
11 magnitude of the parameters were consistent, indicating the results are not driven by  
12  
13 idiosyncratic results from one category.  
14  
15

16  
17  
18 A potential concern arises about endogeneity, either from omitted variable bias or possibly  
19  
20 reverse-causality, such as marketers reacting to erosion by altering their marketing mix. An  
21  
22 indicator of endogeneity is correlation between the independent variables and the error term  
23  
24 (e.g. Wooldridge, 2015 Ch. 4). We confirmed that the error term was uncorrelated with the  
25  
26 independent variables. We then tested for reverse causality by examining if changes in price  
27  
28 promotion incidence and product range breadth were related to erosion levels in the previous  
29  
30 year. There was no correlation between these variables and past erosion. This provides some  
31  
32 confidence that there is not reverse causality present. We do, however, recognise that we do  
33  
34 not have information on the full spectrum of marketing activity, such as advertising, to fully  
35  
36 rule out endogeneity. We discuss this limitation in the final section.  
37  
38  
39

40  
41  
42 We used dummy-variable binary coding for the year variable (with year 2 being the contrast  
43  
44 year) to incorporate potential non-linear effects of time on erosion. Using a mix of metric and  
45  
46 binary independent variables is a conventional approach in regression modelling, for example  
47  
48 Greene (2011 Ch. 11) employs several examples. The model coefficients for year 3,4,5  
49  
50 represent the main effect of time on customer loss.  
51  
52  
53

## 54 **5. Findings**

55  
56  
57 We first show the model-free results averaged across brands within each category, along with  
58  
59 some key category metrics. Between year 2 and year 5 the average loss of base-year buyers  
60

(% failing to rebuy the brand in a year) increased from 57% to 71.5%. From this figure we derive the erosion rate of 14.5 points (26% in proportional terms) over three years. Details are shown in Table 2. While the extent of loss among base-year buyers varies, it does not vary hugely. We note that the smallest extent of loss is in Ice-Cream, in which 62.2% of year 1's brand buyers failed to re-buy in year 5. The extent of erosion from year 2 onwards is therefore (62.2-50.2) 12 percentage points. The largest extent of loss is in Razor blades, with 85.9% of year 1's buyers failing to re-buy by year 5; the extent of erosion from year 2 to 5 is 14.3 points on average for brands in this category.

**Table 2 Descriptive results for Customer Loss & Erosion**

	Cat. Penetration	Cat. Purch. freq. (mean)	Cat. Purch. freq. (median)	NBD fit (MAPE) *	Avg. % of Year 1 brand buyers who do not buy brand in:				Accumulated erosion in absolute % points			
					Yr 2	Yr 3	Yr 4	Yr 5	Yr 2	Yr 3	Yr 4	Yr 5
Ice cream	90	15.6	9.5	0.04	50.2	57.3	58.9	62.2	na	7.1	8.7	12.0
Instant coffee	85	9.5	5.5	0.04	49.0	53.0	59.2	64.2	na	4.0	10.2	15.2
Cook-in Sauce	83	13.1	7.5	0.10	50.2	56.2	61.9	65.8	na	6.0	11.7	15.6
Fabric care	94	7.0	5.5	0.07	49.9	56.8	62.4	65.9	na	6.9	12.5	15.9
Beer / lager	52	7.3	3.5	0.17	59.6	64.7	68.9	72.0	na	5.1	9.3	12.4
Pasta sauce	74	10.1	5.5	0.12	56.1	62.6	68.2	72.2	na	6.5	12.1	16.1
Facial Care	57	5.3	2.5	0.03	60.6	66.6	70.4	73.7	na	6.0	9.8	13.1
Toothpaste	90	6.4	4.5	0.09	56.7	65.8	69.9	73.9	na	9.1	13.2	17.2
Olives	27	4.7	2.5	0.11	66.5	73.3	77.2	79.5	na	6.8	10.7	13.0
Razor blades	46	2.3	1.5	0.12	71.6	76.8	81.7	85.9	na	5.2	10.2	14.3
<b>Average</b>	<b>70</b>	<b>8.1</b>	<b>4.8</b>	<b>0.09</b>	<b>57.0</b>	<b>63.3</b>	<b>67.9</b>	<b>71.5</b>		<b>6.3</b>	<b>10.8</b>	<b>14.5</b>

\* Mean Average Percentage Error

The regression results are shown in Table 3.

**Table 3 Regression results**

	<b>Model 1.</b> Only brands that stayed within 2 points of commencing market share. Observations = 684. Dependent variable: proportion of year 1 buyers who fail to purchase the brand in year 2,3,4,5				<b>Model 2.</b> All brands. Observations = 800. Dependent variable: proportion of year 1 buyers who fail to purchase the brand in year 2,3,4,5			
R Sq. within	0.79				0.78			
between	0.80				0.80			
overall	0.79				0.78			
	Coef.	Robust Std. Err.	Z	P> Z	Coef.	Robust Std. Err.	Z	P> Z
Year 3**	0.06	0.002	40.9	0.001	0.06	0.002	40.4	0.001
Year 4	0.11	0.003	34.6	0.001	0.11	0.004	25.2	0.001
Year 5	0.14	0.004	36.5	0.001	0.14	0.004	33.4	0.001
Brand Penetration	-1.02	0.14	-7.3	0.001	-1.01	0.11	-8.8	0.001
Niche Brand	-0.04	0.01	-5.7	0.001	-0.05	0.01	-5.9	0.001
Store Brand	-0.06	0.03	-2.5	0.014	-0.07	0.03	-2.3	0.023
Promotion Incidence Mfr. Brand	-0.03	0.01	-2.5	0.013	-0.03	0.01	-2.6	0.008
Price Promotion depth	0.001	0.01	-0.1	0.929	-0.006	0.00	-1.3	0.194
Brand Price Index*	-0.004	0.00	-1.0	0.320	-0.006	0.01	-1.1	0.266
Range Breadth	-0.02	0.007	-3.1	0.002	-0.024	0.006	-4.0	0.001
Category Penetration	-0.11	0.034	-3.2	0.001	-0.08	0.024	-3.3	0.001
Category Purchase Frequency	0.002	0.001	1.8	0.071	0.003	0.001	2.1	0.032
Constant	0.86	0.025	34.6	0.001	0.85	0.020	42.4	0.001

\*\* Year 2 is the contrast for these yearly dummy variables. \*Price index: (smaller index = lower price)

### 5.1 Hypothesis testing

H1 posed that erosion takes place at a constant rate, that is, the rate it occurs at does not diminish over time. In Table 2 we see that on average 57% of year 1's brand buyers fail to re-purchase the brand in year 2. This figure climbs to 63.3% in year 3 (an increase of 6.3). It climbs again to 67.9 in year 4 (total loss from year 2 of 10.8, an increase of 4.5 from year 3). By year 5, 71.5% of year 1's buyers fail to re-purchase, which is a total loss from year 2 of 14.5, and between year 4 and 5 a loss of 3.7. Therefore, erosion in years 3,4,5 respectively is 6.3, 4.5, and 3.7 points. The rates are statistically significantly different (each significantly different to the other at  $p < 0.05$ ,  $F = 16.7$ , d.f. 2 using a post-hoc test). Therefore, H1 is not supported – the rate of erosion diminishes over time.

1  
2  
3 Next, to test H2 we examine the link between erosion and repertoire growth. We first  
4  
5 calculated the projected 5-year penetration for each brand by applying the NBD to the base  
6  
7 year metrics (Ehrenberg, 1988). We then used the projected penetrations to calculate  
8  
9 theoretical repertoire sizes (Trinh, 2014). This calculation produces an estimate of what  
10  
11 repertoire sizes would grow to over time if purchase propensities were fixed. We then  
12  
13 computed the actual 5-year penetrations and repertoire sizes, and then compared the estimated  
14  
15 figures to the actual figures.  
16  
17

18  
19  
20 We found that actual repertoire size was significantly larger than the NBD-estimated figure,  
21  
22 in other words, larger than what would occur if purchase propensities were fixed (actual 4.2,  
23  
24 NBD estimate 3.2,  $p < 0.01$ ). If brand repertoires are larger, then brand penetrations should  
25  
26 also be larger than expected over the five-year period. Findings confirmed that brand  
27  
28 penetrations over time were larger than expected (mean penetration 0.19 vs. expected 0.15,  
29  
30  $p < 0.01$ ). H2 is therefore supported. This finding clarifies the mechanism by which erosion  
31  
32 occurs. Erosion for a brand does not mean buyers in a sense ‘drop’ one brand and confine  
33  
34 their purchases to a smaller subset than before, but rather, one brand is dropped and replaced  
35  
36 with another, or other brands. The end result is that brands exhibit a larger buyer base over  
37  
38 time than would otherwise be the case, but their buyers are also lighter or less frequent,  
39  
40 because they are purchasing across a larger brand repertoire.  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45

#### 46 *5.2 Testing Hypotheses 3 to 7*

47  
48  
49

50 To address hypotheses 3 to 7 we utilise the regression models.  
51  
52

53 H3a proposed that higher promotion incidence is negatively related to erosion. We found that  
54  
55 including promotion incidence and the interaction term (price promotion incidence x  
56  
57 manufacturer brand) rendered both variables non-significant due to collinearity. We retained  
58  
59 the interaction term. Table 3 shows the coefficient for this variable is negative and  
60

1  
2  
3 statistically significant in the sample of stable brands (-0.03,  $p=0.01$ ) and also in the full  
4  
5 sample of brands. These results provide partial support for H3a, in that there is evidence price  
6  
7 promotion incidence is associated with lower levels of erosion in the buyer base – but only for  
8  
9 manufacturer brands, not store brands.

10  
11  
12  
13 H3b proposed that greater depth of price cuts would be negatively related to erosion.

14  
15 However, we see promotion depth is not significant in either model.

16  
17  
18  
19 H4 posed that niche brands will have lower erosion rates. The models provide support for  
20  
21 this hypothesis, with the coefficient for niche brand being negative and statistically significant  
22  
23 in the stable sample (-0.04,  $p<0.01$ ), with a similar result in the full sample of brands.

24  
25 Therefore, niche brands, with high relative loyalty in terms of current purchase frequency or  
26  
27 SCR (Bhattacharya, 1997), also tend to retain their existing customers in subsequent years to  
28  
29 a somewhat greater extent.

30  
31  
32  
33 H5 posed that store brands will have lower rates of erosion. We find support for this  
34  
35 hypothesis in the models, with the store brand coefficient being negative and statistically  
36  
37 significant (model 1 -0.06,  $p=0.01$ ; model 2 -0.07,  $p=0.02$ ).

38  
39  
40  
41 H6 relates to low priced-brands. The coefficient for brand price index is non-significant in  
42  
43 both of the models. Therefore, there is an absence of evidence that low brand price is  
44  
45 associated with lower erosion.

46  
47  
48  
49 H7 relates to a larger product range being associated with lower erosion. The coefficient for  
50  
51 range breadth is negative and statistically significant in the sample of stable brands (-0.02,  
52  
53  $p=0.002$ ) and the full sample of brands (-0.024,  $p=0.001$ ). Therefore, H7 is supported.

54  
55  
56  
57 We also note the models show large, negatively signed coefficients for brand penetration (e.g.  
58  
59 -1.0,  $p<0.01$  in model 1), indicating brands with larger penetration have lower rates of  
60

1  
2  
3 erosion. This variable was not the subject of a hypothesis, but was included as a covariate.  
4  
5 The results for this variable support the findings of East & Hammond (1996): large brands  
6  
7 have lower erosion. Next, the coefficient for category penetration is negative and significant  
8  
9 in both models, indicating the rate of customer loss over time is lower for brands in categories  
10  
11 that a higher proportion of the population buy in a year. Lastly, we find category purchase  
12  
13 frequency is positive and significant in both models. This finding suggests erosion is slightly  
14  
15 higher for brands in categories that are purchased more frequently. It may be that frequent  
16  
17 category purchasing is linked to variety seeking (e.g. Kahn, 1995), leading to replacement of  
18  
19 brands in the repertoire over time.  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24

## 25 **6. Discussion**

26  
27 The findings build upon two previous studies (Ehrenberg, 1988, East and Hammond, 1996),  
28  
29 not only confirming and clarifying the erosion phenomenon, but identifying several factors  
30  
31 that co-vary with it. In addition, the results provide an explanation of how erosion occurs.  
32  
33  
34

35 It has long been known that of all the buyers who buy a brand in a base period, such as a year,  
36  
37 only a proportion will buy the next year. This is simply because many buyers are very 'light'  
38  
39 or infrequent (Sharp, 2010) buying at an average rate of less than once per year, so they  
40  
41 appear in certain years and not others. However, what we see here is that the proportion of  
42  
43 the base year's buyers who return reduces steadily over time, whereas fixed propensity  
44  
45 models suggest this proportion should remain stable. More specifically, we find the loss in  
46  
47 the base year's customer pool continues, albeit at a declining rate, over multiple years.  
48  
49

50 Moreover, we find that this loss differs systematically according to category, brand and  
51  
52 marketing mix factors. While erosion means that for any brand, some of its buyers drop it  
53  
54 from their repertoires, this does not mean that those buyers then confine their purchases to a  
55  
56 smaller brand set.  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 In fact, we see that erosion is linked to *larger* brand repertoires: buyers of this sample of  
4 brands on average had repertoires of approximately one additional brand over a multi-year  
5 period than would occur with no erosion; and likewise brands on average had four percentage  
6 points larger penetration. The mechanism underlying erosion is therefore that even in  
7 equilibrium markets, consumer's propensities to buy a brand are not fixed, rather, they change  
8 or drift over time. Therefore, this study contributes to past work on the conceptualisation and  
9 measurement of brand purchase propensities (e.g. Fader and Lattin, 1993).

10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20 Next, the findings of this study have implications for customer acquisition and retention  
21 research. Firstly, this sample of stable brands exhibited significant reductions over time in  
22 their base-year buyers; yet they managed to remain stable in market share. This highlights the  
23 fact that some degree of erosion (while showing associations with certain covariates,  
24 discussed shortly) - is a 'fact of life' for consumer goods brands. The managerial implication  
25 is that finding new buyers is not optional, even for a brand with stable market share. The  
26 stable brands in our sample have remained so *because* they have been able to attract enough  
27 new, or very infrequent buyers to buy the brand at least occasionally, and have also been able  
28 to either (a) replace the buyers 'lost' via erosion, and for some brands, (b) perform somewhat  
29 better on lowering the erosion rate, reducing the need to work quite as hard to attract new  
30 buyers. Therefore, the beneficial supporting role of retention on brand share maintenance via  
31 lower erosion is made more apparent from these findings.

32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49 The study also has implications for research on brand growth and marketing metrics. Past  
50 work has highlighted that brand growth comes more from acquisition than retention (e.g.  
51 Riebe et al., 2014). Related work has also shown brand growth is primarily reflected in  
52 higher penetration figures, with little change in loyalty metrics such as purchase frequency or  
53 share of wallet (Nenycz-Thiel et al., 2018, Romaniuk et al., 2014). However, an aspect of this  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60



1  
2  
3 study provides additional evidence linking loyalty metrics to brand growth. We refer to the  
4 correlation matrix of variables in Appendix 2. While we filtered out brands that changed  
5 market share by more than two points for model 1, we included the figures for annual market  
6 share change in this table for information. We note the bivariate correlation between  
7 customer loss and annual brand market share change is negative and significant, ( $r=-0.21$ ,  
8  $p<0.01$ ). This relationship warranted some supplementary analysis, which revealed that the  
9 partial correlation between erosion and market share change, controlling for all the variables  
10 that were used in the regression model is  $r=-0.20$ ,  $p<0.01$ . In other words, brands that grew  
11 had lower rates of loss or erosion, and brands that declined had higher rates of such loss –  
12 controlling for other relevant variables. Therefore, we establish that there is certainly an  
13 association not only between erosion and a brand's ability to maintain share, but that erosion  
14 levels are linked to brand growth or decline. This provides a useful contribution to the stream  
15 of work examining brand growth factors (e.g. Bennett and Graham, 2010, Nenycz-Thiel et al.,  
16 2018).

17  
18  
19 Now we turn to the findings relating to brand or marketing mix factors. There is evidence  
20 that higher levels of price promotion (either within brands over time, or across brands) is  
21 related to lower erosion in the buyer base. This evidence was, however, confined to  
22 manufacturer brands. This finding provides a useful longitudinal perspective on the after-  
23 effects of price promotions. Past work has identified promotions have only temporary effects  
24 (Ehrenberg et al., 1994), partly because most buyers have purchased the brand previously  
25 (Dawes, 2018); but that a promotion also brings in some lower-propensity buyers who are less  
26 likely to buy afterwards at normal price (Shoemaker and Shoaf, 1977). The findings here add  
27 to that knowledge by showing that promotions may play a useful role in reminding and  
28 reinforcing existing buyer propensities to purchase the brand. This defensive, albeit  
29 expensive, activity may allow other activities to more readily produce sales gains.  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 Next, the results indicate that niche brands (Jarvis and Goodman, 2005) tend to naturally do  
4 somewhat better at retention. Conversely, a brand identified as change-of-pace, i.e. relatively  
5 large customer base but low loyalty – Kahn, Kalwani & Morrison (1988), will require more  
6 marketing effort to retain its current buyer base than a brand of the size that is not change-of-  
7 pace. This represents useful contextual knowledge for practitioners. In terms of academic  
8 contribution, this is the first finding that has linked strictly cross-sectional behavioural loyalty  
9 metrics with a longitudinal measure of loyalty, namely over-time retention.  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19

20 Of interest to retail brand managers and scholars is the finding that store brands have lower  
21 rates of customer loss over time – controlling for category and marketing mix factors. The  
22 precise reason is unclear. One potential explanation relates to a purchase reinforcement effect  
23 from the store brand often being present in many categories. Another may be that store  
24 brands still have some particular appeal to value-seeking consumers, who persist with them  
25 over time, with this persistence aided by the fact consumers tend to have high first-store  
26 loyalty (East et al., 2000).  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36

37 A broader range, measured as the number of SKUs offered by a brand compared to the  
38 category average was also found to be associated with lower erosion. An important way that  
39 a brand's range depth is broadened is via new product introductions. While new products are  
40 cast as expensive and risky (Steenkamp and Gielens, 2003), these results indicate part of the  
41 payoff from engaging in new product development and launch is a better ability to retain  
42 current buyers, likely by providing new options to accommodate consumer desire for variety  
43 (Kahn, 1995), drawing attention to the brand on shelf, or simply ensuring a broad spectrum of  
44 tastes and preferences is being met (Romaniuk and Sharp, 2016 Ch. 8).  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 Certain category level factors emerged as significant covariates of erosion, in particular  
4 category penetration. Therefore, brands in categories with higher penetration can expect  
5 lower rates of erosion in their customer base, all other things being equal. This finding  
6 implies brands in low penetration categories have to 'work harder' to keep themselves salient  
7 to their current buyer base.  
8  
9

## 10 11 12 13 14 15 **7. Limitations and Directions for Future Research** 16 17

18  
19 Erosion was suggested to be 'a consistent, pervasive empirical fact ... little related to the  
20 other factors studied' (East and Hammond, 1996 p. 169). This study has advanced our  
21 knowledge about erosion and the factors that co-vary with it. This advance may pave the way  
22 for fruitful future research endeavours.  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27

28  
29 A limitation of the present study is that data were not available on the full suite of marketing  
30 mix activities, such as brand advertising. It is possible that an inability to incorporate  
31 advertising (the focal brand, or competitor's) in the study caused endogeneity, in other words  
32 the results of the study could be biased due to omitting potential explanatory variables.  
33  
34  
35

36  
37 Examining the relationship between brand advertising and erosion is therefore a prime  
38 candidate for further work. Past studies have shown short-term effects of advertising on  
39 individual buyers (Jones, 2006, Taylor et al., 2009), as well as short and long-term effects on  
40 brand sales (e.g. Dekimpe and Hanssens, 1995b). Advertising is suggested to be a vehicle  
41 that works via reminding and nudging buyer's purchase propensities (Ehrenberg et al., 2002).  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49 Examining the over-time covariation between advertising spending and brand erosion rates  
50 may be an approach to generate new insights into advertising effectiveness. However, such  
51 an investigation would require multi-year data on advertising for a large sample of brands.  
52  
53  
54  
55

56  
57 A large body of literature finds price promotions generally have only short-term sales effects,  
58 with little long-term benefits (Ehrenberg et al., 1994, Dawes, 2018). The results here provide  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 evidence that price promotions may play a role in preserving the brand's existing buyer base.

4  
5 An avenue for future work is to explore whether certain characteristics of promotions are  
6  
7 more strongly linked to this outcome. Such work would be well-warranted given the large  
8  
9 sums spent on such promotions (Bogomolova et al., 2017). The potential moderating or  
10  
11 mediating effects of factors such as brand size, price, range size, and the breadth of  
12  
13 promotions across the range could add to the initial findings from this study.  
14  
15

16  
17 An intriguing finding relates to lower levels of over-time loss for Store brands. Future  
18  
19 research could examine the extent to which this phenomenon is contingent on the multi-  
20  
21 category breadth of the retailer's range. Given the rise in store brands, the high level of  
22  
23 academic research dedicated to the field, and the investments made in them by retailers  
24  
25 (Seenivasan et al., 2015), insights into store brand performance on this longitudinal loyalty  
26  
27 metric would be a useful advance.  
28  
29

30  
31 Finally, the present study identified an important association between erosion and brand  
32  
33 market share change: brands that grew had lower erosion; brands that declined had higher  
34  
35 erosion. An avenue for future research is to attempt to disentangle the potential chain of  
36  
37 cause and effect between erosion and change in market share.  
38  
39

40  
41  
42  
43 *Author names are in alphabetical order. All authors contributed equally to the work.*  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

## References

- Alford, B. L. & Biswas, A. (2002), "The effects of discount level, price consciousness and sale proneness on consumers' price perception and behavioral intention", *Journal of Business Research*, 55, 9, 775-783
- Allenby, G. M. & Lenk, P. J. (1995), "Reassessing brand loyalty, price sensitivity, and merchandising effects on consumer brand choice", *Journal of Business and Economic Statistics*, 13, 3, 281-89
- Ambler, T., Braeutigam, S., Stins, J., Rose, S. & Swithenby, S. (2004), "Salience and Choice: Neural Correlates of Shopping Decisions", *Psychology & Marketing*, 21, 4, 247-261
- Ataman, M. B., Mela, C. F. & Van Heerde, H. J. (2008), "Building Brands", *Marketing Science*, 27, 6, 1036-1054
- Ataman, M. B., Van Heerde, H. J. & Mela, C. F. (2010), "The long-term effect of marketing strategy on brand sales", *Journal of Marketing Research*, 47, 5, 866-882
- Baldinger, A. L. & Rubinson, J. (1996), "Brand Loyalty: The Link Between Attitude and Behavior", *Journal of Advertising Research*, 36, November/December, 22-34
- Bandyopadhyay, S. & Martell, M. (2007), "Does attitudinal loyalty influence behavioral loyalty? A theoretical and empirical study", *Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services*, 14, 1, 35-44
- Banelis, M., Riebe, E. & Rungie, C. (2013), "Empirical evidence of repertoire size", *Australasian Marketing Journal*, 21, 1, 59-65
- Bennett, D. & Graham, C. (2010), "Is loyalty driving growth for the brand in front? A two-purchase analysis of car category dynamics in Thailand", *Journal of Strategic Marketing*, 18, 7, 573-585
- Bhattacharya, C. B. (1997), "Is Your Brand's Loyalty Too Much, Too Little, or Just Right? Explaining Deviations in Loyalty from the Dirichlet Norm", *International Journal of Research in Marketing*, 14, 5, 421-435
- Bhattacharya, C. B., Fader, P. S., Lodish, L. M. & Desarbo, W. S. (1996), "The Relationship Between the Marketing Mix and Share of Category Requirements", *Marketing Letters*, 7, 1, 5-18
- Bijmolt, T. H. A., Van Heerde, H. J. & Pieters, R. G. M. (2005), "New empirical generalizations on the determinants of price elasticity", *Journal of Marketing Research*, XLII, May, 141-156
- Bogomolova, S., Dunn, S., Trinh, G., Taylor, J. & Volpe, R. J. (2015), "Price promotion landscape in the US and UK: Depicting retail practice to inform future research agenda", *Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services* 25, 7, 1-11
- Bogomolova, S., Szabo, M. & Kennedy, R. (2017), "Retailers' and manufacturers' price-promotion decisions: Intuitive or evidence-based?", *Journal of Business Research*, 76, 1, 189-200
- Bolton, R. N. (1989), "The Relationship Between Market Characteristics and Promotional Price Elasticities", *Marketing Science*, 8, 2, 153-169
- Cameron, A. C. & Trivedi, P. K. (2010), *Microeconometrics Using Stata*, Stata Press, College Station, Texas, United States.
- Casteran, G., Chrysochou, P. & Meyer-Waarden, L. (2019), "Brand Loyalty Evolution and the Impact of Category Characteristics", *Marketing Letters*,
- Castleberry, S. B., Barnard, N. R., Barwise, T. P., Ehrenberg, A. & Dall'olmo Riley, F. (1994), "Individual Attitude Variations Over Time", *Journal of Marketing Management*, 10, 1-3, 153-162

- 1  
2  
3 Chatfield, C., Ehrenberg, A. & Goodhardt, G. (1966), "Progress on a simplified model of  
4 stationary purchasing behaviour", *The Journal of the Royal Statistical Society*, 129, 3,  
5 317-367  
6  
7 Dall'olmo Riley, F., Ehrenberg, A., Castleberry, S. B., Barwise, T. P. & Barnard, N. R.  
8 (1997), "The variability of attitudinal repeat-rates", *International Journal of Research*  
9 *in Marketing*, 14, 5, 437-450  
10 Dawes, J. (2013), "Reasons for variation in SCR for private label brands", *European Journal*  
11 *of Marketing*, 47, 11/12, 1804-1824  
12 Dawes, J. (2014), "Cigarette brand loyalty and purchase patterns: an examination using US  
13 consumer panel data", *Journal of Business Research*, 67, 9, 1933-1943  
14 Dawes, J., Bond, A., Hartnett, N. & Sharp, B. (2017), "Does Double Jeopardy apply using  
15 Average Spend Per Buyer as the Loyalty Metric?", *Australasian Marketing Journal*  
16 25, 261-268  
17 Dawes, J., Meyer-Waarden, L. & Driesener, C. (2015), "Has brand loyalty declined? A  
18 longitudinal analysis of repeat purchase behavior in the UK and the USA", *Journal of*  
19 *Business Research*, 68, 2, 425-432  
20 Dawes, J. G. (2018), "Price promotions: examining the buyer mix and subsequent changes in  
21 purchase loyalty", *Journal of Consumer Marketing*, 35, 4, 366-376  
22 De Wulf, K., Odekerken-Schröder, G., Goedertier, F. & Van Ossel, G. (2005), "Consumer  
23 perceptions of store brands versus national brands", *Journal of Consumer Marketing*,  
24 22, 4, 223-232  
25 Dekimpe, M. G. & Hanssens, D. M. (1995a), "Empirical Generalizations About Market  
26 Evolution and Stationarity", *Marketing Science*, 14, No. 3, Part 2, G109-G121  
27 Dekimpe, M. G. & Hanssens, D. M. (1995b), "The persistence of marketing effects on sales",  
28 *Marketing Science*, 14, 1, 1-21  
29 Dick, A. S. & Basu, K. (1994), "Customer Loyalty: Toward an Integrated Conceptual  
30 Framework", *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 22, No. 2, 99-113  
31 East, R. & Hammond, K. (1996), "The Erosion of Repeat-Purchase Loyalty", *Marketing*  
32 *Letters*, 7, 2, 163-171  
33 East, R., Hammond, K., Harris, P. & Lomax, W. (2000), "First-store loyalty and retention",  
34 *Journal of Marketing Management*, 16, 4, 307-325  
35 East, R., Wright, M. & Vanhuele, M. (2008), *Consumer Behaviour: Applications in*  
36 *Marketing*, Sage, London.  
37 Ehrenberg, A. (1959), "The pattern of consumer purchases", *Applied Statistics*, 8, 1, 26-41  
38 Ehrenberg, A. (1988), *Repeat-buying: Facts, theory and applications*, Oxford University  
39 Press, London.  
40 Ehrenberg, A. (2000), "Repeat-buying: facts, theory and applications", *Journal of Empirical*  
41 *Generalisations in Marketing Science*, 5, 2, 392-770  
42 Ehrenberg, A., Barnard, N., Kennedy, R. & Bloom, H. (2002), "Brand advertising as creative  
43 publicity", *Journal of Advertising Research*, 42, 4, 7-18  
44 Ehrenberg, A., Goodhardt, G. & Barwise, T. P. (1990), "Double Jeopardy revisited", *Journal*  
45 *of Marketing*, 54, 3, 82-91  
46 Ehrenberg, A., Hammond, K. & Goodhardt, G. J. (1994), "The After-Effects of price-related  
47 consumer promotions", *Journal of Advertising Research*, 34, 4, 11-21  
48 Ehrenberg, A., Uncles, M. D. & Goodhardt, G. G. (2004), "Understanding brand performance  
49 measures: using dirichlet benchmarks", *Journal of Business Research*, 57, 12, 1307-  
50 1325  
51 Evanschitzky, H., Malhotra, N., Wangenheim, F. V. & Lemon, K. N. (2017), "Antecedents of  
52 Peripheral Services Cross-Buying Behavior", *Journal of Retailing and Consumer*  
53 *Services*, 36, 1, 218-224  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

- 1  
2  
3 Fader, P. & Lattin, J. M. (1993), "Accounting for Heterogeneity and Nonstationarity in a  
4 Cross-Sectional Model of Consumer Purchase Behavior", *Marketing Science*, 12, No.  
5 3, Summer, 304-317  
6  
7 Fader, P. S. & Schmittlein, D. C. (1993), "Excess behavioral loyalty for high-share brands:  
8 deviations from the Dirichlet model for repeat purchasing", *Journal of Marketing*  
9 *Research*, 30, 4, 478-493  
10  
11 Farris, P., Bendle, N., Pfeifer, P. E. & Reibstein, D. J. (2016), *Marketing metrics: The*  
12 *manager's guide to measuring marketing performance*, Pearson, New Jersey, United  
13 States.  
14  
15 Givon, M. & Horsky, D. (1990), "Untangling the effects of purchase reinforcement and  
16 advertising carryover", *Marketing Science*, 9, 2, 171-187  
17  
18 Goodhardt, G. & Ehrenberg, A. (1967), "Conditional trend analysis: A breakdown by initial  
19 purchasing level", *Journal of Marketing Research*, 4, May, 155-161  
20  
21 Goodhardt, G. J., Ehrenberg, A. & Chatfield, C. (1984), "The Dirichlet: A comprehensive  
22 model of buying behaviour", *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society*, 147, 5, 621-655  
23  
24 Graham, C., Bennett, D., Franke, K., Henfrey, C. L. & Nagy-Hamada, M. (2017), "Double  
25 Jeopardy—50 years on. Reviving a forgotten tool that still predicts brand loyalty",  
26 *Australasian Marketing Journal (AMJ)*, 25, 4, 278-287  
27  
28 Graham, C. D. A. (2009), "What's the point of Marketing anyway? The prevalence, temporal  
29 extent and implications of long-term market share equilibrium", *Journal of Marketing*  
30 *Management*, 25, 9-10, 867-874  
31  
32 Greene, W. H. (2011), *Econometric analysis*, Prentice hall Upper Saddle River, NJ.  
33  
34 Grewal, D., Monroe, K. B. & Krishnan, R. (1998), "The effects of price-comparison  
35 advertising on buyers' perceptions of acquisition value, transaction value, and  
36 behavioral intentions", *The Journal of Marketing*, 62, 2, 46-59  
37  
38 Habel, C., Rungie, C., Geursen, G. & Kweh, J., (2003), "Common ground for Bass and  
39 NBD/Dirichlet: is conditional trend analysis the bridge?", *ANZMAC: Australian &*  
40 *New Zealand Marketing Academy Conference*, Adelaide,  
41  
42 Hair, J. F., Anderson, R. E., Tatham, R. L. & Black, W. C. (1995), *Multivariate Data*  
43 *Analysis*, Prentice Hall International, New Jersey.  
44  
45 Hoch, S. J., Kim, B.-D., Montgomery, A. L. & Rossi, P. E. (1995), "Determinants of Store-  
46 Level Price Elasticity", *Journal of Marketing Research*, 32, February, 17-29  
47  
48 Hyman, M. R., Kopf, D. A. & Lee, D. (2010), "Review of literature—Future research  
49 suggestions: Private label brands: Benefits, success factors and future research",  
50 *Journal of Brand Management*, 17, 5, 368-389  
51  
52 Jarvis, W. & Goodman, S. (2005), "Effective marketing of small brands: niche positions,  
53 attribute loyalty and direct marketing", *Journal of Product & Brand Management*, 14,  
54 5, 292-299  
55  
56 Jones, J. P. (2006), *When ads work: New proof that advertising triggers sales*, M.E. Sharpe,  
57 Inc, New York.  
58  
59 Jung, S., Gruca, T. & Lopo, R. (2010), "Excess loyalty in CPG markets: a comprehensive  
60 examination", *Journal of Empirical Generalisations in Marketing Science*, 13, 1, 1-13  
61  
62 Kahn, B. (1995), "Consumer variety-seeking among goods and services: An integrative  
63 review", *Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services*, 2, 3, 139-148  
64  
65 Kahn, B. E., Kalwani, M. U. & Morrison, D. G. (1986), "Measuring Variety-Seeking and  
66 Reinforcement Behaviors Using Panel Data", *Journal of Marketing Research*, 23,  
67 May, 89-100  
68  
69 Kahn, B. E., Kalwani, M. U. & Morrison, D. G. (1988), "Nicheing versus change-of-pace  
70 brands: Using purchase frequencies and penetration rates to infer brand positionings",  
71 *Journal of Marketing Research*, 25, 4, 384-390

- 1  
2  
3 Kalwani, M. U., Yim, C. K., Rinne, H. J. & Sugita, Y. (1990), "A Price Expectations Model  
4 of Customer Brand Choice", *Journal of Marketing Research*, 27, August, 251-262  
5  
6 Keane, M. P. (1997), "Modeling heterogeneity and state dependence in consumer choice  
7 behavior", *Journal of Business & Economic Statistics*, 310-327  
8  
9 Keller, W. I. Y., Deleersnyder, B. & Gedenk, K. (2019), "Price Promotions and Popular  
10 Events", *Journal of Marketing*, 83, 1, 73-88  
11  
12 Kumar, N. & Steenkamp, J.-B. E. M. (2007), *Private label strategy: How to meet the store  
13 brand challenge*, Harvard Business Press, US.  
14  
15 Kumar, V., Dalla Pozza, I. & Ganesh, J. (2013), "Revisiting the satisfaction–loyalty  
16 relationship: empirical generalizations and directions for future research", *Journal of  
17 Retailing*, 89, 3, 246-262  
18  
19 Lam, D. & Mizerski, R. (2009), "An investigation into gambling purchases using the NBD  
20 and NBD-dirichlet models", *Marketing Letters*, 20, 3, 263-276  
21  
22 Lattin, J. M. & Bucklin, R. E. (1989), "Reference Effects of Price and Promotion on Brand  
23 Choice Behavior", *Journal of Marketing Research*, 26, August, 299-310  
24  
25 Lee, R., Rungie, C. & Wright, M. (2011), "Regularities in the consumption of a subscription  
26 service", *Journal of Product & Brand Management*, 20, 3, 182-189  
27  
28 Lenk, P. J., Rao, A. G. & Tibrewala, V. (1993), "Nonstationary Conditional Trend Analysis:  
29 An Application to Scanner Panel Data", *Journal of Marketing Research*, 30, August,  
30 288-304  
31  
32 Lodish, L. M. & Mela, C. F. (2007), "If brands are built over years, why are they managed  
33 over quarters?", *Harvard Business Review*, 85, 7/8, 104-112  
34  
35 Ludwichowska, G., Romaniuk, J. & Nenycz-Thiel, M. (2017), "Systematic response errors in  
36 self-reported category buying frequencies", *European Journal of Marketing*, 51, 7/8,  
37 1440-1459  
38  
39 Macé, S. & Neslin, S. A. (2004), "The determinants of pre- and postpromotion dips in sales of  
40 frequently purchased goods", *Journal of Marketing Research*, 31, August, 339-350  
41  
42 McAlister, L. & Pessemier, E. (1982), "Variety Seeking Behavior: An Interdisciplinary  
43 Review", *Journal of Consumer Research*, 9, December, 311-322  
44  
45 McCabe, J. & Stern, P. (2009), "Stochastic modelling and industrial networks -  
46 complementary views of organisational buyer behavior", *Journal of the Academy of  
47 Marketing Science*, 37, 2, 204-214  
48  
49 Mizerski, D., Miller, R., Mizerski, K. & Lam, D. (2004), "The stochastic nature of purchasing  
50 a State's Lottery products", *Australasian Marketing Journal*, 12, 3, 56-69  
51  
52 Morrison, D. G. (1969), "Conditional trend analysis: A model that allows for nonusers",  
53 *Journal of Marketing Research*, VI, August, 342-6  
54  
55 Nenycz-Thiel, M., Dawes, J. & Romaniuk, J. (2018), "Modeling Brand Market Share Change  
56 in Emerging Markets", *International Marketing Review*, 1-40  
57  
58 Nogales, A. F. & Suarez, M. G. (2005), "Shelf space management of private labels: a case  
59 study in Spanish retailing", *Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services*, 12, 3, 205-  
60 216  
61  
62 Pare, V. & Dawes, J. (2011), "The persistence of excess brand loyalty over multiple years",  
63 *Marketing Letters*, 21, 2, 163-175  
64  
65 Reichheld, F. F. (1993), "Loyalty-based management", *Harvard Business Review*, 71, 2, 64-  
66 73  
67  
68 Riebe, E., Wright, M., Stern, P. & Sharp, B. (2014), "How to grow a brand: Retain or acquire  
69 customers?", *Journal of Business Research*, 67, 5, 990-997  
70  
71 Romaniuk, J., Dawes, J. & Nenycz-Thiel, M. (2014), "Generalizations regarding the growth  
72 and decline of manufacturer and store brands", *Journal of Retailing and Consumer  
73 Services*, 21, 5, 725-734



- 1  
2  
3 Romaniuk, J. & Sharp, B. (2016), *How brands grow: Part 2*, Oxford University Press, South  
4 Melbourne.
- 5 Sayman, S. & Raju, J. S. (2004), "Investigating the cross-category effects of store brands",  
6 *Review of Industrial Organization*, 24, 129-141
- 7 Schmittlein, D. C., Cooper, L. G. & Morrison, D. G. (1993), "Truth in Concentration in the  
8 Land of (80/20) Laws", *Marketing Science*, 12, 2, 167-183
- 9 Scriven, J., Clemente, M., Dawes John, Trinh, G. & Sharp, B. (2017), "Buying Brands at both  
10 Regular Price and on Promotion Over Time ", *Australasian Marketing Journal* 25, 4,  
11 252-260
- 12  
13 Seenivasan, S., Sudhir, K. & Talukdar, D. (2015), "Do store brands aid store loyalty?",  
14 *Management Science*, 62, 3, 802-816
- 15 Sethuraman, R. (1996), "A Model of How Discounting High-Priced Brands Affects the Sales  
16 of Low-Priced Brands", *Journal of Marketing Research*, 33, November, 399-409
- 17 Sethuraman, R. & Cole, C. (1999), "Factors influencing the price premiums that consumers  
18 pay for national brands over store brands", *Journal of Product and Brand  
19 Management*, 8, 4, 340-351
- 20  
21 Sethuraman, R. & Srinivasan, V. (2002), "The asymmetric share effect: An empirical  
22 generalization on cross-price effects", *Journal of Marketing Research*, 39, 3, 379-386
- 23 Sethuraman, R., Srinivasan, V. & Kim, D. (1999), "Asymmetric and Neighborhood Cross-  
24 Price Effects: Some Empirical Generalizations", *Marketing Science*, 18, No. 1, 23-41
- 25 Sharp, B. (2010), *How Brands Grow*, Oxford University Press, South Melbourne.
- 26 Sharp, B., Wright, M., Dawes, J., Driesener, C., Meyer-Waarden, L., Stocchi, L. & Stern, P.  
27 (2012), "It's a Dirichlet world: Modeling individuals' loyalties reveals how brands  
28 compete, grow, and decline", *Journal of Advertising Research*, 52, 2, 203-213
- 29 Shoemaker, R. W. & Shoaf, F. R. (1977), "Repeat Rates of Deal Purchases", *Journal of  
30 Advertising Research*, 17, 2
- 31  
32 Steenkamp, J. B. E. M. & Gielens, K. (2003), "Consumer and market drivers of the trial  
33 probability of new consumer packaged goods", *Journal of Consumer Research*, 30, 3,  
34 368-384
- 35  
36 Swait, J. & Adamowicz, W. (2001), "The influence of task complexity on consumer choice: A  
37 latent class model of decision strategy switching", *Journal of Consumer Research*, 28,  
38 1, 135-148
- 39  
40 Tanusondjaja, A., Nenycz-Thiel, M., Dawes, J. & Kennedy, R. (2018), "Portfolios: Patterns in  
41 brand penetration, market share, and hero product variants", *Journal of Retailing and  
42 Consumer Services*, 41, 211-217
- 43  
44 Tanusondjaja, A., Trinh, G. & Romaniuk, J. (2016), "Exploring the past behaviour of new  
45 brand buyers", *International Journal of Market Research*, 58, 5, 733-748
- 46 Taylor, J., Kennedy, R. & Sharp, B. (2009), "Is Once Really Enough? Making  
47 Generalizations about Advertising's Convex Sales Response Function", *Journal of  
48 Advertising Research*, 49, 2, 198-200
- 49 Ter Braak, A., Geyskens, I. & Dekimpe, M. G. (2014), "Taking private labels upmarket:  
50 Empirical generalizations on category drivers of premium private label introductions",  
51 *Journal of Retailing*, 90, 2, 125-140
- 52  
53 Trinh, G. (2014), "Predicting variation in repertoire size with the NBD model", *Australasian  
54 Marketing Journal*, 22, 2, 111-116
- 55  
56 Trinh, G. & Lam, D. (2016), "Understanding the attendance at cultural venues and events  
57 with stochastic preference models", *Journal of Business Research*, 69, 9, 3538-3544
- 58  
59 Uncles, M. D. & Ellis, K. (1989), "The Buying of Own Labels", *European Journal of  
60 Marketing*, 23, No. 3, 47-70

- 1  
2  
3 Wilkinson, J. W., Trinh, G., Lee, R. & Brown, N. (2016), "Can the negative binomial  
4 distribution predict industrial purchases?", *Journal of Business and Industrial*  
5 *Marketing*, 31, 4, 543-552  
6  
7 Wooldridge, J. M. (2015), *Introductory Econometrics: A Modern Approach (Upper Level*  
8 *Economics Titles)* South-Western College Pub, United States.  
9 Zeithaml, V. A. (1988), "Consumer perceptions of price, quality, and value: A means-end  
10 model and synthesis of evidence", *The Journal of Marketing*, 52, 3, 2-22  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

**Appendix: Descriptive statistics and correlation matrix of variables (all brands).**

		Mean	Std Dev.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
Customer Loss	1	0.65	0.15	1	-.723**	-.440**	.106**	-.331**	-.102**	-.076*	-.550**	-.390**	-.411**	-.432**	-.211**
Brand penetration	2	0.08	0.09	-.723**	1	.087*	-.373**	.502**	.147**	0.053	.684**	.387**	.388**	.410**	.121**
Niche brand	3	2.39	0.80	-.440**	.087*	1	.255**	-.117**	0.035	0.016	0.046	.369**	.255**	.305**	.104*
Store brand	4	0.48	0.50	.106**	-.373**	.255**	1	-.534**	-.231**	-.119**	-.237**	-.132**	-.093**	.136**	-0.047
Promotion incidence	5	0.35	0.26	-.331**	.502**	-.117**	-.534**	1	.304**	.119**	.343**	.316**	.224**	.319**	0.018
Promotion depth	6	0.08	0.48	-.102**	.147**	0.035	-.231**	.304**	1	0.04	.130**	.152**	.117**	.144**	-0.003
Brand price	7	9.17	15.7	-.076*	0.053	0.016	-.119**	.119**	0.04	1	.298**	-.126**	.098**	.097**	-0.008
Range breadth	8	23.7	24.3	-.550**	.684**	0.046	-.237**	.343**	.130**	.298**	1	.115**	.142**	.146**	0.036
Category purchase rate	9	8.19	3.91	-.390**	.387**	.369**	-.132**	.316**	.152**	-.126**	.115**	1	.648**	.972**	0.021
Category penetration	10	0.69	0.22	-.411**	.388**	.255**	-.093**	.224**	.117**	.098**	.142**	.648**	1	.724**	0.056
Repertoire size	11	2.19	0.63	-.432**	.410**	.305**	-.136**	.319**	.144**	-.097**	.146**	.972**	.724**	1	0.023
Market share change**	12	0.01	0.01	-.211**	.121**	.104*	-0.047	0.018	-0.003	-0.008	0.036	0.021	0.056	0.023	1

\* = sig. at  $p \leq 0.05$  \*\* sig. at  $p \leq 0.01$  \*\*\* note, brands that changed market share by more than two points over the period were omitted from model 1 but retained as a robustness check in model 2.