

How Store Flyers Affect Consumer Choice Behaviour: National Brands vs. Store Brands

Juan Carlos Gázquez-Abad and Manuel Sánchez-Pérez

Abstract

Feature promotions or advertised deals constitute an important element of retailer promotion activities. In particular, the effectiveness of store flyers is one of the aspects of most concern to the marketing managers of retail stores as part of their marketing strategy. This paper looks to shed more light on this issue by analysing the effect of brand presence in flyers on consumer choice for both national brands and store brands. To this end, a Multinomial Logit Model (MNL) is estimated with parameters specific to brands using store-flyers. With these specific parameters, a “competitive flyer effect” ratio is estimated in order to establish which brand benefits from being featured in the same flyer. The results provide key insights for both retailers and manufacturers on how to improve the effectiveness of store flyers.

Keywords

Retailing, Store Flyers, Store Brand, National Brands, MNL Models

Juan Carlos Gázquez-Abad (*corresponding author*)

Department of Business Administration, University of Almería, Almería, Spain
(Tel: ++34 9500 15179; E-mail: jcgazque@ual.es).

Manuel Sánchez-Pérez

Department of Business Administration, University of Almería, Almería, Spain.

Received: July 7, 2008
Revised: November 26, 2008
Accepted: December 8, 2008

**EUROPEAN
RETAIL
RESEARCH**

Vol. 23, Issue I, 2009, pp. 1-20

1. Introduction

How effective store flyers are is one of the aspects of most concern to the marketing managers of retail stores as part of their marketing strategy (Hansen/Christiansen/Thomsen 2003). This issue is important because firms spend large sums on producing and subsequently disseminating this material (Raghubir/Inman/Grande 2004). Thus, according to data from IRI, price cuts are the most used promotional technique by hypermarkets (7.3% of the total promotion budget), followed by the use of store flyers (6.6%). Unfortunately, retailers do not know exactly how effective store flyers are in improving their sales. Marketing managers attribute this high investment in sales promotion to the immediate effects of these actions on sales (Schultz/Robinson/Peterson 1998).

Feature promotions or advertised deals constitute an important element of retailer promotion activities (Arnold/Kozinets/Handelman 2001). These huge budgets are justified by the strategic role attributed to promotion advertisements (e.g. Bodapati 1999; Volle 1997; Arnold/Kozinets/Handelman 2001). Thus, many customers engage in a search for low prices and promotions by reading supermarket newspapers or flyers (Walters/Jamil 2003). In addition, feature promotions advertised in store flyers constitute an important source of income for retailers, resulting from fees charged to manufacturers whose brands appear in the flyer (Gijbrecchts/Campo/Goossens 2003), helping stores to promote new products, announcing new stores, and communicating price specials. On the other hand, store flyers are a means of generating traffic and sales among consumers (Shimp 1997).

Nevertheless, the increasing economic importance of store flyers as a promotional tool in retailing has not been reflected in marketing literature (Ailawadi/Neslin/Gedenk 2001; Raghubir/Inman/Grande 2004). Thus, few studies have assessed the efficacy of this promotional tool in retail stores (Blattberg/Briesch/Fox 1995; Schmidt/Bjerre 2003). Clearly, more research is needed on this issue to provide guidelines that will support important store flyer decisions (Miranda/Kónya 2007). As these authors establish (p. 181), "it would be useful to investigate the response to store label-featured promotions on flyers". Thus, the main objective of the present study is to address this gap in the literature by analysing the differentiated effect of brands' presence (national vs. store brands [SBs]) in store flyers on consumer choice behaviour.

There is no evidence of flyers' effectiveness distinguishing between both national and SBs to the best of our knowledge. It is true that Gijbrecchts/Campo/Goossens (2003) analysed how much emphasis to place on both types of brands; however they focused on the effect on store traffic and (store) sales of portion of in-flyer space allocated to SBs, more than effect on consumer choice probability itself.

Given this current research gap, and starting from a situation where the retailer offers a weekly store flyer, this paper examines the following issues:

- We develop and test hypotheses on the positive effects of brands' presence in store flyers on consumers' choice behaviour.
- We identify how presence of national brands in flyers moderates the influence of store brands' presence in flyers on consumers' choice behaviour.

Not only do these insights improve our understanding of how featuring works at household level, they are also of crucial importance to retailers attempting to improve their store flyer composition.

The discussion is organized as follows. In the next section, we provide a review of the relevant literature. Next, both data and methodology are discussed. Our test involves a Multinomial Logit Model (MNL) using specific parameters with panel data. Following this, we present the results of the empirical analysis. Based on the findings, the paper outlines the main conclusions and suggests some implications for retail management.

2. Theoretical Framework

2.1. Literature Review and Proposing of Hypotheses

In strategic retail literature, retail advertising is described by very similar typologies that distinguish between short term (promotional advertising) and long term (corporate advertising) (Cox/Brittain 1993).

Promotional advertising is advertising in which the manufacturer (or retailer) informs customers that its product is available in conditions favourable to the consumer (Blattberg/Neslin 1990). In practice, any promotion should be advertised to a certain extent if the appropriate effect is to be produced.

Advertising the promotions is a very important part of retailers' promotional activities, amounting to approximately 50% of the total budget firms allocate to this type of activity (Volle 2001). In particular, in the context of retailers using High-Low price strategies, it is one of the most used tools to increase both sales and store traffic.

There is no clear definition of store flyers (Cox/Brittain 1993), and various terms tend to be used to refer to them. Terms such as catalogue, leaflet, free sheet, circular, or shopper can be found as synonyms for flyers. According to Christiansen/Bjerre (2001): "A flyer is a frequently distributed free printed matter, part of the mass communication marketing from the sender(s), with a minimum of four pages, immediately readable, targeted at private households or firms". Analysing this definition can help us understand the main characteristics of store flyers (Schmidt/Bjerre 2003):

- Frequently distributed means more than once a year.
- Immediately readable printed matter implies that the consumer can access the message without needing any type of technical appliance (e.g. if an advertising message on TV is to reach the individual, he/she first needs to have a TV set, this must be switched on, tuned to the correct channel, etc.).
- Mass communication indicates that the flyer is not sent to the consumers personally. Indeed, on many occasions the flyers are actually handed out at the entrance to the store, kept at strategic points in the store (e.g. "hotspots" inside the store, such as gondolas or central aisles), or placed in the shopping baskets and carts (Burton/Lichtenstein/Netemeyer 1999).
- A minimum of four pages indicates that the content has a certain complexity or size.
- Targeted at private households or firms: flyers have traditionally been targeted at individuals/households, but now many retail chains whose customers are SMEs have begun to use flyers as a promotional medium.
- The source of the message is usually a retailer or manufacturer, although it can also be a combination of both. Sometimes various distributors co-publish a flyer.

Store flyers are usually "perishable offers", that is to say their utility is limited to a particular period in time. In this respect, the conditions of the deal being advertised in the flyer are usually limited to a week (sometimes two weeks).

2.2. Choice

Few studies have analysed the effect of store flyers on consumer purchase behaviour. Thus, a number of authors have reported a strong positive effect of feature promotions on consumer choice behaviour (Abraham/Lodish 1993; Cooper et al. 1999; Hoch et al. 1995). In particular, some studies have found a positive effect on the level of sales (White/Anzalone/Barbour 1980; Van den Poel/De Schampelaere/Wets 2004). Other studies, however, did not find any significant sales effects (e.g. Walters/MacKenzie 1988; Burton/Lichtenstein/Netemeyer 1999; Volle 1997). Indeed, Walters/Jamil (2003) showed that only consumers visiting the store primarily to purchase price specials were more likely to read flyers and purchased more advertised price specials than consumers on other types of shopping trips (e.g. "regular consumers").

Schmidt/Bjerre (2003) define three groups of consumers on the basis of their use of store flyers: two groups of more flyer-prone consumers, and another group that is more sceptical about using this promotional tool (but it also uses flyers). For Burton/Lichtenstein/Netemeyer (1999) and Ailawadi/Neslin/Gedenk (2001), the individuals least influenced by brands' appearance in store flyers are the least price sensitive. According to Krishna/Currim/Shoemaker (1991), these individuals are continually informed about the prices of their most preferred brands. Walters/Jamil (2003) observe that consumers with high price sensitivity seek price

specials before entering the stores that use store flyers most in order to learn about the existence of such prices.

According to previous literature, it is true that price-conscious consumers are more flyer-prone than those more insensitive to sale price; however, actual consumer behaviour patterns of visiting stores and finding discounts implies accuracy in searching for information for a better bargain, both for price-conscious as well as non price-conscious consumers. For this reason and since a number of studies have analysed the positive influence of feature promotions on sales empirically (e.g. Walters/Rinne 1986; Walters/MacKenzie 1998; Mulhern/Padgett 1995; Bodapati 1999; Gijsbrechts/Campo/Goossens 2003), we posit a positive effect of brands' presence in store flyers on consumer choice behaviour [1]. Therefore:

H1: The presence of brands in store flyers increases their probability of being chosen by the consumer.

2.3. Store Flyers Composition (National Brands vs. Store Brands)

A question of interest in store flyer management is how much emphasis to place on national brands vs. store brands. Featuring more SBs may result in higher gross margins, and allow for more distinctive positioning towards competitors. For this reason, SBs are frequently featured through flyers and advertised less through other media. This helps SBs to suffer less of an advertising wear-out effect. But at the same time, the higher presence of SBs in store flyers means foregoing significant revenues from manufacturers who are willing to pay to have their brands featured in the store flyer (Gijsbrechts/Campo/Goossens 2003).

The related literature contains rival viewpoints on whether national brands or SB promotions are more successful in generating sales. The traditional belief is that national brands' promotions are the more effective ones because SBs appeal primarily to customers already loyal to the store (Steenkamp/Dekimpe 1997; Volle 1997). In particular, Walters/Jamil (2003) found on the one hand a high degree of flyer readership by consumers with low levels of loyalty to the retailer and its brand. These consumers use flyers to help resolve their patronage and purchase decisions. On the other hand, the lower levels of flyer readership found among consumers with more loyalty to the retailer show that these consumers use flyers primarily for purchase decisions and not decisions about where to shop. For this reason, these shoppers will not be influenced very much by deals coming from a store (brand) if he/she patronizes the store anyway (Froloff-Brouche 1994).

Nevertheless, the discussion as to whether national brands or store brands are more deal-elastic remains somewhat ambiguous, and depends on the competitive position the store brand has acquired (Dhar/Hoch 1997). Thus, according to Ailawadi/Neslin/Gedenk (2001) and

Gijsbrechts/Campo/Goossens (2003), the higher the private-label share in a category, the lower the promotional impact on manufacturer brands.

Considering that SB products now account for more than 20% of global grocery sales and are expected to grow to 30% by 2020 [2] (Lamey et al. 2007), as well as the fact that retailers frequently use store flyers in order to stress their own brand (Urbany/Dickson/Sawyer 2000), we posit a stronger impact of store brand's presence in store flyers on consumer choice probability.

H2: The effect of SBs' presence in store flyers on consumer brand choice probability is stronger than that of national brands.

3. Methodology and Data

3.1. Model Specification

The main objective of this study was to analyse the effect of brands' presence in store flyers on consumers' choice behaviour. In accordance with previous studies that have analysed consumers' choice behaviour (e.g. Chintagunta 2001; Andrews/Currim 2002), the present study employed an MNL specifying brand-specific parameters. There are three important reasons for the use of MNL: (i) analytical tractability and ease of econometric estimation; (ii) conceptual appeal (being grounded in economic theory); and (iii) excellent empirical performance (as measured by model fit and other criteria) (Guadagni/Little 1983).

Let I be the number of consumers (households) and T_i be the number of purchase occasions for the consumer i . In the model utilized here, consumer i ($= 1, 2, \dots, I$) can, on any purchase occasion t ($= 1, 2, \dots, T$), choose a single brand j from a set of J ($= 1, 2, \dots, J$) distinct brands in a product category. It is assumed that the utility derived by the consumer from the purchase of this item is a linear function of: (i) price; (ii) price reduction; (iii) brand presence in flyer; and (iv) a loyalty variable. If so, the utilities U_{ijt} ($j = 1, 2, \dots, J$) that consumer i would derive from purchasing brand combination j on purchase occasion t can be expressed as follows.

$$U_{ijt} = \alpha_j + \beta_1 \text{Price}_{jt} + \beta_2 \text{Flyer}_{jt} + \beta_3 \text{PriceReduction}_{jt} + \beta_4 \text{Loyalty}_{ijt} + \varepsilon_{ijt} \quad (\text{Equation 1})$$

in which: α_j is a brand-specific constant; β_k ($k=1, 2$ (brand-specific), 3, 4) are the response parameters; ε_{ijt} is an error term.

For each brand in the posited unit of time (week), two types of variables of the consumer's choice were employed:

- A variable reflecting purchase price (EUR), price reductions, and presence in store flyers.
- A binary index of customer brand loyalty (as demonstrated in successive purchase actions in the periods analysed).

In spite of the fact that this paper is focused on store flyers variables, we have also included both purchase price and price promotions because among the retail marketing variables, price and price-related promotions have the most dramatic impact on short-term consumer purchase behaviour (Bell/Chiang/Padmanabhan 1999; Leeflang/Wittink 1992; Mulhern/Williams/Leone 1998).

In addition, we have included a customer-level variable. In particular, brand loyalty was measured by a dummy variable that took a value of 1 if the customer chose the same brand in period t as in period $t-1$, and a value of 0 if the customer did not choose the same brand in period t as in period $t-1$. This approach (of incorporating the individual's previous choice experience) has been adopted in previous studies that have analysed brand choice (Chintagunta/Prasad 1998).

In a previous (unpublished) study, a variable of "historic loyalty" was used in addition to the variable of "previous loyalty" (as described above). In accordance with the principle of parsimony, however, it was decided to include only the variable of "previous loyalty" in the present study because this variable was demonstrated (in the previous study) to have: (i) a more significant effect on choice behaviour; and (ii) a greater ability to explain consumer choice behaviour. The results are available from the authors on request.

The existence of a price reduction as a sales promotion in a particular brand during a particular week was ascertained by observing the price levels of the ten brands selected for the study and assuming that a significant decrease (more than a 15%) in the price of a brand for a limited period (one or two weeks) constituted a sales promotion (as suggested in sales-promotion literature by many authors, such as Della Bitta/Monroe 1981; Uhl/Brown 1971). Using one variable for the regular price and another for the price in the sales promotion is an accepted method for handling this promotional variable in the marketing literature (Mulhern/Leone 1990).

Brand's presence in store flyers was analysed using a dummy variable, which took a value of 1 if the brand in question was present in the store's flyers in period t , and a value of 0 if the brand in question was not present in the store's flyers in period t . Treating promotional factors as dichotomous variables is an accepted procedure in marketing literature (Blattberg/Neslin 1990; Kannan/Yim 2001).

Following Greene (1993), the absence of multi-co-linearity problems is verified. In this respect, VIF values as well as Conditional Index (CI) were estimated. Both VIF values [2.191 (purchase price) 2.074 (flyer), 1.783 (price reduction), and 1.016 (loyalty)], and CI values for each dimension were found to be below harmful levels (Mason/Perreault 1991) [3]. Thus, no multi-co-linearity problems were detected in this study.

On the other hand, we analysed the possible existence of heteroskedasticity problems for the price variable [4]. In this respect, the value of the Goldfeld-Quandt (GQ) statistic=1.093, so that, at a significance level of 99% (for an F distribution with 139 (145-6) df both in the numerator and denominator,) we can accept the null hypothesis of homoskedasticity, and reject the possible existence of heteroskedasticity problems for this variable.

3.2. Data

Data on a range of olive oil brands, using the Universal Product Code (UPC), were collected by point-of-sale scanner during 2002 in a hypermarket belonging to an international distribution group located in the south-east of Spain. Olive oil is an essential foodstuff in the dietary habits of Spaniards and can be considered a fast-moving consumer good (FMCG). The study examined the sales of various brands of .4 acidity olive oil packaged in 1-litre plastic bottles, which is the most common form of olive oil used by Spanish consumers. Figure 1 summarizes the characteristics of the data used in this analysis.

Figure 1: Data

Data	Scanner choice data
Product category	Olive oil (1litre bottle)
Store	Hypermarket from an international distribution group
Period	53 weeks
Choice set	10 brands: - 8 national brands (Carbonell, Coosur, La Masía, La Española, Elosúa, Giralda, Ybarra y Mueloliva) - 2 store brands (Standard store brand (SSB) and Low-price store brand (LPSB))
Consumers	Only those customers paying for their purchases with the store's loyalty card
Size	389 individuals making a total of 3,241 purchases

The choice set comprised the ten brands of olive oil sold in the establishment at the time of analysis. Only those customers paying for their purchases with the store's loyalty card were considered. The consumer panel was considered over a total period of 53 weeks. The definitive scanner data set consisted of 389 individuals making a total of 3,241 purchases. Table 1 gives both some basic data and the promotional-frequency of the ten brands analysed in this work.

Table 1 shows that over at least forty-one weeks one of the ten brands appears in store flyers, while brands are only promoted in price over twenty weeks. In addition; a brand is also featured in store flyers in only eleven of these twenty times that the brand is promoted in price. This result confirms that not all the products appearing on the flyers have a reduced price, as many authors suggest (e.g. Volle 2001). Indeed, some products presented in these flyers are not explicitly promoted (e.g., no indication of any special price or extra-product offer). According to Walters/Jamil (2003), only a portion of the Hi-Low retailer's price specials is advertised in their flyers. The majority of the retailer's price specials are presented to consumers at the point of purchase using signs denoting products on special and their reduced prices. On

the other hand, three brands (two national brands and LPSBs) are never featured in store flyers. Retailers, therefore, use flyers in order to promote their main brand, but not for LPSBs. Nevertheless, retailers have recently been printing “specials flyers” in which only LPSBs are featured.

Table 1: Description of the Brands

	Market share (%)	Average price (EUR)	Weeks promoted in price	Weeks featured in store flyers	Weeks promoted in price and featured in flyers
Carbonell (M)	26.67	2.69	1	10	0
Standard store brand (R)	22.38	2.04	1	10	3
Coosur (M)	16.34	2.34	3	4	0
La Masía (M)	11.87	2.42	1	6	3
La Española (M)	9.83	2.40	1	6	2
Elosúa (M)	4.01	2.35	0	0	0
Giralda (M)	3.87	2.26	2	2	0
Ybarra (M)	2.45	2.44	0	3	3
Low-price store brand (R)	2.17	2.09	0	0	0
Mueloliva (M)	.41	2.55	0	0	0
TOTAL	100		9	41	11

Note: M - Manufacturer brand; R - Retailer brand.

4. Results

Table 2 shows the estimation for the MNL model defined in equation 1. Purchase-price parameter was negative and significant (-1.212; $p < .000$), thus confirming the well-known negative relationship (in the FMCG sector) between the price of a brand and a consumer's probability of choosing it (Bronnenberg/Dhar/Dubé 2005; Simpson 2006).

Brand presence in store flyers has a positive and significant effect on consumer choice probability for all brands - the exceptions are those brands not featured in store flyers during the whole period: Elosúa, LPSB and Mueloliva. Therefore, Hypothesis H1 is supported.

In addition, Table 2 shows that the store-flyer specific parameter is positive and significant for national top-price brands (Carbonell [.945; $p < .000$] and Coosur [.987; $p < .000$]). Using the promotional data described in Table 1, however, we can observe that these brands are not both promoted in price and featured in flyers at the same time. Indeed, they are only promoted in price during one (Carbonell) and three (Coosur) weeks. In contrast, they appeared in flyers more frequently (ten and four weeks, respectively). This result is in accordance with the findings of Inman/McAlister/Hoyer (1990), who showed that, through a signalling effect, the mere announcement of a promotion with no real deal increases the intention to purchase.

Table 2 further reveals that, contrary to expectations, the brand with most influence on the likelihood of the customer choosing it is the SSB (3.911; $p < .000$). In evaluating this result, it

should be acknowledged that SSB (as well as Carbonell) is the brand featured most in flyers (ten weeks).

Table 2: Estimation of Brand Choice Model

Preferences towards each brand	α	t-value	p-value	
Carbonell	6.77	8.505	.000	
Coosur	5.438	7.053	.000	
La Española	5.278	7.694	.000	
La Masía	5.136	5.687	.000	
SSB	4.291	6.357	.000	
Ybarra	2.234	3.754	.000	
Giralda	2.217	3.646	.000	
Elosúa	1.488	7.052	.000	
LPSB	1.160	1.011	.290	
Mueloliva	-	-	-	
Parameters of the explanatory variables	β	t-value	p-value	
Price	-1.212	-9.889	.000	
Price reduction	.696	22.949	.000	
Loyalty	2.264	119.157	.000	
Flyer ¹				Marginal effects for brand presence in flyers
SSB	3.911	5.119	.000	.6873
Coosur	.987	10.966	.000	.9318
Carbonell	.945	9.001	.000	.6291
Giralda	.830	1.736	.043	.5595
La Masía	.759	189.750	.000	.4391
La Española	.415	1.640	.050	.3574
Ybarra	.397	1.829	.016	.3121

Note: ¹ Only for those brands appearing (for at least one week) on flyers.

An interpretation of the results of the multinomial logit models based on the coefficients alone must be approached with caution because the coefficients do not give a true measure of the change in the dependent variable with respect to a unit change in the independent variable. The marginal effects show the effect of a unit change in the dependent variable on the probability of a brand being chosen (Nganje/Kaitibie/Taban 2005). The marginal effects, which are partial derivatives of probabilities with respect to the set of characteristics, are calculated from multinomial logit results according to the equation below.

$$\frac{\partial P_j}{\partial X_k} = P_j (\beta_j - \sum_b \beta_b P_b) \quad (\text{Equation 2})$$

in which P_j represents the probability that the j^{th} brand is chosen, while b is the number of brands. On the other hand, k refers to brand attributes. Table 2 shows marginal effects for brand presence in store flyers [5].

As Table 2 shows, a unitary change in the dependent variable (brand is advertised in store flyer) will significantly increase the probability of choosing Carbonell by .6873. Similarly, positive marginal effects are observed for the rest of the brands. The marginal effect for SSB is the strongest. Thus, when SSB is advertised in the store flyer, the probability of it being chosen will increase significantly by .9318. Results show that featuring both top-price national brands (brands with a higher marginal effect) (e.g. Carbonell, Coosur/La Masía) as well as SSB is going to have the most positive impact on store sales. This is in accordance with the findings of such authors as Gijsbrechts/Campo/Goossens (2003), who found that the allocation (and selection) of inside pages to brand types is crucial and may alter the store flyer's effectiveness.

The value of the parameter β_3 indicates the effect of carrying out price promotions on the consumers' probable choice. As we can see in Table 2, β_3 (.696) is significant ($p < .000$). This result is in accordance with many authors such as Blattberg/Wisniewski (1989) and Van Heerde/Bijmolt (2005), all of whom documented the positive effect of price promotions on the consumer's choice behaviour. In this respect, a growing body of literature over the 80s and 90s documented that temporary retail price reductions substantially increase sales (see Blattberg/Briesch/Fox 1995; Bronnenberg/Wathieu 1996).

On the other hand, as Table 2 shows, consumers demonstrate significant loyalty behaviour (2.264; $p < .000$). This finding is consistent with previous works (e.g. Anderson/Fornell/Lehmann 1994; Gremler/Gwinner 2000) that established a positive relation between consumer loyalty and (re) purchase intentions.

Nevertheless, results also indicate that consumers can be influenced by promotions (both price reductions as well as brands' presence in store flyers), so perhaps they are loyal consumers until other brands appear in the store flyers, mainly national brands, as preference values show (e.g. Carbonell [6.77; $p < .000$], Coosur [5.438; $p < .000$], La Española [5.278; $p < .000$], La Masía [5.136; $p < .000$]), and also SSB (4.291; $p < .000$). On the other hand, brands not appearing in store flyers (Elosúa, and LPSB) show either a lower preference (Elosúa [1.488; $p < .000$]) or a non-significant one (LPSB).

Using parameters from Table 2 specific to store flyers, we can analyse the relationship between different brands appearing on flyers. We called this relationship a "competitive flyer effect". This ratio is estimated as follows.

$$a_{jm} = \frac{\beta_j}{\beta_m} \quad (\text{Equation 3})$$

in which β_j, β_m are the j^{th} and m^{th} brand store flyer parameters.

This ratio [6] indicates which of both brands (j , m) has a stronger effect on consumer choice when they are (both) featured in store flyers, that is to say, what happens if both brands are featured simultaneously in store flyers the same week. In this sense, if $a_{jm} > 1$, j brand has the stronger effect. On the contrary, if $a_{jm} < 1$, the effect of m brand presence in the store flyer is stronger. Since we are using β brand-specific parameters in order to estimate such ratio, we are taking into account how many weeks a brand is featured and also the impact of such presence on consumer choice probability. Table 3 shows the value of this ratio for store flyer coefficients.

Table 3: Competitive Flyers Effects ¹

	Carbonell	SSB	Coosur	La Masía	La Española	Giralda	Ybarra
Carbonell	-	.242	.957	1.245	2.277	1.139	2.380
SSB		-	3.963	5.153	9.424	4.712	9.851
Coosur			-	1.300	2.378	1.189	2.486
La Masía				-	1.829	.914	1.912
La Española					-	.500	1.045
Giralda						-	2.090
Ybarra							-

Note: ¹ β_j/β_m ; j - row; m - column.

To test hypothesis H2, a t-test was conducted on the averages of differences for each j brand and 1 (see Table 4).

Table 4: Average Differences for Each Brand ¹

	Average	/Average-1/	SD ²	t-value	p-value
Carbonell	1.373	.373	.819	1.116	.315
SSB	6.621	5.621	2.791	4.503	.011
Coosur	1.838	.838	1.131	1.625	.107
La Masía	1.552	.552	.553	1.727	.226
La Española	.773	.227	.386	-.834	.558

Note: ¹ t-tests; ² Standard deviation.

As Table 4 shows for SSB only, the average of differences was different to 1 (6.6205; $p < .05$). This demonstrates that the effect of SB presence in store flyers on consumer choice probability was stronger than that of national brands. Hypothesis H2 is therefore supported because the stronger impact of SSB's presence in the store flyer on consumer choice behaviour is confirmed. Indeed, according to its significant average value (6.6205) higher than 1, SSB is the only brand that benefits from being featured in flyers in the same week as another brand. In this respect, it is not recommendable for national brands to be featured in flyers in the same week as SSB. This is in accordance with the findings of authors such as Ailawadi/Neslin/Gedenk (2001), and Gijsbrechts/Campo/Goossens (2003), who indicated that the higher the private-label share in a category, the lower the promotional impact on manufacturer

brands. In this respect, Ailawadi/Gedenk/Neslin (2003) found that higher store brand usage is associated with lower national brand deal usage and vice versa. Note that the hypermarket considered in this study has a strong store brand with a high market share in many categories. In particular, SSB is the brand with the second largest market share (22.38%) for olive-oil, higher than other top-price national brands (e.g. Coosur, La Masía, La Española, or Ybarra).

5. Conclusions and Managerial Implications

In today's highly competitive retail environment, feature promotions play an increasingly important role in attracting customers to the store and influencing their in-store spending. In particular, how effective store flyers are is one of the aspects of most concern to the marketing managers of retail stores as part of their marketing strategy. Nevertheless, the increasing economic importance of using store flyers as a promotional tool in retail stores has not been reflected in the marketing literature. The sales promotion literature to date leaves retailers with few guidelines with which to decide on the bundle of promotions to be offered and the way they are to be communicated to potential customers. This paper aimed to shed more light on these issues by analysing the effect of brands' presence in flyers on consumer choice for both national brands as well as store brands.

We find that consumers' choice probability is affected significantly by brands' presence in store flyers. In this respect, consumers' preferences toward brands appearing on flyers are higher than for those brands not appearing. Indeed, brands not featured in store flyers showed no significant preference for consumers. This, together with the fact that most shoppers read the flyers only to be informed of price specials that the store has to offer (Miranda/Kónya 2007), justifies the huge (regular) expenditure by retailers on promotions advertised on store flyers [7] and confirms the main role of store flyers in retailer promotion activities. Thus, flyers serve two different purposes (Walters/Jamil 2003): (i) to build traffic in a segment that must be motivated to visit the store by the offer of low prices, and (ii) to facilitate purchase decisions by regular customers during their shopping trip.

Somewhat surprisingly, SB presence in store flyers has the strongest effect on the likelihood of the customer choosing that brand. National brands' presence in flyers also has a positive influence on consumer choice. The effect, however, has less influence on the likelihood of the customer choosing them. This result is not in accordance with findings by many authors (e.g. Steenkamp/Dekimpe 1997; Volle 1997) who showed that national brand promotions are the more effective ones. This argument is weakened, however, by recent findings: 1) SB is no longer bought exclusively by customers loyal to the store, but appeals increasingly to multiple-store shoppers and deal-prone consumers (Ailawadi 2001), and 2) in recent years the value positioning of most SBs has been substantially improved (e.g. Corstjens/Corstjens 1995), thereby closing the gap in promotion effectiveness between SBs and national brands.

The implication is that retailers should increase the presence of their own brands in flyers. This is in accordance with the findings of such authors as Dick/Jain/Richardson (1995), who indicated that retailers need to strengthen the advertising and promotional campaigns of their store brand lines. In addition, by using in-store displays and information material at the point-of-purchase, product aisles and consumers' mail box, consumers could be educated with regard to the quality of ingredients and manufacturing processes used in store brand manufacture. In this respect, Corstjens/Lal (2000) indicated that the effectiveness of SB deals is consistent with its improved value positioning advocated in recent marketing literature, and with its potential to differentiate the retailer's promotion offer from that of his competitors. This, together with the fact that SB items typically generate higher margins (Ailawadi 2001), provides an incentive to increase emphasis on this brand type in a store's featuring activities. In addition, SBs allow the retailer to differentiate his own firm and constitute an asset in the strategic "customer competition" (Dhar/Hoch 1997).

The stronger positive effect of SBs depends on the private-label share in the product category. Thus, consumers in categories with a large private-label share tend to stockpile less and to be less impulsive than consumers in categories with a small private label share (Ailawadi/Neslin/Gedenk 2001). Thus, promotions may have less impact (for manufacturers' brands) in categories with a high private label share. In this respect, Gijsbrechts/Campo/Goossens (2003) indicated that, for retail chains that have succeeded in matching the quality of their SB products to that of competing national brands, featuring SB items is expected to have a stronger positive effect on sales, given their price/quality advantage and chain-specific character.

In addition, featuring more SB items could increase consumers' familiarity with products in the store (e.g. price, quality, promotion, etc.). Such product familiarity may increase consumers' understanding and confidence that store brands provide good value, leading to more purchases of store brand. In this respect, Gutwilling (2000) points out that an excellent SB programme provides many important, but frequently ignored return-on-investment advantages. One of the greatest strategic benefits of these programmes is its ability to attract loyal shoppers and to create a point of competitive difference to retailers who mainly sell known value items (national brands). According to this author, store flyers emphasizing SB appeals could possibly build sales volumes from the more price-conscious without a disproportionate risk of customer attrition.

This result is also consistent with the growing belief - among both academics and retail practitioners - that more emphasis should be placed on customer franchise building (Urbany/Dickson/Sawyer 2000). Thus, several researchers have suggested that store brands are associated with better store image and higher store loyalty (Ailawadi/Neslin/Gedenk; Corstjens/Lal 2000), which would have a positive effect on retail sales because loyal consumers buy a larger share of their total requirements from the store (Ailawadi/Harlam 2004). If a consumer is

loyal to a brand, it is likely that, over time, that consumer will continue to use the same store because he/she has been successful in obtaining the desired product.

On the other hand, in order to increase the effectiveness of store flyers, retailers could offer a greater number of flyers featuring only Low-Price Store Brand. In our opinion, it wouldn't be interesting to feature it in the same flyers as other national brands and standard store brands as this brand is positioned on the lowest price level. In this respect, a higher number of retailers (especially supermarkets) are increasingly printing "specials flyers" in which only Low-Price Store Brand is featured.

Nevertheless, retailers must retain a balance between store brands and national brands in order to attract and retain profitable customers who buy some store brands, but not too many (Ailawadi/Harlam 2004). In this context, the latter continue to be major traffic builders, and reducing national brand choices may make the store less attractive to its most profitable shoppers (Ailawadi 2001). Indeed, as Corstjens/Lal (2000) suggest, for a quality store brand strategy to be profitable there should be enough customers who buy national brands. This balance is in the best interest of consumers as it ensures a broad choice as well as low prices.

Although we have focused on the retailer's perspective, our results can also provide insights for manufacturers. For example, it would be very interesting to increase their presence in store flyers. Even manufacturers should negotiate with retailers in order to print an "only-national brands" flyer because if both types of brands (national and store) are featured in the same flyer, the effect of national brands' presence on the likelihood of the customer choosing it will be less than if store brand is not featured. The presence of other national brands, however, is less troublesome for the manufacturer. Thus, as Wedel/Zhang (2004) indicated, the competition between national brand and SB items is stronger than that among national brand items. In this respect, Sethuraman (2000) shows that national brands enjoy a level of equity and image, over and above quality, that is not offset by the lower price of store brands. This better image can help manufacturers negotiate more favourable trade deals with retailers (Walters 1991) (e.g. a less presence of SB on flyers).

6. Limitations and Further Research

Clearly, our study has a number of limitations. Given that the analysis is confined to one chain and store format (supermarkets), there is a need for external validation by examining store flyers effects for other store types. Also, as in similar studies using panel data, the analysis was conducted on only one product category. Nevertheless, the characteristics of the product category that was analysed were such that it is likely that the results can be extrapolated with confidence to any type of mass-consumer good. In support of this contention, the present authors note that the leading brands of olive oil studied here were national brands, the store's

brand ("SB") had a large market share, and the distributor had a second premium-priced brand ("LPSB"). Nevertheless, validation of these results by analysis of other product categories is recommended.

Another limitation of the present study relates to SB quality. In this respect, this aspect has been neglected in the model, and the higher SB market share is probably (also) a consequence of its higher quality levels (not only price variable). Unfortunately, scanner data does not yield such variables as quality or brand value. In addition, other retailer variables, such as displays or information on the point-of-sale, have not been used. Thus, the lack of control over other advertising and in-store merchandising activities can make it more difficult to (really) know how much of the sales uplift comes from the flyer and how much from other promotional activities.

Finally, only customers using the store's loyalty card were taken into consideration; nevertheless, these consumers represent more than 70% of consumers shopping at the store.

It would also be interesting to analyse the optimal store flyer composition (e.g. the allocation of store flyer space to category and brand types). In addition, there is a research opportunity that could address what messages to include in flyers to improve their effectiveness. The authors also recommend that future research could analyse the effect of both types of brands (national and SB) on other aspects of consumer behaviour apart from consumer choice (e.g. brand equity).

Notes

- [1] On the other hand, this paper does not aim to characterize flyer-prone consumers, but is focused on the differentiated effect of national and store brands' presence in store flyers on consumer choice behaviour.
- [2] Still, in many Western European countries store brand's market share is higher than 20% (e.g. Switzerland (38%), Spain (23%) or France (21%) (Lamey et al. 2007).
- [3] The results are available from the authors on request.
- [4] Of the 389 observations, we eliminated 99 central observations, estimating model (1) for each of the resulting two groups of 145 observations in order to analyse this problem.
- [5] Statistical significance of marginal effects is the same as that of brand-specific flyer parameters.
- [6] This approach has frequently been employed in marketing literature focused on market structure, competitive interaction between brands, and asymmetry in brand positioning (e.g. Cooper/Nakanishi 1988; Elrod/Keane 1995).
- [7] Thus, according to data from IRI, price cuts is the promotional technique most used by hypermarkets, followed by the use of store flyers.

References

- Abraham, M.; Lodish, L. (1993): An Implemented System for Improving Promotion Productivity Using Store Scanner Data, in: *Marketing Science*, Vol. 12, No. 3, pp. 248-269.
- Ailawadi, K. (2001): The Retailer Power-Performance Conundrum: What Have We Learned?, in: *Journal of Retailing*, Vol. 77, No. 3, pp. 299-318.
- Ailawadi, K.; Harlam, B. (2004): An Empirical Analysis of the Determinants of Retail Margins: Determinants of Retail Margins: The Role of Store-Brand Share, in: *Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 68, No. 1, pp. 147-165.
- Ailawadi, K.; Gedenk, K.; Neslin, S. (2003): Understanding Competition Between Retailers and Manufacturers: An Integrated Analysis of Store Brand and National Brand Deal Usage, in: *Tuck Business School Working Paper No. 03-16*, Dartmouth.
- Ailawadi, K.; Neslin, S.; Gedenk, K. (2001): Pursuing the Value Conscious Consumer: Store Brands Versus National Brand Promotions, in: *Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 65, No. 1, pp. 71-89.
- Anderson, E.; Fornell, C.; Lehmann, D. (1994): Customer Satisfaction, Market Share and Profitability: Findings from Sweden, in: *Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 58, No. 3, pp. 53-74.
- Arnold, S.; Kozinets, R.; Handelman, J. (2001): Hometown Ideology and Retailer Legitimation: The Institutional Semiotics of Wal-Mart Flyers, in: *Journal of Retailing*, Vol. 77, No. 2, pp. 243-271.
- Andrews, R.; Currim, I. (2002): Identifying Segments with Identical Choice Behaviours across Product Categories: An Intercategory Logit Mixture Model, in: *International Journal of Research in Marketing*, Vol. 19, No. 1, pp. 65-79.
- Bell, D.; Chiang, J.; Padmanabhan, V. (1999): The Decomposition of Promotional Response: An Empirical Generalization, in: *Marketing Science*, Vol. 18, No. 4, pp. 504-526.
- Blattberg, R.; Briesch, R.; Fox, E. (1995): How Promotions Work, in: *Marketing Science*, Vol. 14, No. 3, pp. G122-G132.
- Blattberg, R.; Neslin, S. (1990): *Sales Promotion. Concepts, Methods and Strategies*, Englewood Cliffs, NJ.
- Blattberg, R.; Wisniewski, K. (1989): Price-Induced Patterns of Competition, in: *Marketing Science*, Vol. 8, No. 4, pp. 291-309.
- Bodapati, A. (1999): *The Impact of Out-of-Store Advertising on Store Sales*, Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation: Stanford University.
- Bronnenberg, B.; Dhar, S.; Dubé, J. (2005): *Consumer Packaged Goods in the United States: National Brands, Local Branding*, in: *Working Paper UCLA*, Los Angeles, CA.
- Bronnenberg, B.; Wathieu, L. (1996): Assymetric Promotion Effects and Brand Positioning, in: *Marketing Science*, Vol. 15, No. 4, pp. 379-394.
- Burton, S.; Lichtenstein, D.; Netemeyer, R. (1999): Exposure to Sales Flyers and Increased Purchases in Retail Supermarkets, in: *Journal of Advertising Research*, Vol. 39, No. 5, pp. 7-14.
- Chintagunta, P. (2001): Endogeneity and Heterogeneity in a Probit Demand Model: Estimation Using Aggregate Data, in: *Marketing Science*, Vol. 20, No. 4, pp. 442-456.

- Chintagunta, P.; Prasad, A. (1998): An Empirical Investigation of the "Dynamic McFadden" Model of Purchase Timing and Brand Choice: Implications for Market Structure, in: *Journal of Business & Economic Statistics*, Vol. 16, No. 1, pp. 2-12.
- Christiansen, C.; Bjerre, M. (2001): Circulars - A Conceptual Framework, in: Hansen, F. Hansen, L. (eds.): *Advertising Research in the Nordic Countries*, Copenhagen, pp. 244-253.
- Cooper, L.; Nakanishi, M. (1988): *Market Share Analysis: Evaluating Competitive Marketing Effectiveness*, Boston, MA.
- Cooper, L.; Baron, P.; Levy, W.; Swisher, M.; Gogos, P. (1999): PromoCast Trademark: A New Forecasting Method for Promotion Planning, in: *Marketing Science*, Vol. 18, No. 3, pp. 301-16.
- Corstjens, J.; Corstjens, M. (1995): *Store Wars: The Battle for Mindspace and Shelfspace*, New York, NY.
- Corstjens, M.; Lal, R. (2000): Building Store Loyalty through Store Brands, in: *Journal of Marketing Research*, Vol. 37, No. 3, pp. 281-291.
- Cox, R.; Brittain, P. (1993): *Retail Management*, 2nd ed., London.
- Della Bitta, A.; Monroe, K. (1981): A Multivariate Analysis of the Perception of Value from Retail Price Advertisements, in: *Advances in Consumer Research*, Vol. 8, No. 1, pp. 161-165.
- Dhar, S.; Hoch, S. (1997): Why Store Brand Penetration Varies by Retailer, in: *Marketing Science*, Vol. 16, No. 3, pp. 208-227.
- Dick, A.; Jain, A.; Richardson, P. (1995): Correlates of Store Brand Proneness: Some Empirical Observations, in: *Journal of Product & Brand Management*, Vol. 4, No. 4, pp. 15-22.
- Elrod, T.; Keane, M. (1995): A Factor-Analytic Probit Model for Representing the Market Structure in Panel Data, in: *Journal of Marketing Research*, Vol. 32, No. 1, pp. 1-16.
- Froloff-Brouche, L. (1994): L'influence de la Promotion des Ventes sur le Consommateur: Un Essai de Conceptualisation, in: *Recherche et Applications en Marketing*, Vol. 9, No. 3, pp. 45-62.
- Gijsbrechts, E.; Campo, K.; Goossens, T. (2003): The Impact of Store Flyers on Store Traffic and Store Sales: A Geo-Marketing Approach, in: *Journal of Retailing*, Vol. 79, No. 1, pp. 1-16.
- Greene, W. (1993): *Econometric Analysis*, London.
- Gremler, D.; Gwinner, K. (2000): Customer-Employee Rapport in Service Relationships, in: *Journal of Service Research*, Vol. 3, No. 1, pp. 82-104.
- Guadagni, P.; Little, J. (1983): A Logit Model of Brand Choice Calibrated on Scanner Data, in: *Marketing Science*, Vol. 2, No. 3, pp. 203-238.
- Gutwilling, R. (2000): *Household Names*, Supermarket Business, New York, NY.
- Hansen, F.; Christiansen, L.; Thomsen, R. (2003): The Role of Retailers Free-Sheets in Merchandising, Working Paper Copenhagen Business School.
- Hoch, S.; Kim, B.-D.; Montgomery, A.; Rossi, P. (1995): Determinants of Store-Level Price Elasticity, in: *Journal of Marketing Research*, Vol. 32, No. 1, pp. 17-29.

- Inman, J.; McAlister, L.; Hoyer, W. (1990): Promotion Signal: Proxy for a Price Cut?, in: *Journal of Consumer Research*, Vol. 17, No. 1, pp. 74-81.
- Kannan, P.; Yim, C. (2001): An Investigation of the Impact of Promotions on Across-submarket Competition, in: *Journal of Business Research*, Vol. 53, No. 3, pp. 137-149.
- Krishna, A.; Currim, I.; Shoemaker, R. (1991): Consumer Perceptions of Promotional Activity, in: *Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 55, No. 2, pp. 4-16.
- Lamey, L.; Deleersnyder, B.; Dekimpe, M.; Steenkamp, J.B. (2007): How Business Cycles Contribute to Private-Label Success: Evidence from the United States and Europe, in: *Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 71, No. 1, pp. 1-15.
- Leeflang, P.; Wittink, D. (1992): Diagnosing Competitive Reactions Using (Aggregated) Scanner Data, in: *International Journal of Research in Marketing*, Vol. 9, No. 1, pp. 39-57.
- Mason, C.; Perreault, W. (1991): Collinearity, Power and Interpretation of Multiple Regression Analysis, in: *Journal of Marketing Research*, Vol. 28, No. 3, pp. 268-280.
- Miranda, M.; Kónya, L. (2007): Directing Store Flyers to the Appropriate Audience, in: *Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services*, Vol. 14, No. 3, pp. 175-181.
- Mulhern, F.; Leone, R. (1990): Retail Promotional Advertising: Do the Number of Deal Items and Size of Deal Discounts Affect Store Performance?, in: *Journal of Business Research*, Vol. 21, No. 3, pp. 179-194.
- Mulhern, F.; Padgett, D. (1995): The Relationship between Retail Price Promotions and Regular Price Purchase, in: *Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 59, No. 4, pp. 83-90.
- Mulhern, F.; Williams, J.; Leone, R. (1998): Variability of Brand Price Elasticities across Retail Stores: Ethnic, Income and Brand Determinants, in: *Journal of Retailing*, Vol. 74, No. 3, pp. 427-446.
- Nganje, E.; Kajitibie, S.; Taban, T. (2005): Multinomial Logit Models Comparing Consumers' and Producers' Risk Perception of Specialty Meat, in: *Agribusiness*, Vol. 21, No. 3, pp. 375-390.
- Raghubir, P.; Inman, J.; Grande, H. (2004): The Three Faces of Consumer Promotions, in: *California Management Review*, Vol. 46, No. 4, pp. 23-42.
- Schmidt, M.; Bjerre, M. (2003): Can Recipients of Sales Flyers be Segmented?, in: *International Journal of Advertising*, Vol. 22, No. 3, pp. 375-391.
- Schultz, D.; Robinson, W.; Petrison, L. (1998): *Sales Promotion Essentials*, 3rd ed., Chicago, IL.
- Sethuraman, R. (2000): What Makes Consumers Pay More for National Brands Than for Store Brands- Image or Quality?, *Review of Marketing Science Working-Paper No. 318*, Cambridge, MA.
- Shimp, T. (1997): *Promotion Management and Marketing Communications* 2nd ed., Hinsdale, IL.
- Simpson, L. (2006): Enhancing Food Promotion in the Supermarket Industry. A Framework for Sales Promotion Success, in: *International Journal of Advertising*, Vol. 25, No. 2, pp. 223-245.
- Steenkamp, J.B.; Dekimpe, M. (1997): The Increasing Power of Store Brands: Building Loyalty and Market Share, in: *Long Range Planning*, Vol. 30, No. 6, pp. 917-930.

- Uhl, J.; Brown, H. (1971): Consumer Perception of Experimental Retail Food Price Changes, in: *Journal of Consumer Affairs*, Vol. 5, No. 2, pp. 174-185.
- Urbany, J.; Dickson, P.; Sawyer, A. (2000): Insights Into Cross and Within-Store Price Search: Retailer Estimates vs. Consumer Self Reports, in: *Journal of Retailing*, Vol. 76, No. 2, pp. 243-258.
- Van den Poel, D.; De Schamphelaere, J.; Wets, G. (2004): Direct and Indirect Effects of Retail Promotions on Sales and Profits in the Do-It-Yourself Market, in: *Expert Systems with Applications*, Vol. 27, No. 1, pp. 53-62.
- Van Heerde, H.; Bijmolt, T. (2005): Decomposing the Promotional Revenue Bump for Loyalty Program Members Versus Nonmembers, in: *Journal of Marketing Research*, Vol. 42, No. 4, pp. 443-457.
- Volle, P. (1997): Quelles Perspectives de Développement pour Prospectus Promotionnels des Distributeurs, in: *Décisions Marketing*, Vol. 12, No. 9, pp. 39-46.
- Volle, P. (2001): The Short-Term Effect of Store-Level Promotions on Store Choice, and the Moderating Role of Individual Variables, in: *Journal of Business Research*, Vol. 53, No. 2, pp. 63-73.
- Walters, R. (1991): Assessing the Impact of Retail Price Promotions on Product Substitution, Complementary Purchase and Interstore Sales Displacement, in: *Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 55, No. 2, pp. 17-28.
- Walters, R.; Jamil, M. (2003): Exploring Relationships Between Shopping Trip Type, Purchases of Products on Promotion and Shopping Basket Profit, in: *Journal of Business Research*, Vol. 56, No. 1, pp. 17-29.
- Walters, R.; MacKenzie, S. (1988): An Empirical Investigation into the Impact of Price Promotions on Retail Store Performance, in: *Journal of Retailing*, Vol. 62, No. 3, pp. 237-266.
- Walters, R.; Rinne, H. (1986): An Empirical Investigation into the Impact of Price Promotions on Retail Store Performance, in: *Journal of Retailing*, Vol. 62, No. 3, pp. 237-266.
- Wedel, M.; Zhang, J. (2004): Analyzing Brand Competition Across Subcategories, in: *Journal of Marketing Research*, Vol. 41, No. 4, pp. 448-456.
- White, K.; Anzalone, C.; Barbour, D. (1980): The Effectiveness of Shopper Guides, in: *Journal of Advertising Research*, Vol. 20, No. 2, pp. 17-24.

Contents

How Store Flyers Affect Consumer Choice Behaviour: National Brands vs. Store Brands	1
<i>Juan Carlos Gázquez-Abad and Manuel Sánchez-Pérez</i>	
The Effect of Free Product Premiums on Attitudes and Buying Intention for Durable Goods: Moderating Effects of Value and Product Premium Fit in the Dual Mediation Model	21
<i>Roland Helm, Antje Mark and Sabine Bley</i>	
Direct Selling: Consumer Profile, Clusters and Satisfaction	47
<i>Braúlio Alturas and Maria C. Santos</i>	
Logistics Service Quality and Technology Investment in Retailing	69
<i>Irene Gil-Saura and Maria-Eugenia Ruiz-Molina</i>	
Does Architecture Influence the Price Image and Intention to Shop in a Retail Store?	83
<i>Stephan Zielke and Waldemar Toporowski</i>	
Consumer Perceptions of Grocery Retail Formats in Romania: The Varying Impact of Retailer Attributes	101
<i>Bernhard Swoboda, Bettina Berg, Nicolae A. Pop and Christian Dabija</i>	
An Assessment of Wal-Mart's Global Expansion Strategy in the Light of its Domestic Strategy	125
<i>David P. Brennan and Lorman L. Lundsten</i>	

Country Reports

Retailing in Germany: Current Landscape and Future Trends	153
<i>Joachim Zentes and Sebastian Rittinger</i>	
The Finnish Retail Market: Overview	183
<i>Heli Paavola, Mari Ainasoja, Eelina Vuoli and Sanna Rytöviuori</i>	

**EUROPEAN
RETAIL
RESEARCH**

Vol. 23, Issue 1, 2009, pp. 1-214

Bibliographic information published by the Deutsche Nationalbibliothek.
The Deutsche Nationalbibliothek lists this publication in the Deutsche Nationalbibliografie;
detailed bibliographic data are available in the Internet at <http://dnb.d-nb.de>.

The 23rd Volume Issue I is sponsored by

METRO Group



"Jahrbücher zur Handelsforschung" were first published at:

Physica-Verlag (1986-1988)
Gabler Verlag (1989-1999/2000)
BBE-Verlag (2000/01-2004)
Kohlhammer Verlag (2005-2007)

1st Edition 2009

All rights reserved

© Gabler | GWV Fachverlage GmbH, Wiesbaden 2009

Editorial Office: Claudia Jeske

Gabler is part of the specialist publishing group Springer Science+Business Media.
www.gabler.de



No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording, or otherwise, without the prior written permission of the copyright holder.

Registered and/or industrial names, trade names, trade descriptions etc. cited in this publication are part of the law for trade-mark protection and may not be used free in any form or by any means even if this is not specifically marked.

Cover design: Regine Zimmer, Dipl.-Designerin, Frankfurt/Main

Printed on acid-free paper

Printed in Germany

ISBN 978-3-8349-1225-1

ISSN 1867-8785