

Ehrenberg-Bass Institute Working Paper:

Re-examining age-related loyalty for low-involvement purchasing

*This working paper, dated 25 May 2022, was subsequently published in **European Journal of Marketing**.*

To access the published version of this article see:

Mecredy, P., Wright, M., Feetham, P., Stern, P. (2022). Re-examining age-related loyalty for low-involvement purchasing". European Journal of Marketing. Vol. 56 No. 7. pp. 1773-1798

Authors:

Dr Philip Mecredy - [Massey University](#)

Professor Malcolm Wright - [Ehrenberg-Bass Institute, Massey University](#)

Dr Pamela Feetham - [Massey University](#)

Professor Philip Stern - [Ehrenberg-Bass Institute, University of Exeter](#)



RE-EXAMINING AGE-RELATED LOYALTY FOR LOW-INVOLVEMENT PURCHASING

ABSTRACT

Purpose – Previous research on age-related loyalty is sparse, contradictory and suffers from methodological limitations and criticisms. This study applies two methodological advances to fresh purchasing data to give a much clearer picture of age-related differences in brand loyalty.

Design/methodology/approach – An online brand choice survey (n=1,862) is used to examine age-related loyalty within three low-involvement categories in New Zealand. The polarisation index (ϕ) is adopted as the measure of loyalty to control for confounding influences present in prior research. Results for chronological age are validated through comparison with results for measures of cognitive, biological and sociological age, as well as household lifecycle.

Findings – Contrary to prior research, age-related differences in loyalty are detected in two of the three low-involvement categories studied. The third category does not show detectable loyalty for any age group. While differences in brand loyalty are broadly present across all age measures, no alternative measure outperforms chronological age in detecting variations in age-related loyalty.

Research limitations/implications – This is the first evidence that age-related brand loyalty is present in low involvement categories. However, effects are small, and easily obscured by confounding factors. More research is needed to determine how results vary by category.

Practical implications – Despite showing minor differences in loyalty, older consumers still purchase from a wide portfolio of brands and so should not be ignored by marketers. Future research can investigate loyalty for older consumers by adopting the method of analysing differences in polarisation (ϕ) for chronological age groups.

Originality/value – Previous contradictory findings and methodological concerns about measurement of age-related loyalty are resolved through use of the polarisation index (ϕ) as a measure of loyalty, and by confirmation that chronological age performs as well as any other age measure.

Keywords Brand loyalty; Older consumers; Polarisation index; Juster scale; Dirichlet model; Brand performance measures

Paper type Research paper

1.0 Introduction

By 2050, it is predicted that consumers aged 60 years and over will represent 22% of the world's population, while those aged 80 years and over will represent close to 30% of the population in Europe, North America, and Oceania (United Nations, 2015). As the global population ages, baby boomers (born 1943-1963) have become the wealthiest and highest spending generational cohort in the United States, spending \$548 billion annually compared to \$357 billion by Gen X, the second highest spending cohort (Epsilon, 2019).

Yet, researchers have devoted relatively little attention to understanding how age influences consumer loyalty patterns (Evanschitzky and Woisetschläger, 2008, Lambert-Pandraud *et al.*, 2005, Uncles and Lee, 2006). Some marketing practitioners and advertisers erroneously believe older consumers have low spending power and are loyal to well-established brands, resulting in heavier investment in younger consumers (Thompson and Thompson, 2009, Yoon and Cole, 2008, Moschis, 2003); for example, only 15% of media images in the United States depict consumers aged 50 years and above (The American Association of Retired Persons, 2019). Evidence does not support this neglect as Phua *et al.* (2020) show older consumers regularly buy new brands and Anesbury *et al.* (2021) find that dead sub-brands were more likely to have skewed towards younger rather than older buyers.

One reason for the lack of research may be some puzzling contradictions and methodological limitations in published work on age-related loyalty. There are only a few studies and they focus predominately on cars, perfume, and fast-moving consumer goods (FMCGs). In the high-involvement categories of cars and perfume, older consumers have smaller

consideration sets, higher brand loyalty, and a greater preference for well-established brands compared to younger consumers (Evanschitzky and Woisetschläger, 2008, Lambert-Pandraud *et al.*, 2005, Maddox *et al.*, 1978, Lambert-Pandraud and Laurent, 2010). In contrast, in low-involvement categories research reports that while there are age-related differences in category purchase rates, brand loyalty patterns appear not to differ across age groups (Uncles and Ehrenberg, 1990, Singh *et al.*, 2012, Uncles and Lee, 2006).

The present study seeks to resolve the contradictory results in age-related loyalty, while addressing two major criticisms of the current corpus of work. A limitation of existing studies of low-involvement categories is that the brand performances measures (BPMs) used to measure loyalty may be confounded by differing category purchase rates and market shares across age groups. Therefore, to conclude whether age-related differences in brand loyalty extend from high-involvement categories to low-involvement categories, fresh research is needed using loyalty measures independent of these confounds. A further limitation is the past use of chronological age, as it is viewed as an unsophisticated measure due to heterogeneity among older consumers (Nelson and Dannefer, 1992). Researchers have considered other age-related explanations of consumer behaviour such as cognitive, sociological and biological age (e.g. Evanschitzky and Woisetschläger, 2008), as well as the impact of life circumstances and events (Mathur *et al.*, 2003, Mathur *et al.*, 2008, Eastman and Liu, 2012). However, as Zniva and Weitzl (2016) indicate these alternative measures are used sparingly across studies and it is not clear whether research using chronological age is sufficient to establish generalisations about age-related loyalty.

Since observations of age-related loyalty may be an artefact of lower category purchase frequencies, differing brand shares among older age groups, or differing definitions of age, the presence of age-related loyalty cannot be accurately determined without first controlling

for these factors. Should age-related differences be confirmed, then the initial step (taken in the present research) is to attempt to determine which ageing processes provide more, or less plausible explanations for the observed empirical results. Once the candidate ageing processes are narrowed down, future research can investigate the influence of specific mechanisms through appropriate detailed experimental investigations.

The present research therefore seeks to resolve past uncertainties and thereby encourage fresh research into age-related loyalty including extending the generalisability of findings in the area. It does so by adding (i) substantive new evidence and (ii) addressing two key methodological concerns that contribute to uncertainty about prior findings in age-related loyalty. Specifically, the research addresses the following questions:

RQ1: Can prior findings of age-related similarities in brand loyalty for low-involvement categories be replicated?

RQ2: How do these findings change once the potentially confounding effects of category buying rates and brand shares are taken into account?

RQ3: Which measures of age best describes patterns of brand loyalty for older consumers?

An online survey is used to investigate age-related loyalty patterns in store and product choice, using three low-involvement categories: supermarket store choice, toothpaste and fruit juice. Loyalty patterns are explored using benchmarks from the NBD-Dirichlet (Dirichlet) model, a commonly used stochastic model that describes purchasing in a stationary and unsegmented market (Goodhardt *et al.*, 1984, Ehrenberg *et al.*, 2004).

As mentioned earlier, the descriptive brand performance metrics typically reported when using the Dirichlet model (see. Table III) are dependent upon both the frequency with which the category is purchased and also the number and market shares of competing brands in the

category. To overcome these potential confounds, the present analysis uses a loyalty measure that is independent of category purchasing rates and individual market shares; the polarisation index (φ). Results for φ are compared across alternative age measures (chronological, cognitive, sociological and biological age) as well as household lifecycle (HLC) to determine which measure best captures variations in brand loyalty between age segments.

Consistent with previous literature, brand loyalty remains relatively low for all chronological age groups, with most consumers regularly switching between a portfolio (repertoire) of brands. However, unlike previous research, results do show differences in brand loyalty across age groups for two of the three low-involvement categories studied, suggesting that prior conflicting results may be in part due to confounding factors in the methods used. While age-related differences in brand loyalty are broadly present for all alternative age measures, none consistently outperform chronological age in detecting variations in loyalty. These results provide fresh evidence on the relationship between age and loyalty and provide a methodological blueprint for future age-related research – that is, the measurement of loyalty through the polarisation index (φ), and confidence in the use of chronological age as a measure.

2.0 Literature Review

2.1 Age-related patterns of purchasing

The first comprehensive analysis of the influence of age on consumer purchasing was the examination of repeat purchase rates for automobiles by Lambert-Pandraud *et al.* (2005). Results from French car buyers revealed higher brand loyalty among older consumers who repurchased their previous car brand more often than younger consumers. Specifically, 42%

of under 40 year-olds repurchased their previous brand, compared to 54% for the 40-59 year-olds, 66% for the 60-74 year-olds, and 72% for the over 74 year-olds. Evanschitzky and Woisetschläger (2008) found similar results with data from German respondents in the automobile category, confirming that chronological age had a positive influence on brand loyalty. A subsequent study of the French perfume market found older women also remain more attached to their previously purchased brand while younger women were more innovative consumers who switched more frequently between perfume brands (Lambert-Pandraud and Laurent, 2010). The findings in the French perfume market show age-related differences in brand loyalty are likely to occur in multiple high-involvement categories, and are not confined to automobiles.

However, age-related differences in brand loyalty have not been detected for BPMs in studies of low-involvement purchase categories (see Table I). While research confirms the presence of age-related differences in the *frequency* with which consumers purchase low-involvement categories, the *brand loyalty* patterns within such categories typically do not differ across age groups (Uncles and Ehrenberg, 1990, Singh *et al.*, 2012, Uncles and Lee, 2006, Yang *et al.*, 2005).

Table I: Relevant studies of age-related loyalty

Authors	Categories	Age measures	Key finding
Lambert-Pandraud <i>et al.</i> (2005)	High-involvement Cars	Chronological age	Older car buyers considered fewer car brands and repurchased their previous car brand more often than younger car buyers.
Evanschitzky and Woisetschläger (2008)	Cars	Chronological, cognitive age, biological and sociological age	Chronologically older car buyers gather less information, consider fewer brands and are more brand loyal than younger car buyers. The alternative age measures do not outperform the explanatory power of chronological age.

Lambert-Pandraud and Laurent (2010)	Perfume	Chronological age	Older consumers are more likely to remain attached to older brands.
Uncles and Ehrenberg (1990)	Low-involvement Seven FMCG categories	Chronological age	Older consumers have smaller portfolio sizes, but this is likely caused by lower category buying rates.
Yang et al. (2005)	Eight FMCG categories	Chronological age	There are many similarities between older and younger consumers. Older consumers have smaller portfolio sizes in only two out of eight categories, and this is positively correlated to purchase frequency.
Uncles and Lee (2006)	Teabags, retail fuel, newspaper, and credit cards	Chronological age	Despite differences in purchase frequency and portfolio sizes, consistent loyalty patterns (double jeopardy) are found across age groups.
Singh <i>et al.</i> (2012)	Six FMCG categories	Chronological age	Older consumers have lower purchase rates and smaller portfolio sizes across most categories. However, consistent loyalty patterns (double jeopardy) are found across age groups.
Phua <i>et al.</i> (2020)	Six FMCG categories	Chronological age	Older consumers regularly buy new brands instead of regularly remaining loyal to older brands.

For example, Uncles and Ehrenberg (1990) discovered that the portfolio size (number of brands purchased) of older consumers is similar to younger consumers once adjusted for differences in category buying rates. Uncles and Lee (2006) and Singh *et al.* (2012) demonstrated that brand choice does not vary with age as leading brands (in terms of market share) are consistent across age groups. Additionally, these authors reveal similar Double Jeopardy patterns are present for each age group; that is, brands with smaller market shares have fewer buyers who tend to purchase the brand slightly less frequently. Double Jeopardy is a lawlike pattern reported across many product categories, countries, and time periods (Ehrenberg *et al.*, 1990, Wright *et al.*, 1998, Sharp, 2010), so the existence of consistent

Double Jeopardy patterns found across all age groups indicates each age-group continues to exhibit typical loyalty.

2.2 Measuring behavioural loyalty

Consumers are rarely solely loyal when making store and product choices, instead buying from a repertoire of brands over time (Banelis *et al.*, 2013, Dawes, 2008, Sharp *et al.*, 2002).

The portfolio or repertoire is an important BPM as it indicates the number of brands a consumer switches between over a specified time period (Banelis *et al.*, 2013, Dawes, 2008).

Other BPMs commonly obtained from panel data to measure performance in the presence of repertoire buying include market share, penetration, purchase frequency, share-of-category requirements and sole loyalty rates, with the latter three commonly reported as measures of brand loyalty (Ehrenberg *et al.*, 2004).

Analysis of BPMs reveal many lawlike patterns observable across a wide range of product and service categories, countries, and time periods, including the Double Jeopardy pattern mentioned above and used in some previous studies to examine loyalty across age groups (Uncles and Lee, 2006, Singh *et al.*, 2012). These lawlike patterns are consistently and accurately benchmarked through the application of the NBD-Dirichlet model of purchase incidence and brand choice (Goodhardt *et al.*, 1984). The NBD component models category purchase rate as a mixed gamma-poisson process, with individual poisson purchasing means being gamma distributed across the population of buyers. The Dirichlet (multivariate Beta) component models the distribution of brand choices, given that a category purchase is made, using the S parameter, calculated as the weighted mean of the sum of the parameters of the Beta distribution (α , β) for each brand.

The Dirichlet S parameter therefore represents the average consistency of choices (loyalty) across the whole category and population studied. This measure applies irrespective of the category purchase rate (NBD parameters) or particular brand (market share). The BPMs used in prior studies therefore do not provide a pure measure of loyalty, but instead represent the expression of underlying loyalty (S parameter) for a particular category purchase rate and particular set of market shares. Hence comparisons of BPMs are not true measures of differences in underlying loyalty as they may be confounded by any differences in category purchase rates and market shares between age groups. In contrast, comparisons between age groups using the S parameter directly as a measure of loyalty would not be subject to any such confounds.

The S parameter is nonetheless somewhat cumbersome. It ranges from zero to infinity, with a value of zero indicating individual brand choice is totally consistent and every buyer is 100% loyal to a single brand, and a value of infinity indicating that individual brand choice constantly changes with no consistency (loyalty) whatsoever. It is useful to transform S into the more intuitive measure φ , known as the *polarisation index*, as follows:

$$\varphi = \frac{1}{1 + S} \quad \text{where } 0 \leq \varphi \leq 1$$

In contrast to the S parameter, φ ranges from zero to one, and so is more easily interpretable. If φ is zero, there is zero loyalty (maximum brand switching), whereas if φ is one there is 100% loyalty (no brand switching at all) – hence the closeness of φ to one indicate the degree of *polarisation* of loyalty. As with S, φ is independent of category purchase rates and unaffected by brand share.

φ was first used to analyse television program loyalty by Sabavala and Morrison (1977) and nowadays is regularly used to measure loyalty in the wine industry (Jarvis and Goodman, 2005, Jarvis *et al.*, 2007, Krystallis and Chrysochou, 2010, Casini *et al.*, 2009, Corsi *et al.*, 2011). Studies have also measured φ in other FMCG categories, such as dairy products, cigarettes, soft drinks and healthy food (Krystallis and Chrysochou, 2011, Krystallis, 2013, Sjostrom *et al.*, 2014, Anesbury *et al.*, 2018). While φ is easily derived from the Dirichlet S parameter, it also represents a transformation of the Hendry model switching constant, the Bass correlation measure, and the parameters of the Beta distribution (Sabavala and Morrison, 1977) and so can be seen a more general expression of the probabilistic choices widely found in the study of buyer behaviour.

Should age-related loyalty be present, older age-segments would have a higher value of φ than younger age-segments. How this would translate into changes to observed BPMs is illustrated below by simulation, using the DIRICHLET program (Kearns, 2009) to generate theoretical BPMs for different values of φ for the average brand in one of the studied age groups (Table II). In this simulation only φ varies, and not category purchase rate or market share, to give an intuitive demonstration of how BPMs change with φ while confounding factors are held constant.

Table II: Relationship between φ , S and Dirichlet BPMs for toothpaste (under 40 year-olds)

Dirichlet BPMs for the average brand						
φ	S	Repeat buying (%)	Portfolio size	Purchase frequency	Sole loyalty (%)	
0.01	99.00	48	2.7	1.5	4	
0.10	9.00	55	2.5	1.7	5	
0.20	4.00	61	2.2	1.8	7	
0.30	2.33	66	2.0	2.1	11	
0.40	1.50	70	1.9	2.3	15	
0.50	1.00	74	1.7	2.5	21	

0.60	0.67	78	1.5	2.8	29
0.70	0.43	82	1.4	3.1	41
0.80	0.25	86	1.2	3.5	55
0.90	0.11	92	1.1	4.0	74
0.99	0.01	97	1.0	4.6	97

The simulation illustrates that increases in φ affect loyalty-related BPMs to varying degrees. Changes in repeat buying and portfolio size are rather consistent with a 0.1 increase in φ resulting in roughly a 5% increase in repeat buying and 0.1 - 0.2 reduction in portfolio size for the simulated data. In contrast, purchase frequency and sole loyalty increase exponentially. For example, as φ increases from 0.10 to 0.20 there are small changes in purchase frequency (+0.1) and sole loyalty (+2%); however, as φ increases from 0.80 to 0.90 there are larger changes in purchase frequency (+0.5) and sole loyalty (+19%).

Clearly the polarisation index φ has attractive properties as a measure of loyalty, being easily calculated from the parameters of the Dirichlet model, theoretically accurate as a measure of underlying loyalty, and unaffected by confounding influences from differing market shares and category purchase rates. The present study therefore adopts φ as the measure of loyalty.

2.3 Alternative age measures

Despite heavy use in consumer research, *chronological age* as a measure faces long-standing criticism due to heterogeneity in health and behaviour among older adults (Nelson and Dannefer, 1992). According to Moschis (2012), individuals age psychologically, biologically, and socially at different rates and stages throughout their lifetime, leading to substantial behavioural differences between older adults. Some therefore argue that chronological age is an ineffective determinant of purchase behaviour (Ahmad, 2002, Barak and Schiffman, 1981). A few researchers apply alternative age measures, such as cognitive,

sociological, and biological age (e.g. Evanschitzky and Woisetschläger, 2008), as well as life events (Mathur *et al.*, 2003, Mathur *et al.*, 2008, Eastman and Liu, 2012) to predict purchase behaviour. A more recent literature review by Zniva and Weitzl (2016) highlights that these alternative age measures are used infrequently and suggests future work consider alternative age measures. Details of each age measure are provided below.

- *Cognitive age* is a self-reported measure based on the age a person feels, looks, acts, and their perceived interests (Barak and Schiffman, 1981) with most adults reporting they feel younger than their chronological age (Mathur and Moschis, 2005).

Marketers have occasionally applied cognitive age as an alternative to chronological age in predicting consumer behaviour (Mathur and Moschis, 2005, Szmigin and Carrigan, 2000, Evanschitzky and Woisetschläger, 2008, Teller *et al.*, 2013). In particular, Evanschitzky and Woisetschläger (2008) found cognitive age has a positive influence on brand loyalty. However, cognitive age may not provide better predictive power than chronological age as they are highly correlated (Evanschitzky and Woisetschläger, 2008).

- *Biological age* reflects declines in physiological abilities over time due to accumulated damage to the cells and tissues within the body (Moschis, 2012, Adams and White, 2004). Biological changes in later life can involve declines in hearing and vision, and onset of chronic conditions and diseases, and is regularly measured through self-reported health status (Zniva and Weitzl, 2016). For example, Evanschitzky and Woisetschläger (2008) measured biological age using self-reported responses on difficulties in mobility; however, they found biological age did not have a significant impact brand loyalty in the automobile category. An alternative method is to measure biological age through objective reports of health status (Zniva and

Weitzl, 2016) such as lengthy hospitalization or rehabilitation, hearing impairment, assistance in day-to-day living, diagnosis of a chronic condition or long-term illness, and eye issues (Mathur and Moschis (2005).

- *Sociological age* represents changes to the roles and relationships that adults experience later in life (Moschis, 2012) leading to reductions in social network size (Carstensen, 1992, Lang and Carstensen, 1994). Reductions in social network size result in less word-of-mouth and subsequently impact decision-making and purchase behaviour (East *et al.*, 2014). While marketers have rarely investigated the impact of *sociological age* on consumer behaviour (Zniva and Weitzl, 2016) it can be measured through the frequency and impact of social interactions (Evanschitzky and Woisetschläger (2008).
- *Life events* consist of expected (e.g. retirement, empty nest) and unexpected (e.g. death of a spouse, major accident) life-altering events associated with ageing (Moschis, 2012, Zniva and Weitzl, 2016). As adults experience such events they tend to shift into older age-related roles that also impact the psychological, biological, and sociological ageing dimensions (Zniva and Weitzl, 2016, Moschis, 2012). Studies by Mathur *et al.* (2003), Mathur *et al.* (2008) demonstrate that life events can cause stress and altered brand preferences. Other studies measure similar effects by examining how household lifecycle (HLC) affects loyalty patterns (e.g. Trinh *et al.*, 2014), as this efficiently captures many life events (e.g. Birth of children, empty nest, and retirement) and therefore presents a simplified measure for comparison against other age measures.

In summary, age-related differences in loyalty are limited to a small number of studies over the last 30 years with contradictory results. The lack of literature, potential confounding effects of category purchase rates and market shares on loyalty-related BPMs, and the unquestioning use of chronological age in the face of widespread criticism, all justify the need for further research.

3.0 Methodology

3.1 Data collection – online survey

Data were gathered from a cross-sectional online survey of the New Zealand public (n=1,862) with respondents recruited by a commercial panel provider. Respondent demographics were subject to quota selection to ensure the sample is broadly representative of the New Zealand population with respondents ranging between 18 and 96 years of age.

Respondents were questioned about their purchasing in three categories using the Juster scale, an eleven-point purchase probability scale that has multiple visual, verbal, and numeric cues. The scale was developed by the US Bureau of the Census (Juster, 1966) and has since been subject to many further applications and tests (e.g. Wright and MacRae, 2007, Day *et al.*, 1991, Gabor and Granger, 1972). It is a prospective, prompted, scale that seeks considered reports of underlying purchase propensities. The scale is therefore less subject than other methods to recall biases, such as telescoping of recalled events forward or backward in time, over-reporting from clumping of adjacent time periods together, or under-reporting due to memory decay. Meta-analysis demonstrates Juster estimates of demand are unbiased with relatively low dispersion for established products and services (Wright and MacRae, 2007), while comparison of Juster-based market statistics to corresponding panel

data shows them to be accurate as well as sufficient to estimate the Dirichlet model (Wright *et al.*, 2002).

Shopper panel data does not contain measures of cognitive, sociological, or biological age required for this study, so a survey is optimal for collecting data on these various age measures. The use of Wright *et al.*'s (2002) method for calculating BPMs from Juster-based inputs allows direct comparison of age measures and BPMs *for the same respondents*. The use of Juster-based inputs follows precedent as both Uncles and Lee (2006) and Singh *et al.* (2012) applied this method of data collection to study age-related loyalty. For formulas of the Juster-based estimators for BPMs, and for detailed empirical validation of these formulas, see Wright *et al.* (2002).

3.2 Product categories and behavioural loyalty measures

Three categories are investigated; toothpaste, fruit juice, and supermarket store choice. In each category, respondents are asked to provide Juster-based probabilities of purchase and most likely purchase frequencies for the five leading brands and 'any other' brands.

Supermarket patronage and fruit juice purchases are framed as likelihoods over a four-week period and toothpaste purchases are framed as likelihoods over a three-month period. The timeframes selected are based on the purchase incidence of each category and the recommendation by Uncles and Lee (2006) to measure purchase probabilities over slightly longer time periods. The toothpaste category is chosen as it was studied by Singh *et al.* (2012), while fruit juice and supermarket store choice provide an extension of prior work by using categories not yet investigated, and in the case of supermarkets also represent the first study of age-related loyalty in store choice.

The BPMs investigated are market share, brand penetration, and purchase frequency, all based on purchase occasions. Average portfolio size is also reported, calculated as the sum of all brand penetrations. While shopping data may be subject to debate over the most appropriate aggregation of pack sizes and purchase quantities, and differences between the buyer and the user, the approach taken here - to measure purchase occasions by the buyer - are standard in panel data analysis.

The common methods used to fit the Dirichlet model and deriving theoretical norms are from either individual panel data records using the BUYER software (Uncles, 1989), counts of purchase frequencies using maximum likelihood iteration in EXCEL (Rungie, 2003), or aggregate market statistics using the DIRICHLET software (Kearns, 2009). The DIRICHLET software is the most commonly applied in practice and is suitable for Juster-based estimates of BPMs. ‘Theoretical’ Dirichlet BPMs are therefore estimated using DIRICHLET from penetrations and average purchase frequencies for the overall category and for each brand, repeated for each age group. The Dirichlet S parameter, used to calculate φ , is obtained as described earlier from the Beta distribution estimated for each brand.

To determine whether Juster-based estimates derived for the Dirichlet model can accurately describe behaviour for each age group across the three categories and five age measures studied, the present study uses eight goodness-of-fit tests proposed by Driesener et al. (2017). Age groups that pass at least four out of eight tests are deemed appropriate for Dirichlet modelling (Driesener et al., 2017). Across 60 age groups examined, all met the minimum requirement with a large majority of groups passing 7 or 8 out of 8 tests. Therefore, all of the data in the present study is appropriate for Dirichlet modelling.

3.3 Selection of age groups and age measures

For *chronological age*, the present study adopts the three groupings used by Uncles and Lee (2006); 39 years and below, 40-59 years, and 60-74 years, as well as an additional 75 years and above age group used by Lambert-Pandraud *et al.* (2005) to represent “old-old” consumers. The inclusion of the “old-old” is in line with the recommendation by Cole *et al.* (2008) of adjusting the age categories as people live, work, and stay active longer nowadays.

Cognitive age is measured using a multi-dimensional scale developed by Barak and Schiffman (1981) that asks respondents to select the age group they ‘feel’, ‘look’, ‘act’, and perceive their ‘interests’ reflect. Each of the four dimensions are answered on an ordinal scale that includes ‘teens’, ‘twenties’, ‘thirties’, ‘forties’, ‘fifties’, ‘sixties’, ‘seventies’, ‘eighties’, and ‘nineties’.

Biological age is measured through Mathur and Moschis (2005) approach to recording experienced biological life events. Respondents indicate whether they have personally experienced lengthy hospitalisation or rehabilitation, hearing impairment, an eye problem that cannot be corrected with glasses, needed assistance in day-to-day living, or been diagnosed with a chronic condition or long-term illness. A summated 0-5 point age index is used to represent an individual’s biological age (Mathur and Moschis, 2005).

Sociological age is measured following the approach developed by Carstensen (1992) and subsequently amended by Evanschitzky and Woisetschläger (2008). Respondents report the degree of emotional closeness, satisfaction, and frequency of interactions they have with family members, friends, and colleagues on 7-point Likert scales (Evanschitzky and

Woisetschläger, 2008). Responses across the Likert scales are summed to provide sociological age.

Life events are measured using an adjusted version of Murphy and Staple's (1979) household lifecycle. Respondents are split into four categories based on their age, marital and parental status. 'Pre-family' includes respondents under 35 years old, either single, married or living with a partner, with no dependent children; 'family' includes respondents under 65 years old, married or living with a partner, with dependent children; 'post/no family' includes respondents 35 years and above, married or living with a partner, with no dependent children; and 'single elderly' includes respondents 65 years and above, single, separated, widowed, or divorced, with no dependent children. While the traditional HLC is becoming less relevant due to an increase in non-traditional households, such as single parent households (Wilkes, 1995), most respondents fall within the four HLC categories used. Respondents that do not fall within the four categories are removed from the HLC analysis due to insufficient group sample sizes – there are not enough of them to provide a meaningful analysis.

3.4 Analytical approach

The first task is a close replication to establish whether previous findings are replicable and whether they hold under slightly different conditions, as advised by Uncles and Kwok (2013). Accordingly, this first stage is to replicate work by Uncles and Lee (2006) and Singh *et al.* (2012) comparing BPMs obtained from the NBD-Dirichlet model using probabilistic Juster-scale estimators across chronological age groups (RQ1). Next, is a differentiated replication, as recommended by Uncles and Kwok (2013), applying the polarisation index φ to chronological age groups to assess whether controlling for category purchase rates and market shares leads to different conclusions about age-related loyalty (RQ2). Finally, analysis

of φ is extended to alternative age measures to determine which best captures the maximum variation in loyalty present for the different age groups (RQ3).

Studies of age-related effects are also potentially subject to confounding influences from cohort membership and the specific time period chosen (Jaspers and Pieters, 2014, Rentz and Reynolds, 1981, Yoon *et al.*, 2009). For example, loyalty found for people born in the 1950's could be due to age, but also cohort effects for 50's baby boomers or history effects related to the specific time period for which data is collected. The present design controls for history effects as the survey timing does not differ between age groups; however, it does not directly control for cohort effects. Cohort effects can nonetheless be ruled out as an explanation for loyalty differences as the key results from prior studies are found to hold across multiple time periods and countries.

4.0 Results

4.1 Differences in category purchasing across age groups (RQ1)

Table III reports category purchasing statistics by chronological age group. Penetration rates do not vary much for supermarket store choice, although there are differences across age groups for the toothpaste and fruit juice categories. Conversely, average category purchase frequency and portfolio size become progressively smaller across the age groups, in all three categories.

Table III: Category performance measures across chronological age groups

Age Groups	n	Category Penetration (%)	Ave. category purchase frequency	Average Portfolio Size
<i>Supermarkets (next 4 weeks)</i>				
<40 years	416	100	9.9	2.9
40-59 years	484	99	9.3	2.6
60-74 years	503	99	9.0	2.3
>74 years	494	99	8.6	2.2
Average		99	9.2	2.5
<i>Toothpaste (next 3 months)</i>				
<40 years	416	98	4.6	2.7
40-59 years	484	96	4.1	2.4
60-74 years	503	94	3.1	1.8
>74 years	494	90	2.9	1.7
Average		94	5.6	2.2
<i>Fruit Juice (next 4 weeks)</i>				
<40 years	416	88	5.6	2.9
40-59 years	484	83	4.5	2.6
60-74 years	503	66	3.1	2.1
>74 years	494	66	3.2	2.0
Average		76	4.1	2.4

The source of age-related differences in purchase frequency is unknown. One explanation is the reduction of household sizes across age groups in the sample (Uncles and Ehrenberg, 1990). The average household size varied from 3.4 persons for the under 40 year-olds to 3.0 persons for the 40-59 year-olds, 2.0 persons for the 60-74 year-olds, and finally 1.7 persons for the over 74 year-olds. Another possible reason is that older consumers have difficulty accessing supermarkets (Meneely *et al.*, 2009). Difficulty accessing retailers would affect supermarket patronage and subsequently the purchase frequency of products sold within the supermarkets.

Smaller portfolio sizes among older consumers indicate less brand switching and so could superficially be interpreted as evidence of age-related loyalty. However, a competing explanation can be found in lower category purchase frequencies among older consumers, as

research shows that portfolio size decreases as the category buying rate declines (Banelis *et al.*, 2013). As the older age groups buy from categories less frequently, there is less opportunity to switch brands, leading to smaller portfolios than found in younger age groups. Thus, patterns in portfolio size highlight the difficulties of disentangling purchase rate and loyalty effects, emphasising the need for a measure of loyalty that does not confound the two.

4.2 Differences in brand performance measures across age groups (RQ1)

The DIRICHLET program estimates the Dirichlet model from category penetration, category purchase rate, brand penetration and brand average purchase frequency. The fit of the model is typically assessed on the last two of these metrics. When examining brand performance measures, it is useful to first consider the overall fit of the Dirichlet model as well as the typical patterns of purchase loyalty present (Table IV). For each age group, fruit juice brands are listed in Juster-derived market share order with BPMs derived from the Juster scale (O) reported together with the corresponding theoretically predicted measures from DIRICHLET (T). BPMs are not reported here for supermarket choice and toothpaste to avoid repetition of similar results (see the Appendix for this data).

Table IV: NBD-Dirichlet fit to brand performance measures by chronological age (fruit juice)

Age groups	Brands ranked by market share	Market share	Brand		Ave. purchase frequency	
		(%) O	Penetration (%) O T		O	T
<i><40 years</i>	1st	30	62	63	2.4	2.4
	2nd	25	60	58	2.1	2.2
	3rd	20	50	51	2.0	1.9
	4th	10	26	33	1.9	1.5
	5th	9	32	30	1.4	1.5
	6th	5	21	19	1.1	1.3
	<i>Average</i>	17	42	42	1.8	1.8
<i>40-59 years</i>	1st	31	55	55	2.1	2.1
	2nd	28	52	53	2.0	2.0
	3rd	21	45	44	1.8	1.8
	4th	9	28	24	1.2	1.4
	5th	9	21	24	1.6	1.4
	6th	2	13	8	0.7	1.2
	<i>Average</i>	17	36	35	1.6	1.6
<i>60-74 years</i>	1st	33	38	39	1.8	1.7
	2nd	23	33	31	1.5	1.5
	3rd	16	27	23	1.2	1.4
	4th	15	15	23	2.1	1.4
	5th	11	19	17	1.1	1.3
	6th	2	6	4	0.8	1.1
	<i>Average</i>	17	23	23	1.4	1.4
<i>>74 years</i>	1st	35	40	41	1.9	1.8
	2nd	24	32	32	1.6	1.6
	3rd	16	26	24	1.3	1.4
	4th	12	17	20	1.5	1.4
	5th	12	14	19	1.8	1.4
	6th	1	5	3	0.6	1.1
	<i>Average</i>	17	22	23	1.4	1.5

Comparisons between observed and theoretical brand performance measures reveal Juster estimates strongly reflect theoretical expectations. The closeness of observed and theoretical penetration and purchase frequency values within each age group is consistent with findings in Australia and Japan by Uncles and Lee (2006) and Singh *et al.* (2012) respectively.

Further, a clear Double Jeopardy pattern exists in each age group as brands with high market

shares have a greater number of buyers (penetration) who purchase the brand slightly more often (purchase frequency) than brands with low market shares. The consistent presence of the Double Jeopardy pattern across each age group shows that older consumers have similar within-category loyalty patterns to younger consumers. This pattern also occurs in the supermarket and toothpaste categories (not shown). Overall, the results demonstrate that observed measures derived from the Juster scale fit the Dirichlet theoretical norms and that each age group displays typical Dirichlet-like purchase and loyalty patterns.

Differences in the proportion of consumers purchasing the average brand are observed across age groups. For example, the average fruit juice brand is purchased by 42% of consumers aged under 40 years old, 36% of 40-59 year-olds, 23% of 60-74 year-olds, and 22% of over 74 year-olds. These differences in brand penetration are reflective of the decrease in category purchase rate across age groups (Table III). In other words, a smaller proportion of older consumers (60 years and over) purchase fruit juice and this leads to a smaller proportion purchasing each brand. Age-related differences in category purchase rate similarly explain the decreasing purchase frequency across age groups for the average brand.

Turning to consider market leading brands, Table V displays the top six brands in market share order across each age group for the three categories. In each case, there is little change in the order across age groups. There are some exceptions, but these are minor; for example, PAK'nSAVE is ranked 2nd in terms of market share for the under 40 year-olds and 40-59 year-olds. However, it is ranked 3rd for the 60-74 year-olds and over 74 year-olds age, with New World holding greater market share among these older consumers. Minor differences in the fruit juice category are also reported with Just Juice ranked 1st for the two youngest age groups and 2nd for the two oldest age groups.

Table V: Leading brands across age groups for all categories

Brands ranked by market share	Age Groups			
	<40 years	40-59 years	60-74 years	>74 years
<i>Supermarkets (next 4 weeks)</i>				
1st	36% Countdown	36% Countdown	35% Countdown	37% Countdown
2nd	32% PAK'nSAVE	29% PAK'nSAVE	31% New World	32% New World
3rd	15% New World	22% New World	26% PAK'nSAVE	23% PAK'nSAVE
4th	7% Four Square	5% Four Square	5% Four Square	4% Other
5th	5% Other	5% Other	3% Other	3% Four Square
6th	5% SuperValue	1% SuperValue	1% SuperValue	2% SuperValue
<i>Toothpaste (next 3 months)</i>				
1st	44% Colgate	46% Colgate	45% Colgate	47% Colgate
2nd	16% Macleans	19% Macleans	21% Macleans	21% Macleans
3rd	15% Sensodyne	14% Sensodyne	17% Sensodyne	17% Sensodyne
4th	11% Oral-B	8% Red Seal	7% Other	6% Oral-B
5th	9% Red Seal	8% Oral-B	5% Red Seal	5% Red Seal
6th	5% Other	4% Other	5% Oral-B	4% Other
<i>Fruit Juice (next 4 weeks)</i>				
1st	30% Just Juice	31% Just Juice	33% Keri	35% Keri
2nd	25% Keri	28% Keri	23% Just Juice	24% Just Juice
3rd	20% Fresh Up	21% Fresh Up	16% Fresh Up	16% Fresh Up
4th	10% Other	9% McCoy	15% Other	12% McCoy
5th	9% McCoy	9% Other	11% McCoy	12% Other
6th	5% Thexton's	2% Thexton's	2% Thexton's	1% Thexton's

The similarity in market shares among leading brands between age groups is consistent with prior research on age-related loyalty. The result is expected given research shows that competing brands have similar customer profiles (Anesbury *et al.*, 2017, Kennedy and Ehrenberg, 2001, Hammond *et al.*, 1996). Each brand has a similar proportion of younger and older consumers, as do their competitors, so a brand with a high market share in one age group is expected to have a similar market share in the other age groups. Overall, the similarity of leading brand market shares across all age groups provides evidence of no major age-related differences in brand loyalty patterns.

4.3 Polarisation index (φ) across chronological age groups (RQ2)

The analysis so far indicates that while age-related purchase patterns are consistent across age groups, there is mixed evidence given age-related differences in portfolio size but no age-related differences to other patterns of loyalty. As noted earlier, differences in age-related loyalty could potentially be explained or indeed obscured as a function of the category buying rate and changes to the market share of individual brands. To overcome these potential confounds, Table VI reports ϕ across chronological age groups for the three categories. When interpreting the polarisation index, recall that ϕ values close to one indicate high loyalty and limited brand switching.

Table VI: Polarisation index (ϕ) across chronological age

Age Groups	n	Supermarkets	Toothpaste	Fruit Juice
<40 years	416	.21 (.02)	.03 (.02)	.03 (.01)
40-59 years	484	.24 (.02)	.06 (.02)	.04 (.02)
60-74 years	503	.36 (.02)	.14 (.03)	.03 (.03)
>74 years	494	.35 (.02)	.20 (.04)	.05 (.03)

Note: Standard errors in parenthesis, calculated from software provided by Rungie *et al.* (2005) with n = group sample size, q = category purchase frequency (rounded), u = average brand market share (17%), and ϕ as reported.

The results in Table VI reveal extremely clear patterns of age-related loyalty for the categories examined. Brand loyalty is low for all categories and age groups, as indicated by ϕ being less than 0.50 and close to zero in the case of fruit juice showing an absence of loyalty in this category. Low brand loyalty is expected as consumers tend to switch regularly between a portfolio of brands in low-involvement categories. Despite low loyalty, there are clear differences in ϕ across chronological age groups in the supermarket (0.21 to 0.35) and toothpaste (0.03 to 0.20) categories, while ϕ does not differ across age groups in the juice category. This indicates that older consumers are more loyal to supermarket and toothpaste brands than younger consumers even after controlling for category purchase rates and market shares.

The presence of age-related loyalty for low-involvement categories is confirmed for two out of the three categories investigated, and this includes the first reports in the literature on age-related loyalty for low-involvement products and store choice. Interestingly, using φ to control for different toothpaste purchase rates across age groups revealed differences in brand loyalty not previously detected by Singh *et al.* (2012) for toothpaste purchases in Japan. While differences in the toothpaste markets between Japan and New Zealand may exist, the results highlight the advantage of φ for detecting age-related differences in loyalty not captured by examining BPMs directly. Conversely, the difference in portfolio size shown in descriptive analysis of fruit juice is shown to be a function of category purchase rates and not a result of any differences in loyalty. No age-related differences are found for fruit juice; however, this can be accounted for by the absence of loyalty in that category. Before loyalty can differ, it must first be present.

4.4 Relationship between chronological age and alternative age measures (RQ3)

What about alternative age measures as explanations of age-related loyalty? Table VII shows chronological age (mean = 57.1) has a strong positive correlation ($r=.85$, $p<.01$) with cognitive age (mean = 51.6), suggesting that as consumers age chronologically their perceived age also increases, albeit lagged by five and half years. Similar relationships between chronological and cognitive age are found in previous studies (Wilkes, 1995, Mathur and Moschis, 2005). Not surprisingly, the HLC stage is also highly correlated with chronological age ($r=.84$, $p<.01$) as people typically pass through life stages as they age chronologically. Chronological age is also moderately positively correlated with biological age ($r=.31$, $p<.01$) and weakly positively correlated with sociological age ($r=.16$, $p<.01$),

demonstrating that people experience more biological life events and have fewer meaningful social interactions as they age.

Table VII: Correlation of age-related measures

	Chron. Age	Cog. Age	HLC Stage	Bio. Age	Soc. Age
Chron. Age	1				
Cog. Age	.849*	1			
HLC Stage	.841*	.731*	1		
Bio. Age	.309*	.359*	.300*	1	
Soc. Age	.160*	.186*	.222*	.171*	1

Note: *p<0.01

For ease of comparison with the chronological age groups reported earlier, each alternative age measure is also split into four groups for further analysis. Quartile groups are formed through box-and-whisker plots for cognitive and sociological age, while for biological and HLC measures groups were formed by combining sub-groups.

Table VIII reports the polarisation index across groups for each age measure, based on a separate estimation of the Dirichlet for each quartile group. The maximum difference reported in Table VIII highlights the variation in ϕ captured by each age measure – in effect the discriminatory ability of the measures. This discriminatory ability is generally low indicating age-related loyalty effects are modest.

Table VIII: Comparison of the polarisation index (φ) across age groups

Age Groups	n	Supermarkets	Toothpaste	Juice
<i>Chronological age</i>				
<40 years	416	.21 (.02)	.03 (.02)	.03 (.01)
40-59 years	484	.24 (.02)	.06 (.02)	.04 (.02)
60-74 years	503	.36 (.02)	.14 (.03)	.03 (.03)
>74 years	494	.35 (.02)	.20 (.04)	.05 (.03)
<i>Max difference</i>		.15	.18	.02
<i>Cognitive age</i>				
35 years and below	441	.19 (.02)	.02 (.02)	.02 (.02)
36 – 50 years	434	.30 (.02)	.09 (.03)	.05 (.02)
51 – 64 years	468	.36 (.02)	.12 (.03)	.04 (.03)
65 years and above	519	.37 (.02)	.19 (.03)	.04 (.03)
<i>Max difference</i>		.18	.16	0.03
<i>Household lifecycle</i>				
Pre-family	161	.21 (.03)	.03 (.03)	.03 (.02)
Family	412	.22 (.02)	.04 (.02)	.03 (.02)
Post/no Family	628	.35 (.02)	.16 (.04)	.03 (.02)
Single Elderly	266	.40 (.04)	.17 (.05)	.07 (.04)
<i>Max difference</i>		.19	.14	0.04
<i>Biological age</i>				
0	797	.26 (.02)	.06 (.02)	.03 (.02)
1	463	.30 (.02)	.08 (.03)	.03 (.02)
2	321	.33 (.03)	.13 (.03)	.04 (.03)
3+	281	.36 (.03)	.12 (.03)	.11 (.03)
<i>Max difference</i>		.09	.07	.08
<i>Social Age</i>				
Quartile 1 (youngest)	467	.25 (.02)	.10 (.02)	.03 (.02)
Quartile 2	493	.30 (.02)	.10 (.02)	.04 (.02)
Quartile 3	474	.33 (.02)	.10 (.03)	.04 (.03)
Quartile 4 (oldest)	428	.34 (.03)	.03 (.03)	.02 (.02)
<i>Max difference</i>		.10	.07	.01

Note: Number may vary from individual age groups due to rounding. Standard errors in parenthesis.

Although loyalty remains low for all categories and all age groups, these findings suggest that chronologically and cognitively older consumers, as well as those in later stages of the HLC have greater loyalty towards supermarket choice and toothpaste brands. In the case of juice, no age measures appear to detect any large differences in φ across age groups. This suggests that no ageing process affects loyalty for juice brands as loyalty in this area remains very low.

Further examination of the performance of alternative age-group measures describing age-related loyalty is therefore restricted to the supermarket and toothpaste categories.

Chronological age, cognitive age, and HLC exhibit similar variation in ϕ between age groups for both the supermarket category (0.15, 0.18, and 0.19 respectively) and toothpaste category (0.18, 0.16, 0.14 respectively). The consistency is not surprising given the strong correlation between these measures (Table VII). In contrast, biological age and sociological age exhibit lower variation in ϕ for both the supermarket category (0.09 and 0.10 respectively) and toothpaste category (0.07 and 0.07 respectively).

Thus, chronological and cognitive age, as well as HLC are the best discriminators of age-related loyalty patterns, while biological and sociological age are the worst. Interestingly, despite the literature suggesting that chronological age is an unsophisticated age measure, no alternative age measures appear to provide better discrimination of age-related loyalty patterns. As no age measure detects age-related loyalty for juice, the findings further suggest that age-related loyalty may be category specific, even within low-involvement categories.

5.0 Discussion and implications

5.1 Discussion

The present research extends studies by Uncles and Lee (2006) and Singh *et al.* (2012) that cast doubt on the impact of chronological age on brand loyalty. Extensions to these studies are made in two important ways. First, through application of the polarisation index as a loyalty measure independent of category purchase rates and market shares (RQ2). Second, through examination of whether alternative age measures (cognitive age, biological age,

sociological age, and HLC) are any better as discriminators of loyalty differences than is chronological age (RQ3).

To ensure differences in results were not due to differences in method, the analysis first confirmed that the original findings of Uncles and Lee (2006) and Singh *et al.* (2012) could be reproduced using the same methods (RQ1). This allowed demonstration of the presence of age-related differences in category purchase patterns and brand performance measures in the current data, as well as similarity in Double Jeopardy patterns and consistency in leading brands across the four chronological age groups. The similarity of results across widely separate countries and time periods also allows the exclusion of cohort and period effects as an explanation of the results. Nonetheless, as with prior studies, age-related differences in category purchase rates and variations in market share could not be ruled out as explanations of the observed differences in brand performance measures.

However, use of the polarisation index (φ) to address the potential confounding influences revealed that older consumers *are* more loyal than younger consumers in the supermarket and toothpaste categories, even though overall levels of loyalty were low. The result supports previous findings of age-related loyalty in high-involvement product categories (Lambert-Pandraud and Laurent, 2010, Lambert-Pandraud *et al.*, 2005), as well as making several further novel contributions. First, it applies an approach to measuring age-related loyalty that is not confounded by differences in category purchase rates or market shares. Second, by applying this approach, it successfully identifies patterns of age-related brand loyalty that previous studies by Uncles and Lee (2006) and Singh *et al.* (2012) were unable to confirm. It is understandable that these prior studies failed to detect differing loyalty across age groups, as they had relied on descriptive measures such as portfolio size, purchase frequency and sole loyalty that are confounded by changes to category purchase rates and market shares. Third, it

extends research on age-related loyalty to store choice and highlights the generalisability of these findings beyond product choice. Fourth, it demonstrates that loyalty can vary considerably between categories.

Another substantial contribution of the present research is the assessment of the relative discriminatory ability of chronological age in identifying age-related loyalty patterns. The results for chronological age are similar to both cognitive age and HLC, whereas biological and sociological age are less effective at capturing age-related differences in loyalty. The poor performance of biological and sociological age suggests that changes in the ability to process information, or gather WOM, do not greatly impact age-related loyalty in low-involvement categories. Further, no alternative age measure performs better at predicting age-related loyalty to merit a major overhaul of age measurement. Therefore, the present research indicates there is no need to develop and adopt more sophisticated age measures when predicting differences in loyalty. Chronological age is sufficient and in the absence of further evidence there is no reason to think that cognitive age and HLC capture any other constructs than those represented by chronological age.

5.2 Implications

As age-related loyalty differences are confirmed for two low-involvement categories, while the third category shows no loyalty for any age group, the basic result of age-related loyalty is more general than previously thought and so bears greater examination. The apparent previous disconfirmation of age-related differences in loyalty extending from high-involvement categories to low-involvement categories has now been partially reversed. Greater knowledge of loyalty patterns is now needed across a range of other categories to determine how widely these findings hold, and what natural variation in loyalty exists

between categories. Further, as chronological age captures age-related loyalty differences as well as any other age measure, it is sufficient for academics and practitioners to rely solely on chronological age when attempting to predict differences in loyalty (although cognitive age and household life cycle are acceptable substitutes). In contrast, the present results rule out biological or sociological age as superior explanations of age-related loyalty.

From a methodological perspective, a further contribution is the identification of an improved method to measure age-related loyalty. Applying the polarisation index across age groups avoids confounds from market share and category purchase rate effects. The methodology carried out in the present study should therefore be adopted in future studies in other categories and countries.

A managerial implication is that advertisers and marketing practitioners should not ignore the mature market as older consumers still purchase from a wide portfolio of brands. The evidence of older consumers regularly switching between multiple brands runs counter to negative stereotypes that older consumers are already highly loyal to well-established brands (Yoon and Cole, 2008). Instead, the research provides encouragement to actively market new products and brands towards the mature market. The presence of age-related loyalty offers some reward for marketing efforts, while the low overall level of loyalty indicates that older consumers can still be induced to include other brands in their portfolio. Practitioners must gain a clear understanding of age-related loyalty in the industry in which they operate to ensure they develop effective strategies to target their customer base. Companies can use this knowledge to form realistic expectations for entering the portfolio of older consumers and growing market share among this segment.

6.0 Limitations and future research

This research addresses calls for further investigation of age-related loyalty patterns, and whether alternative age measures are more accurate at predicting these patterns. It does so by investigating age-related loyalty in three low-involvement categories. The results demonstrate that age-related loyalty should be measured using chronological age and φ . Without the resolution of methodological issues provided by the present study, future research would remain ineffective.

Research can now apply this methodological blueprint to larger panel data sets. Doing so will improve the generalisability of these results and allow for analysis across more age brackets as large sample sizes are needed for the analysis of φ . Further work should consider applying the polarisation index to other categories, not just low-involvement categories as noted earlier, but also high-involvement categories as the present research found cross-category differences in age-related loyalty. Work should also be extended from physical products and store choice to services, as studies of age-related loyalty for service brands are lacking.

While the present research does not confirm the exact cause of age-related loyalty differences, the current study confirms the presence of these differences and allows some assessment of potential explanations. For example, the use of φ ruled out differing purchase rates through the HLC as an explanation for age-related loyalty, as consistent differences were found for multiple measures and most of all for chronological age. Perhaps HLC has a secondary effect, through reduced demand for variety, hence leading to more brand loyalty? This hypothesis, although appealing, does not account for differing loyalty in the supermarket category or the lack of loyalty in the juice category. Similarly, while reduced cognitive capability might be thought to account for age related loyalty, this is inconsistent with the

perception of cognitive age as being lower than chronological age, and with the finding that sociological and biological age have smaller effects on age-related loyalty than chronological age. Perhaps experience, or inertia, is the common factor at play? Clearly, there are opportunities for more research into the precise mechanisms underlying age-related loyalty.

The HLC measure used in the research represents a traditional route with respondents placed into four groups based on their age, marital and parental status. While the traditional HLC is becoming less relevant due to an increase in non-traditional households, such as single parent households (Wilkes, 1995), most respondents fall within the four HLC categories used.

Respondents that do not fall within the four categories are removed from the HLC analysis due to insufficient group sample sizes – there are not enough of them to provide a meaningful analysis. While the four groups capture the overwhelming majority of respondents, follow a linear progression, and successfully discriminate between different levels of loyalty, there is certainly an increase in non-traditional households that fall outside of these groups.

Subsequently, future research may want to consider how loyalty patterns differ across a wider range of HLC groups.

The present study uses a cross-sectional survey design. Age-related differences may in theory be confounded by cohort effects; however, the consistency in results across multiple time period and countries (RQ1) rules out cohort effects as the explanation for the patterns of age-related loyalty observed. Nonetheless, another area for future research is to track how loyalty does change longitudinally as the same group of consumers age. This would require extensive (multi-year) longitudinal data that is not subject to too much panel attrition. Such data is challenging if not impossible to obtain from consumer panels, however, it may be available in specialist areas such as pharmaceutical prescribing or public health cohort studies.

A final avenue for future research is to explore where in the sales funnel age-related differences occur. The current study demonstrates that older consumers are more loyal and have smaller portfolios of brands, and so switch between fewer supermarket and toothpaste brands than younger consumers. However, it is not clear whether older consumers have smaller portfolios of brands because they also have smaller awareness and consideration sets. If age-related differences are occurring at an awareness level, this will indicate underlying reasons why older consumers are more brand loyal in certain categories, and provide implications for practice. Investigating the impact of age on awareness and consideration sets will therefore highlight the relative importance of building mental availability among older consumers.

7.0 Conclusion

This research offers fresh insights into the value of the mature segment. Contrary to previous studies, these findings provide evidence that in low-involvement categories, minor differences in brand loyalty across age groups exist. However, these differences are minor and older adults still regularly switch between a repertoire of brands. Older adults therefore can be persuaded to change brands and should not be disregarded in marketing communications.

A noteworthy contribution of the study is that by applying the polarisation index (φ) the influence of category purchase rates and market shares was controlled and exposed small differences in age-related loyalty not seen in previous research. The results also validated the use of chronological age as an appropriate ageing measure for loyalty studies. If applied in brand performance evaluations these two measures, the polarisation index (φ) and

chronological age can provide marketing managers with more confidence in their assessment of loyalty among older adults and subsequent marketing strategies.

8.0 References

- Adams, J. M. and White, M. (2004), "Biological ageing: a fundamental, biological link between socio-economic status and health?", *The European Journal of Public Health*, Vol. 14 No. 3, pp. 331-334. <https://doi.org/10.1093/eurpub/14.3.331>
- Ahmad, R. (2002), "The older or ageing consumers in the UK: are they really that different?", *International Journal of Market Research*, Vol. 44 No. 3, pp. 337-360. <https://doi.org/10.1177/147078530204400305>
- Anesbury, Z., Nguyen, Y. and Bogomolova, S. (2018), "Getting a "sweet" deal: does healthfulness of a sub-brand influence consumer loyalty?", *European Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 52 No. 9/10, pp. 1802-1826. <https://doi.org/10.1108/ejm-04-2017-0285>
- Anesbury, Z., Winchester, M. and Kennedy, R. (2017), "Brand user profiles seldom change and seldom differ", *Marketing Letters*, Vol. 28 No. 4, pp. 523-535. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11002-017-9437-2>
- Anesbury, Z. W., Bellman, S., Driesener, C., Page, B. and Sharp, B. (2021), "Ageism Kills Brands", *Australasian Marketing Journal*, pp. 1-7. <https://doi.org/10.1177/18393349211017316>
- Banelis, M., Riebe, E. and Rungie, C. M. (2013), "Empirical evidence of repertoire size", *Australasian Marketing Journal*, Vol. 21 No. 1, pp. 59-65. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ausmj.2012.11.001>
- Barak, B. and Schiffman, L. G. (1981), "Cognitive age: A nonchronological age variable", *ACR North American Advances*, Vol. 8, pp. 602-606.
- Carstensen, L. L. (1992), "Social and emotional patterns in adulthood: support for socioemotional selectivity theory", *Psychology and Aging*, Vol. 7 No. 3, pp. 331-338. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0882-7974.7.3.331>
- Casini, L., Rungie, C. and Corsi, A. M. (2009), "How loyal are Italian consumers to wine attributes?", *Journal of Wine Research*, Vol. 20 No. 2, pp. 125-142. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09571260903169522>
- Cole, C., Laurent, G., Drolet, A., Ebert, J., Gutches, A., Lambert-Pandraud, R., Mullet, E., Norton, M. I. and Peters, E. (2008), "Decision making and brand choice by older consumers", *Marketing Letters*, Vol. 19 No. 3-4, pp. 355-365. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11002-008-9058-x>
- Corsi, A. M., Rungie, C. and Casini, L. (2011), "Is the polarization index a valid measure of loyalty for evaluating changes over time?", *Journal of Product & Brand Management*, Vol. 20 No. 2, pp. 111-120. <https://doi.org/10.1108/10610421111121107>
- Dawes, J. (2008), "Regularities in buyer behaviour and brand performance: The case of Australian beer", *Journal of Brand Management*, Vol. 15 No. 3, pp. 198-208. <https://doi.org/10.1057/palgrave.bm.2550099>
- Day, D., Gan, B., Gendall, P. and Esslemont, D. (1991), "Predicting purchase behaviour", *Marketing Bulletin*, Vol. 2 No. 5, pp. 18-30.
- East, R., Uncles, M. D. and Lomax, W. (2014), "Hear nothing, do nothing: The role of word of mouth in the decision-making of older consumers", *Journal of Marketing Management*, Vol. 30 No. 7-8, pp. 786-801. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0267257x.2013.841275>
- Eastman, J. K. and Liu, J. (2012), "The impact of generational cohorts on status consumption: an exploratory look at generational cohort and demographics on status

- consumption", *Journal of Consumer Marketing*, Vol. 29 No. 2, pp. 93-102.
<https://doi.org/10.1108/07363761211206348>
- Ehrenberg, A. S., Goodhardt, G. J. and Barwise, T. P. (1990), "Double jeopardy revisited", *Journal of marketing*, Vol. 54 No. 3, pp. 82-91. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1251818>
- Ehrenberg, A. S., Uncles, M. D. and Goodhardt, G. J. (2004), "Understanding brand performance measures: using Dirichlet benchmarks", *Journal of Business Research*, Vol. 57 No. 12, pp. 1307-1325. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2002.11.001>
- Epsilon. (2019), "Age matters: A guide to cross-generation marketing", available at: <https://us.epsilon.com/resources/cross-generational-marketing> (accessed 19 September 2020).
- Evanschitzky, H. and Woisetschläger, D. (2008), "Too old to choose? The effects of age and age related constructs on consumer decision making", *Advances in Consumer Research*, Vol. 35, pp. 630-636.
- Gabor, A. and Granger, C. (1972), "Ownership and acquisition of consumer durables: Report on the Nottingham consumer durables project", *European Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 6 No. 4, pp. 234-248. <https://doi.org/10.1108/eum000000005145>
- Goodhardt, G. J., Ehrenberg, A. S. and Chatfield, C. (1984), "The Dirichlet: A comprehensive model of buying behaviour", *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society. Series A (General)*, pp. 621-655. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2981696>
- Hammond, K., Ehrenberg, A. S. and Goodhardt, G. J. (1996), "Market segmentation for competitive brands", *European Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 30 No. 12, pp. 39-49. <https://doi.org/10.1108/03090569610153291>
- Jarvis, W. and Goodman, S. (2005), "Effective marketing of small brands: niche positions, attribute loyalty and direct marketing", *Journal of Product and Brand Management*, Vol. 14 No. 5, pp. 292-299. <https://doi.org/10.1108/10610420510616322>
- Jarvis, W., Rungie, C. and Lockshin, L. (2007), "Revealed preference analysis of red wine attributes using polarisation", *International Journal of Wine business research*, Vol. 19 No. 2, pp. 127-138. <https://doi.org/10.1108/17511060710758687>
- Jaspers, E. and Pieters, R. (2014), "The Age of Materialism: Age, Period, & Cohort Effects Across the Life Cycle", *ACR North American Advances*, Vol. 42, pp. 106-112.
- Juster, F. T. (1966), "Consumer buying intentions and purchase probability: An experiment in survey design", *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, Vol. 61 No. 315, pp. 658-696. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01621459.1966.10480897>
- Kearns, Z. (2009), "Dirichlet no solver software", *Massey University, New Zealand*.
- Kennedy, R. and Ehrenberg, A. (2001), "There is no brand segmentation", *Marketing Research*, Vol. 13 No. 1, pp. 4-7.
- Krystallis, A. (2013), "Uncovering attribute-based determinants of loyalty in cigarette brands", *Journal of Product & Brand Management*, Vol. 22 No. 2, pp. 104-117. <https://doi.org/10.1108/10610421311320988>
- Krystallis, A. and Chrysochou, P. (2010), "An exploration of loyalty determinants in Greek wine varieties", *EuroMed Journal of Business*, Vol. 5 No. 2, pp. 124-137. <https://doi.org/10.1108/14502191011065473>
- Krystallis, A. and Chrysochou, P. (2011), "Health claims as communication tools that enhance brand loyalty: The case of low-fat claims within the dairy food category", *Journal of Marketing Communications*, Vol. 17 No. 3, pp. 213-228. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13527260903432836>

- Lambert-Pandraud, R. and Laurent, G. (2010), "Why do older consumers buy older brands? The role of attachment and declining innovativeness", *Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 74 No. 5, pp. 104-121. <https://doi.org/10.1509/jmkg.74.5.104>
- Lambert-Pandraud, R., Laurent, G. and Lapersonne, E. (2005), "Repeat purchasing of new automobiles by older consumers: empirical evidence and interpretations", *Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 69 No. 2, pp. 97-113. <https://doi.org/10.1509/jmkg.69.2.97.60757>
- Lang, F. R. and Carstensen, L. L. (1994), "Close emotional relationships in late life: Further support for proactive aging in the social domain", *Psychology and aging*, Vol. 9 No. 2, pp. 315-324. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0882-7974.9.2.315>
- Maddox, R. N., Gronhaug, K., Homans, R. E. and May, F. E. (1978), "Correlates of information gathering and evoked set size for new automobile purchasers in Norway and the US", *NA-Advances in Consumer Research*, Vol. 5, pp. 167-170.
- Mathur, A. and Moschis, G. P. (2005), "Antecedents of cognitive age: A replication and extension", *Psychology & Marketing*, Vol. 22 No. 12, pp. 969-994. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1002/mar.20094>
- Mathur, A., Moschis, G. P. and Lee, E. (2003), "Life events and brand preference changes", *Journal of Consumer Behaviour*, Vol. 3 No. 2, pp. 129-141. <https://doi.org/10.1002/cb.128>
- Mathur, A., Moschis, G. P. and Lee, E. (2008), "A longitudinal study of the effects of life status changes on changes in consumer preferences", *Journal of the Academy of Marketing science*, Vol. 36 No. 2, pp. 234-246. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11747-007-0021-9>
- Meneely, L., Burns, A. and Strugnell, C. (2009), "Age associated changes in older consumers retail behaviour", *International Journal of Retail & Distribution Management*, Vol. 37 No. 12, pp. 1041-1056. <https://doi.org/10.1108/09590550911005010>
- Moschis, G. P. (2003), "Marketing to older adults: an updated overview of present knowledge and practice", *Journal of Consumer Marketing*, Vol. 20 No. 6, pp. 516-525. <https://doi.org/10.1108/07363760310499093>
- Moschis, G. P. (2012), "Consumer behavior in later life: Current knowledge, issues, and new directions for research", *Psychology & Marketing*, Vol. 29 No. 2, pp. 57-75. <https://doi.org/10.1002/mar.20504>
- Murphy, P. E. and Staples, W. A. (1979), "A modernized family life cycle", *Journal of Consumer Research*, Vol. 6 No. 1, pp. 12-22. <https://doi.org/10.1086/208744>
- Nelson, E. A. and Dannefer, D. (1992), "Aged heterogeneity: Fact or fiction? The fate of diversity in gerontological research", *The Gerontologist*, Vol. 32 No. 1, pp. 17-23. <https://doi.org/10.1093/geront/32.1.17>
- Phua, P., Kennedy, R., Trinh, G., Page, B. and Hartnett, N. (2020), "Examining older consumers' loyalty towards older brands in grocery retailing", *Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services*, Vol. 52, pp. 1-7. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jretconser.2019.101893>
- Rentz, J. O. and Reynolds, F. D. (1981), "Separating age, cohort and period effects in consumer behavior", *ACR North American Advances*, Vol. 8, pp. 596-601.
- Rungie, C. (2003), "How to estimate the parameters of the Dirichlet model using likelihood theory in Excel", *Marketing Bulletin*, Vol. 14 No. 3, pp. 1-9.
- Rungie, C., Brown, B., Laurent, G. and Rudrapatna, S. (2005), "A standard error estimator for the polarization index: assessing the measurement error in one approach to the analysis of loyalty", *Marketing Bulletin*, Vol. 16 No. 2, pp. 1-11.

- Sabavala, D. J. and Morrison, D. G. (1977), "A model of TV show loyalty", *Journal of Advertising Research*, Vol. 17 No. 6, pp. 35-43.
- Sharp, B. (2010), *How brands grow. What marketers don't know*, Oxford University Press.
- Sharp, B., Wright, M. and Goodhardt, G. (2002), "Purchase loyalty is polarised into either repertoire or subscription patterns", *Australasian Marketing Journal*, Vol. 10 No. 3, pp. 7-20. [https://doi.org/10.1016/s1441-3582\(02\)70155-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/s1441-3582(02)70155-9)
- Singh, J., Riley, F., Hand, C. and Maeda, M. (2012), "Measuring brand choice in the older customer segment in Japan", *International Journal of Market Research*, Vol. 54 No. 3, pp. 347-368. <https://doi.org/10.2501/ijmr-54-3-347-368>
- Sjostrom, T., Corsi, A. M., Driesener, C. and Chrysochou, P. (2014), "Are food brands that carry light claims different?", *Journal of Brand Management*, Vol. 21 No. 4, pp. 325-341. <https://doi.org/10.1057/bm.2014.10>
- Szmigin, I. and Carrigan, M. (2000), "The older consumer as innovator: does cognitive age hold the key?", *Journal of Marketing Management*, Vol. 16 No. 5, pp. 505-527. <https://doi.org/10.1362/026725700785046038>
- Teller, C., Gittenberger, E. and Schnedlitz, P. (2013), "Cognitive age and grocery-store patronage by elderly shoppers", *Journal of Marketing Management*, Vol. 29 No. 3-4, pp. 317-337. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0267257x.2013.766627>
- The American Association of Retired Persons. (2019), "Media Image Landscape: Age Representation in Online Images", available at: https://www.aarp.org/content/dam/aarp/research/surveys_statistics/life-leisure/2019/age-representation-in-online-media-images.doi.10.26419-2Fres.00339.001.pdf (accessed 22 May 2020).
- Thompson, N. J. and Thompson, K. E. (2009), "Can marketing practice keep up with Europe's ageing population?", *European Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 43 No. 11/12, pp. 1281-1288. <https://doi.org/10.1108/03090560910989885>
- Trinh, G., Wright, M. and Stern, P. (2014), "The Relationship between Household Lifecycle and Brand Loyalty", *Advances in Consumer Research*, Vol. 42, pp. 387-391. <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.1842083>
- Uncles, M. and Ehrenberg, A. S. (1990), "Brand choice among older consumers", *Journal of Advertising research*, Vol. 30 No. 4, pp. 19-22.
- Uncles, M. and Lee, D. (2006), "Brand purchasing by older consumers: An investigation using the Juster scale and the Dirichlet model", *Marketing Letters*, Vol. 17 No. 1, pp. 17-29.
- Uncles, M. D. (1989), *Buyer: Buyer Behaviour Software: a Manual for Version 89.1*, London Business School.
- Uncles, M. D. and Kwok, S. (2013), "Designing research with in-built differentiated replication", *Journal of Business Research*, Vol. 66 No. 9, pp. 1398-1405. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2012.05.005>
- United Nations. (2015), "World population aging 2015", New York, available at: http://www.un.org/en/development/desa/population/publications/pdf/ageing/WPA2015_Report.pdf.
- Wilkes, R. E. (1995), "Household life-cycle stages, transitions, and product expenditures", *Journal of Consumer Research*, Vol. 22 No. 1, pp. 27-42. <https://doi.org/10.1086/209433>
- Wright, M. and MacRae, M. (2007), "Bias and variability in purchase intention scales", *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, Vol. 35 No. 4, pp. 617-624. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11747-007-0049-x>

- Wright, M., Sharp, A. and Sharp, B. (1998), "Are Australasian brands different?", *Journal of Product & Brand Management*, Vol. 7 No. 6, pp. 465-480.
<https://doi.org/10.1108/10610429810244648>
- Wright, M., Sharp, A. and Sharp, B. (2002), "Market statistics for the Dirichlet model: Using the Juster scale to replace panel data", *International Journal of Research in Marketing*, Vol. 19 No. 1, pp. 81-90. [https://doi.org/10.1016/s0167-8116\(02\)00049-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/s0167-8116(02)00049-6)
- Yang, Z., Zhou, N. and Chen, J. (2005), "Brand choice of older Chinese consumers", *Journal of International Consumer Marketing*, Vol. 17 No. 4, pp. 65-81.
https://doi.org/10.1300/j046v17n04_04
- Yoon, C. and Cole, C. A. (2008), "Aging and consumer behavior", in Haugtvedt, C. P., Herr, P.M. and Kardes, F.R. (Ed.) *Handbook of consumer psychology*, Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, New York, NY, pp. 247-270.
- Yoon, C., Cole, C. A. and Lee, M. P. (2009), "Consumer decision making and aging: Current knowledge and future directions", *Journal of Consumer Psychology*, Vol. 19 No. 1, pp. 2-16. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcps.2008.12.002>
- Zniva, R. and Weitzl, W. (2016), "It's not how old you are but how you are old: A review on aging and consumer behavior", *Management Review Quarterly*, Vol. 66 No. 4, pp. 267-297.

Appendix A: NBD-Dirichlet fit to brand performance measures by chronological age

(Supermarket store choice)

Age groups	Brands ranked by market share	Market share	Brand		Ave. purchase frequency	
		(%) O	Penetration (%) O T		O	T
<i><40 years</i>	1st	36	82	83	4.3	4.2
	2nd	32	76	80	4.2	4.0
	3rd	15	60	53	2.5	2.8
	4th	7	29	28	2.3	2.4
	5th	5	24	21	1.9	2.2
	6th	5	22	22	2.3	2.3
	<i>Average</i>	17	49	48	2.9	3.0
<i>40-59 years</i>	1st	36	79	80	4.2	4.2
	2nd	29	71	73	3.8	3.7
	3rd	22	57	63	3.6	3.3
	4th	5	21	21	2.3	2.3
	5th	5	17	21	2.9	2.3
	6th	1	13	6	1.0	2.2
	<i>Average</i>	17	43	44	3.0	3.0
<i>60-74 years</i>	1st	35	73	71	4.3	4.3
	2nd	31	65	67	4.2	4.1
	3rd	26	57	60	4.0	3.8
	4th	5	14	14	2.8	2.8
	5th	3	13	10	2.2	2.8
	6th	1	7	4	1.6	2.7
	<i>Average</i>	17	38	38	3.2	3.4
<i>>74 years</i>	1st	37	69	73	4.5	4.3
	2nd	32	55	68	5.0	4.0
	3rd	23	63	54	3.0	3.5
	4th	3	13	11	2.2	2.7
	5th	4	12	12	2.7	2.7
	6th	2	7	6	2.2	2.6
	<i>Average</i>	17	37	37	3.3	3.3

Appendix B: NBD-Dirichlet fit to brand performance measures by chronological age

(Toothpaste)

Age groups	Brands ranked by market share	Market share	Brand		Ave. purchase frequency	
		(%)	Penetration (%)		O	T
		O	O	T	O	T
<i><40 years</i>	1st	44	86	84	2.4	2.4
	2nd	16	48	48	1.5	1.5
	3rd	15	44	48	1.6	1.5
	4th	11	37	36	1.3	1.3
	5th	9	29	31	1.4	1.3
	6th	5	21	19	1.1	1.2
	<i>Average</i>		17	44	44	1.5
<i>40-59 years</i>	1st	46	78	79	2.3	2.3
	2nd	19	49	48	1.5	1.6
	3rd	14	36	38	1.5	1.4
	4th	8	24	24	1.3	1.3
	5th	8	27	23	1.1	1.3
	6th	4	14	14	1.2	1.2
	<i>Average</i>		17	38	38	1.5
<i>60-74 years</i>	1st	45%	66	68	2.0	1.9
	2nd	21%	42	41	1.5	1.5
	3rd	17%	30	33	1.6	1.4
	4th	7%	10	16	1.9	1.3
	5th	5%	12	12	1.3	1.3
	6th	5%	13	11	1.1	1.3
	<i>Average</i>		17%	29	30	1.6
<i>>74 years</i>	1st	47%	64	63	1.9	1.9
	2nd	21%	35	35	1.6	1.6
	3rd	17%	26	29	1.6	1.5
	4th	6%	11	11	1.3	1.4
	5th	5%	9	10	1.5	1.3
	6th	4%	7	8	1.4	1.3
	<i>Average</i>		17%	26	26	1.6