

Determinants of Commercial Performance in the Sector of Selective Distribution of Cosmetics Worldwide: Impact of the Nature and Age of the Retail Brand, and of the Number of Stores

Philippe Jourdan, Jean-Claude Pacitto
University of Paris (UPEC), Paris, France

The academic literature has focused more on the competitive performance of retail brands than on their commercial performance per se and its antecedents. Our research study examines the factors that impact commercial performance by addressing two questions: does the commercial performance of a cosmetic retail brand depend on the country in which it operates (where I am?) or does it depend on the nature of the circuit (who I am?). Finally, our explanatory model of the penetration and market share comprises four factors: the type of store, the geographical area, the percentage of stores owned by the brand, and the time elapsed since the launch of the brand. The choice of these factors is relevant as evidenced by the strong predictive validity and explanatory power of the model. The model reveals a significant effect of the factors and their interactions.

Keywords: commercial performance, market share, penetration, retailing, international marketing

While the function of distribution is mainly to market products to the greatest number of people, academic research has paradoxically paid little attention to the commercial performance of retail brands, and has focused mainly on their competitive (Vyt, 2006) or financial performance (Shi, Lim, Weitz, & France, 2018; Pekovic & Rolland, 2012). As Filser, Des Garets, and Paché (2012) have rightly pointed out “a buyer’s relationship with a retail outlet has long remained a minor issue for both practitioners and marketing researchers”. Our study focuses on retail brands’ commercial performance as measured via the market share. We choose here to examine the selective distribution of cosmetic products, because of the heterogeneity of distribution channels, of the brands sold, and of the universal nature of this market.

Our research goal is to investigate the factors that are likely to influence commercial performance in the context of an internationalization strategy. We seek to determine whether international commercial success in the cosmetics sector solely depends on the nature of the retail brand (who I am) or on the country in which it is established (where I am). In other words, is there a type of channel that performs better, regardless of the country of location, or, on the contrary, is success contingent upon the country of location, the type of store, and of course, upon their interaction.

Acknowledgements: This research has been made possible from an operational perspective thanks to the generous support of Valérie Jourdan, CEO of Promise Consulting, along with her team. The authors express the gratefulness to her (them).

Philippe Jourdan, Ph. D., associate professor, University of Paris (UPEC), Paris, France.

Jean-Claude Pacitto, Ph. D., assistant professor, University of Paris (UPEC), Paris, France.

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Philippe Jourdan, 76-78 rue Saint Lazare, Paris 75009, France.

To answer this question, we have to control for—at least—the following factors: the percentage of stores owned by each brand—which reflects a retail brand's market coverage—and how long the brand has been in the country; indeed, this factor may explain why a brand has more notoriety, a better image, or a greater market share, and therefore is better established than other brands (Urban, Carter, Gaskin, & Mucha, 1986; Fershtman et al., 1990). Of course, the factors that we manipulate or control for are not exclusive of other factors that may influence commercial performance, but in this as yet little explored field, we think it appropriate to take one step at a time. Our results will certainly elicit comments, which will motivate further studies, and this is how research progresses.

Our choice to focus on cosmetic products (perfume, facial care and make-up products) must also be explained. Cosmetics can be classified in a kind of intermediate category between that of luxury goods and that of consumer goods; they are neither convenience goods nor shopping goods, and neither are they really specialty or luxury goods. They are in fact part of all three product categories. By the same token, it is difficult to offer this category of products in a single type of store, as Bucklin (1967) suggests in his now classic typology. Indeed, cosmetic products are sold in single-brand or multi-brand, specialist or generalist stores, and the range of distribution channels varies greatly from one geographic area to another. From this point of view and given the specificity of cosmetic products, selecting the two dimensions—location and the type of stores—as factors explaining commercial performance seemed to be the obvious choice.

As we know, abundant research has been conducted on the role of location ever since the publication of Huff's (1964) seminal work, which established a link between attractiveness and geographical proximity. However, we have chosen to base our study on the concept of internationalization rather than on that of location. As Dimitrova et al. (2018) have clearly shown, internationalization poses a risk for commercial performance in that it exposes a brand from a given country to other cultures, different market structures, consumption behaviours, etc. Success or failure, therefore, depends on a particularly large number of factors. Consequently, underestimating the implications of internationalization can have serious consequences and have long term undermining effects on retail brands that have not prepared sufficiently for it (Bianchi, 2011; Dawson, 2007; Leonidou, Katsikeas, Samiee, & Aykol, 2018).

The performance of each type of store is indicative of the relative importance, in commercial performance, of the attractiveness of a product and its brand, on the one hand, and that of the store brand on the other (Howard & Sheth, 1969; Howard, 1989; Lambrey, 1995), particularly in cases where the product is sold under the store brand (specialized stores selling their own product brand) or in the case of selective retail brands that have chosen to distribute exclusive brands (perfume stores/cosmetics retail chains). In the world of cosmetics, the choice to sell only certain product brands is particularly significant, and we know that this choice and commercial performance are linked (Porter, 1980). And, in this precise configuration, the measurement of commercial performance is problematic (Vyt, 2006), and raises the question of the choice of resources that must be created in priority, or even leveraged (Swoboda, Elsner, & Morschett, 2014).

Finally, the number of years a retail brand has been on the market cannot be ignored as it is likely to influence the brand's reputation and image, and, from a more strategic point of view, its ability to maintain its competitive advantage in the long term. Indeed, the number of years a brand has been in business is taken into account when one examines a brand's typicality (Amine & Pontier, 1999; Cliquet, Fady, & Basset, 2006), because it is one of the three factors, along with external appearance and the internal physical environment, of

typicality. The link between the number of years of existence and the commercial performance of a business is now well demonstrated (Coad, 2018; Coad, Holm, Kraft, & Quatraro, 2018). In particular, being perceived as a reference brand does have consequences on commercial performance, but how much so? Moreover, it can be assumed that the degree of preference for a store (Malhotra, 1983) is also influenced by the number of years it has been on the market, for example via the reputation it has built for itself, or the market share it has achieved (Tang & Tan, 2003).

The brand database we have used aggregates the information collected through over 28,000 questionnaires administered online to consumers who buy their cosmetics from selective stores, in 14 countries. The variable to be explained is the market share in sales volume for each brand in each country. Our first factor is the type of store (store brands) and has four modalities: department stores (multi-brand generalists), drugstores (multi-brand generalists), own-brand stores (single-brand specialists), and cosmetics stores (multi-brand specialists). In the multi-brand generalist category, we distinguish department stores from drugstores, because of their distinct positioning and offering in the market. Our second factor is geographic location and has six modalities, grouping countries together according to their geographic, sociological and cultural proximity: Western Europe (France, Spain, Italy, Portugal), Eastern Europe (Poland, Czech Republic, Romania), Southeast Europe (Greece, Turkey), North America (Canada), Central and South America (Brazil, Mexico), the Middle East (Saudi Arabia, United Arab Emirates). Two other factors are introduced into the analysis, because of their likely impact on market share: the percentage of stores owned by a brand modelled as the total number of stores owned by the brand divided by the total number of stores per country, all brands included; the number of years of existence calculated from the date of its creation or first launch in each country. Finally, the analysis of variance-covariance focuses on four factors: the type of store, the geographic location, the proportion of stores owned by a retail brand, and the number of years of existence on the market. The brands selected in each country account for at least 90% of the market shares in the selective cosmetics retail trade, except in Brazil (65%), where the door-to-door cosmetics sales segment is significant but is not considered in this study as it is considered non-selective. Two factors are measured with continuous variables (proportion of stores, number of years of existence), and two are measured with nominal variables (type of store, geographic location): the analysis of covariance (ANCOVA), a hybrid between linear regression and ANOVA, is the most suitable statistical treatment and the one we have used. We have 143 observations on 88 different retail brands: Thus, some retail brands are evaluated in several countries because they are present internationally. However, performing a repeated-measures ANCOVA is not justified insofar as the samples for each country are different from one another (furthermore, the franchised stores are legally independent, sometimes have a high degree of decision-making freedom in terms of marketing mix management, and their commercial performance is assessed according to the competitive environment specific to each country).

After comparing different nested models, the model below, which has a high explanatory power ($R^2 = 0.747$) while using a minimum number of variables (principle of parsimony), has been used to calculate the market share. It takes into account the proportion of stores, the variables “geographic location” and “type of store”, as well as the interactions between the geographic location and the type of store, and between the geographic location and the proportion of stores. The interaction between the number of years since the store was opened and the proportion of stores is also considered since the number of open stores is logically a function of the time elapsed since the first store was opened. On the other hand, the third-order interactions are

removed because they do not significantly increase the R^2 of the overall model. The final model for a given brand is formulated as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Market share}_i = & \rho + \tau * \text{proportion of doors}_i + \sum_j \beta_j \text{type of shop}_j + \sum_k a_k \text{Zone}_k \\ & + \sum_l \gamma_l \text{proportion of doors}_l * \text{time} + \sum_m \delta_m \text{proportion of doors}_i * \text{Zone}_m \\ & + \sum_{n,o} \theta_{n,o} \text{type of shop}_n * \text{Zone}_o + \varepsilon \end{aligned}$$

The above model helps to explain a large proportion of the variation in market share between the different retail brands versus the null model where the market share is equal to the average market share for all retail brands. The H_0 hypothesis is rejected with a very low probability (Fisher's $F = 12.810$; $p < 0.0001$). Table 1 below details the contribution of each variable and of their interaction to the quality of the model, by evaluating the impact of removing it from the model: the lower the probability F associated with the Fisher test, the stronger the impact of the variable on the quality of the model. At a threshold of 5%, the variables "proportion of stores", "type of store", "geographic location" and the interactions between the proportion of stores and the number of years of existence, between the proportion of stores and the geographic location and finally between the type of store and the geographic location are all significant. The market share of a retail brand is therefore determined primarily by its market coverage as reflected by the relative number of stores, the type of store and the geographic location, but also by the interactions between these variables. This finding gives a preliminary positive answer to the question raised in the title of our article: commercial performance, measured by market share (vol.), is influenced both by "where I am" and "who I am". Furthermore, while the variable related to the time elapsed since the first store was opened in a geographic zone, does not, on its own, have an impact, it does have an effect when in interaction with the variable "type of store" ($F = 4.541$; $p = 0.035$). Finally, the geographic location is an important determinant of market share, both by itself and in interaction with the percentage of stores owned by the brand and the type of store. Thus, market shares vary according to the type of store, the geographic location and the time elapsed since the first store was opened, which contradicts the idea of a global market governed by a single set of rules applicable to everyone, everywhere and at all times.

Table 1

Fisher's F-Test for Each Variable of the Market Share Model

Source	DF	Sum of the squares	Mean squares	F	Pr > F
Proportion of stores	1	0.107	0.107	30.648	< 0.0001
Type of stores	3	0.033	0.011	3.129	0.029
Geographic location	5	0.079	0.016	4.488	0.001
Proportion of stores * Time elapsed since first store opened	1	0.016	0.016	4.541	0.035
Proportion of stores * Geographic location	5	0.274	0.055	15.676	< 0.0001
Type of stores * Geographic location	11	0.073	0.007	1.895	0.047

What interpretation can be drawn from the final ANCOVA result? The values of the parameters for each variable in the model (and their interactions) are indicated in Annex 1. The t -test confirms that the coefficients are significantly different from zero, which leads to the rejection of hypothesis H_0 . Let us bear in mind that perfumeries and Western Europe are used as reference for the calculation of the coefficients (these parameters

are therefore set to 0) and that the value of the other coefficients must be interpreted in relation to this reference value.

Several conclusions can be drawn:

- The value of the constant term (3.9%) gives an indication of the average market share, independently of the effect of any other variable: it is low.
- The geographic location has an impact on the average market share, since all other things being equal, the latter is lower in South-Eastern Europe (Greece and Turkey) and Eastern Europe (Poland, Czech Republic, Romania) than in Western Europe (France, Spain, Italy, Portugal).
- The time elapsed since the first store was opened is not significantly correlated with market share. However, we found that the interaction between the variable “time elapsed since the first store was opened” and the relative “proportion of stores” has an impact on the market share (val. = 0.006; $p = 0.035$). In other words, the time elapsed since the first store was opened only has an effect on the market share if the brand utilizes this time to open a large number of new stores.
- *The proportion of stores alone* has no impact on market share. However, it does have a very significant effect when in interaction with the geographic location. Thus, in North America, South East Europe, and Eastern Europe, the higher the number of stores owned, the greater the market share. In reality, these three regions share the same characteristic: Department stores and drugstores’ historically high market share is now being challenged by more specialized brands, primarily perfumeries/cosmetics store chains and stores that sell their own brand, which are more recently established retail brands but are particularly dynamic organizations.
- Finally, with respect to the nature of the brand, the drugstore modality is the only one that has a significant impact: this impact is positive in Central and South America and Eastern Europe, whereas it is negative in North America (Canada) when the average market share of perfumeries/beauty chains are used as reference. In other words, in Canada, any type of retail brand—other than a drugstore—with the same number of stores has a higher share of the selective cosmetics retail market than drugstores do.

What does our explanatory model indicate about market share performance in the international cosmetics market? The ANCOVA model, which includes factors related to the brands’ time in existence, their number of stores, their geographic location, and their nature (as well as their interactions), has a strong explanatory power of their market share ($R^2 = 74.7\%$). In the world of cosmetics, a brand’s “time in existence” alone has no effect on commercial performance. This factor must be combined with a relatively high number of stores to have a positive effect on the brand’s market share. Only a long time of market presence coupled with a high proportion of sales outlets has a positive effect on market share. A dynamic of commercial success is therefore based primarily on the pace at which the brand opens new stores to secure good customer coverage in both small and large territories. Similarly, the number of outlets alone does not explain a brand’s international market share. Time in existence and geographic area must be considered. The number of stores is very often used as an indicator of a brand’s commercial development. And the impact of the number of stores on a given brand’s market share must be assessed in a specific geographic context. Finally, with respect to the nature of the store brand, “drugstores” is the only modality that has a significant effect on market share; it is positive in Central and South America and Eastern Europe and negative in North America: drugstore companies, which have historically been present in large numbers in North America appear, at first sight, to have larger shares of the market, but this is merely due to the fact that they have larger numbers of outlets than other types of retail brands. Finally, the nature of the brand combined with the geographic location proves to be an explanatory

factor of commercial performance, which allows us to answer positively the question raised in the title of our article: the commercial performance is, indeed, determined by “*where I am*” and “*who I am*” and by the interaction between these two variables. This broadens the scope of Arnold et al.’s findings (1978) regarding the food and clothing retail market.

Our study presents some limitations which further research should address. We have limited the scope of our study to retail brands in the selective cosmetics segment and it would be useful to consider the mass market channels (hypermarkets and supermarkets), as well as E-commerce, the duty-free or door-to-door retail segments. Other major markets also deserve to be studied: The United States in North America, and China, Japan, and Korea, in Asia, which we have not considered here. Finally, it would have been interesting to include in the model an estimate of the average sales area per brand. All these limitations are an invitation for further research, using the same approach and removing some of the constraints inherent in any research.

References

- Amine, A., & Pontier, S. (1999). Rôle de la typicalité dans le positionnement des enseignes. *Décisions Marketing*, 17, 7-15.
- Bianchi, C. (2011). The growth and international expansion of an emerging market retailer in Latin America. *Journal of Global Marketing*, 24(4), 357-379.
- Bucklin, L. P. (1967). *Postponement, speculation and the structure of distribution channels. The marketing channel: A conceptual view point*. Mollen B.E, John Wiley, NY 63-66.
- Cliquet, G., Fady, A., & Basset, G. (2006). *Management de la distribution* (2nd ed., p. 376). Dunod.
- Coad, A. (2020). Firm age: A survey. *Journal of Evolutionary Economics*, 28, 13-43.
- Coad, A., Holm, J. R., Kraft, J., & Quatraro, F. (2018). Firm age and performance. *Journal of Evolutionary Economics*, 28, 1-11.
- Dawson, J. A. (2007). Scoping and conceptualizing retailer internationalization. *Journal of Economic Geography*, 7(4), 373-397.
- Dimitrova, B. V., Rosenbloom, B., Andras, T. L., & Kim, S. (2018). Retail internationalization: A review and directions for future research. *Journal of Marketing Channels*, 1-2(25), 1-21.
- Filsler, M., Des Garest, V., & Pache, G. (2012). *La distribution: organisation et stratégie* (2nd ed., p. 394). EMS.
- Howard, J. (1989). *Consumer behavior in marketing strategy* (p. 375). Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs.
- Howard, J. A., & Sheth, J. N. (1969). *The theory of buyer behavior* (p. 458). John Wiley.
- Huff, D. L. (1964). Defining and estimating a trading area. *Journal of Marketing*, 28(3), 34-38.
- Lambrey, B. (1995). L’importance de l’enseigne dans le processus d’achat de vêtements et le comportement de fréquentation des points de vente. Association Française du Marketing: actes du congrès de l’AFM, Reims.
- Leonidou, L. C., Katsikeas, C. S., Samiee, S., & Aykol, B. (2018). International marketing research: A state-of-the-art review and the way forward. In L. Leonidou, C. Katsikeas, S. Samiee, & B. Aykol (Eds.), *Advances in global marketing*. Springer, Cham. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-61385-7_1
- Pekovic, S., & Rolland, S. (2012). L’impact de la relation client sur la performance des entreprises françaises: étude empirique des effets directs et modérateurs. *Recherche et Applications Marketing*, 27, 11-38.
- Porter, M. E. (1980). *Competitive strategy*. NY: The Free Press.
- Shi, Y., Lim, J. M., Weitz, B. A., & France, S. L. (2018). The impact of retail format diversification on retailers’ financial performance. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 46, 147-167.
- Swoboda, B., Elsner, S., & Morschett, D. (2014). Preferences and performance of international strategies in retail sectors: A empirical study. *Long Range Planning*, 47(6), 319-336.
- Thang, D. C. L., & Tan, B. L. B. (2003). Linking consumer perception to preference of retail stores: An empirical assessment of the multi-attributes of store image. *Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services*, 10(4), 193-200.
- Urban, G. L., Carter, T., Gaskin, S., & Mucha, Z. (1986). Market share rewards to pioneering brands: An empirical analysis and strategic implications. *Management Science*, 32(6), 645-659.
- Vyt, D. (2006). Mesure de la performance en grande distribution alimentaire. *Décisions Marketing*, 40, 51-56.

Appendix 1: Parameters of the ANCOVA Market Share Model

Source	Value	Standard dev.	t	Pr > t	Lower boundary (.95%)	Upper boundary (.95%)
Constant	.039	.014	2.787	.006	.011	.067
Proportion of stores	.189	.138	1.366	.175	-.085	.462
Type of stores						
Department stores	.029	.029	.975	.332	-.030	.087
Stores selling their own product brand	.027	.021	1.309	.193	-.014	.069
Perfumeries / beauty chains	.000	.000				
Drugstores	-.089	.049	-1.835	.069	-.185	.007
Geographic location						
Middle East	.013	.033	.406	.685	-.052	.079
Western Europe	.000	.000				
Central & South America	-.001	.030	-.043	.966	-.061	.058
North America	-.016	.044	-.357	.721	-.104	.072
Eastern Europe	-.053	.023	-2.353	.020	-.098	-.008
Southern East Europe	-.091	.033	-2.726	.007	-.156	-.025
Proportion of stores						
(...)*Time in existence	.006	.003	2.131	.035	.000	.011
Proportion of stores						
(...)*North America	1.700	.482	3.526	.001	.745	2.656
(...)*Southern East Europe	1.028	.202	5.084	<.0001	.627	1.428
(...)*Eastern Europe	.688	.154	4.455	<.0001	.382	.994
(...)*Middle East	.091	.215	.423	.673	-.335	.517
(...)*Western Europe	.000	.000				
(...)*Central & South America	-.139	.139	-.997	.321	-.414	.137
Type of stores - Department stores						
(...)*Southern East Europe	.041	.048	.850	.397	-.055	.137
(...)*Central & South America	.007	.046	.141	.888	-.085	.098
(...)*Eastern Europe	.000	.000				
(...)*Western Europe	.000	.000				
(...)*Middle East	-.029	.042	-.679	.499	-.113	.055
(...)*North America	-.083	.062	-1.329	.187	-.206	.041
Type of stores - Drugstores						
(...)*Central & South America	.155	.079	1.966	.052	-.001	.312
(...)*Eastern Europe	.119	.059	2.010	.047	.002	.235
(...)*Middle East	.000	.000				
(...)*Southern East Europe	.000	.000				
(...)*Western Europe	.000	.000				
(...)*North America	-.313	.138	-2.266	.025	-.587	-.039
Type of stores - Stores selling their own product brand						
(...)*Middle East	.017	.043	.406	.686	-.067	.102
(...)*Southern East Europe	.000	.000				
(...)*Western Europe	.000	.000				
(...)*Eastern Europe	-.001	.036	-.021	.983	-.072	.070
(...)*Central & South America	-.038	.039	-.967	.335	-.115	.040
(...)*North America	-.051	.058	-.871	.385	-.166	.065
Type of stores - Perfumeries / beauty chains						
(...)*Central & South America	.000	.000				
(...)*Eastern Europe	.000	.000				
(...)*Middle East	.000	.000				
(...)*North America	.000	.000				
(...)*Southern East Europe	.000	.000				
(...)*Western Europe	.000	.000				